

如何发表 SCI 论文，丁香园很多战友都有谈到这个话题，再来说这个话题似乎是老生常谈。所以，今天美捷登编辑剑走偏锋，将 SCI 论文发表中大家可能比较感兴趣的一些小技巧整理出来，与大家分享。

一. SCI 论文，并没有想像中的难写

- 1.要熟悉你的专业，实验方法；要尊重结果，实事求是面对结果，下笔之前多看看文献，尤其是国外近期文献。相信只要是正确试验得来的结果都是可以解释的，是可以发表的。
- 2.对于初写者，“抄写”不可避免，妙在“抄写”技巧。同类性质的研究文章，撰写格式大同小异，所以，格式可以“照抄”。常用句型可灵活“抄”用。有些描述性、结论性的句子在读懂的情况下尽量用自己的语言表达和总结。但千万不可照抄未读懂的原句，否则，小者笑话百出，大者断送文章前程。
- 3.尽量使用你熟悉的词汇。不要故意使用华丽、少用或罕见词汇。
- 4.要舍得投入精力和时间。
- 5.文章写成后，一定要请导师、老板、共同作者或者同事审阅，有必要的话也可以请信誉度高的专业服务公司（比如美捷登）把关，提高成功率。

二. 如何投稿

论文投向哪份杂志其实还是有学问的。一般视课题的新颖及创造性、实验结果的完整及可靠性和论文写作质量而定。

如果你有足够的时间（1 年以上）等，最好先投比你的目标杂志更高的杂志，哪怕是 **Lancet, NEJM, JAMA** 等都不妨一试。这些杂志要么直接拒稿，要么送审后退稿（及少数直接收稿）。前者一般不到一周完成，后者 1-2 个月。所以即使拒稿，你都不会有任何损失，反而有可能收到非常有建设性的意见或建议。要知道，给这则杂志审稿的全非等闲之辈。他们在一针见血提出里文章的“软肋”的同时，往往会提出许多改进论文的良好建议。

如果你没有时间等，想让论文一次中的，又不愿“下嫁”你的大作，那么就要费心选择了。首先要正确判断你文章的内容及水平，在从资料库 **ISI Web of Knowledge** <http://www.isiwebofknowledge.com> 查找相关专业的杂志。再根据杂志刊名，杂志内容，IF 及年发表量等选择。进入杂志网站并参考其目录和发表的文章均有助于会杂志的选择。

三. 如何选择审稿人

许多杂志编辑希望你推荐 3-4 名审稿人，并很可能向你推荐的审稿人发审稿邀请。所以推荐审稿人还是有学问的。

如果你推荐的审稿人太忙或者太“牛”，他们根本不会理睬一般杂志的邀请，你的文章就可能不能及时找到审稿人。其实杂志对审稿人的身份要求不是太高的，但审稿人必须是某专业的专家。因此，许多在某专业发过论文的（我指的是英文 SCI）的作者都会收到审稿邀请信。因此，你在推荐审稿人时，不必太“挑剔”。

建议：

1. 推荐国外发过与你结果、结论相似文章的作者；
2. 推荐你论文中曾引用论文的作者；
3. 推荐你或你老板认识的同专业的教授、副教授。在国际有些影响的国内的学者也可以，这些学者在国内不一定是“牛”人，但深受国外学术界尊重。

四. 关于撤稿

有作者投稿后因种种原因需要撤稿，但又担心编辑不高兴，甚至会被打入黑名单。其实这种担心是没有必要的。但需要说明的是，你为什么要撤稿？材料方法不可

靠，结果不能重复，还是设计本身有问题？这都是撤稿的理由。

但目前因体制原因国内有许多作者一稿多投，当文章被其中一份杂志接受后，作者就开始要求其他杂志撤稿。此种一稿多投的行为为国外学者所不齿。因为这样会浪费编辑和审稿人的大量时间。

