

Advances in Optics and Photonics (AOP) Review Criteria for Tutorials

Advances in Optics and Photonics (AOP) publishes comprehensive review articles and multimedia tutorials appropriate for students, researchers, faculty, business professionals and engineers. The all-electronic Journal's authoritative content covers advances in optics and photonics from fundamental science to engineering applications. Coverage in AOP encompasses theoretical and experimental optics along with applications of optics and photonics technology.

Tutorials

AOP tutorials introduce an important or emerging area that has produced groundbreaking results recently and is expected to immediately impact research and applications of optics and photonics in several directions to a broad audience of students and non-specialists. These tutorials are expected to feature excellent graphics and interactive components, like animation and video to maximize their reach. They are not intended to be a comprehensive overview of advances in the subject area but will likely include an element of review. Reviewers should pay close attention to the tutorial nature of the article they are reviewing and mention in their report if they feel that the article cannot be justified to be a tutorial. They should also judge to what extent the authors have used the multimedia capabilities and make suggestions to improve the tutorial.

Submitted papers are subjected to critical review according to the criteria listed below.

1. Does the article focus on a recent breakthrough?

Tutorials should teach readers about a recent breakthrough that will be useful for application and advancement in one or more fields.

Rating Options: yes, no

2. Is the paper comprehensive, covering an entire field and not just the author's own work?

AOP articles should provide a comprehensive overview of recent advances on the topic, presenting a balanced view rather than simply a summary of the author's own research. Reviewers should pay close attention to what extent the authors are focusing on their own work and mention in their report if they feel that the scope is too narrow or the bibliography needs to be expanded.

Rating Options: 1-very narrow, to 4-very comprehensive

3. Does the paper contain sufficient background/foundational material to be useful for someone new to the field?

Articles should be pedagogical and self-contained such that readers new to the area can get a good overview and do not need to consult additional references.

Rating Options: 1-not pedagogical to 4-very pedagogical

4. Is the paper a cohesive and in-depth description of the topic?

Articles should provide in-depth analysis with both qualitative and quantitative content, as opposed to a literature survey, so that they are useful to practitioners in the field.

Rating Options: 1-not in-depth to 4-very in-depth

5. Does the paper have a forward-looking component?

Articles should discuss future directions for the field to provide value for other experts in the subject.

Rating Options: 1-not forward-looking to 4-very forward-looking

6. Quality of presentation.

Is the manuscript clearly written and logically organized? Is the title accurate and does it clearly identify the subject matter? Is the abstract succinct and comprehensible to a non-specialist? Are figures and tables understandable and readable as submitted, including all captions and labels? Is the quality of English language usage and grammar appropriate for an archival journal? Is any multimedia content clearly presented and does it contribute to presentation of the research?

Rating Options: Very high, High, Moderate, Low