Section 6

Cover letters
Cover letters

Significance
Relevance → Why your work is important!

Cover letter:
First impression for journal editors

Interesting to their readers? → Writing style
Dear Editor-in-Chief,

I am sending you our manuscript entitled “Techniques to detect entanglement in cats” by Schrodinger et al. We would like to have the manuscript considered for publication in Quantum Theory Frontiers.

Please let me know of your decision at your earliest convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Albert Einstein, PhD

---

**Is this a good cover letter?**

**No!**

- **Not personally addressed**
- **Not enough information about the manuscript**
Dear Dr Lippman,

Please find enclosed our manuscript entitled “Evaluation of the Glasgow prognostic score in patients undergoing curative resection for breast cancer liver metastases,” which we would like to submit for publication as an Original Article in Breast Cancer Research and Treatment.

The Glasgow prognostic score (GPS) is of value for a variety of tumours. Several studies have investigated the prognostic value of the GPS in patients with metastatic breast cancer, but few studies have performed such an investigation for patients undergoing liver resection for liver metastases. Furthermore, there are currently no studies that have examined the prognostic value of the modified GPS (mGPS) in these patients. The present study evaluated the mGPS in terms of its prognostic value for postoperative death in patients undergoing liver resection for breast cancer liver metastases.

A total of 318 patients with breast cancer liver metastases who underwent hepatectomy over a 15-year period were included in this study. The mGPS was calculated based on the levels of C-reactive protein and albumin, and the disease-free survival and cancer-specific survival rates were evaluated in relation to the mGPS. Prognostic significance was retrospectively analyzed by univariate and multivariate analyses. Overall, the results showed a significant association between cancer-specific survival and the mGPS and carcinoembryonic antigen level, and a higher mGPS was associated with increased aggressiveness of liver recurrence and poorer survival in these patients.

This study is the first to demonstrate that the preoperative mGPS, a simple clinical tool, is a useful prognostic factor for postoperative survival in patients undergoing curative resection for breast cancer liver metastases. This information is immediately clinically applicable for oncologists treating such patients. As a premier journal covering the broad field of cancer, we believe that the Breast Cancer Research and Treatment is the perfect platform from which to share our results with the international medical community.

We would also like to suggest the following reviewers for our manuscript...

& publication ethics declarations
Declarations on publication ethics

- Cover letters

- Original and unpublished
- Not submitted to other journals
- Authors agree on paper/journal

- "Must-have" statements
  - Declare potential conflicts of interest
  - Sources of funding
  - Authorship contributions

Additional forms: authorship, COI, informed consent, or CONSORT
Marc Lippman, MD
Editor-in-Chief
Breast Cancer Research and Treatment

9 September 2015

Dear Dr Lippman,

Please find enclosed our manuscript entitled “Evaluation of the Glasgow prognostic score in patients undergoing curative resection for breast cancer liver metastases,” which we would like to submit for publication as a Original Article in Breast Cancer Research and Treatment.
The Glasgow prognostic score (GPS) is of value for a variety of tumours. Several studies have investigated the prognostic value of the GPS in patients with metastatic breast cancer, but few studies have performed such an investigation for patients undergoing liver resection for liver metastases. Furthermore, there are currently no studies that have examined the prognostic value of the modified GPS (mGPS) in these patients. The present study evaluated the mGPS in terms of its prognostic value for postoperative death in patients undergoing liver resection for breast cancer liver metastases.
A total of 318 patients with breast cancer liver metastases who underwent hepatectomy over a 15-year period were included in this study. The mGPS was calculated based on the levels of C-reactive protein and albumin, and the disease-free survival and cancer-specific survival rates were evaluated in relation to the mGPS. Overall, the results showed a significant association between cancer-specific survival and the carcinoembryonic antigen level. A higher mGPS was associated with increased aggressiveness of liver recurrence and poorer survival in these patients.
This study is the first to demonstrate that the preoperative mGPS, a simple clinical tool, is a useful prognostic factor for postoperative survival in breast cancer patients undergoing curative resection for liver metastases. This information is immediately clinically applicable for surgeons and medical oncologists treating such patients. As a premier journal covering breast cancer treatment, we believe that Breast Cancer Research and Treatment is the perfect platform from which to share our results with all those concerned with breast cancer.
This study is the first to demonstrate that the preoperative mGPS, a simple clinical tool, is a useful prognostic factor for postoperative survival in breast cancer patients undergoing curative resection for liver metastases. This information is immediately clinically applicable for surgeons and medical oncologists treating such patients. As a premier journal covering breast cancer treatment, we believe that Breast Cancer Research and Treatment is the perfect platform from which to share our results with all those concerned with breast cancer. Target your journal – keywords from the aims and scope
We confirm that this manuscript has not been published elsewhere and is not under consideration by another journal. All authors have approved the manuscript and agree with submission to *Breast Cancer Research and Treatment*. This study was funded by the Japanese Ministry of Health, Labour and Welfare. The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.
We would like to recommend the following reviewers to evaluate our manuscript:

