

Author Responses to Editors' and Reviewers' Comments

Frances E. Likis, DrPH, NP, CNM, FACNM, FAAN
Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health

An essential part of the manuscript revision process is the author writing a response to the editor in which they address the editor and reviewer comments, including specific changes made during revision. Each distinct comment made by the editor(s) and reviewer(s) should be addressed. There are several ways to do this. One method for organizing comments and responses is to cut and paste the editor and reviewer comments into a document and respond to each point in a different color or font, as shown below. Another method is to cut and paste each editor and reviewer comment into a table with the comments pasted into rows in the left column, and the author's responses in the right column, as shown on the next page. An author does not need to make every change requested by the reviewers; however, the author does need to provide rationale for the decision not to make requested changes (see the next page for examples of such responses).

METHOD #1

Editor's comments

Please explicitly state the aim and purpose of the study in the Introduction.

This was added as the final sentence of the last paragraph of the Introduction section.

Reviewer #1

There are newer studies that should be included in the literature review.

Thank you for noting this. We have updated the references and added the newer citations to the Introduction and Discussion sections.

METHOD #2

The next page has a blank response table template that can be used to write your author response.

Editor and Reviewer Comments	How and Where It was Addressed
<i>Editor</i>	
Please explicitly state the aim and purpose of the study in the Introduction section.	This was added as the final sentence of the last paragraph of the Introduction section.
More detail is needed on how data were collected.	We have added a paragraph on data collection to the Methods section.
<i>Reviewer 1</i>	
There are newer studies that should be included in the literature review.	Thank you for noting this. We have updated the references and added the newer citations to the Introduction and Discussion sections.
This topic has some relevance to nonpregnant women as well; the authors should expand on this in the discussion.	While we agree that the topic pertains to other populations, we feel adding this information goes beyond the scope and purpose of this manuscript and would cause it to exceed the journal's word limit. We respectfully decline to add this content.
<i>Reviewer 2</i>	
This is an interesting and well written study.	Thank you.
Most of the journal's readers are clinicians, and the authors should include some thoughts on the implications of this study for clinical practice.	Thank you for raising this important point. We have added text to the Discussion section about the implications for practice.
<i>Reviewer 3</i>	
The information about how many people were approached and how many agreed to participate belongs in the Results section. The numbers including the exclusions do not add up. Please clarify.	This information has been moved to the Results section. We have verified and corrected all numbers and added a graphic that shows the flow of study participants.
The tables are very difficult to follow and contain a lot of statistical jargon. Please make these more readable for the non-researcher.	We have discussed the tables with the editor and have revised them to be more reader-friendly; however, we kept some of the statistical information that is important for the researchers who access this article.

