

**PHYSICAL REVIEW**  
**PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS**

1 Research Road, Ridge, New York 11961-2701

pra, prb, prc, prd, pre, or prl@aps.org  
<http://publish.aps.org>

PRA (631) 591-4010  
PRB (631) 591-4020  
PRB (631) 591-4030  
PRD (631) 591-4040  
PRE (631) 591-4050  
PRL (631) 591-4060

FAX (631) 591-4141

---

Title:

Author(s):

Manuscript Code Number

Address:

Date:

Manuscript Referral

We would appreciate your review of the enclosed manuscript.

The enclosed Suggestions for Referees indicate some questions we would like you to consider in preparing your report. Please see the enclosed Referee Response Form for instructions on sending us your report. In some cases you may wish to make additional remarks that would be inappropriate for forwarding to the authors; such remarks should be clearly identified and separate from your report.

If you are unable to review the paper promptly, please contact us. If you cannot review the paper, please suggest alternative referees or ask a colleague to review the paper and notify us.

**Re: Received**  
by

## REFEREE RESPONSE FORM

(Please include this form with your full report)

**Referee Please Note: This form is not a substitute for a full report**

You may send your report by email (which we prefer), fax, or conventional mail. If you use email, give as the subject "report" followed by manuscript code number and last name of first author, and include in the message the summary information on this form (a template is available at the URL <http://forms.aps.org/referee/refresp-pr.asc>); if you do not receive an acknowledgment within one working day, please repeat the message or send the report via another mode. (For technical reasons, we cannot send automatic acknowledgments if the subject line includes "Re:", "re:", etc., so please avoid such subject lines.) If you use conventional mail or fax, please check the appropriate boxes on the enclosed form and return the form with your report. The manuscript should not be returned (except for pages you have marked for the benefit of the author). Do not automatically follow an email or fax report with a backup by conventional mail.

Please summarize your assessment of the paper

	YES	MAYBE	NO
Does the paper contain enough significant new physics to warrant publication in the Physical Review?	( )	( )	( )
Is the paper scientifically sound and not misleading?	( )	( )	( )
Is the paper well organized and clearly written?	( )	( )	( )
Are the subject matter and style of presentation appropriate for the Physical Review?	( )	( )	( )
Is the length appropriate?	( )	( )	( )

Please evaluate quality of  
**Research and Presentation**

- ( ) Excellent ( )  
 ( ) Good ( )  
 ( ) Average ( )  
 ( ) Marginal ( )  
 ( ) Poor ( )

**Recommendation**

- ( ) Publish without change (please give reasons).  
 ( ) Publish after authors have considered the optional revisions mentioned in the report.  
 ( ) Publish after authors have made the revisions mentioned in the report.  
 (I do not need to see the manuscript again.)  
 ( ) Revisions are necessary. Return to me on resubmittal.  
 ( ) Revisions are necessary. On resubmittal, send to \_\_\_\_\_  
 ( ) Manuscript is more appropriate for another ( ) journal \_\_\_\_\_  
 ( ) Do not publish; see report. or ( ) section \_\_\_\_\_  
 ( ) Other; see report.

Please provide a report suitable for transmission to the authors.

Signature of referee \_\_\_\_\_

Suggestions for alternative referees:

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

### ***Physical Review* Suggestions for Referees**

The enclosed manuscript is sent to you for review. Do not distribute copies of the manuscript or use results contained in it without permission from the authors. Please feel free to show it to knowledgeable colleagues and to consult them about your review. Suggestions for alternative referees are helpful to the editors and would be appreciated.

**Please consider the following points in writing your report:**

Does the paper contain sufficient new physics to warrant publication in the *Physical Review*?

Is the paper scientifically sound and not misleading? Criticisms based on published or unpublished work should be referenced.

Does the paper report a significant advance over previously published work? If a substantial number of its results appeared previously, please cite references.

Are there appropriate and adequate references to related work?

Is the paper well organized and written clearly and correctly? If you find it necessary to write suggested changes on the manuscript for the benefit of the author, please send us the marked pages, not the complete manuscript, with your report.

Are the figures and tables (if any) clear, with suitable captions? Are they all useful? Is there unnecessary duplication of figures and tables?

Is the paper of suitable length, with no parts too brief or too long? If not, please suggest specific omissions or parts that should be expanded. Should some of the material (for example, long tables) be deposited with the Electronic Physics Auxiliary Publication Service (EPAPS)?

Are the title and abstract informative, concise, and clear?

Is the section for which this is being considered (regular article, Rapid Communication, Brief Report, Comment) the best one for this work? Length limits apply to Rapid Communications, Brief Reports, and Comments.

Does the subject matter of the paper justify the special handling of Rapid Communications?