

Mr. Zimmermann,

I received your complaint and I'm sorry for the situation, but I believe that my intentions must have been misunderstood.

It was never my intention not to include in my references the document from the European Commission (2010), as it can be clearly seen from my paper, it is mentioned right under the graph in question and I did mean to include it among the references the European Commission (2010), but I mistakenly included only the other document from the Commission, that I used for this particular paper.

By mistake I mentioned in my references only: *European Commission, Brussels, 3.3.2010, Communication from the commission, EUROPE 2020 "A strategy for smart, sustainable and inclusive growth"*, and I did not realize that I overlooked: *European Commission, 2010, "Proposal for a Council Decision on guidelines for the employment policies of the Member States, Part II of the Europe 2020 Integrated Guidelines"*, because both documents are from the same month and both from European Commission.

This editing mistake must have occurred while I changed the format of my paper to fit the publisher's guidelines and used a previously submitted paper to the same publisher as a template – I ended up sending a version of the file insufficiently checked (I must have just glanced over the reference and, seeing a 2010 European Commission document I didn't realize it was only one of the documents and not both of them).

Now, that you have informed me of the situation, I wrote to the magazine's editor and explained the situation and he ensured me that he will republish the correct form of my article as soon as possible.

I am willing to make whatever it is necessary to correct my mistake. Please inform me of what I have to do next / what my next steps should be.

Thank you for giving me the opportunity to present my point of view on this complaint and I really appreciate it.

Therefore, please accept my apologies and I look forward to hearing from you.

Yours faithfully,  
Roberta Stanef, PhD.