


REVIEWER'S SIGN-OFF SHEET

Author / Org: Tony Lentine/1712

Title: Characterization of a silicon-photonics wideband switch in UCSD's MORDIA ring network

Outside Recipient: Optics Express Optical Interconnects

		Org	Initial	Date
*Reviewer:	Paul Davids	1712	psd	04/10/2013
**Referee:	_____	_____	_____	_____
Manager:	_____	_____	_____	_____

Primary author scans completed document, keeps archival copy, and emails to Department Manager.

*To be chosen by Author. The Reviewer should have technical expertise related to the information being reviewed

**To be chosen by Department Manager if the need arises. The Referee should have technical expertise related to the information being reviewed and is capable of arbitrating differences that may occur between the author and the reviewers.

Reviewer's Checklist

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Yes | No |
| 1) The title accurately reflects the focus/target of the work being reported. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Suggested Changes: _____

(use additional pages if necessary)

Recommendation to publish:

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 2) I have reviewed the <u>scientific and technical merit</u> of the paper and concur that the results are based on <u>sound scientific principles</u> . | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3) I believe that the technical content contains substantial <u>breakthroughs</u> , <u>novelties</u> , or <u>new insights</u> that warrant publication. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- 4) The manuscript is being submitted to an appropriate journal. ☒ ☐

Alternate Recommendations: _____

Organization and quality of writing and presentation:

- 5) I have considered the technical impact of the work and have suggested enhancements as needed. ☒ ☐
- 6) I have considered the flow of ideas in the manuscript and have recommended improvements as needed, such as: ☒ ☐
- a) The introduction clearly states the problem that is being addressed, puts it into context of previous work and effectively conveys its potential significance.
 - b) The body of the paper describes the work in a logically ordered manner.
 - c) The conclusion of the paper enhances its impact.
- 7) The manuscript acknowledges prior work in an appropriate manner. ☒ ☐
- 8) I have evaluated the readability and grammar of the manuscript and have suggested improvements as appropriate. ☒ ☐
- 9) I have examined the figures and figure captions and have made suggestions to enhance their descriptiveness and effectiveness as appropriate. ☒ ☐

- 10) Other Comments:
