

Review Criteria for Comments and Replies

Comments and Replies serve a useful role within the scholarly literature. Optica Publishing Group's Journals will accept Comments that satisfy the criteria described below. *Comments* should point out and correct significant errors or deficiencies in papers, clarify the implications of a paper, or question the conclusions reached. Comments whose primary purpose is to discuss issues of priority or to call attention to oversights in a reference list will not be considered for publication. *Replies* should add new information beyond that already published in the original article. They must clearly refute, clarify, or further acknowledge the issues presented in the Comment. Additionally, it is not appropriate for a Comment or Reply to make allegations of ethical violations, such as plagiarism or data fabrication.

Comments

Appropriateness

Does the Comment add value to the literature by clearly highlighting substantial technical issues or oversights in the related manuscript? Does the Comment limit its claims to a single paper? Are the errors significant enough to warrant publication as a Comment? Would an Erratum be sufficient instead? Are the claims supported by the data presented? Should the Comment be reconsidered as a brief research article? Is the tone collegial and professional?

Rating Options: Very high, High, Moderate, Low

Quality of Presentation

Is the abstract succinct and comprehensible to a non-specialist? Is the Comment clearly written and logically organized? 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? If there is supplemental material, is it clearly presented and is it essential for supporting claims made in the Comment?

Rating Options: Very high, High, Moderate, Low

Replies

Appropriateness

Does the Reply add value to the literature by clearly addressing the issues raised in the Comment? Are the claims supported by the data presented? Is the tone collegial and professional?

Rating Options: Very high, High, Moderate, Low

Quality of Presentation

Is the abstract succinct and comprehensible to a non-specialist? Is the Reply clearly written and logically organized? 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? If there is supplemental material, is it clearly presented and is it essential for supporting claims made in the Reply?

Rating Options: Very high, High, Moderate, Low