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**Abstract**

Any academician, scientist or medical professional would have come across manuscripts sent back by the journal after peer review, asking for modifications and review of the original work. While the peer review process is essential to maintain the scientific integrity of research and publications, authors often get flustered by the long and exhaustive process of peer review.

This piece is a sarcastic and humorous take on an imaginary reviewer #2 who has sent back the manuscript to the author for several reviews and modifications. The author in a spat of anger and frustration over this, decides to send an email to the reviewer #2 detailing the futility of the entire process.

**An Angry Email to Reviewer #2**

Dear Reviewer #2,

Thank you for submitting your review comments on my diligently drafted manuscript. I appreciate the opportunity of evaluating your review but **unfortunately** (highlighted so you can read this first to get the gist of this email and not jump in happiness before falling back again with disappointment) your reviews seem to lack the optimism I was looking for.

Although I think that you address an important issue when suggesting that I shorten the manuscript by 5 pages and replace the keywords of the paper with something more out of Shakespearean literature. But I regret to tell you that I cannot consider it serious enough to chop the entire manuscript. Some of the ideas are interesting but I think they would have greater traction with someone pursuing a Ph.D. in English Literature.

Unfortunately, as it would appear to a sane individual not choking on some kind of deep sadistic nihilism that review option is only for ensuring a rigorous standard of the scientific process and not in exercising your spiteful, diabolical, remorseless, tyrannical and Mephistophelian (You see, I do use a dictionary) power over wretched researchers.

The volume of reviews to my manuscript is usually very high and I desk reject 99% of them. So do not consider yourself as special. Since I can consider only a small proportion of reviews received, I must make a difficult decision of leaving most reviews out. It looks like you should read your daily horoscope before submitting such ridiculous reviews next time or better still keep your tissues ready. Why do I only have to cry every time?

I believe your literary prowess in reviewing manuscripts will be better placed elsewhere. Have you tried a career as a restaurant or movie reviewer? You will be surprised to find similar hate for ravenous reviewers in those two professions as well. Maybe you could form a cult and worship your satanic lord with sacrifices of manuscripts that took months to be written.

I do have a segment for general rants on my Research Gate profile. You may submit your complaints there on the personal message. For public-facing outlets, we can engage in a wholly public debate on Twitter. If you are interested in submitting your opinion to those venues, please create a troll account and follow me on my given user accounts, to save your professional credibility from this public humility.

Thank you for submitting your reviews to me. I respectfully consider it a waste of my time.

I wish you success in finding a more suitable publication to practice the grammar Nazi in you, and I thank you for the work you have done because you definitely wrote this down in the basement of your parent’s house after your girlfriend left you for someone who doesn’t necessarily says “tighten the text” for every time she talks with you.

I am sorry that I did not accept your review this time and I hope you find your success somewhere else in fulfilling your sadistic bloodthirsty appetite for reviews.

PS: Should you completely rewrite your review and include a token of apology along with accepting the manuscript as it is, I would consider going out of my way to endorse your research and review skills on LinkedIn.

Sincerely,

Transfer desk to hell (another long submission process in this case)