SCI投稿信件的一些套话

一、投稿信

1. Dear Dr. Defendi ML:

I am sending a manuscript entitled “” by - which I should like to submit for possible publication in the journal of - .

Yours sincerely

2. Dear Dr. A:

Enclosed is a manuscript entitled “” by sb, which we are submitting for publication in the journal of - . We have chosen this journal because it deals with - . We believe that sth would be of interest to the journal’s readers.

3. Dear Dr. A:

Please find enclosed for your review an original research article, “” by sb. All authors have read and approve this version of the article, and due care has been taken to ensure the integrity of the work. No part of this paper has published or submitted elsewhere. No conflict of interest exits in the submission of this manuscript, and we have attached to this letter the signed letter granting us permission to use Figure 1 from another source.

We appreciate your consideration of our manuscript, and we look forward to receiving comments from the reviewers.

二、询问有无收到稿件

Dear Editors,

We dispatched our manuscript to your journal on 3 August 2006 but have not, as yet, receive acknowledgement of their safe arrival. We fear that may have been lost and should be grateful if you would let us know whether or not you have received them. If not, we will send our manuscript again. Thank you in advance for your help.

三、询问论文审查回音

Dear Editors，

It is more than 12 weeks since I submitted our manuscript (No:) for possible publication in your journal. I have not yet received a reply and am wondering whether you have reached a decision. I should appreciated your letting me know what you have decided as soon as possible.

四、关于论文的总体审查意见

1. This is a carefully done study and the findings are of considerable interest. A few minor revision are list below.

2. This is a well-written paper containing interesting results which merit publication. For the benefit of the reader, however, a number of points need clarifying and certain statements require further justification. There are given below.

3. Although these observation are interesting, they are rather limited and do not advance our knowledge of the subject sufficiently to warrant publication in PNAS. We suggest that the authors try submitting their findings to specialist journal such as -
4. Although this paper is good, it would be ever better if some extra data were added.
5. This manuscript is not suitable for publication in the journal of - because the main observation it describe was reported 3 years ago in a reputable journal of - .
6. Please ask someone familiar with English language to help you rewrite this paper. As you will see, I have made some correction at the beginning of the paper where some syntax is not satisfactory.
7. We feel that this potentially interesting study has been marred by an inability to communicate the finding correctly in English and should like to suggest that the authors seek the advice of someone with a good knowledge of English, preferable native speaker.
8. The wording and style of some section, particularly those concerning HPLC, need careful editing. Attention should be paid to the wording of those parts of the Discussion of and Summary which have been underlined.
9. Preliminary experiments only have been done and with exception of that summarized in Table 2, none has been repeated. This is clearly unsatisfactory, particularly when there is so much variation between assays.
10. The condition of incubation are poorly defined. What is the temperature? Were antibody used?

五、给编辑的回信

1. In reply to the referee's main criticism of paper, it is possible to say that -
One minor point raised by the referee concerns of the extra composition of the reaction mixture in Figure 1. This has now been corrected. Further minor changes had been made on page 3, paragraph 1 (line 3-8) and 2 (line 6-11). These do not affect our interpretation of the result.
2. I have read the referee's comments very carefully and conclude that the paper has been rejected on the sole grounds that it lake toxicity data. I admit that I did not include a toxicity table in my article although perhaps I should have done. This was for the sake of brevity rather than an error or omission.
3. Thank you for your letter of - and for the referee's comments concerning our manuscript entitled "". We have studied their comments carefully and have made correction which we hope meet with their approval.
4. I enclosed a revised manuscript which includes a report of additional experiments done at the referee's suggestion. You will see that our original findings are confirmed.
5. We are sending the revised manuscript according to the comments of the reviewers. Revised portion are underlined in red.
6. We found the referee's comments most helpful and have revised the manuscript
7. We are pleased to note the favorable comments of reviewers in their opening sentence.
8. Thank you for your letter. I am very pleased to learn that our manuscript is acceptable for publication in Cancer Research with minor revision.
9. We have therefore completed a further series of experiments, the result of which are summarized in Table 5. From this we conclude that intrinsic factor is not account.

10. We deleted the relevant passage since they are not essential to the contents of the paper.
11. I feel that the reviewer's comments concerning Figures 1 and 2 result from a misinterpretation of the data.
12. We would have include a non-protein inhibitor in our system, as a control, if one had been available.
13. We prefer to retain the use of Table 4 for reasons that it should be clear from the new paragraph inserted at the end of the Results section.
14. Although reviewer does not consider it is important to measure the temperature of the cells, we consider it essential.
15. The running title has been changed to "".
16. The Materials and Methods section now includes details for measuring uptake of isotope and assaying hexokinase.
17. The concentration of HAT media (page12 paragraph 2) was incorrectly stated in the original manuscript. This has been rectified. The authors are grateful to the referees for pointing out their error.
18. As suggested by both referees, a discussion of the possibility of laser action on chromosome has been included (page16, paragraph 2).
19. We included a new set of photographs with better definition than those originally submitted and to which a scale has been added.
20. Following the suggestion of the referees, we have redraw Figure 3 and 4.
21. Two further papers, published since our original submission, have been added to the text and Reference section. These are:
22. We should like to thank the referees for their helpful comments and hope that we have now produced a more balance and better account of our work. We trust that the revised manuscript is acceptable for publication.
23. I greatly appreciate both your help and that of the referees concerning improvement to this paper. I hope that the revised manuscript is now suitable for publication.
24. I should like to express my appreciation to you and the referees for suggesting how to improve our paper.
25. I apologize for the delay in revising the manuscript. This was due to our doing an additional experiment, as suggested by referees.