

***OSA Continuum* Review Criteria for Research Articles**

OSA Continuum publishes original, scientifically and technically sound peer-reviewed articles for the optics and photonics community without consideration of novelty, significance or potential impact. The Journal scope encompasses the entire spectrum of optics and photonics, the continuum of fundamental to applied results, and the progression of discovery from initial findings to in-depth analysis. Negative results pertaining to new experimental or measurement techniques are also acceptable.

To meet *OSA Continuum's* goal of publishing quality work that is beneficial to the optics and photonics community, reviewers should evaluate submissions according to the criteria listed below, without an assessment of novelty, significance or potential impact. Manuscripts judged by reviewers as low in these criteria will generally not be accepted for publication in *OSA Continuum*. Reviewers may provide additional written comments to assist authors with improving the technical quality of the manuscript.

Appropriateness for *OSA Continuum*:

- Does the subject material fall within the scope of the Journal?
- Does the manuscript describe a theory, technique, method, process, or development that will be useful to the optics and photonics community to build upon their own work? Negative results are acceptable.

Rating Options: High, Moderate, Low

Scientific and Technical Quality:

- Is the manuscript scientifically valid and free from technical errors?
- Are the conclusions supported by the data presented?
- Were the experiments, statistics and other analysis performed to a high standard?
- Are the methods, experiments, theories, statistics, etc., complete and in sufficient detail for them to be applied by others?

Rating Options: High, Moderate, Low

Originality:

- Is it a unique contribution based on an established foundation? (Note that submissions based on conference publications are eligible for consideration. See OSA Publishing's policy on [Conference Papers](#))
- Is the work placed in proper context?
- Is prior or related work adequately referenced?

Rating Options: High, Moderate, Low

Quality of Presentation:

- Does the title clearly define the subject matter and is it free from poorly defined acronyms?
- Does the abstract succinctly describe both the procedures and conclusions?
- Is the manuscript clearly written and logically organized?
- Are figures, tables, and captions understandable, readable, and useful?
- Is the quality of English appropriate for an archival journal? (Note that *OSA Continuum* articles are not copy-edited)

Rating Options: High, Moderate, Low

Appropriateness of Supplementary Material:

Visualizations (videos, 2D images, 3D images), tabular data, or citations to datasets in external repositories should be integral to understanding the article and support the results reported. Custom code and design files are acceptable to include as additional information, which is helpful to readers.

- Is the supplementary material openly accessible, understandable, and readable?
- Does the supplementary material contribute to presentation of the results?

Rating Options: High, Moderate, Low, Not applicable

Recommendation:

Options: Accept as submitted, Accept with minor/optional revisions, Major revisions required, Reject, Other

Comments to Author

[Provide text comments or upload a file]