



I'm not robot



Continue

Response letter template latex

You've just received reviews for your article. After a long wait, this is the most painful step. The main issue is that reviewers and authors do not speak the same language. To speed up and facilitate this process, authors should address comments so that reviewers can easily assess how their feedback has been addressed. So what is the most effective way to write your rebuttal? The truth about reviewers Before we look at the details (if you are in a hurry, you can skip to the template that I propose in the end), you need to know the following about reviewers: they are experts, they do not have much time, do not attack you, want to be recognized for their help. As a regular reviewer, I see different ways in which authors handle the comments they receive. Also very interesting, I see various ways in which reviewers make their comments. In my reviews, I'm usually very structured and I provide my tag comments so I can follow up afterwards if they're properly addressed. However, other reviewers write several paragraphs, each containing more than one problem. The main idea of the methodology we propose below is to respect the timing of the rejectuer and to highlight what has been done to address their comments. Moreover, he has the advantage of being very effective for me as a supervisor when giving feedback to my doctoral candidates about refuting them. Step 1: Separate the reviews into the list of questions Whether you receive an overview of your work in paragraphs or already as a list of comments, start by separating each reviewer's feedback into individual questions. To make it easier to reference, select each of these problems, such as #2. Copy the exact words of the reviewer: Separate the text only if necessary, never change it. Choose a format to keep everywhere as a simple clue to highlight reviewer comments, what are your responses, and what are parts of your paper text, such as your paper. Step 2: For each number, find the answer Now that you've separated the problems, solve them individually. It's important to be very humble here. If you believe that the reviewer suggests adding something you've already written to your handwriting, or if you think a comment isn't appropriate, indicate that there might be a misunderstanding and offer to resolve it by rephrasing some of the text. If a reviewer asks you to do additional work that you feel won't provide added value (you need to be honest and not dismiss it just because it might take a while), offer to rephrase some of the text, for example, goals that will be more accurate and avoid creating expectations. In any case, do not thank the reviewer for each number, thank them only in the beginning. The most important thing in this part is to acknowledge the contribution of the reviewer. Step 3: For each answer, adjust your handwriting, I believe that's the most important thing. The reviewer's job is to your work and try to improve it. It's in no way to attack you. With this idea in mind, and as a rule, all comments from reviewers should lead to improved handwriting (yes, I really mean everything). Of course, try to be honest and don't claim to have made a difference if it's unrelated. So at this point, highlight the changes you made to the ink by copying the text (remember, with a specific format), or indicating exactly where you implemented the change in the revised ink (page and line number). It is very important that reviewers can immediately assess whether their comment has been properly resolved. Again, respect their time and they will be grateful for it. Rebuttal template Here's a template you can use to refute. Let us know if you consider any improvements. We would be pleased to further improve it: Download the template (zip files) After sending a revised version of the submitted paper to the journal, it is usually necessary to attach an audit statement based on the judges' report. In this statement, you are essentially responding to the judges' comments. A friend asked me if I could publish the LaTeX template I use to write such statements. Well, here he :). As it looks like allows you to start with a screenshot of the PDF that is generated from the template: How to use it As you can see, the template uses a simple style based on the standard article class. In addition to rudimentary details, such as title information, the template defines the reviewer command and response environment. The reviewer command is used to create a title for comments from a particular reviewer. For example, to generate a title from the screen above, use \Reviewer{#1} The response environment creates a few responses to comments. His style is reminiscent of the one used in email replies. Example: \begin{response}{First comment.} Reply to first comment. \end{response} \begin{response}{Second comment.