**List of minor corrections for the thesis of Wendy Niu**

**External examiner - A Tartakovskii**

**Internal examiner – D Credgington**

Page 1: Removed “thermal stability” to reduce confusion [Here and elsewhere - explain the term “thermal stability” in this context, stability is normally considered a materials property rather than an electronic property.]

Page 8: [Define the Sommerfeld factor.]

Page 23: [Explain what excitons are bound to.]

Page 29: [Quantify the dielectric constant contrast.]

Page 71: [Clarify whether monolayers or thin multilayers of these materials have previously been measured, and compare results if so.]

Page 67-68: [Clarify the effect of the 400nm CT transition, since this lies outside the range of these plots.]

Page 81: [Define standard cleaning/experimental conditions. Include sphere size and uniformity, if known.]

Page 85: I’m afraid I don’t have additional data – I may have been referring to the fact that for Ag islands with t<8nm the LSP resonances are similar (see Page 78, highlighted)? [You mentioned that additional data existed where you had attempted to alter the surface plasmon to match the exciton. If so, please include or comment on the results.]

Page 87: [Explain what “chemically synthesised” means]

Page 93: [Explain, reference or cross-reference your transfer matrix simulations.]

Page 110: “As seen in PS-coated Ag gratings…” [Explain in the text what is learned from these simulations, and link to your observations of exciton-plasmon coupling]

Page 107: “The biexcitons do not emit directly…” [sentence ‘...’image-biexcitons’, which are outcoupled via SSP...’ This needs more explanation. What is meant exactly?]

Page 106-107: [Why do exciton and ‘image-biexciton’ coexist in the spectrum? Why are they also included in the strong-coupling model, which takes into account 3 oscillators? It is not completely clear why the spectral width of the ‘image-biexciton’ is comparable with that of the exciton. One could expect a range of magnitudes for the interaction of the exciton with its image charges leading to a spectrally broad feature. These aspects need to be explained more clearly in the text.]

3. Page 110: Added arrows to Figs 7.18(b,c) and note in caption (highlighted). Added Page 110, “the time-averaged near-field…” [the differences between Fig.7.18(b) and (c) are very subtle and need to be explained more in text. Perhaps some labelling should be made on the figures to emphasize the regions with the different intensity.]

4. Pages 113-116: Various changes throughout Chapter 8 [Outlook specific to the results of the thesis is missing, and is only given instead broadly for the research field. Please provide quantitative comparisons to the state of the art and prior work on this and related systems, so your discoveries can be understood in context. Please include additional commentary on future work and applications of your findings, concrete suggestions for expanding the current data set and directions in which this work could be taken next.]

Minor stylistic corrections:

For figures where the data from other literature are shown, I suggest to start or finish the caption with the words ‘Data from Ref.[xx]’ or ‘Diagram from Ref.[xx]’. In some cases throughout the thesis it is otherwise unclear whether the data were measured by the author or just taken from a source in the literature. Figs 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.6, 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, 2.10, 2.11, 2.12, 2.13, 2.14, 2.15, 2.16, 2.17, 2.18, 2.19, 3.6, 3.7, 3.11

Page 85, first sentence of conclusions, typo in ‘can be used’.

Page 88, Fig.7.1(c). It is not clear how φ is measured. Think of a better diagram or describe in words in the caption.

Page 105, typo in the sentence ‘The linewidth of the exciton...’

Page 107, typo in sentence ‘as well as strong excitons’.