五. 如何请国外 SCI 杂志减免版面费用

关于这个问题，其实是有点小窍门的，比如可以减少使用的图片，将彩色变为黑白等等……

这里所说的几个问题，可能只是沧海一粟。希望对大家有一点作用。

要了解更多详情，请登陆 丁香通美捷登 答疑专题。

六 论文投出后的命运

网上投稿完成后，作者会即时收到稿件通知。如果论文题材（Content）不适合所投刊物，编辑会比较快地回信退稿。如果格式(Format)有问题，编辑部也会即时要求重投（Re-submission）。否则，作者就进入等待期。收到稿件后，编辑会挑选 2—3 名审稿人（很可能是由您自己推荐的）对论文进行评审。论文评审大多是对作者采用匿名形式。国外审稿人不是专职人员，也无评审费。但他们是已经在本领域建立了地位的“牛人”或者对本领域有相当研究但还不太知名的学者。前者比较忙碌，后者因考虑评审也可给自己带来声誉，所以会小心谨慎地进行评审。因此 两者完成评审可能都需要花较长时间。等待 2-3 个月是很普遍的。投稿者应对此予以理解，并耐心等待。除接收稿通知建议时间与编辑联系外，一般应给评审 3 个月时间。若仍无消息，可以与编辑联系催促一下。千万不要投稿一周就开始催促或过于频繁地催促，这样不仅不礼貌还会给编辑留下很不好的印象。（记住，也有比你更无耐心的编辑）。好的杂志一般都是按照杂志本身的时间规律去办事的。

审稿结束，作者会收到稿件评审意见和编辑的仲裁结果 -编辑在审稿过程中是仲裁和最后决策者。一般本质上有四种结果：拒绝（Rejection），修改后再投（Re-submission），修改（大修（Major revision）或小修（Minor revision），及接受(直接接受(Acceptance)或有条件接受(Conditional acceptance upon satisfactory revision))。

七 如何对待编辑来信

1. 拒绝（Rejection）

国外刊物的拒稿率高低不等，5 分以上的杂志拒稿率可高达 80%，一般杂志拒稿率在 30%以上。所以，如果收到这样的答复，应根据评审意见修改文稿，然后根据修改质量再投其它杂志。通常是投到影响因子更低的杂志。但是，如果审稿人提出了非常有建设性的意见和建议，而你又感觉已充分合理地回答了这些意见和建议，你完全可以投向更好的杂志。

2. 修改后再投（Re-submission）

十几年前似乎没有修改后再投的情况。现在也不是所有杂志有这个类别。

这种情况时有发生。往往表明论文竞争力不够，甚至有缺陷。通常需要补试验或资料。多个审稿人之间意见也不一致，褒贬参半，编辑无法定夺。所以会退回作者修改。这时，作者应该认真阅读编辑和每个审稿人的意见和建议，至少补充审稿人建议的一个试验（能全部补充当然更好），然后有理有据的回答审稿人的每一个问题。修改后再投的论文被当作新投稿件，会重新编号，往往会给原审稿人重新评审，甚至送另一批审稿人评审。但只要认真回应了编辑和审稿人的意见和

建议，论文大多是会被接受的。

3. 修改（大修（Major revision）或小修（Minor revision））

修改与修改后再投不同的是，修改后的文章不会重新编号，只在原编号后加 R1。其实，许多杂志的“大修”其修改程度不亚于上述的“修改后再投”。不易轻视。同样，修改后的文章很可能会送原审稿人评审。一般被接收的机会很大。“小修”的文章一般原则上已被接受，但有少量地方需作者确认修改，故与有些杂志的“有条件接受”差不多（见下）。

4. 接收（Accepted with or without minor revision）

除少数杂志外，绝大多数杂志，尤其高质量的杂志，不会“直接接受(Accept as it is)”第一次投稿的论文。最好的情况是“有条件接受（Accepted with or without minor revision）”，也就是只要作者同意做某方面的修稿或补充，论文即被接受。但大多收论文经过第一次修后接收。有时需要第二次修改。一般修改两次还不能让审稿人满意，编辑往往会拒稿。

八，如何回答审稿人

如何回答审稿人（或写回复信 Reply Letter）是一门艺术，我们将会另辟专贴，详细举例介绍。

国外审稿人是义务的，可以根据文章质量和自己的看法自由地提出意见和建议。国外审稿人绝大多数治学严谨，很注重 reputation，可以说拿信誉当生命。当他们接到审稿要求时，如果很忙或不懂你的专业或领域，他们会 decline。但只要答应审稿，一般都是尽职尽责的完成审稿任务。因此，当你接到审稿人的意见时，首先要摆正心态，保持冷静。不要用“偏见“的心态去断定审稿人有”偏见“、“歧视”。做研究的确很辛苦，发表文章也确实很不容易。但审稿人同样也很辛苦，也很不容易。他们认真地阅读你的文章，给你提出中肯的意见，甚至很好的建议。如果还被你措辞强硬的怪罪一阵，换着谁也会生气。要知道，找理由拒绝一篇文章并不是一件很难的事情。因此，这个时候，你一定要好好的静下心来，好好分析理解审稿人的意见，找出问题的所在。

