

## Submitting your paper to another journal

If you are advised that your paper isn't appropriate for the journal to which you have initially submitted it (e.g., it is not sufficiently novel or does not have the right focus), the best course is usually to select another journal. In some cases, you may not want to inform editors of the second journal that the manuscript was submitted elsewhere and rejected—it might prejudice the process. For example, if your paper was rejected by Nature and you resubmit it to Science (or vice versa), don't let the editors of the second journal know. These journals compete for the best papers and don't want to publish each other's rejections. If, however, your paper was reviewed by Nature or Science and the reviews were generally positive but the editor did not feel the paper had a sufficiently high impact value for a top-tier journal, you may be able to use the reviewers' comments as leverage for your next submission to a second-tier journal. Ask the first journal's editor to support the resubmission, and tell the second editor that your paper has already been reviewed. The second review process may be expedited. Regardless of your course of action, never send a rejected manuscript without changes to a second journal.

If, as is likely, the same reviewers receive it a second time, they will be annoyed to see that you have completely ignored their comments.

تم سؤال أحد الأشخاص في مسابقة من سيرج الطليون

س1 : كم استمرت حرب المئة عام ؟

أ. 116 ب. 99

ج. 100 د. 150

فكر المتسابق كثيرا ثم اختار تخطى هذا السؤال لعدم تمكنه من إجابته

س2 : أين تصنع قبعات بنما ؟

أ. البرازيل ب. تشيلي

ج. بنما د. الاكوادور

اختار المتسابق أن يستعين بصديق للإجابة أيضا.

س3 : في أي شهر يحتفل الروس بثورة أكتوبر ؟

أ. يناير ب. سبتمبر

ج. أكتوبر د. نوفمبر

لم يستطع المتسابق الإجابة وطلب مساعدة الجمهور.

س4 : أي هذه الأسماء هو الإسم الأول للملك جورج

السادس ؟

أ. جون ب. ألبرت

ج. جورج د. مانويل

فطلب حذف إجابتين وبعد جهد جهيد توصل للإجابة.

س5 : حيوان أخذت منه إسم جزر الكناري ؟

أ. طائر الكناري ب. الكنغر

ج. الجرو د. الفأر

عندها انسحب المتسابق من المسابقة ولم يستطع إكمالها

فإذا كنت تظن بأنك أذكى من هذا المتسابق فأرجو أن تقرأ الإجابات في نشرة الشهر القادم.



AUQAAC

مركز ضمان الجودة  
والتأهيل للاعتماد

# مركز ضمان الجودة والتأهيل للاعتماد

نشرة رقم (20)

عنوان المركز :

المبنى الإداري بجامعة أسيوط

جناح (د) الدور الثاني

غرف (15 ، 16 ، 18)

أسيوط - 71515 - ج. م. ع

تليفون وفاكس: 2354505/088

داخلي (3216 ، 3218)

E.mail : [auqaac2013@yahoo.com](mailto:auqaac2013@yahoo.com)

Web Site : [www.aun.edu.eg/evaluation/index](http://www.aun.edu.eg/evaluation/index)

يفضل المركز أن يكون موضوع النشرة بلغة المصدر حتى لا تنقص الترجمة بعض المفاهيم

أ.د. إبراهيم محمد إسماعيل مدير المركز

## **Reviewing Process of Scientific Papers**

The reviewers of your paper will be chosen by the journal's editor, who will take into account any names you have suggested, his or her own knowledge of the field, and a literature search.

### **Receiving the reviewers' comments**

A paper is rarely accepted after the first round of review. When you receive the editorial decision and the reviewers' comments, you will have to decide how to proceed. Sometimes the editors will indicate they would like to publish your work, provided that you make a few minor revisions or do a few additional experiments. In other cases, the editors will say that the work is potentially interesting but too preliminary or that it has significant flaws that preclude its publication. Another possibility is that the reviewers will advise the editors not to publish the work even if it is revised, because it is either not sufficiently novel or it does not fit the scope of the journal. Most editors are happy to talk to you by telephone to help you assess whether you should revise and resubmit your paper or try another journal. In any event, it is important to remain unemotional during such conversations

## **Responding to reviews**

Do not react defensively. Focus instead on the substance of each editorial comment. Value good advice wherever you find it. Read the reviews carefully and communicate your responses in writing to the editor. It is a good idea not to respond as soon as you hear from the editor. Let a couple of days go by. A hastily written and emotional response will hurt your chances for resubmission. If the reviews include a request for additional information that will require a few more experiments, carry them out and send your response to the editor. You can make the process easier by repeating each comment, stating your response, and indicating explicitly where in your paper you are making a recommended change. If the main problem is that the manuscript does not convey the importance of the work, you may want to rewrite it and add more data. You might want to check with the editor first to make sure this is an appropriate course of action. In the end, you will have to do a cost-benefit analysis. If you believe that satisfying all the reviewers' concerns would bog down your research program in unnecessary experiments, you may have no choice but to take your paper elsewhere. If you think a requested additional experiment is unreasonable, write a rebuttal letter

explaining why the experiment cannot be done or why it will not help strengthen the conclusions of your paper. You may discuss your concerns with the editor, before working on a revised manuscript. For example, you should ask, "If I do revisions A and B, but instead of doing experiment C, I do D, will you still consider a revised manuscript?"

Remember that you are the person best acquainted with the details of your work and the limitations of your research tools. If you think a referee's comments are completely off the mark, write a rebuttal letter explaining your concerns. If all three referees, or even two out of three, had serious misgivings, it may be difficult to convince the editor that the referees missed the point. Regardless of how you proceed, keep your emotions in check.

You should never demean the reviewers. . The reality is that reviewers, especially those who manage their own laboratories, sometimes work under unrealistic time pressures. Occasionally, the reviewer selected may not have the expertise to judge a paper competently. Whatever the case, do not question a reviewer's expertise. If you think a reviewer missed an important point, politely tell your editor, who has the option of identifying additional reviewers for your paper if doing so seems warranted.