

### ***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 Criticisms based on published or unpublished work should be referenced.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?