1.所有问题必须逐条回答；2.尽量满足意见中需要补充的实验；3.满足不了的也不要回避，说明不能做的合理理由；4.对于你不认同的意见，也要委婉有技巧地回答，做到有理有据有节；5. 审稿人推荐的文献一定要引用，并加以讨论。

九，论文被接受后的事项

论文被接受后，就会收到印刷编辑寄回的校样。校样不容许大幅改动，除非有原则错误。校稿时主要查看基金号是否写错，作者名字是否写错（大部分杂志是不允许投稿后增减作者的），图表中的数据是否有误。有的杂志清样校正后的稿子是不允许再改动的。再改动要收费，并且延误出版。校样一般需要尽快寄还给印刷编辑。寄校样时，出版商会要求填写版权转让书（Transfer of Copy Right），并告知支付版面费的办法和订购单行本的方法。以往绝大多数杂志不收版面费，现在，随着 Open access 流行，收版面费的杂志多了，但至少半数以上的杂志仍然不收费。

是否需要单行本，需要多少单行本？以往网络不发达，许多同行会写信或明信片索要论文，邮寄单行本是很通行的办法。但目前向作者索要论文的已经不多，而且作者很容易从网上得到自己论文的 pdf 文本，电邮给索要者即可。

一般用个人信用卡(Credit Card)或单位的（Purchase Order）支付版面费。很多杂志容许你选择论文发表后寄 Invoice 给你。让你在论文发表后再付费。信用卡在国内外已很普遍，非常方便、可靠。所以，不必担心资料“被盗”的情况。

十，论文被发表后的事项

论文一旦发表，不宜撤稿。在许多人眼里，“撤稿”几乎等同“学术不端行为”。所以，一稿多投或一稿多发亦涉及诚信问题，应在发表论文之前慎重考虑。

另外，论文发表后，你有可能收到来自不发达国家或国内学者的论文索要信。这表明，你的论文有人感兴趣，其次，有人可能会阅读并引用你的论文，从而增加你的知名度。许多大学按论文所在杂志的影响因子和被引用次数来评价论文水平。对此，你应抱积极态度，尽量用电子邮件发给他们你在网上下载的 pdf 文本。

如何回复审稿人提问，实例讲解：

15 January 2009 （第一讲）给编辑的回复信

论文题目：Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic studies on the antiviral effects of A (一种中草药) against virus B （一种病毒）

所投杂志：Life Sciences

投稿结果：这次大修后又经过一次小修，被接受发表

编辑信内容（注：有删节）：

Dear Mr. XXX,

Your manuscript has been examined by the editors and qualified referee Moon. We think the manuscript has merit but requires revision before we can accept it for publication in the Journal. Careful consideration must be given to the points raised in the reviewer comments, which are enclosed below.

If you choose to submit a revision of your manuscript, please incorporate responses to the reviewer comments into the revised paper. A complete rebuttal with no manuscript alterations is usually considered inadequate and may result in lengthy re-review procedures.

A letter detailing your revisions point-by-point must accompany the resubmission.

You will be requested to upload this Response to Reviewers as a separate file in the Attach Files area.

We ask that you resubmit your manuscript within 45 days. After this time, your file will be placed on inactive status and a further submission will be considered a new manuscript.

To submit a revision, go to <http://ees.elsevier.com/lfs/> and log in as an Author.

You will see a menu item called Submission Needing Revision. You will find your submission record there.

Yours sincerely,

Joseph J. Bahl, PhD

Editor

Life Sciences

Format Suggestion: Please access the Guide to Authors at our website to check the format of your article. Pay particular attention to our References style.

Reviewers' comments:

Reviewer #1:

XXXXX （略）

Reviewer #2:

XXXXX (略)

Editors note and suggestions: (注: 编辑的建议)

Title: Re-write the title to read more smoothly in contemporary English>>>

Pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic studies of the antiviral effects of A against virus B.

Abstract: Re-write the abstract to read more smoothly.

