



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1:

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| Journal Name: | Physical Review & Research International |
| Manuscript Number: | MS: 2012 PRRI 2719 |
| Title of the Manuscript: | Simulation of Nanostructures fabricated in chalcogenide glasses for use as surface-enhanced Raman scattering substrates |

General guideline for Peer Review process is available in this link:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

- This form has total 9 parts. Kindly note that you should use all the parts of this review form.



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 2: Review Comments

| | Reviewer's comment | Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here) |
|--|--|---|
| <u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Line 97, the calculation of the amount of adsorbed molecules is difficult to understand. A clarification is required. 2. Lines 103-104, a factor of greater enhancement with gold than silver is really surprising. Comparison with the literature is absolutely necessary and it is important to provide justifications to explain this result. Please, check that there are no major errors of simulation which can lead to such result. 3. For the figures, it is difficult to understand them as "simulated" spectra are not introduced. 4. The experimental conditions are very incomplete (type of Laser, wavelength, analysis (microscope?)...) which make the comparison with experimental conditions difficult. | |
| <u>Minor</u> REVISION comments | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The introductory bibliography on SERS is | |



SDI Review Form 1.6

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>weak (3 references) and do not mention particularly Fleischmann who is one of the first discoverer of SERS.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none">2. A part of the text is done on the enhancement factor without reference. The text is fine, but it is not argued.3. The equations of the DDA are too broadly detailed, especially since it is already known. A simplification is needed to go to the essentials.4. Some typing errors are present and please check references as well | |
| <u>Optional/General</u> comments | | |

Reviewer Details:

| | |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|
| Name: | Anonymous Reviewer |
| Department, University & Country | |