

REVIEWS ON THE MANUSCRIPT [7]

Reviewer 1:

Quite a good combination of theoretical research and experimental verification. The experiment is clearly understandable and appropriately done. Article is recommended to be accepted for publishing.

Reviewer 2:

This paper is well written and has a good structure. I suggest improving the formulas by increasing the resolution possibly by using the equation editor in Word. I recommend it for publication.

Editorial request:

References: The list of references is not typeset properly. Please type the references in a way that the readers may immediately understand where and how they may look for a document. Add volumes and journal titles for the references [2, 3, 3] and the URLs for the references [1] and [4], if [4] is an online publication. Note that you have two references [3].

What parts of the manuscript rely on or cite each of the references?

Consistency of units: Please use a blank spacing between a numerical value and its unit (600 nm, not 600nm).

Graphs 3 and 5: Consider improving the notations at the y-axes. “2e+12” is not a fully appropriate representation.

This request was focused on the technical side of the manuscript and abstained from judging its physical essence.