A, an alkaloid isolated from C (注: 一种中草药), was tested for antiviral activity against virus B. Both in vitro and in vivo assays along with serum pharmacological experiments showed A to have potent antiviral activity. The pharmacokinetic profile of A in Sprague/Dawley rat plasma after oral administration was measured by HPLC. Blood samples taken at selected time points were analyzed to study potential changes in antiviral pharmacodynamics as measured by infectivity of viruses. From the similarity of the serum concentration profiles and antiviral activity profiles it is concluded that A itself, rather than a metabolite, exerted the effect against the virus prior to bioinactivation. The need for effective clinical agents against virus B and these results suggest the possibility of benefit from further experiments with A.

The authors should check to be sure that the terms blood samples, plasma and serum are always used appropriately throughout the abstract and text.

Introduction: some sentences can be made less passive. example 1st paragraph

>>>> A appears to be the most important alkaloid isolated from the plant, its structural formula is shown in Fig 1. ... While it produced a general inhibition of antibody production lymphocyte proliferation was stimulated (Xia and Wang, 1997). These pharmacological properties suggest a potential use in the treatment of viral myocarditis against virus B that could be studied in experiments in cell culture and animals.

>>>The authors should check the entire manuscript for spelling errors (example given: in your text alkaloid is incorrectly spelled alkaloïd)

>>>The authors should read the guidelines to the authors and not include the first name of the authors being cited in the text. In the reference section the first name should be abbreviated as shown in the guideline to authors (thus the earlier text reference should be (Liu et al., 2003) and the remaining one should be (Chen et al., 2002)

>>>>The authors instead of directly answering the first complex question of reviewer #1 may include the three questions as future research aim in the discussion section.

>>>>>Rather than redrawing figure the authors may choose to amend the wording of the statistical analysis section to state that the result of tables are means $\pm$ SEM and for figures are $\pm$ SD.

>>>>> reviewer #1 comment number 8 and reviewer # 2 comment 3 might be satisfied by inclusion of a representative photo of cells and heart showing CPE. Remember most readers of the journal have never seen what you are trying to describe.

Because I think that you can deal with all of the points raised I am hoping to see a

revised manuscript that you have carefully checked for errors. If you have questions or do not know how to respond to any of the points raised please contact me at bahl@u.arizona.edu Joseph Bahl, PhD Editor 2 Life Sciences

作者回复信原稿:

Dear Dr. Bahl,

I' m (注: 正式信函不要简写) very appreciate (注: 不适合作为给编辑回信的
开始, 同时有语法错误) for your comments and suggestions.

I (注: 实际上是学生做的) have conducted in vivo antivirus experiments again (注:
要表明是应审稿人或编辑建议而作) . Mice were sacrificed on 15 days and 30 days
after infection. Death rate, heart weight to body weight ratio (HW/BW), virus titers
and pathologic slices (注: 用词错误) were calculated (注: 用词不当) . Production
of mRNA of IL-10, IFN- γ and TNF- α were (注: 语法错误) measured by RT-PCR.

I have revised this manuscript and especially paid much attention to your comments
and suggestions. I would like to re-submit it to LIFE SCIENCE. Title of manuscript has
been changed to "The antivirus effects of A against virus B and its pharmacokinetic
behaviour in SD rats serum" to make it more clear and smooth.

Answers to Reviewers' questions were as follows: (注: 可附在给编辑的回复信
后)

Reviewer #1:

XXXXX

Reviewer #2:

XXXXX

Editors note and suggestions:

Title: Re-write the title to read more smoothly in contemporary English

Answer: I have rewrite the title to "The antivirus effects of A against virus B and its
pharmacokinetic behaviour in SD rats serum" to make it more clear and smooth (注:
多处语法错误) .

Abstract: Re-write the abstract to read more smoothly.

Answer: I have revise the abstract carefully to make it more smooth and informative
(注: 语法错误) .

The authors should check to be sure that the terms blood samples, plasma and
serum are always used appropriately throughout the abstract and text.

Answer: I have paid attention to this question and it is clearer (注: 不具体) .

Introduction:

some sentences can be made less passive.

Answer: I have revise the whole paper to make sentences less passive and obtained
help of my colleague proficient in English (注: 语法错误, 句子不通顺) .

The authors should check the entire manuscript for spelling errors

Answer: I' m very sorry to give you so much trouble for those spelling errors (注:
不必道歉, 按建议修改即可) . I have carefully corrected them.

