



Dealing with reviewers: From opposition to acceptance

Papers are very rarely accepted without revisions. Reviewers' comments, even those that lead to rejection, are an essential part of the publication process. The review process is an opportunity to get feedback on your manuscript before publishing, and to negotiate with editors and reviewers towards the best possible version of your paper.

Strategic and linguistic challenges. Who is the reviewer and what do they want? Who is the editor and how can they help? How do I recognise and strategically deal with different types of reviewers' comments? How do I argue when I don't want to do an experiment? How do I deal with rude or biased reviewers in a polite and professional manner? How do I use the English language to be diplomatic and to get what I want?

Negotiate professionally and successfully! In this workshop, you will swap perspectives between author, editor and reviewer through analysis of examples and in active writing and discussion exercises. The trainer will provide plenty of examples, and you are also very welcome to bring your own reviews as material. You will develop a strategic understanding of the review process and learn to use appropriate language to defend your work and to negotiate successfully.

Here is an example of the content for this course, in a two - day format (each day 9.00 - 15.00). Longer and shorter versions of this course are possible, and the content can be adapted to your requirements. If you have questions, please contact us at leonie@science-kitchen.net

Day 1 General strategies

- Challenges in publishing
- Who is the reviewer? What do they want?
- Who is the editor? How can they help?
- Types of reviewers' comments and strategies for dealing with them
- Assignment: Write responses to different kinds of reviewers' comments

Day 2 Specific examples

- Feedback on writing assignment
- Reviewer selection
- Experiments you cannot do, or do not want to do
- Dealing with biased or rude reviewers
- Language: professionally and politely arguing back
- Final discussion