

### **Editor's Comment:**

In my opinion, the revised manuscript as it stands is not eligible for publication. The reasons for this are as follows:

- There is no explicitly stated purpose of the study at the end of the introduction (before the methodology section). There are statements in the introduction that should be supported by relevant references (e.g. "Recent studies have begun to pay attention to this combination, though there is limited exploration of the relationship between language and non-linguistic elements in advertising discourse", p.1., as noted by the reviewers).
- The methodology lacks a description of the procedure for data collection and analysis, the sample size, sampling technique, etc. (a recommendation highlighted by the reviewers).
- The discussion section is missing (in the revised manuscript it is inserted in the results section).
- The revised text (Charts 1 & 2) refers to American ads, whereas the text refers to English context (it is not clear why the reference to American English in the original manuscript was dropped in the revised one).
- Author names and years of sources cited in the text are absent from the reference list. At the same time, the bibliography includes sources that are absent from the text (e.g., Kress, G. & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). The question remains as to why the author shortened the list of bibliographic sources in the revised version of the manuscript, instead of supplementing it with contemporary sources as recommended.

### **Editor's Details:**

Dr. Maya Tcholakova  
Associate Professor, Sofia University St. Kliment Ohridski, Bulgaria.