

Guidelines for Responding to Peer Review Comments

First of all, congratulations!

If you are reading this guide, it most likely means that your article has been reviewed by two or more reviewers and that the editorial team of *Continuity in Education* sent it back to you because they believe that your manuscript may be published after you have made the requested changes.

The process of responding, revising – and perhaps responding and revising yet again – can be frustrating and time consuming, but it is important to remember that you, the journal editor, and the peer reviewers, are all working toward the same goal: to improve your work, thus increasing the quality of information CiE's readers receive when reading your paper. In addition, responding to a peer review is also a way for you to grow professionally.

The work of the editor and the reviewers will be more efficient, and the publication cycle smoother, if you adopt a courteous and objective tone in dealing clearly and thoroughly with every detail and issue raised. Keep in mind as you write that not just the editor, but all of the reviewers may end up seeing everything you have written in your response letter.

Address each of the reviewers' comments and queries, aiming for a format that makes it perfectly clear which comment or query you are responding to (see [CiE' review response template](#)). You do not have to make all of the reviewers' suggested changes, but if you decide not to respond to a given point, you must give clear reason(s) for why you have chosen not to.

In your response letter, you may use different fonts and colours to distinguish reviewer comments from your responses, and save them in a Word document or pdf file. Do not hesitate to repeat information as necessary; for instance, if two reviewers ask you to make the same correction to the text. In the article itself, please **highlight in yellow** all the text portions you have changed or added in response to one of the review requests.

If there are matters of a particularly sensitive nature that you wish to communicate to the editor only, the best way is to communicate directly with him/her via email or through CiE's submission system.

Finally, do not neglect to thank the editor and the reviewers for their observations and comments. Their time is precious, and if you received many comments on your manuscript, this means that they have dedicated a significant portion of their time to help you improve your work. The most effective way to repay the reviewers' efforts is to give thoughtful attention to each of their observations and suggestions and to provide detailed and well-documented answers.

Further suggested readings:

<https://thinkscience.co.jp/en/articles/2016-06-WritingResponseLetters.html>

<https://thinkscience.co.jp/en/articles/Declining-Reviewer-Suggestions.html>

<https://journals.plos.org/ploscompbiol/article?id=10.1371/journal.pcbi.1005730>