

Ethic actions of author (-ors) at the repeated consideration of the article and answers on the remarks of a reviewer

After the scientific retest of Your article and preparation of answer on a suggestion of reviewers, please:

- pay attention to all remarks, given a reviewer (-ers);
- describe all changes which took place in maintenance of Your article in a reverse letter;
- conduct all additional experiments or do a retest, taking into account the analytical reasoning which a reviewer recommends to carry out. If you are sure that the offered measures will not perfect Your article then thoroughly and reasonably motivate, why do you consider so;
- in a reverse letter separately describe all points of remarks, which you agree with, and with which – no;
- provide the tolerant scientific ground of all debatable questions;
- clearly mark all changes in Your article, which you brought in at a revision of the article (distinguish a color);
- give back the revised manuscript and reverse letter in terms, set by an editor (-ors);
- be polite and show respect to the reviewers when you agree, and when not agree with their remarks. In addition, you must bring into the article necessary changes which are offered by a reviewer;
- remember, a reviewer is an expert in psycholinguistic area. If suggestions which are brought into by an expert do not answer Your vision, then it, probably, because he did not understand the aspect of Your manuscript. It means that Your article is written in style, not quite clear for perception, thus, complicated for understanding of Your research. Hence, you must perfect the text of Your article, attain it communicative expediency, perfection and readability.