Appendix O. Sample Revise and Resubmit Letter

Dear Professor XXXX,

The reviews are now in on your, “XXXXXXXXX.” Based on the reviewers’ comments and our own reading, we are unable to accept the manuscript in its current form. We would, however, be willing to consider a resubmission of a substantially revised version of the manuscript. This invitation is not a promise of eventual acceptance.

As you will see, the reviewers expressed a great deal of enthusiasm for your manuscript’s topic, an enthusiasm we share. However, the reviewers also raise a number of serious concerns that must be resolved before this manuscript can be published. We encourage you to take time to digest these reviews and to address each of the suggestions the reviewers or we make, either in your revisions or in an accompanying response memo. Below we highlight several overlapping reviewer comments that, in our view, are especially central. We also intersperse our comments about the manuscript. Rest assured, we were successful in securing very learned, hardworking, and insightful reviewers for this manuscript. The result is a very demanding set of recommended revisions, but also, hopefully, the opportunity to craft a manuscript with convincing empirical findings and widespread impact.

Analysis. There were several recommendations, of varying gravity, for strengthening your analysis. Reviewer 3 suggests that consideration of the naming of this event be considered in relation to the paper’s key concerns, and also calls for more information regarding the taken-for-granted aspects of the speeches deployed at the various sites. Reviewer 1 raises two points that are perhaps most challenging and significant from our point of view. First, this reviewer, and we believe, more should be done to strengthen the paper by providing more systematic data demonstrating that form of discourse in fact varied across the three sites. Second and most challenging, the question of why the discourses varied requires a more convincing analysis. We very much hope that you will take these concerns seriously in revision.

Literatures. While reviewers were generally impressed by your treatment of key literatures, Reviewer 2 does suggest that your manuscript would be enriched by engagement with two literatures: recent work in the theory of cultural trauma; and literature on emotions. These are useful suggestions that should enhance the manuscript’s contribution.

Style, Accessibility and Length – It is important that all American Sociological Review (ASR) manuscripts be accessible to as much of the potential readership as possible. Our goal is for the majority of those with sociology PhDs from research universities to be able to understand the issue, the argument, and the findings. These goals are achieved in the abstract, introduction, and conclusions but also have implications for writing throughout the manuscript. For example, all sub-disciplinary jargon should be translated into ordinary English so that readers outside the sub-discipline can understand and benefit from your article. The length of the current version is a little longer than needed for this project. Therefore, please make sure to offset any additions to the text by tightening the prose elsewhere so that the next draft is less than 11,500 words, inclusive of abstract, text, footnotes and references.
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The next round of reviews will assess whether you have been able to resolve the serious concerns raised by the reviewers and us. Our reading of the reviewers’ comments, in combination with our own careful reading, suggest that the outcome for this manuscript is still very much in play, and as such, the manuscript will require significant and thoughtful revisions. A successful outcome will require rigorous attention to all of the reviewers’ and editors’ suggestions. If you decide to pursue a revision, when you return your revised manuscript, please include a detailed response memo explaining how you revised your manuscript in light of the reviewers’ and editors’ comments. For any reviewer or editor recommendations you decide not to follow, please provide a well-reasoned rationale for not revising the manuscript as recommended. At this point, we envision returning your revised manuscript, previous reviews, and response memo to one or more of the current reviewers and to one or more new reviewers.

Once you have had the chance to read and digest the reviewers’ comments, please let us know if you plan to submit a revision. If you do plan to resubmit the manuscript, please let us know when we might be able to expect the next draft.

To revise your manuscript, log into http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/asr and enter your Author Center, where you will find your manuscript title listed under "Manuscripts with Decisions." Under "Actions," click on "Create a Revision." Your manuscript number has been appended to denote a revision.

You may also click the below link to start the revision process (or continue the process if you have already started your revision) for your manuscript. If you use the below link you will not be required to login to ScholarOne Manuscripts.

http://mc.manuscriptcentral.com/asrXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX

You will be unable to make your revisions on the originally submitted version of the manuscript. Instead, revise your manuscript using a word processing program and save it on your computer. Once the revised manuscript is prepared, you can upload it and submit it through your Author Center.

When submitting your revised manuscript, you will be able to respond to the comments made by the reviewer(s) in the space provided. You can use this space to document any changes you make to the original manuscript. In order to expedite the processing of the revised manuscript, please be as specific as possible in your response to the reviewer(s).

IMPORTANT: Your original files are available to you when you upload your revised manuscript. Please delete any redundant files before completing the submission.

Please note that submission of a manuscript to another professional journal while it is under review by American Sociological Review (ASR) is regarded by the American Sociological Association (ASA) as unethical, and significant findings or contributions that have already appeared (or will appear)
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elsewhere must be clearly identified. All persons who publish in ASA journals are required to abide by these ASA guidelines and ethics codes. We thus assume that this manuscript or a substantially similar version of this manuscript is not under review elsewhere and that portions have not been published elsewhere in whole or in part. Please let us know if either of these conditions is not true.

Thank you for giving us the opportunity to consider the manuscript for publication in ASR.

Sincerely,
Tony N. Brown, Katharine M. Donato, Larry W. Isaac, Holly J. McCammon
Editors, American Sociological Review
ASR@vanderbilt.edu