

The shortest distance between  
the Sun (Journal) and the Earth (Author)

Chair Professor, Nian-Shing Chen

National Sun Yat-sen University

Editor-in-Chief, Educational Technology & Society (SSCI)

Chair, IEEE Technical Committee on Learning Technology

Email: [nianshing@gmail.com](mailto:nianshing@gmail.com)

Web: <http://www.nschen.net>

# Part 1: Behind The Scenes

- About ET&S Journal

# Editors: Division of Labors

- Nian-Shing Chen: Handling review process of all regular submissions
- Demetrios Sampson: In charge of ET&S special issue affairs
- Kinshuk: Handling post editing and publishing of all accepted papers

# Four major waiting queues

- Priority 1: Reviewed submissions waiting for editor's decision
- Priority 2: Assign reviewers for revised submissions
- Priority 3: Assign reviewers for initial submissions
- Priority 4: Initial submissions with only one reviewer (Declined by reviewers after ...)

# How decision made?

- Two definitely rejects → Reject
- Two definitely accept → Accept
- Two major revisions → Major revision or Reject
- Two minor revisions → Minor revision
- One major revision, one minor revision → Major revision
- One major revision, one definitely accept → Third opinion

## Part 2: writing and publishing

- Personal Experience sharing

# Conduct 、 Write 、 Submit 、 Revise

- Conduct
  - Originality, identify research gap, contribution
- Write
  - Understand who are your main target readers?
- Submit
  - Know what they are looking for from different stakeholders' perspective
- Revise
  - Iteration and positive attitude toward to reviewer' s comments

# 討論大綱

- 如何判斷自己的Paper是否已經真正Ready可以投稿了？
- 嚴格遵守期刊規定的寫作格式很重要嗎？
- 嚴格遵守期刊規定的文章長度很重要嗎？
- 一定需要引用所欲投稿期刊已經發表過的相關文獻嗎？
- 這一篇Paper應該要投稿到哪一個期刊最恰當？
- 投稿前需要先寫EMAIL問主編自己的Paper是否適合投稿該期刊嗎？
- 主編是如何處理投稿的文章？
- 主編是如何選擇一篇文章的審稿者？
- 一篇Paper投稿後合理的審查時間是多久？
- 投稿後要經過多久比較恰當可以寫EMAIL去問主編審查的進度？
- 一篇Paper投稿之後審查很久的原因是什麼？



# 討論大綱

- 一審的結果兩位審查者都給了很好的評價，主編給予Minor Revision，二審結果出來卻被拒絕了，是怎樣？
- 如何面對審稿者所提出來的審查意見？
- 為何用心準備針對審稿者意見的具體修改報告(Change report)是非常重要的？
- 修改完再投稿時需要給主編額外寫封信嗎？
- 一篇文章在被接受之前最多可能經過幾次修改？
- 一篇文章有可能在第一輪審查之後就被接受嗎？
- 為何完整記錄一篇Paper投稿的過程是非常重要的？
- Paper被拒絕了，怎麼辦？
- 已經發表在研討會的文章可以轉投稿到期刊去發表嗎？
- 已經發表在期刊上的文章可以轉投到專書文章去發表嗎？

如何判斷自己的Paper是否已經真正Ready  
可以投稿了？

- 趕快寫完就急著投稿是大部分作者的心態
- 趕著投稿往往不是能夠讓Paper快速被接受的好方法
- Many iterations of revision are needed before submission
- Self-directed peer-review process
- A paper on hand for improvement is better than a submitted paper sitting in the queue waiting for processing

嚴格遵守期刊規定的寫作格式很重要嗎？

- 真的很重要，因為這是看一個作者是否具有足夠專業學術水平最直接有效的方法。
- 不同期刊有不同的格式要求，如果連這點基本要求都做不好，如何說服別人自己的研究會有多嚴謹。
- 許多期刊會因為不符合格式而直接退稿。
- 用A期刊的格式直接轉投B期刊，馬上就露餡了。充分顯示作者對投稿該期刊一點誠意都沒有。

## 作者都很會抱怨

-----Original Message-----

From: XXXX

Sent: Tuesday, April 28, 2015 6:56 AM

To: ETS Editors

Subject: Re: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 5091)

Thank you very much. I do have a complaint about your process. We submitted a paper that was in very close format, it had only very minor problems. The paper was rejected, and we were told to reformat it. We did, and got this. Well, it would have saved us a lot of work if you had told us the paper was not right for the journal with the first submission. Frankly, I would not submit to this journal again.