1. Reviewer 1 and contact information
2. Reviewer 2 and contact information
3. Reviewer 3 and contact information
4. Reviewer 4 and contact information

Please address all correspondence to:

Can also exclude reviewers!
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Peer review & revisions
Peer review

Positive process

- Experts give their advice on how you can improve your *study* and your *manuscript*

- Peer review ensures that only papers that are *relevant* for the field and *conducted well* are published

- Not only helps you improve the quality of your paper, but also helps to *advance the field*
10 January 2015

Dear Dr. Robens,

Manuscript ID JOS-11-7839: “Prediction of the largest peak nonlinear seismic response of asymmetric structures under bi-directional excitation”

Your manuscript has been reviewed, and we regret to inform you that based on our Expert reviewers’ comments, it is not possible to further consider your manuscript in its current form for publication in the Journal of Seismology.

Although the reviews are not entirely negative, it is evident from the extensive comments and concerns that the manuscript, in its current form, does not meet the criteria expected of papers in the Journal of Seismology. The results appear to be too preliminary and incomplete for publication at the present time.

The reviewer comments are included at the bottom of this letter. I hope the information provided by the reviewers will be helpful to revise your manuscript. Thank you for your interest in the journal and I regret that the outcome has not been favorable at this time.
Peer review

The Reviewer comments are not entirely negative.

It is not possible to consider your manuscript in its current form.

I hope the information provided will be helpful to revise your manuscript in the future.

I regret that the outcome has not been favorable at this time.
We cannot publish your manuscript

Your study does not contain novel results that merit publication in our journal.

We appreciate your interest in our journal. However, we will not further consider your manuscript for publication.

We wish you luck in publishing your results elsewhere.
Peer review

Writing response letters

Read by the journal editor, and maybe the reviewers

Respond to every reviewer comment

- Easy to see changes
- Refer to line and page numbers
- Use a different color font
- Highlight the text
- Strikethrough font for deletions
Dr. Mariano García-Fernández
Editor-in-Chief
Journal of Seismology

12 March 2015

Dear Dr. García-Fernández,

Re: Resubmission of manuscript reference No. WJS-07-5739

Please find attached a revised version of our manuscript originally entitled “Prediction of the largest peak nonlinear seismic response of asymmetric structures under bi-directional excitation,” which we would like to resubmit for consideration for publication in the Journal of Seismology.

The reviewer’s comments were highly insightful and enabled us to greatly improve the quality of our manuscript. In the following pages are our point-by-point responses to each of the comments.

Revisions in the manuscript are shown as highlighted text. In accordance with the first comment, the title has been revised and the entire manuscript has undergone substantial English editing. We hope that the revisions in the manuscript and our accompanying responses will be sufficient to make our manuscript suitable for publication in the Journal of Seismology.
Reviewer Comment: In your analysis of the data you have chosen to use a somewhat obscure fitting function (regression). In my opinion, a simple Gaussian function would have sufficed. Moreover, the results would be more instructive and easier to compare to previous results.

Response: We agree with the reviewer’s assessment of the analysis.

Why do you agree, and what changes did you make?
Reviewer Comment: In your analysis of the data you have chosen to use a somewhat obscure fitting function (regression). In my opinion, a simple Gaussian function would have sufficed. Moreover, the results would be more instructive and easier to compare to previous results.

