

# Gute Paper ...

- Welche Botschaft(en) will ich vermitteln?
- Aufhänger?
- Publikum bei bekannten Dingen abholen
- aber auch: Abgrenzung gegenüber früheren Arbeiten. Was ist das neue?
- Zielgruppe? – breites Publikum (z.B. PRL)  
– Fachpublikum (z.B. PRB)

## Strukturierung

- Gedankengänge entflechten  
⇒ linearer Gedankenfluß
- Was gehört zusammen?
- Was gehört – an den Anfang (Einleitung)  
– in die Mitte  
– an den Schluß (Ausblick)
- Wo stocke ich immer wieder beim lesen, ... weil wahrscheinlich der Gedankenfluß unterbrochen ist?  
⇒ Sätze / Absätze verschieben
- Wichtiges hervorheben: *Figure 1 highlights the main findings of the paper.*

## Abbildungen

- möglichst selbsterklärend
- Skizzen zur Illustration

## Referee Response Form (taken from Physical Review)

### 1. Please summarize your assessment of the paper:

|  | yes                      | maybe                    | no                       |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Does the paper contain enough significant new physics to warrant publication in the Physical Review? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is the paper scientifically sound and not misleading?  | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is the paper well organized and clearly written?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Are the subject matter and style of presentation appropriate for the Physical Review?                | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Is the length appropriate?   | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

### 2. Please evaluate quality of Research and Presentation:

- Excellent
- Good
- Average
- Marginal
- Poor

### 3. Recommendation:

- Publish without change (please give reasons in report).
- Publish after authors have considered the optional revisions mentioned in the report.
- Publish after authors have made the revisions mentioned in the report. (I do not need to see the manuscript again.)
- Revisions are necessary. Return to me on resubmittal.
- Revisions are necessary. On resubmittal, send to ...
- Manuscript is more appropriate for another  
 journal (specify):  
or  section (specify):
- Do not publish; see report.
- Other; see report.

## Suggestions for Referees (taken from Physical Review)

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?