Alternatively, the numerical system may be used w

For the benefit of readers, both final and initial page numbers of references should be given wherever possible. References in the text should be in the form "..... Townsend (1987) showed ....." or " ..... it has been shown (Townsend 1987) ....."

Reference lists in reviews are lengthy and authors are urged to pay particular attention to following this style, to avoid the need for lengthy reworking.

- List of captions for illustrations on a separate sheet.
- Set of copies of illustrations (not larger than A4).

2. One set of fair copies of originals of all diagrams and glossy prints of photographs (not larger than 300 mm across). Where illustrations are reproduced from previously published papers, these should be either glossy photographs of redrawn copies.

- Where difficulties are experienced in preparing illustrations in the desired form, the editorial office may be able to assist, but authors must consult the Production Editor at an early stage. Every effort will be made to use the material provided, but if it should be necessary to redraw a significant number of illustrations to meet the journal's requirements, the cost of this work may be charged to the author.
- Where illustrations are reproduced from previously published papers, authors should obtain the permission of the authors of such papers. The editorial office undertakes to obtain the permission of the relevant publishers, provided that full reference to journal and publisher is supplied by authors.

FURTHER DETAILS

The Managing Editor will be pleased to assist in resolving any queries or difficulties that authors may encounter. Please direct all correspondence to:

The Managing Editor
Reports on Progress in Physics
IOP Publishing Limited
Dirac House
Temple Back
BRISTOL BS1 6BE
UK
be either glossy photographs or 2.

NOTES FOR GUIDANCE ON LEVEL AND STYLE

It is taken for granted that authors will ensure a high standard of scientific merit. The following recommendations are intended to assist authors in satisfying the broader needs of both specialist and general readers.

1 .It is very important that the review have a good introductory section aimed particularly at the reader new to the field. This should be at an introductory level and should lead the reader gradually into the more sophisticated material which follows. It should aim to put the subject into context and, in the case of topics on the fringe of physics or with a technological bias, should bring out the relevant physics. It should also explain why the subject is of current interest and should pull together the main conclusions that are reached in the article.

2 .Specialist concepts and terminology should be introduced and adequately explained early on in the review and certainly on first occurrence.

3 .Authors should:

- b Avoid overspecialisation in the subject matter of the article.
- b Use language accessible to the nonspecialist reader (e.g. avoid too mathematical treatment).
- b Aim at objectivity and avoid articles dealing largely with current reserach and reflecting the author's own views.
- b Avoid articles that are catalogues of data or superficial summaries of earlier work.
- b Aim for concrete rather than too abstract presentation.
- b Establish the relevance of the subject to physics and avoid articles that are, for example, wholly chemical or wholly medical.

1 .Articles should conclude with a section that rounds off the review and picks out the main advances.

2 .The length of articles should be between 20000 and a maximum of 25000 words, including an allowance of 250 words for each illustration. The average page of double - spaced typescript contains about 300 words.

MATERIAL TO BE SUBMITTED

The completed review article should be submitted in duplicate, and the copy submitted should include:

1. Two copies of the typescript (one copy should be single-sided and the other may be double-sided and/or reduced), each with:

- b Title page giving title of review, author's name and establishment (if author has moved, give present address as a footnote).
- b Abstract on a separate sheet.
- b Contents list, giving the headings of sections and subsections of the review.
- b Text typed in double space.
- b References given in alphabetical order of authors' names, in the form.

Reinhard P-G and Goeke K 1987 Rep. Prog. Phys. 50 1-67

<u>REVIEW ARTICLES FOR REPORTS ON PROGRESS IN PHYSICS</u>

NOTES FOR PROSPECTIVE AUTHORS

Reports on Progress in Physics has been established for some fifty years as a journal for the publication of authoritative review articles in all branches of physics. Its appeal lies in both the breadth of its subject coverage and the high standing of the reviews, and these combined impose special requirements on the authors of review articles.

GENERAL REQUIREMENTS

Authors should take care to present a fair and balanced account of their subject. They should make a clear distinction between points of view which are well established and those which are still speculative or controversial. The opportunity for such a review of a particular field in the journal does not recur frequently, and authors should therefore cover the history of the subject over a period of the order of a decade, and not confine their remarks to the very latest developments.

Authors should keep it firmly in mind that most readers will not be expert in the subject of the review but may be physicists working in other fields who wish to keep themselves informed of developments outside their own specialisation, or who look for an introduction to a new field. Articles should therefore be addressed to an audience with no more than a degree of equivalent qualification in one of the physical sciences, and experience of research or development in a field of science or technology other than the subject under review.

Careful attention should be paid to those sections of the review in which the current status of the subject, and its place within a wider context, are explained in nonspecialist terms. Complex mathematical formalisms or lengthy catalogues of numerical data which do not carry the argument along to a clear conclusion should be avoided. Provided the background and principles of the subject are explained initially in elementary terms, the author should have no difficulty in leading the reader to the most recent and advanced developments and ideas of the subject.

These reviews, then, aim somewhere between a general overview and the kind of specialist review addressed to expert research workers in a fairly narrow branch of physics. This is not an easy task, but when successfully performed the result is of great value to the reader, to the author and to the discipline reviewed.

OUTLINE

Before commissioning articles formally, the Editorial Board would like to see an outline of the proposed review. The purpose of this is to allow the Board to judge whether the proposal reflects what was intended in the invitation, and to ensure that overlap with any related articles is kept to sensible proportions. The outline should give a brief summary of the approach to the review, plus a list of contents to allow the Board to satisfy itself that the article will cover the subject comprehensively.

Please indicate with your outline whether your review would be available in an electronic form, i.e. on magnetic disc or through electronic mail. We can process papers produced in TEX and most other formats. Please give as much information as possible on the format and word/text processing package used so that the editorial office can assess whether it would be feasible to produce your review directly from your output.