嚴格遵守期刊規定的文章長度很重要嗎？

- 真的很重要，不同的期刊對於文章長短的喜好不同
- 短文章要的東西與長的文章不一樣
- 因為寫太長的文章某種程度顯示文章寫作不夠精準
- 一般文章長度都在4000~8000字，可是這之間長度差了一倍
- 如果真的有需要寫超過長度限制的文章，可以具明理由先徵求期刊主編的同意



# Respect the word limit of a Journal

Dear XXX,

The maximum word limit of 7000 is expected to be honored by all authors.

Sometime it helps to reduce some peripheral content to give more room to more important issue at hand.

With regards,

Nian-Shing

**From:** XXX

**Sent:** Tuesday, April 01, 2014 3:36 AM

**To:** nianshing@gmail.com

**Subject:** RE: Outcome of your submission to ET&S Special Issue

Dear Nian-Shing,

Please advise on ET&S' editorial policy regarding word counts.

Inté,

XXX

# Respect the word limit of a journal

From: nianshing@gmail.com [mailto:nianshing@gmail.com]

Sent: Wednesday, March 05, 2014 9:00 PM

To: XXX; 'Kinshuk' Cc: 'ETS Editors' Subject: Re: Advice

Dear XXX,

Thanks for your email.

We are pleased to see such a qualitative study based on hard evidences.

15000 words is really a bit too long compared to the journal's 7000 words limit.

Could you please kindly shorten it to less than 12000 words. Regards,

Nian-Shing on behalf of the editors

From: XXX

Sent: Wednesday, March 5, 2014 7:45 PM

To: nianshing@gmail.com ; 'Kinshuk' Subject: Advice

Dear Prof. Chen,

We would like to seek your advice (but pls kindly ignore our question if you think it is inconvenient for you to answer us.)

We've recently completed a manuscript on game-based learning (which is a piece of qualitative research and that's why it is a bit long, with about 15000 words including the references), as the attached. We are planning to submit it to JETS.

It is quite difficult for us to shorten the paper without depriving the qualitative evidence and messages that we want to deliver ... we will try to shorten it further a bit.

I cordially enquire whether it is possible for JETS to accept a submission in this length. Best, XXX

<nianshing@gmail.com> 於 11 Mar, 2014 7:38 AM 寫道 :  
XXX,

Thanks for keeping me informed.

I have made a note for your submitted paper to avoid the technical checking person kicking back your paper directly.

Nian-Shing

From: XXX

Sent: Tuesday, March 11, 2014 1:19 AM

To: nianshing@gmail.com ; 'Kinshuk'

Cc: 'ETS Editors'

Subject: RE: Advice

Dear Prof. Chen,

We just finished revising the paper to 11714 words, and submitted the word version to the JETS submission system. Many thanks for advice, attached is for your information.

Best,

XXX

一定需要引用所欲投稿期刊已經發表過的  
相關文獻嗎？

- 理論上不需要，可是務實考量上需要
- 如果該期刊真的有發表過重要的相關文獻，那作者原本就應該知道並適度引用
- 如果該期刊真的完全沒有發表過相關的文獻，那可能代表作者選擇投稿該期刊本身就不太合適
- 審稿者大都是在該期刊曾經發表過文章的，有些審稿者對於你做類似的研究居然沒有引用他發表的文章，印象就會大壞，後果…
- 有些期刊會認為既然你連一篇都沒有引用該期刊的文章，代表你平時應該也沒有在看該期刊

這一篇Paper應該要投稿到哪一個期刊最  
恰當？

- 首先要掌握自己研究領域到底有哪些重要的期刊
  - 善用Google Scholar的[Metrics](#)功能
- 充分了解一個期刊所欲徵求文章的主題跟範圍真的很重要
- 有些期刊的屬性變了可是徵求文章的主題跟範圍在網頁上都沒有更新
- 最好的方法就是務必仔細分析該期刊過去1-3年所發表過的文章主題與屬性
- 實務上考量包含該期刊的類別(SCI, SSCI)，影響係數(IF)，審稿的平均速度，是否收費，是否為Open Access



▼ English

Business, Economics & Management

Chemical & Material Sciences

Engineering & Computer Science

Health & Medical Sciences

Humanities, Literature & Arts

Life Sciences & Earth Sciences

Physics & Mathematics

▼ Social Sciences

**Educational Technology**

Chinese

Portuguese

German

Spanish

French

Top publications - Educational Technology [Learn more](#)

Publication	h5-index	h5-median
1. Computers & Education	81	116
2. British Journal of Educational Technology	44	63
3. Educational Technology & Society	39	59
4. Journal of Computer Assisted Learning	38	59
5. The Internet and Higher Education	35	57
6. The International Review of Research in Open and Distance Learning	34	54
7. Educational Technology Research and Development	33	46
8. Australasian Journal of Educational Technology	30	57
9. IEEE Transactions on Learning Technologies	27	36
10. International Journal of Computer-Supported Collaborative Learning	25	43
11. Language Learning & Technology	24	48
12. Interactive Learning Environments	23	31
13. Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET	23	28
14. Distance Education	22	29
15. Learning, Media and Technology	20	36

