Feedback Synthesis

Introduction

Introduce Classical Novae

Brief description of paper's concepts and ideas: Sentence presenting the "plan" i.e. First we'll present background info, then ….

No need to capitalize "Disk Instability Model" and "Mass Transfer Burst Model" ? (not sure)

Background

(Many people agree with Audrey on the no subsubsections thing)

For "Subsequent Detections": "Why do amateur's have the leg up" (I think its because of the unpredictability, pro telescopes need a degree of certainty); "How are amateur obs. Catalogued/recorded"

In First theories: At the beginning a figure of the light curves of U Gen and SS Cygni would supplement the first paragraph well. Maybe link to "light curve analysis" in geometric variability section and use to illustrate the "hump" you mention in the accretion disk paragraph.

People want examples when you mention instruments: such as "didn't allow detections of binary stars"; "powerful spectrographs", what wavelength is "sufficiently high"

In last sentence of the accretion disk paragraph apparently, you're "glossing over important physics". I'd phrase the sentence a little differently to avoid giving that impression.

Current Theory

More descriptive when saying mass and proximity in a binary are important?

Figure for Roche lobe overflow?

Describe outburst state better

Source for increased mass flow

Add flow

Move 3.6 to observations

"Telescopic Data": what Telescope

Mention improvements of SIM

Detection

For section 4.1: Consolidating info about “above period gap” and “below period gap”

Thermal tidal instability prob (I’ll solve this in my section), if not the same as DIM when does the DIM apply

Explain alpha hot and alpha cold more: what is hot and what is cold , why are there 2 (how different are they) why does a high alpha hot lead to shorter more symmetric outbursts.

For section 4.2: People didn’t understand that the list was only for the draft, make sure to make things flow once its no longer in bullet point format

Motivation for observation? When? How? Data reduction? Direct result?

Curiosity about how Sion et al. determined T and that 50% of UV flux comes from accretion disk. Is it through white dwarf modelling and fitting?

Conclusion

People had a hard time understanding that a conclusion can have open questions in it