**REVISION OF ARTICLE**

For the articles requiring corrections, first, a RESPONSE TO REVIEWER file is created. This file consists of a table containing reviewer recommendations and responses to reviewers (Table 1).

Authors should create a table for each reviewer recommendation and provided response, indicating their thoughts on the recommendations.

The revised text of the article**, with corrections (changes, additions, or deletions) highlighted**, should be appended to the continuation of the Response to Reviewer file.

These processes are continued after each round of corrections requested by the reviewers.

**Table 1. Sample response to reviewer table**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Reviewer Comment** | **Reviewer Comment** | **Reviewer Recommendation** | **Response to Reviewer** |
| **Reviewer 1**  | Major revision | Linguistic quality, fluency should be reviewed. | Linguistic quality and fluency were reviewed, and changes were marked in red. |
| ……….. | ……… |
| **Reviewer 2** | Minor revision | The conclusion should be rewritten considering the research findings. | The conclusion was rewritten taking into account the research findings. |
|  |  |  |  |

\*Each reviewer recommendation and the responses given to reviewers should be indicated in the table by adding a new row.

**REVISED, HIGHLIGHTED ARTICLE TEXT**

**….**

**…**

**…**

**…**