投稿前需要先寫EMAIL問主編自己的Paper  
是否適合投稿該期刊嗎？



- 就專業上而言應該是不需要
- 一般期刊網站上都有清楚的徵求主題與範圍
- 如果作者平時有在關注該期刊應該不難判斷是否適合
- 過去經驗顯示會來問這種問題的大都是新手作者或是不夠專業的
- 有些情況是可以問，或許也該問。
- 例如，比較新的研究議題，過去該期刊真的完全沒有登過
- 研究方法比較特別跟該期刊過去所刊登的文章都不一樣

主編是如何處理投稿的文章？

（現場演示）

主編是如何選擇一篇文章的審稿者？

（現場演示）

一篇Paper投稿後合理的審查時間是多久？

- 有快篩機制的期刊，可能幾小時內到一個月左右
- 有真正送給審稿者審查的話，一般是三個月到一年左右
- 少數的案例，也有審查一個月內就回來的，也有超過兩年才回來的
- 許多期刊會在刊登的文章上顯示以下的資訊

Article history:

Received 25 October 2012

Received in revised form

10 August 2013

Accepted 12 August 2013

(Submitted August 15, 2013;

Revised November 29, 2013;

Accepted August 19, 2014)

- 多收集一些這類的資訊自己平均一下，對該期刊的審稿時間就有譜了

投稿後要經過多久比較恰當可以寫EMAIL  
去問主編審查的進度？

- 過了該期刊平均審稿時間之後就可以寫EMAIL去問了
- 投稿後如果該期刊有明確的回覆平均審稿時間，切忌不要在該時間結束之前去問。
- 有些作者很白目，投稿兩周之後就來問審稿進度了
- 有些作者很善良，投稿兩年之後才來問審稿進度
- 為什麼超過合理審查時間之後，還是沒有收到審稿意見，作者一定要主動趕快去問呢？
- 因為可能有位審查者已經完全不理會被分配該文章的審查工作了
- 因為可能主編老早就已經發審稿結果的通知信給你，只是你的信被過濾掉了或你們學要的EMAIL伺服器掉信了

From: nianshing@gmail.com  
Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2015 2:56 PM  
To: XXX; ETS Editors  
Subject: Re: ETS Submission Notification. Paper ID: 5182

The review usually takes 3-4 months, please don't send any query email regarding review status of your submission within 4 months period.

From: XXX  
Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2015 1:03 PM  
To: ETS Editors  
Subject: Re: ETS Submission Notification. Paper ID: 5182

The Editor,  
I would like to follow-up my paper.  
Thank you.

-----  
DR. XXXXXX  
Faculty-Researcher, Mathematics Department  
University of San Carlos  
Cebu City  
Philippines  
-----

On Wednesday, May 6, 2015 10:52 PM, ETS Editors <ets-editors@ifets.info> wrote:

Dear Author,  
Your Paper entitled "Impact of the Integration of Text-Messaging in Mathematics Teaching-Learning Process" has been successfully submitted.  
Your Submission has been assigned Paper ID: 5182.  
This is the Initial Submission.  
We shall contact you as soon as we have received feedback from reviewers. However, you can always check the status of your paper on journal website.  
**The review usually takes 3-4 months, please don't send any query email regarding review status of your submission within 4 months period.**  
Sincere regards.  
Nian-Shing Chen  
Kinshuk  
Demetrios G Sampson

Co-Editors-in-Chief,  
Journal of Educational Technology & Society



**From:** [Charalampos Alifragkis](#)  
**Sent:** Monday, June 8, 2015 5:51 PM  
**To:** [Angie XXXX](#)  
**Cc:** [ETS Editors](#)  
**Subject:** Re: ETS Submission Notification. Paper ID: 3701

Dear Dr. XXXX,

thank you very much for your message. Please find enclosed at the end of this message the decision notification message regarding your paper (ID: 3701)

According to our records, this decision notification message has been sent to you on **September 7, 2013**. Most probably, this e-mail was ended up to your spam folder or was blocked from your mail server. However, you could also use the "Track your Paper" functionality of our website here: [http://ifets.info/ets\\_journal/paper\\_status.php](http://ifets.info/ets_journal/paper_status.php) by using your Paper ID and your email, in order to track the status of your paper, anytime.

On **8 June 2015** at 12:22, Angie XXXX <[angie.XXXX@gmail.com](mailto:angie.XXXX@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear Editors,

I have received this message 2 years ago. I have never ever received any further reply, and the journal's author's log in does not recognise my log in and so I cannot see what happened with my submission. How am I guaranteed that my article did not get stolen and published with another author's name? How is it possible for a review to take 2 years and that the authors are never contacted?

