

Alan McGaughey Associate Professor Department of Mechanical Engineering Carnegie Mellon University Pittsburgh, PA 15213-3890

Tel: (412) 268-9605 Fax: (412) 268-3348

Email: mcgaughey@cmu.edu

April 9, 2013

Dear Alexios Klironomos:

We would like to thank the editors for the further consideration given to our submitted manuscript, BC12512. We are disappointed we could not meet the criteria required for a review process, although we are still uncertain exactly why we have not done so.

We are currently preparing another manuscript for submission to *Physical Review B* on a different topic than that covered in BC12512. To assist in the preparation of this manuscript, we would like to have a firm understanding of the criteria needed to receive a review process.

We would like to ask two final questions regarding the rejection of BC12512:

- 1) In the letter named "cover_rebuttal_040613_JL.pdf", we tried to demonstrate how our manuscript satisfied the four criteria required for publication in *Physical Review B*. We assume that these criteria also pertain to receiving a review process. These criteria were, as stated, "be of high quality and scientific interest, be recognized as an important contribution to the literature, and be of particular interest to our readers". In the final letter from the editors:
 - "The editors of PRB have considered your most recent letter, and your manuscript again. We regret to inform you that we are not convinced that the Physical Review B is the appropriate journal for your manuscript. We suggest that it will be more productive for you to seek publication in another, more specialized, journal."
 - Could you be more specific which, of the four stated criteria, we failed to meet and why?
- 2) What influence does the previously submitted, and referee-rejected, manuscript BP11533 have on the referee-review denial for the current manuscript, BC12512? We thought we clarified in the reply letter "cover_rebuttal_2_040913_JL_AM.pdf" that these two manuscripts, BP11533 and BC12512, have almost nothing in common. With no further clarification

on the referee-review denial, we are left wondering if there is some suspicion about the content of the current manuscript, BC12512.

Thank you again for the further consideration you offered.

Sincerely,

Alan McGaughey

Alan M'baugh