Physical Review Letters – REFEREE RESPONSE FORM

This form asks for your assessment of this paper regarding its suitability for PRL, or for Physical Review if PRL is not appropriate. It includes space for both short answers and a detailed report. If the paper is transfered to Physical Review, your report will be used by the editors there. You may also include private remarks to the editors, distinct from what you intend for the authors, in the designated space below. The form is largely self-explanatory, but some additional advice can be found at http://forms.aps.org/referee/advicetoreferees.pdf

---

Referee: _____ _____ Manuscript Number: _____

Author:

Title:

PRL aims to publish physics research that is valid, innovative, and significant, with broad implications. A Letter should change or influence the research or scientific understanding of many physicists, and sometimes nonphysicists, and thus be essential reading for many.

The questions below all lead to the basic question about any possible Letter: Why should this paper be published in PRL, rather than in the Physical Review, which also publishes papers that significantly advance physics? Please address them in your report, as appropriate.

- In what ways does the work reported here open either a new area of research or new avenues of research within an established area? How will it change the research of others?
- What critical outstanding problem does this manuscript treat, and how? Does it solve the problem, or make essential steps towards solving it?
- If the work employs a new technique or methodology, what can it teach us? Why is it important to physics and how will physicists use it?
- Is this manuscript of unusual intrinsic interest? If so, why? What message does it convey to nonspecialists?

I. Based on the above, please judge the manuscript regarding its:

1) Impact on the specific field:	very low	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	very high
2) Impact on physics research:	very narrow	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	very broad
3) Degree of innovation:	very low	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	very high
4) Validity:	not valid	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	valid
5) Readability for a nonspecialist:	not accessible	( ) ( ) ( ) ( ) ( )	very accessible

II. Your detailed report: (Please attach and use as much space as is needed)

Additional remarks to the editors only:

Would you be willing to review the paper again? ( )yes ( )no

Could you suggest alternative referees?

III. Brief Recommendation:

a) Publish in PRL as written or after minor revision.	( )	e) Publish in Physical Review with little or no revision.	( )
b) Reconsider for PRL following revision.	( )	f) Submit to Physical Review after substantial revision.	( )
c) Perhaps reconsider for PRL after extensive revision.	( )	g) Submit to another journal.	( )
d) Do not reconsider for PRL.	( )	h) Do not publish in any journal.	( )

IV. Additional recommendations for Physical Review:

Inclusion of detailed advice in your report is helpful to the editors of the Physical Review and to the authors. Please do not use a recommendation to publish in the Physical Review to soften a rejection from PRL. If the Physical Review is a suitable venue, which journal is best?

PRA( ) PRB( ) PRC( ) PRD( ) PRE( )

Which article type?

Rapid Communication( ) Regular Article( ) Brief Report( )