Please respond promptly to this email and verify what happened to my paper.  
Thank you.

Regards,  
XXXX

On Tue, **Jul 2, 2013** at 9:50 PM, ETS Editors <[ets-editors@ifets.info](mailto:ets-editors@ifets.info)> wrote:

Dear Author,

Your Paper entitled "**Podcasts as a prelecture technique to enhance learning of unfamiliar material**" has been **successfully submitted**.

Your Submission has been assigned Paper ID: **3701**.

This is the **Initial Submission**.

We shall contact you as soon as we have received feedback from reviewers. However, you can always check the status of your paper on journal website.

The review usually takes 3-4 months, please don't send any query email regarding review status of your submission within 4 months period.

Sincere regards.

Nian-Shing Chen

Kinshuk

Demetrios G Sampson

Co-Editors-in-Chief,  
Journal of Educational Technology & Society

一篇Paper投稿之後審查很久的原因是什麼？

- 可能主編很難找到願意審查的審稿者
- 可能主編分配到的多位審稿者一直拒絕審查
- 可能有位審查者已經完全不理會被分配該文章的審查工作了
- 可能原本答應審查的審稿者在拖了許多個月之後，受不了期刊一直來催促審查意見，乾脆直接按下拒絕審查的按鈕
- 最可能的原因是自己的文章沒寫好，寫得不通順。審稿者嘗試審查好幾次都無法順利完成

# Why my paper has been under review for such a long time?

The following reviewer declined the review assignment:

**Reviewer:** XXX

**Assigned Paper:** 3174i

**Declination Reason:** I am not available to review the assigned paper

Please login to the ETS System ([http://www.ifets.info/ets\\_journal/admin/login.php](http://www.ifets.info/ets_journal/admin/login.php)), so as to assign the Paper to another Reviewer.

The following reviewer declined the review assignment:

**Reviewer:** XXX

**Assigned Paper:** 3174i

**Declination Reason:** I do not have the expertise to review the assigned paper

Please login to the ETS System ([http://www.ifets.info/ets\\_journal/admin/login.php](http://www.ifets.info/ets_journal/admin/login.php)), so as to assign the Paper to another Reviewer.

# Why my paper has been under review for such a long time

From: XXX Sent: Saturday, January 11, 2014 7:13 AM

To: ETS Editors Subject: Re: ETS Journal - Paper ID: 3678i Review Submission Reminder

Dear Editors,

Thanks for the reminder. I am sorry I am late with my review **but the paper has been written in very poor English and it has taken me too long to review.**

Regards, XXX.

Sent from my BlackBerry® powered by Virgin Mobile.

From: ETS Editors<ets-editors@ifets.info> Date: Fri, 10 Jan 2014 01:35:02 +0200

To: XXX Subject: ETS Journal - Paper ID: 3678i Review Submission Reminder

Dear XXX,

This is a gentle reminder that your review is URGENTLY due for the paper:

"Visual feedback improves transfer of learning: A case study."

of the SSCI indexed Educational Technology & Society Journal. The review was due on **December 7, 2013**, and we would highly appreciate if you could enter the review in the system urgently. This is very important, since we are committed to a timely and high quality review feedback to all submitted papers.

To enter the review, please log in to the review system at:

[http://www.ifets.info/ets\\_journal/admin/login.php](http://www.ifets.info/ets_journal/admin/login.php)

Your username and password are listed below.

Thank you in advance for your efforts and support in this matter.

Sincere regards.

Nian-Shing Chen

Co-Editors-in-Chief,

Journal of Educational Technology & Society

# Acceptable level of English writing matters a lot

Paper Summary:

Have authors revised the paper by taking account of all relevant comments from ALL reviewers?:

Authors did not revise the paper properly.

Please explain which comments of reviewers the authors missed out, and how they should have considered those comments?:

I have now read this paper 3 times and the first two times I suggested (and so did other reviewers) that the paper be reviewed by a native English speaker. This has not been done. The authors claim that "\\\"professional assistance\\\" was obtained but this is obviously not a language usage specialist. **The English in the paper gets worse with each revision!**

Please comment on the quality of the revised paper? Is the paper worth publishing at this stage? Have any new problems come up in the revised paper? :

It is not worth publishing. In fact, the authors rely on the reviewers to make comments to help them make the paper publishable and then don\\\'t revise the paper appropriately.

Any other feedback for authors:

I have now read this paper 3 times and still feel that it is not in publishable form. I am throwing in the towel - the author(s) is(are) not taking into account suggestions made by the reviewers and our concerns about the technology overshadowing language learning are not addressed sufficiently. Critical language learning time is wasted when the students are required to learn to use the technology needed to finish the assignment. It is frustrating to see that our suggestions are not taken into consideration and each time I reread the paper after its revisions, I feel like it gets worse instead of better.