The authors should read the guidelines to the authors and not include the first name
of the authors being cited in the text. In the reference section the first name should
be abbreviated as shown in the guideline to authors (thus the earlier text reference
should be (Liu et al., 2003) and the remaining one should be (Chen et al., 2002)

Answer: I changed the style of references.

Rather than redrawing figure the authors may choose to amend the wording of the statistical analysis section to state that the result of tables are means $\pm$ SEM and for figures are $\pm$ SD.

Answer: （注：作者请编辑公司帮回答）

reviewer #1 comment number 8 and reviewer # 2 comment 3 might be satisfied by inclusion of a representative photo of cells and heart showing CPE. Remember: most readers of the journal have never seen what you are trying to describe.

Answer: Thank you for your suggestions. I have supplemented pictures of cardiac pathologic slices in the paper (Fig2).

I have to apologize for giving you so much trouble because of those misspelling and confusing statements （注：一般不是延误或人为失误，不必轻易道歉，按建议修改即可）. Your comments and suggestions really helped me a lot. I have put great efforts to this review. I wish it can be satisfactory.

If there's （注：正式信函不要简写）any information I can provide, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Thank you again for your time and patience. Look forward to hear （注：语法错误）from you.

Yours Sincerely

Xxxx Xxxx (通讯作者名)

建议修改稿:

Dear Dr. Bahl,

Thanks you very much for your comments and suggestions.

As suggested, we have conducted in vivo antiviral experiments. Mice were sacrificed on 15 days and 30 days after infection with virus B. Mortality, heart weight to body weight ratio (HW/BW), virus titers and pathologic scores were determined. In addition, mRNA expression of IL-10, IFN- γ and TNF- α were measured by RT-PCR.

We have revised the manuscript, according to the comments and suggestions of reviewers and editor, and responded, point by point to, the comments as listed below. Since the paper has been revised significantly throughout the text, we feel it is better not to highlight the amendments in the revised manuscript （正常情况最好表明修改处）.

The revised manuscript has been edited and proofread by a medical editing company in Hong Kong.

I would like to re-submit this revised manuscript to Life Sciences, and hope it is acceptable for publication in the journal.

Looking forward to hearing from you soon.

With kindest regards,

Yours Sincerely

Xxxx Xxxx (通讯作者名)

Replies to Reviewers and Editor

First of all, we thank both reviewers and editor for their positive and constructive comments and suggestions.

Replies to Reviewer #1:

Xxxxx (略)

Replies to Reviewer #2:

Xxxxx (略)

Replies to the Editors note and suggestions:

Title: Re-write the title to read more smoothly in contemporary English

Answer: I have rewrite the title to "The antivirus effects of Sophoridine against Cocksackievirus B3 and its pharmacokinetics in rats" to make it more clear and read more smoothly.

Abstract: Re-write the abstract to read more smoothly.

Answer: I have rewritten the abstract to make it more informative and read more smoothly.

The authors should check to be sure that the terms blood samples, plasma and serum are always used appropriately throughout the abstract and text.

Answer: I have paid attention to this issue, and they are now used appropriately throughout the abstract and text in the revised manuscript.

Introduction:

some sentences can be made less passive.

Answer: I have revised the whole paper to make sentences less passive with the help of the editing company.

The authors should check the entire manuscript for spelling errors

Answer: This has been done by us as well as the editing company.

The authors should read the guidelines to the authors and not include the first name of the authors being cited in the text. In the reference section the first name should be abbreviated as shown in the guideline to authors (thus the earlier text reference should be (Liu et al., 2003) and the remaining one should be (Chen et al., 2002)

Answer: I have changed the style of references according to the journal.

Rather than redrawing figure the authors may choose to ament the wording of the statistical analysis section to state that the result of tables are means $\pm$ SEM and for figures are $\pm$ SD.

Answer: SD has been used throughout the text, and shown in the Figs. 3 and 4 in the revised manuscript.

reviewer #1 comment number 8 and reviewer # 2 comment 3 might be satified by inclusion of a representative photo of cells and heart showing CPE. Remember: most readers of the journal have never seen what you are trying to describe.

Answer: Thank you very much for the suggestion. I have added pictures of cardiac pathologic changes in the revised manuscript (Fig. 2).

