



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Physical Review &amp; Research International</a>
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**

	<b>Reviewer's comment</b>	<b>Author's comment</b> <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>
<b><u>Compulsory</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Use some efficient equation editing tools (e.g., MathType) to prepare all the equations in the manuscript. Currently, the equations in this paper look like images with poor resolution and some of errors.</p> <p>2. Restructure the whole manuscript to present your results logically and clearly. For example, in abstract and conclusions parts, your major conclusions should be presented precisely. However, in your abstract, you declared several points but didn't conclude them in your conclusions. In the main body of the paper, you also have to describe these points one by one.</p>	<p>The presentation of the equations has been improved, using the referee's excellent suggestion of MathType. During this process errors in Eqn. 5 have been corrected (as marked in the manuscript).</p> <p>We have substantially re-organised the abstract and conclusion to clarify the major contributions of this work and more closely follow the structure of the main body of the text. The conclusions to the manuscript now present the main points from the abstract in the order in which they are discussed in the text.</p> <p>We thank the referee for these comments; by addressing them, the manuscript has been substantially strengthened.</p>
<b><u>Minor</u></b> REVISION comments	<p>1. Check your English carefully. For example, in your abstract, the sentence "The integral of the energy flux at the surface of the particles and in the far field agree for a gold rounded nanodisc and nanorod" absolutely don't have the same meaning as you want to say.</p> <p>2. Use same format in references. For instance, in ref. [8] you use "Opt. Express" and in ref. [9] you use "Optics Express".</p>	<p>We have re-structured the abstract, correctly re-phrasing the intention of this sentence. The references are now all formatted according to the journal guidelines.</p>



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

<b><u>Optional/General</u></b> comments	Overall, this is manuscript can be considered for publication in the journal only after the major changes (regarding the points mentioned above) are made.	We thank the referee for their support of the publication of this work.
---	--	---