一審的結果兩位審查者都給了很好的評價，主編給予Minor Revision，二審結果出來卻被拒絕了，是怎樣？

On 9/06/2015, at 11:10 pm, <[nianshing@gmail.com](mailto:nianshing@gmail.com)> <[nianshing@gmail.com](mailto:nianshing@gmail.com)> wrote:

Dear XXX,

Your frustration is understandable.

However, it is not unusual to get rejection in the second run of review or even the third run of review.

If the result of initial run review is unquestionable, it implies the second run of review has no meaning.

As you may have noticed that in the decision letter, we already mentioned that

if you wish to submit the article again after extensive revisions, We would be happy to initiate a fresh review process.

Thanks for your understanding.

Regards,

Nian-Shing



如何面對審稿者所提出來的審查意見？

- 先認清客觀的事實：審稿者都是義務擔任國際期刊的審稿者
- 審稿者的審查意見對於提升自己文章的品質有很大的幫助
- 一定要用正面的態度來面對期刊審稿者所提出來的意見
- 當然有部分審稿者的意見真的很不合理或是沒有真正看懂自己的文章
- 心平氣和地想審稿者也都很忙，人家沒有義務給你非常高品質的意見
- 客觀的陳述沒有接受對方意見的理由為何
- 不要指責對方沒有真正看懂自己的文章，要相信是自己沒有寫清楚讓對方誤解了

# Positive attitude toward the comments made by reviewers

Dear XXX,

We have re-examined your change report and r1 revision (as enclosed). It is very clear that you did not address reviewer 2' comments adequately. In fact, the comments of this round 2 was provided by the reviewer 1. Obviously, reviewer 1 strongly suggest you should address reviewer 2's comments after reviewing your change report and the revised manuscript.

Let me know if you are willing to address the comments or feel free to submit your paper to elsewhere.

Regards, Nian-Shing

-----Original Message-----

From: XXX Sent: Wednesday, March 26, 2014 6:19 PM

To: 'ETS Editors' Subject: RE: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 3833)

Dear colleagues,

Thank you for your message.

After carefully reading the reviewers' comments, we regret to say that we believe that reviewer 2 is probably biased against our submission. We received same comments as in the first round although we tried to answer- in the best possible way - most of the comments made by both reviewers. Having said that, it is quite disappointing that reviewer 2 says that we made a quick attempt to answer the comments. Just to make clear our position: We are not saying that we don't accept criticism. On the contrary we tried to work on most of the issues as raised by both reviewers and could be changed without re -running the whole study. We believe that it would be much more acceptable by us **if she/he rejected our submission in the first place so we wouldn't have to wait 4 additional months** (time from review round 1 to round 2) to get the same review comments as if nothing has happened in the meantime.... By the way we would like to know what the reaction of reviewer 1 was, because here we see comments only from reviewer 2.

According to the above we would like to work more on our submission on the aspects that can be changed and submit our new revision but we would like to ask you to exclude reviewer 2 from further reviewing our work. Looking forward to receiving your response. XXX

From: XXX

Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2014 6:55 PM

To: nianshing@gmail.com

Subject: RE: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 3833)

Dear Nian-Shing,

Thank you for your message. We totally respect your view.

After discussion with my colleague which is the co-author we decided to withdraw our submission.

Thanks again for your efforts.

Best regards, XXX

From: Prof Demetrios G Sampson, ETS Co-Editor

Sent: Thursday, March 27, 2014 2:13 PM

To: nianshing@gmail.com ; 'ETS Editors'

Subject: RE: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 3833)

I was very disappointed to read this request from this "post-doc" student while at Tunis airport. Thank you Nian-Shing for your firm and justified reply. Dimitris

為何用心準備針對審稿者意見的具體修改報告(Change report)是非常重要的？

- 好的修改報告(Change report)可以加速所修改的文章被審查的時間
- 好的修改報告(Change report)可以感動審稿者提高文章被接受的機率
- 好的修改報告(Change report)可以讓審稿者充分了解為何有些意見你沒有依照他的建議去修改
- 好的修改報告(Change report)可以让你將無法放入文章中的重要資訊或內容清楚的呈現在修改報告之中

修改完再投稿時需要給主編額外寫封信嗎？

- 如果你不想主編再送給那個不適任的審稿者，那就該給主編寫封信並述明你的理由
- 要站在合理的角度，不要讓主編覺得你是來硬幺的
- 善用過程中的一些事件，例如審查拖很久啦，審稿者的建議等於整個實驗研究必須要重新來過等等

一篇文章在被接受之前最多可能經過幾次修改？



- ET&S最多到R3
- BJET聽說沒有上限
- 本人的經驗是到R5
- 黃國禎說他有一篇到R7

一篇文章有可能在第一輪審查之後就被接受嗎？

## Review Results:

Reviewer 1

### Paper Summary:

The aim of this study is to develop a scale for determining perception of students towards online learning (POSTOL). This scale consists of four dimensions: instructor characteristics, social presence, instructional design, and trust. Research data is collected from 208 Taiwan university students.

