

Guideline for Responding to Reviewers

This brief guideline is designed to assist you with writing a response letter to your reviewers. We encourage you to read through “Response to reviewers” by American Psychological Association (2019) and “Navigating the peer review process” by Strickland (2016) to further understand how you should attend to reviewers’ comments and suggestions. See the References section at the bottom of this page for links to both of these articles.

Be responsive and respectful

- a. Fully revise your manuscript and highlight the changes using [a text highlight color](#) before writing your response letter.
- b. In your response letter, copy each reviewer’s comments and suggestions point-by-point.
- c. Provide detailed explanations of how you addressed each point.
- d. Unless a reviewer’s recommendation dramatically decreases the quality of your work, you should make the suggested revision.
- e. Indicate the exact location (page number, paragraph, and/or line) where each revision was made. You may also choose to include the exact text from the revised manuscript within the response letter as you deem appropriate.
- f. If reviewers ask for information that is already included in the manuscript, ensure that the information is clearly stated, and indicate how this information was further emphasized—if you updated the information—in the revision.
- g. If a reviewer requests a revision that contradicts your understanding of a certain topic, and you chose *not* to make a suggested revision, provide a clear justification for why you chose not to make the revision. For example, you may include information that clarifies your understanding of the state of the literature, and explain why you feel the suggested revision would not be beneficial to the manuscript.
- h. Use kind and courteous language throughout your response letter. Show gratitude by thanking your reviewers for their suggestions and show respect when you wish to communicate disagreement.

Note

Educational Studies uses a double-blind peer review process. Make sure that you conceal your identity in the revised manuscript and response letter.

References

- American Psychological Association. (2019, September). *Response to reviewers*. Retrieved April 8, 2022, from <https://apastyle.apa.org/style-grammar-guidelines/research-publication/response-reviewers>
- Strickland, J. (2016, November). *Navigating the peer review process*. American Psychological Association. Retrieved April 8, 2022, from <https://www.apa.org/science/about/psa/2016/11/peer-review>

Sample Response Letter to Guarantor

Dear Professor XXXX (Name of your guarantor),

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to submit a revised draft of the manuscript “XXXXXXXXXX (Title of the manuscript)” for publication in *Educational Studies*. We appreciate the time and effort that you dedicated to providing feedback on our manuscript and are grateful for the insightful comments on our manuscript. We have incorporated most [or “all”] of your suggestions and highlighted the changes within the manuscript. Please see below, in blue, for a point-by-point response to your comments and concerns. All page numbers refer to the revised manuscript file.

*Use first person (I, my, me), if you are a single author.

Guarantor’s Comments to the Authors:

- [Paste the full comment] General positive comment

Response: Thank you.

- [Paste the full comment] Suggestion for a specific/detailed change

Response: We agree with the reviewer’s suggestion. We have, accordingly, changed [explain the changes made, including the exact location (page number, paragraph, and/or line) where the change can be found in the revised manuscript]. Throughout the manuscript, we have revised [explain the changes made].

- [Paste the full comment] General negative comment (e.g., “I don’t think this study makes a valuable contribution to the field”)

Response: While we appreciate the reviewer’s feedback, we respectfully disagree. We think this study makes a valuable contribution to the field because [describe the knowledge gained, insights provided, questions answered, etc. by your study and its results or findings].

- [Paste the full comment] Asking for discussion or analyses that are not possible given constraints on the data available

Example response #1: Thank you for pointing this out. Although we agree that this is an important consideration, it is [beyond the scope / not appropriate for inclusion / cannot be analyzed] in this manuscript because [provide a justification for why the content cannot be added to the manuscript].

Example response #2: Thank you for this suggestion. It would have been interesting to explore this aspect. However, in the case of our study, it seems slightly out of scope because [provide a clear explanation/justification providing supporting evidence].