31 January 2009 (第二讲) 给审稿人的回复信

论文题目: Clinical implications of XXXX (一种病理指标) in X cancer

所投杂志: BMC Cancer.

结果: 这次大修后被接受发表 (同时编辑在接受信中提出课题是否得到伦理委员会同意的问題。作者在论文适当地方加上了有关陈述)

审稿人内容 (有删节):

Reviewer's report

Clinical implications of XXXX (一种病理指标) in X cancer

Version: 1 Date: 12 June 200X

Reviewer: XXXX XXXX (A Japanese Reviewer)

Reviewer's report:

General

Major Compulsory Revisions (that the author must respond to before a decision on publication can be reached)

1. XXXXX.
2. XXXXX.
3. XXXXX.
- 4) The clinico pathological parameters examined are reported in Table 1. Among the primary tumor characteristics, the Authors consider the diameter, but ignore T stage. Consequently the T parameter is not considered in the multivariate analysis. In other studies, T stage has emerged as an independent factor. The Authors should therefore state the reason for their unusual choice. Nor is the number of metastatic nodes reported in this table. Moreover, for tumor differentiation, the Authors distinguish between two groups (differentiated vs undifferentiated), instead of between the usual 3 categories (G1, G2 and G3). I have never heard of the histological classification used by the Authors (massive, next and diffuse). They might therefore state their reasons for choosing it, providing a reference, if available.

Minor Essential Revisions (such as missing labels on figures, or the wrong use of a term, which the author can be trusted to correct)

XXXXX.

Discretionary Revisions (which the author can choose to ignore)

(None)

What next?: Reject because too small an advance to publish

Level of interest: An article of limited interest

Quality of written English: Needs some language corrections before being published

[b]Statistical review: Yes, but I do not feel adequately qualified to assess the statistics.

作者原答: T stage is considered in the multivariate analysis, and some modification has been made in tumor differentiation and histological classification.

建议改答: We accept Dr. XXX comment (表明你对审稿人的欣赏和赞同). In the revised version of the manuscript, T stage has been added in the multivariate analysis, and description of tumor differentiation and histological classification has been modified; the histological classification in the original manuscript has been replaced by the generally accepted classification (Page 6, line 15; Table 4) (同意审稿人的建议, 并根据其建议进行修改。同时指出在何处做了修改。).

加注: 作者原回答与修改后的回答并无本质差别, 正文中的修改也是一样的。但作者原回答会给审稿人“不太乐意”或“轻描淡写”的印象。因为审稿人花了122个单词来就此问题发表建议, 而作者只用了20个。

修改后的回答,相信一开始就赢得审稿人的好感。你的回答不光是给审稿人看的,杂志编辑也会看(至少审稿人会这么认为),所以,审稿人会有种满足感(国外审稿人没有酬劳,得到作者和编辑的认可是他们审稿最主要的目的)。建议得到认可(当然,这里审稿人的确是正确合理的),而且作者还按其建议对文章进行修改,相信绝大多数审稿人是不会(不好意思)再拒绝修改稿的(所谓伸手不打笑面人)。当然,这篇文章起死回生、二审通过审稿关,关键是杂志编辑手下留情,给了作者再投(Re-submission)的机会。

有时,审稿人的建议得到作者认可,但作者无法按建议修改,尤其补做试验。这种情况将在以后举例说明。

如何回复审稿人的尖锐提问?

论文题目: Misdiagnosis of A (一种先天性疾病) as 某某 tumor: a case report

所投杂志: Neuro-Ophthalmology

投稿结果: 大修

注: 前段时间投了一个影响因子较低的杂志(2006IF0.06), 内容为某某先天性疾病在门诊被误诊为肿瘤而收入院, 住院时经过详细检查而确诊。今天刚刚收到大修通知:

其中, Referee 2 提的意见非常尖锐。认为我们可能是诊疗措施不够规范, 这样的误诊报道 interesting 但是不适于发表。虽然的确是我们门诊没有认真而详细的检查造成(门诊病人太多, 而且这种先天性疾病太罕见, 收入院除了为手术的目的, 另一个也是为了详细的检查)。该如何回复 Referee 2 的意见?

另外, Referee 2 意见如此尖锐, 肯定给的意见是拒稿, 但主编给了大修的通知, 不知道他的潜在意思? 我该从哪方面着手修改? Question

不知道跟贴求助是否合适, 如果不合适, 请版主通知我, 将另开新帖, 谢谢。同时也希望前辈们出手相助, 感谢了

审稿人意见如下:

Referee: 1

Comments to the Author

On PDF file

Page 4 line 17 -- should read: " accidentally a month before."