How RELEVANT is this paper? (How relevant are the issues for educators and/or educational system developers?):

Very relevant

How SIGNIFICANT is this paper? (How important is the problem studied? Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view?):

Very significant

The topic is timely and important.

How ORIGINAL is this paper? (Are the problems and approaches new? Is this a novel combination of existing techniques? Does the paper points out differences from related research? Does it address a new problem or one that has not been studies in depth? Does it introduce an interesting research paradigm? Does it introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives?):

Very original

Please comment on the QUALITY of this paper? (Is the paper technically sound? Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? Are its claims backed up? Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well-known technique? Does the paper back up a theoretical idea already in the literature with experimental evidence? Does it offer a theoretical analysis of prior experimental results?) :

There is a great effort in this study, And the research design and reporting skills are very rich, hence making the study usable for educators and educational system developers.

Please comment on the CLARITY of this paper? (Is the paper well written? Does it motivate the research? Are the results described and evaluated? Is the paper organized in a logical fashion? Is the paper written in a manner that makes it accessible to most educators and/or educational system developers? Is the paper written in clear English? Is the readability good, average or poor? Are there any presentation problems?) :

English language use is very rich.

Please comment on the appropriateness of the title, abstract and conclusion?:

This study is original. Rich research design and reporting skills to supported the study being significant. Especially the consistency between the problems and results is very important.

Any further comments, advice or explanations?:

This paper is original.

Review Results:

Reviewer 2

Paper Summary:

The authors validate a scale that is designed to measure students' perceptions of online learning.

How RELEVANT is this paper? (How relevant are the issues for educators and/or educational system developers?):

Other scales have been developed.

How SIGNIFICANT is this paper? (How important is the problem studied? Does the paper stimulate discussion of important issues or alternative points of view?):

As noted earlier, other scales have been developed by other authors.

How ORIGINAL is this paper? (Are the problems and approaches new? Is this a novel combination of existing techniques? Does the paper point out differences from related research? Does it address a new problem or one that has not been studied in depth? Does it introduce an interesting research paradigm? Does it introduce an idea that appears promising or might stimulate others to develop promising alternatives?):

The scale is not the first to be developed.

Please comment on the QUALITY of this paper? (Is the paper technically sound? Does it carefully evaluate the strengths and limitations of its contributions? Are its claims backed up? Does the paper offer a new form of evidence in support of or against a well-known technique? Does the paper back up a theoretical idea already in the literature with experimental evidence? Does it offer a theoretical analysis of prior experimental results?) :

The paper is of good quality.

Please comment on the CLARITY of this paper? (Is the paper well written? Does it motivate the research? Are the results described and evaluated? Is the paper organized in a logical fashion? Is the paper written in a manner that makes it accessible to most educators and/or educational system developers? Is the paper written in clear English? Is the readability good, average or poor? Are there any presentation problems?) :

The paper is well written.

Please comment on the appropriateness of the title, abstract and conclusion?:

The title of the scale could be "Students' Expectations of Online Learning" rather than "Students' Perceptions of Online Learning."  
I am making this observation based on my understanding of the items that are listed at the end of the paper.

Any further comments, advice or explanations?:

Good paper.

為何完整記錄一篇Paper投稿的過程是非常重要的？

- 一個漫長的旅程：JCAL這一篇paper的奮鬥史
- 2009年1月：故事的開始，一芳於寒假期間用老師的一門線上課程寫了一篇short paper
- 2009年5月：這一篇short paper成功的投稿到ICIM2009去，一芳用中文進行了口頭發表
- 2010年3月：這一篇paper在老師與Kinshuk聯手大幅修改之後，將full paper投稿到ETR&D 國際SSCI期刊。於2010年5月收到Rejection Letter. 故事至此好像結束了。
- 2011年4月：趙國仁老師加入老師的研究團隊，剛好想到這一篇幾乎被遺忘的paper，又經過一番天旋地轉，大刀闊斧的修改之後，改投稿到JCAL國際SSCI期刊。
- 2011年6月15日：收到主編送回來第一次審查的意見，經過老師，趙老師，逸群等三人聯手一段漫長且日以繼夜的修改之後，於7月24日勇敢的再投稿出去。
- 2011年9月3號：收到主編送回來的第二次審稿意見。又經過三人共同一陣修改之後(其實老師花的時間比較多啦，因為如何回覆reviewers的意見已經變成是老師的專長了)。第二次修改後的paper於9月20滿懷信心的在投稿出去。
- 2011年9月28日：沒錯就是在教師節的這一天早晨，一個來自主編的好消息來了。這一篇paper終於被JCAL國際期刊接受發表了。還是主編自己看過我們非常細心與誠懇的回覆意見之後，就直接發出Acceptance Letter了，沒有再送回去給Reviewers，因此節省了不少時間。
- 從2009年1月起，到2011年9月28日，整整2年又9個月的時間，才孕育了一篇SSCI國際期刊論文。比母親懷胎十月生一個小孩還要久，過程的艱辛也只有實際參與這個過程的人能夠體會了。

