

Editors:
JACK SANDWEISS
GEORGE BASBAS
REINHARDT B. SCHUHMAN
Associate Editors:
ROBERT GARISTO
BRANT M. JOHNSON
SAMINDRANATH MITRA
CHRISTOPHER WESSELBORG
Consulting Editor: STANLEY G. BROWN

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

1 Research Road
Ridge, New York 11961-2701

<http://prl.aps.org/>
prl@aps.org
(631) 591-4060
Fax: (631) 591-4141

Title:

Author(s):

Manuscript Code Number

Address:

Date:

Manuscript Referral

The enclosed manuscript has been submitted to *Physical Review Letters*. The editors request your advice.

We would appreciate a response within **one week** of receipt. If you are not an appropriate referee, or if you are too busy, please ask a knowledgeable colleague to furnish a report, or suggest alternative referees; promptly notify us in any case. You may seek the advice of colleagues when preparing your report, but please remember that the paper has not yet been published and thus is privileged information.

Please provide a tactfully written report suitable for transmission to the authors, based on your consideration of the questions in the enclosed Advice to Referees. Please see the enclosed Referee Response Form for instructions on sending us your report. Please give reasons to support your recommendations. In some cases, you may wish to make remarks to us that would be inappropriate for forwarding to the authors; such remarks must be clearly identified and separate from your report.

We thank you in advance for your help.

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 transferred 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()

Physical Review Letters – ADVICE TO REFEREES

- The editors often have specific comments or questions concerning the paper in question and may also enclose additional reference material. Please read them before your review, and address them either in your report or in additional comments to the editors.
- Your report should contain both an assessment of the scientific soundness of the paper and an evaluation of its potential impact on the physics community. Inclusion of substantive arguments supported by concrete facts will strongly influence how the editors value and use your input.
- Good presentation and wide readability are necessary, but not sufficient, qualities for a paper that is meant to influence the research activities of many readers. We ask you to consider the following questions: Does the introduction convey the basic physics issues addressed, and the primary achievements? Is the research placed in proper context? Are the references sufficient? Are assumptions clearly stated? Is jargon minimized? Do the title and abstract stand alone? Are tables and figures effectively presented?

Advice regarding recommendations to the editors of the Physical Review:

- Any paper that might move from PRL to the Physical Review should be evaluated in light of Physical Review editorial policy, which requires manuscripts to be scientifically sound, to significantly advance physics, and to be presented in satisfactory form. The editors discourage a series of short papers by the same authors on a particular subject, in favor of a single comprehensive article.

Rapid Communications are intended for especially important results that deserve accelerated publication, and are therefore given priority in both the editorial and production process.

Regular articles allow space for comprehensive discussion, but sometimes may be short.

Brief Reports are short papers that provide accounts of completed research. The same standards of scientific quality apply as for other sections, but they do not warrant the priority handling given to Rapid Communications, and are inappropriate as regular articles.