Page 4 line 43 -- should read: " (fig 2). Macula "

Introduction mentions - the conditon frequently requires no treatment--

On your reference #3 the authors mention patching to try to improve vision -- one patient had a good outcome, multiple not done, and few failures. Was patching attempted (recent papers have advocated patching even older children)?

Did the retinal specialist who referred the patient performed a full exam including dilated fundus examination before performing a CT of the orbits?

Color photo would be a plus.

Was B scan ultrasonography of the eye performed? This would have helped to support a clinical diagnosis of a dilated retinal examination with less cost.

Referee: 2

Comments to the Author

The authors try to caution eye specialists and neurosurgeons not to do major orbital surgery on children without doing a dilated fundus examination with an indirect

ophthalmoscope. In their case, once the correct diagnosis was made, by properly examining the eye, surgery was not necessary. A thorough pre-operative examination of the eye should be a automatic prerequisite to orbital surgery for poor vision, so I do not think their paper presents a unique idea.

They have an interesting case, and a case report reviewing the subject might be of value, but I think they may have to be satisfied that they practiced good medicine and saved a child from an unnecessary operation, but that it did not merit publication.

审稿人的意见和建议很重要，一般编辑都会尊重审稿人的建议。但在有多个审稿人且建议不一致的时候，编辑自己会根据文章内容作出决定。半月谈第二讲的案例便是典型一例。

我认为，第二审稿人非常明白你的病理和发病理报告的意图，也给了正面的评价。遗憾的是，他/她在每段的最后一句得出了与前面不一致的结论。这是编辑愿意给你机会的原因。该审稿人应该是非英文背景的，学术水平一般，对病理报告是否应发表的评判能力有限。但你应认真回答他/她的意见。

你可以将针对第二审稿人意见的答复贴上，大家帮你修改。如愿意，给编辑的回复信也可在此贴讨论修改。

当然，战友不知你的病理报告内容，只能就你公开的信息发表看法，可能有些偏颇，最后应由你自己拿定主意。

这期半月谈专题与 duyinapoleon 战友共同主讲。

15 February 2009 （第三讲）给审稿人的回复信

论文题目：Misdiagnosis of A (一种先天性疾病) as 某某 tumor: a case report

所投杂志：Neuro-Ophthalmology

投稿结果：大修，结果未知（前途未卜，因为该审稿人建议拒稿，但审稿人给作者机会）

审稿人审稿内容及作者原答和建议改答（有删节）：

Reviewer 2's report

审稿人问题 1

The authors try to caution eye specialists and neurosurgeons not to do major orbital surgery on children without doing a dilated fundus examination with an indirect ophthalmoscope. In their case, once the correct diagnosis was made, by properly examining the eye, surgery was not necessary. A thorough pre-operative examination of the eye should be a automatic prerequisite to orbital surgery for poor vision, so I do not think their paper presents a unique idea.

作者原答

Answer: Although correct diagnosis can be made by thorough examinations, doctors are often misled by a “wrong” chief complaint (wrong 可能表示主诉症状本身误导，也可能表示病人说错，也可能是收诊医生记录错误). In our case, the retinal specialist who made a misdiagnosis at first (at first 用词不当), was misled by “blurred vision in the left eye over a month” and did not pay enough attention to differentiate a congenital disease from “tumor” (需说明两者关联). In (On) the other hand, it is also the result of too many patients we have to manage per working day (most large hospital (hospitals) in China is (are) on this occasion) and doctors in outpatient clinic have not much time to perform thorough

ophthalmic examination (不应太绝对). So, the clinical misdiagnosis is not complete occasional event. We could learn a lot from this case.