} Reply to another comment. \end{response} The template does not contain a reference list (bibliography). However, if you wish, you can add the following code to the end of the template to use the BibTeX bibliography from a file named statement.bib: \bibliographystyle{plain} \bibliography{statement} Source code The full source code of the LaTeX template is available on GitHub. Recognition I want to thank Sean Allred for the excellent improvements to the original version of the template. LaTeX Response Letter Writing Template for Journal Revisions You cannot perform this action at this time. You signed in with another card or window. Reload to refresh the session. You signed in on another card or window. Reload to refresh the session. This is my LaTeX template for responding to reviewers. I expanded several macros I found on stackexchange to allow LaTeX style to relate between reviewer points. Here's how Layout: Keep the circle in red in place, which is a reference inserted with \ref. Source Code Download: Rebuttal.zip % LaTeX example of letter rebuttal. % % Copyright for 2019 Friedemann Zenke, fzenke.net% On the basis of the example of Dirk Edelbuel, Fran and others of % % Licensed under CC by 3.0 with the necessary attribution. \documentclass[11pt]{article} \usepackage[utf8]{inputenc} \usepackage{lipsum} % to generate filler text \usepackage{fullpage} % import Eq and section references from the main manuscript where it is necessary % \usepackage{xr} % \externaldocument{manuscript} % package required for optional arguments \usepackage{xifthen} % defines counters for reviewers and their points ewcounter{reviewer} \setcounter{reviewer}{0} ewcounter{point}[reviewer] \setcounter{point}{0} % This refines the appearance format of the reviewer/reference point. \newcommand{\thepoint}[P]{\thereviewer.\arabic{point}} % of command statements for reviewer points and our responses ewcommand{reviewersection}{\stepcounter{reviewer} \bigskip \hrule \section*{Reviewer \thereviewer}} ewenvironment{point} {\refstepcounter{point} \bigskip oindent {\textbf{Reviewer- Point- \thepoint} } --- \ } {\par } ewcommand{\shortpoint}[1]{\refstepcounter{point} \bigskip oindent {\textbf{Recenz point- \thepoint} } --- #1\par } ewenvironment{response} {\medskip oindent \begin{sf}\textbf{Reply:} \ } {\medskip \end{sf}} ewcommand{\shortreply}[2][\medskip oindent \begin{sf}\textbf{Reply:} \ #2 \iffhenelse{equal{#1}}{\ }{\ \hfill \footnotesize {#1}}% \medskip \end{sf}} \begin{document} \section*{Response to the reviewers} % General introduction text goes here Thank reviewers for critically evaluating our work. In the next we deal with their concerns point by point. % Let's start from point to point with reviewer 1 \reviewersection % Point one description \startpoint \lipsum[1] \label{pt:foo} \end{point} % Our response \begin{reply} We agree with the reviewer on this important point. That's what we did to fix it. \lipsum[2] \end{reply} \begin{point} Reviewer \thereviewer's second point. \label{pt:bar} \end{point} \begin{reply} And our response to this. \end{reply} \subsection*{Minor} % Use short-handed macros for one-liners. \shortpoint{ Typo in line xy. } \shortreply{ Fixed.} % Start the new reviewer \reviewersection \begin{point} This is the first point of the reviewer \thereviewer. With some other words foo bar foo bar ... \end{point} \begin{reply} Our response to it with respect to one of our points above using LaTeX's tag/ref system (see also \ref{pt:foo}). \end{response} \end{document} I slightly modified this idea, adding counters for automatic number of responses and automatic reference to where you made relevant changes: \usepackage{lineno} % counters for review points ewcounter{reviewer} \setcounter{reviewer}{0} ewcounter{point} \section*{Reviewer \#\thereviewer.} ewcommand{\point}[2][\stepcounter{point} \bigskip \hrule \medskip oindent \textsl{\fontseries{b}\selectfont (\thereviewer, \thepoint) \#1} \#2}}\mand{\odgovor}{\medskip oindent \textbf{Reply:} \ } % upotrijebite ovu naredbu u tekstu u kojoj je došlo do promjene koja se odnosi na točku recenzenta ewcommand{\revpoint}[2][\linelabel{rr:rev#\1.:\#2}] % a ova se odnosi na takvu lokaciju ewcommand{\ revref}{{(p.\ } \pageref{rr:rev\thereviewer:\thepoint}, l.\ } \lineref{rr:rev\thereviewer:\thepoint}} ewif{reviewresponses \reviewresponsesstrue % stavite ovo tamo gdje će se recenzije pojaviti (na kraju?) ewcommand{. \includereviews} \ifreviewresponses \clearpage \setcounter{page}{1} \setcounter{section}{0} \setcounter{subsection}{0} olinenumbers \begin{center} \LARGE \bf Response to Reviews \end{center} \input{\responsefile} \fi } \Imam tex za novine u , recimo, papir.tex, i odgovori u odgovorima.tex (samo dokument , without header commands), and in the paper header.tex: \input{review-response-commands} \reviewresponsesstrue % includes % \reviewresponsesfalse % does not include them ewcommand{\responsefile}{\replies.tex} % of review recurrence file name Immediately after \begin{document}: \ifreviewresponses\linenumbers\fi And below where I want responses to appear in the document: % put in reviews here \includereviews For example, when I add some text or what does not need to be addressed, say, third point reviewer 2, for example: This point was previously tangential al (2007). \revpoint{2}{3} responses may look like \point{p.7}{This was previously studied by Fred et al (2007), which should be specified.} \reply{We included the quote \revref.} This works great; the only unsatisfactory thing about this is that you can't change reviewer points or add/subtract either after you start working or mess up the entire counting scheme. It seems preferable to create unique keys for each point yourself. Are there any other ideas? Ideas?