



SDI Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Physical Review & Research International
Manuscript Number:	2013_PRR1_7549
Title of the Manuscript:	Evaluation of E.M. fields and energy transport in metallic nanoparticles with near field excitation
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.

To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

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



SDI Review Form 1.6

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(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)</i>
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments		
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	<p>The paper "Evaluation of E.M. fields ..." deals out some computations efforts within the interaction of metallic particles with sources of radiation located at sub wavelength distances from the particles. Essentially, the paper presents a comparison between two methods introduced to describe non-spherical particles, i.e., the theory principal modes (TPM) and the Discrete Sources Method (DSM). The paper is interesting and its main contribution can be useful for the numerical description of complex nano-particles geometries. The paper is generally well written the English is good and easily readable for non native English speakers. Nevertheless, the paper cannot be accepted in the present form , I suggest to the authors to describe the basic mathematical formulation both of TPM and DSM in more analytical and quantitative way in order to clarify the numerical results obtained. After such changes will be made the paper can be accepted.</p>	<p>We thank the referee for their careful reading of the manuscript and we are pleased to expand the description of the mathematical formulation of both the TPM and DSM methods. We have substantially re-written the methodology section of the manuscript, also adding further equations, to provide a fuller description of these methods and their differences.</p>



SDI Review Form 1.6

<u>Optional/General</u> comments		
---	--	--