FILE HOME INSERT DESIGN PAGE LAYOUT REFERENCES MAILINGS REVIEW VIEW ADD-INS ACROBAT Nian-Shing Chen

Clipboard Font Paragraph Styles Editing

20. Onyx Hsieh (Hsieh, Sheng-Wen; Teng, Daniel C.; Hwang, Gwo-Jen; Chen, Nian-Shing)  
Effects of Teaching and Learning Styles on Students' Reflection Levels in a Ubiquitous Learning Environment  
24-Apr-2010 Submitted to Journal of Computer Assisted Learning (JCAL)  
02-May-2010 (Rejected)  
26-May-2010 Submitted to Behaviour & Information Technology (BIT)  
18-Aug-2010 (Rejected)  
2-Nov-2010 Submitted to Computers & Education  
6-January-2011 (Accepted)
  
21. I-Chun Hung (Nian-Shing Chen; Kinshuk; I-Chun Hung; I-Fang Huang)  
Design and Implementation of Online Synchronous Assessment and Potential Issues  
18-Mar-2010 Submitted to ETR&D  
02-May-2010 (Rejected)  
29-April-2011 Submitted to Journal of Computer Assisted Learning  
24-July-2011 (First revision)  
20-Sep-2011 (Second revision)  
28-Sep-2011 (Accepted)
  
22. Benazir Quadir & Daniel C. Teng  
Integrating Book, Digital Learning Materials and Robot for Enhancing Elementary School Students to Learn English  
09-May-2010 Submitted to British Journal of Educational Technology.  
30-Jun-2010 (Rejected)  
10-Nov-2010 Submitted to Australasian Journal of Education Technology  
20-May-2011 (Accepted)

Paper被拒絕了，怎麼辦？



# 修改之後再投稿到其他期刊

- 務必要針對審稿者的意見修改完之後，才可以再投稿到其他期刊
- 因為你的文章雖然在不同的期刊，被送到同一個審稿者去審查的機率遠比你想像的還要高。

# How would you react to a rejection letter?

**From:** XXX **Sent:** Monday, March 17, 2014 1:29 AM

**To:** [ETS Editors](#) **Subject:** Re: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 4136)

Hi, What should I do now? Oh my God...what a bad news

On Sun, Mar 16, 2014 at 4:31 PM, ETS Editors <[ets-editors@ifets.info](mailto:ets-editors@ifets.info)> wrote:  
\"The Role of SMS in Iranian EFL Vocabulary and Motivation\"

Submitted to the \"Educational Technology & Society\" (ISSN 1436-4522)  
[Journal indexed in Social Sciences Citation Index (listed in Web of Science)]

=====

Thank you for your submission to the Educational Technology & Society (ET&S).

There are already many studies published in the literature addressing the similar issues. It is recommended that the authors could shift their focus on how specific ICT tools integrating with suitable pedagogical strategies can be used to improve students' learning performance.

In summary, given the large number of new submissions we receive for consideration, we regret to tell you that on the criteria of significance and appropriateness we have decided not to proceed with your submission to the second stage of the reviewing process.

As mentioned above, we would like to give this feedback as quickly as possible in order that our journal does not obstruct your future plans for the article. This is not to deny the merit of your article and we wish you success in placing it elsewhere.

Sincere Regards.

Nian-Shing Chen, Kinshuk, Demetrios G Sampson

Co-Editors-in-Chief,

Educational Technology & Society (ISSN 1436-4522)

# How would you react to a rejection letter?

**From:** XXX **Sent:** Friday, February 14, 2014 11:35 AM **To:** [ETS Editors](#)  
**Subject:** Re: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 3607)

Dear Professor Chen, Thank you very much for your email. If you consider the reviewers' comments, they are radically different. Actually it was very difficult for me to reflect such two radically different views. If I follow the reviewer 1, then I could not reflect on all the comments from the reviewer 2. However I did my best to reflect on their comments. **Hence, it seems to be very unfair that I receive such a bad outcome.** I submitted long time ago, and even I did not properly receive their reviews on time as you remember. Please reconsider your decision. It is a very important paper for me, so I will be very appreciating it if you reconsider your decision. Best regards, XXX