建议改答

Answer: We agree with the referee that correct diagnosis can be made by proper and thorough examinations (首先肯定审稿人的观点 to make him/her happy). However, doctors are often misled by an “atypical” (比 wrong 要具体且客观) chief complaint, especially when there are too many patients in an outpatients department such as in a Chinese ophthalmic hospital (这句点出误诊原因, 下面再逐一解释). In our case, both the retinal specialist and orbital specialist who made the initial misdiagnosis, were misled by the symptom of “blurred vision in the left eye over a month”, which is characteristic of an “acquired disease”, and thus he did not pay enough attention to differentiate a congenital disease from a “tumor” (指出没有想到先天性疾病的原因 1). On the other hand, like most large hospitals in China, doctors in the Outpatient Department have to manage up to X (number) patients we per working day and thus some may have little time to follow the “good clinical practice” and perform thorough ophthalmic examinations (误诊原因 2). Consequently, the misdiagnosis inevitably occurred. This case report presents the lesion and reiterate the importance of thorough ophthalmic examinations prior to any surgery (这句表明为什么该病例报告值得发表).

审稿人问题 2

They have an interesting case, and a case report reviewing the subject might be of value, but I think they may have to be satisfied that they practiced good medicine and saved a child from an unnecessary operation, but that it did not merit publication.

作者原答

Answer: The initially misdiagnosis was made by our two specialists (one is a retinal specialist and the other orbital) (词句的意义不明). Moreover, the reasons for the misdiagnosis have been discussed in our case report, which would be useful for other doctors, especially for residents to avoid the same mistake (说服力比较弱). And (正规书信和论文不宜用 And 开句) we believe our radiology images in our case will contribute to a better understanding of this condition(说服力比较弱).

建议改答

Answer: We did feel relieved and satisfied when the unnecessary surgery was avoided (正面回应审稿人的肯定意见). However, the fact that initial misdiagnosis was made by two experienced but busy specialists (one is a retinal specialist and the other orbital), cannot be ignored in our clinical practice (表明我们不能因为我们避免了不必要的手术而自满). We feel that it would be beneficial to report the case and share our experience or lesion with other doctors, in order to avoid or minimize the same mistake (因此, 我们希望发表该病例报告已警示同行). In addition, we believe that the radiology images from our unique case will contribute to a better understanding of this congenital disease (虽不重要, 但也许编辑喜欢).

加注:

1. 该文的特色是一审稿人觉得本病例报告不值得发表, 但编辑愿意给作者 rebuttal 的机会。其实, 该审稿人的评语总体来讲是不错的。但令人不解的是,

每条评语最后一句得出跟前面截然不同的结论。可能他/她并不是“大牛”，不太能掌握病例报告发表的标准。

2. 作者的回答总体还是非常好的，只是语气稍欠委婉，理据说服力需更进一步加强。

这期半月谈专题与 **blueman1320** 战友共同主讲。

28 February 2009 （第四讲）给编辑的申诉信

论文题目：Prophylactic NSAIDs use in post-ERCP pancreatitis

所投杂志：Gut

结果：编辑直接拒稿，作者重新修改并申诉，申诉成功，直接接受。

编辑信内容（有删节）：

GUT/2008/156323

Prophylactic NSAIDs use in post-ERCP pancreatitis

Authors' names （略）

Dear XXX,

Thank you for submitting this manuscript to Gut, which was discussed at the last Editorial Committee meeting. We are sorry to say that we are unable to accept it for publication, as it did not achieve a high enough priority score to enable it to be published in Gut. We favour letters which add new data and did not feel that your letter did this sufficiently.

Please remember that Gut receives about eight times as many manuscripts as we are able to publish, therefore regrettably it follows that many perfectly adequate papers must be rejected. This decision must be based not only on quality, but also timeliness and priority against other subject areas.

For more details, please go to:

<http://submit-gut.bmj.com>

enter your Author Area and click on the 'Manuscripts with decisions' queue.

We are sorry to disappoint you on this occasion.

With kind regards.

Professor Robin Spiller

Handling Editor

Professor Robin Spiller

Editor

作者申诉信原文：

Dear editors,

Thanks for your kindly help in our previous manuscripts (GUT/2008/156323 and GUT/2008/156711).

The decision of the editorial board was a little disappointed to me. We had discussed the topic again and rewrite the manuscript according to the suggestions of the editorial board. We also invited our friend Harry Hua-Xiang Xia for insightful editing the paper.

Although Elmunzer et al. concluded that rectal administration of NSAIDs is effective in preventing PEP (these results are of significant clinical implications), several issues remain unsolved. For example, do risk factors influence the prophylactic effect? So, we performed a complimentary meta-analysis based on the methodology and the

以上内容仅为本文档的试下载部分，为可阅读页数的一半内容。如要下载或阅读全文，请访问：<https://d.book118.com/45804505100006025>