

Optics Letters Review Criteria

Please base your review on these criteria: Technical content, presentation, and appropriateness. Definitions of the criteria are given below.

Technical Content (Select one)

Reports important new science in an optics discipline. Results are significant to the field and/or offer interdisciplinary application. Conclusions supported by the data presented. Work placed in proper context. Related work adequately referenced. Warrants rapid publication in an archival journal.

- Level 1: The paper meets the criteria above.
- Level 2: Significant clarification/revision is needed to meet the criteria above. Specify revisions that might allow this manuscript to be acceptable in report below.
- Level 3: The paper is not acceptable. It does not report a significant advance, will have little impact on the work of others, or offers only incremental improvement to existing work.
- Level 4: The paper is unpublishable due to major scientific errors, the same material has been published or is considered for publication elsewhere, the technique is not useful, or the work is not relevant to optics.

Appropriateness (Select one)

- Level 1: Highly appropriate for Optics Letters
- Level 2: Marginally appropriate for Optics Letters
- Level 3: Outside the scope of Optics Letters

Suggestion of more appropriate journal:

The paper presents results that would be of interest to the general media Yes No

Presentation (Select one)

Title clearly identifies subject matter. Abstract is succinct, comprehensible to a non-specialist. Clearly written manuscript, logically organized. Figures and tables are understandable and readable (when sized for publication). Quality of writing is adequate (English usage, grammar).

- Level 1: The paper meets the criteria above
- Level 2: Revisions needed to meet criteria above. Give explicit direction in report below to which sections need revisions, extension, or reduction.
- Level 3: The paper cannot be revised to meet presentation criteria. Organization or writing style of the manuscript makes it too difficult to review fairly. English usage, grammar or spelling errors require substantial copy-editing before the paper can be published or even reviewed adequately.

Recommendation to Editor (Select one)

- Accept as submitted. (Comments may be given in review report.)
- Accept with minor/optional changes noted in review report. I do not need to see the manuscript again.
- Major revisions are necessary, noted in the report. Additional review may be necessary.
- Reject. Does not meet criteria indicated in review report.
- Other. See review report.

Separate comments for the Editor and for the Author may be provided in the online form.

Please contact Optics Letters Staff at olmss@osa.org if you have any questions or experience difficulties completing the review.