Response: We agree with the reviewer’s assessment of the analysis. Our tailored function, in its current form, makes it difficult to tell that this measurement constitutes a significant improvement over previously reported values. We describe our new analysis using a Gaussian fitting function in our revised Results section (Page 6, Lines 12–18).
Reviewer Comment: In your analysis of the data you have chosen to use a somewhat obscure fitting function (regression). In my opinion, a simple Gaussian function would have sufficed. Moreover, the results would be more instructive and easier to compare to previous results.

Response: It is clear that this reviewer is not familiar with the current analytical methods in the field. I recommend that you identify a more suitable reviewer for my manuscript.
Reviewer Comment: In your analysis of the data you have chosen to use a somewhat obscure fitting function (regression). In my opinion, a simple Gaussian function would have sufficed. Moreover, the results would be more intuitive and easier to compare to previous results.

Response: Although a simple Gaussian fit would facilitate comparison with the results of other studies, our tailored function allows for the analysis of the data in terms of the Smith model (Robens et al., 2012). We have now explained the use of this function and the Smith model in our revised Discussion section (Page 12, Lines 2–6).
**Reviewer comment:** Currently, the authors’ conclusion that this gene is involved in heart development is not completely validated by their in vitro analyses. They should do additional in vivo experiments using a genetic mouse model to show that heart development is regulated by this gene.

**Reasons why reviewers might make these comments**

- Current results are not appropriate for the scope or impact factor of the journal
- Reviewer is being “unfair”
What you should do

First, contact the journal editor if you feel the reviewer is being unfair

- Do the experiments, revise, and resubmit
- Withdraw submission and resubmit current manuscript to a journal with a different scope or lower impact factor
If rejected, what should you do?

**Option 1: New submission to the *same* journal**
- Fully revise manuscript
- Prepare point-by-point responses
- Include the original manuscript ID number

**Option 2: New submission to a *different* journal**
- Revise manuscript
- Reformat according to the author guidelines
Activity 6: Peer review

Please see Activity 6 in your Workbook
Activity 6: Peer review

1. The journal editor has returned your manuscript along with a question from the reviewers. Choose and justify the most appropriate response.

**Reviewer 2:** The concept of using conformity to explain effective policy implementation is not new. The authors should discuss what has been published previously regarding this issue, such as Stow et al. Int Policy Rev. 2008; 12: 45–52 and Yajima et al. J Res Policy. 2005; 62: 284–296.
Response A: We thank the reviewer for their opinion. However, we have decided to not include these references as they are not relevant to our study.

If you decide not to include the reviewer’s recommended studies, you need to explain why.
Response B: We thank the reviewer for their comment. We have reviewed the suggested papers; however, we do not feel that these papers should be cited in our manuscript. Although these papers address conformity, they do so in a socialist context that is not appropriate for our paper. The studies by Jackson et al. (*J Policy Studies*. 2007; 43: 120–127) and Pack et al. (*Int Econ Rev* 2011; 6: 67–71) are more relevant as they discuss the concept of conformity in a similar context to our paper. Therefore, we have included these references and added text to the Discussion of our revised manuscript.

- Explains why not appropriate
- Suggests other relevant studies
Response C: We thank the reviewer for their valuable suggestions. We have conducted a thorough literature search and have added the two suggested references to our revised manuscript. Where?

If you decide to include the reviewer’s recommended studies, you should explain *why* you feel they are relevant. You should also state *where* they are discussed.
Response D: We thank the reviewer for their valuable suggestions. We have conducted a thorough literature search and have added the two suggested references to our revised manuscript. We have also expanded our Discussion section to clarify how our findings differ from those reported previously. Briefly, although the studies from Stow et al. and Yajima et al. discuss the role of conformity to effectively implement new policies, they do so only in a socialist context. Therefore, we have discussed the novelty of our findings with regard to different government systems.
Your goal is not only to be published, but also to be widely read and cited

Be an effective communicator

- Understand academic publishing
- Effectively communicate your ideas in English
- Logically present your research in your manuscript
- Choose the right audience
- Communicate clearly with journal editors/reviewers