**From:** [nianshing@gmail.com](mailto:nianshing@gmail.com) **Sent:** Friday, February 14, 2014 12:44 PM  
**To:** XXX; [ETS Editors](#) **Subject:** Re: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 3607)

Dear XXX,  
Thanks for your mail.  
In the first run of review, reviewer 1 only provided some general and soft comments, however, reviewer 2 did provide you very constructive comments and the comments have its merit, as an author we should always properly address every single comment raised by reviewers. If you agree, revise it, if you don't agree it, justify your reason. Nian-Shing

On Fri, Feb 14, 2014 at 12:27 AM, XXX wrote:  
Dear Professor Chen,  
Thank you for your understanding. As I mentioned, **it is very important for me to publish it now**, so please let me know whether I could revise it again.  
Best regards, XXX.

On Fri, Feb 14, 2014 at 10:32 AM, XXX wrote:  
Dear Professor Chen,  
I rechecked my responses again and again, and I think I did what you suggested. Hence, I would like to clarify them more explicitly. I will be very appreciating it if you allow me to have a chance to do it. Best Regards, XXX.

# How would you react to a rejection letter?

From: XXX

Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2014 1:29 AM

To: Nian-Shing Chen

Subject: Re: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 3607)

Dear Professor Chen,

I will be really appreciating if you reconsider my situation. I have checked with my colleagues, and they strongly suggested **that I need to look for some ways to appeal my situation**. As you know, one reviewer was very positive and the other one was very negative, and then you suggested me to revise the paper. Also I did not receive the reviewers' comments in a right time, so I was in a hurry to finish my revision. However I did my best in order to reflect the reviewers' comments.

Best regards,

XXX.

From: nianshing@gmail.com Sent: Wednesday, February 19, 2014 7:56 AM

To: XXX Subject: Re: Submission for Educational Technology & Society Journal (ID 3607)

Dear Professor XXX

Thank you for your email. We have now checked the manuscript and the reviewers' feedback again. In the first round, two reviewers provided feedback. As is usual, the feedback from reviewers varies. In such situations, we provide all different feedback to the authors, so that the authors can decide which feedback they can consider while revising the manuscript, and which feedback they would like to contest. We specifically ask authors to provide a "response to reviewers" report, so that authors can clearly identify what changes they made in the revised paper, and why they were not able to take into account certain feedback.

We have checked again and confirmed that you indeed did not provide any arguments regarding why you did not take into account one reviewer's feedback, so that we can discuss with that reviewer whether the reviewer agrees with your arguments, or that he/she has reasons that should be communicated to the authors regarding why the paper needs further revision.

**We are therefore not able to revise the decision.**

If you decide to submit a properly revised and updated manuscript, we would be happy to treat it as a new submission and would initiate a new review process.

With regards, Nian-Shing

# How would you react to a rejection letter?

Hello Nian-Shing Chen, Kinshuk, Demetrios G Sampson

Co-Editors-in-Chief.

Got your answer this morning. Let me tell you that holding a paper for a month, just to let us know it does not suit you is **an indication of an unprofessional work and outrages.**

Prof' XXX.

Tel Aviv University, Bob Shapell School of Social Work.

Currently in Thailand.

Phones in Thailand:

Israel Home Information:

=====

Dear Editor,

Thank you very much for your invaluable comments.

It is important for development of our paper.

Thank you very much for spending your valuable time to give feedback to our paper.

Best regards,

--XXX

# How would you react to a rejection letter?

Dear Editors,  
Thank you so much for letting me know this, and I appreciate your consideration.  
If possible, I'd really appreciate it if you could sent this message to reviewers.

"Dear Reviewers,  
Thank you so much for your time and consideration.  
I really appreciate your feedback. I've learned a lot from your comments and feedback.

Again, thank you very much.  
Best,  
The author of the paper"

XXX

On Tue, Nov 26, 2013 at 10:52 AM, ETS Editors <[ets-editors@ifets.info](mailto:ets-editors@ifets.info)> wrote:  
\"Designing and Developing a Personal Response System Mobile App\"

Submitted to the \"Educational Technology & Society\" (ISSN 1436-4522)  
[Journal indexed in Social Sciences Citation Index (listed in Web of Science)]  
=====

We have now received the review results from the reviewers  
and we are sorry to inform that the reviewers have come back with **negative feedback**.  
We are enclosing the comments from the reviewers below and hope you will find these suggestions helpful in your future research.

Sincere Regards.

Nian-Shing Chen,  
Co-Editors-in-Chief,  
Educational Technology & Society (ISSN 1436-4522)

已經發表在研討會的文章  
可以轉投稿到期刊去發表嗎？

已經發表在期刊上的文章  
可以轉投到專書文章去發表嗎？



Thanks for listening

Q & A