

Hi Michael, thank you for your quick response! I have taken these comments into consideration, and will upload a new draft.

Dear Jesse, all,

thanks a lot for the update and taking into account most of my comments in the new version of the draft. I checked the replies and the diff version of the draft (so I didn't check again unchanged parts).

I give here already green light from my side, but you might want to consider the following comments (some of them are also just replies to your comments) still:

- systematic uncertainties/averaging: thanks a lot for clarification. I was understanding the text as if you would also modify the data point by averaging it (I didn't want to suggest a different procedure). I think in the updated version of the draft it is more clear now, what you are doing.

- systematic uncertainties/other sources: if the IRC/PAG/PWG is OK with not mentioning this extra sources, it is OK also with me (I was just wondering).

Looking back at old notes, I believe the IRC agrees that the variation of the  $\lambda_{ij}$  should be included in the estimation of the systematic uncertainties. I will include this contribution together with the other two suggested in your first round of comments. I do not anticipate these to contribute significantly to the uncertainties.

- Title: probably a question to EB chairs, if this is OK to start with a symbol there...

- There are also still some figure and table captions/titles that start with a symbol. Not sure if all of them need to be changed though.

Sorry, I fixed a number of these cases, but obviously missed a number as well. Hopefully all are taken care of now.

- "z position": what is the reason for writing z in italic?

I think z should be in italics because it is a symbol. I looked quickly in a few other publications, which all had the z in italics. Also, the example on the twiki, `\newcommand{\dedx}{dE$/d$x$}`, seems to support this conclusion. But, please let me know if you think it should be in roman.

- L120-127 (this is the part about hypothesis moved up from the footnote): "assume" is repeated in each sentence. I don't have a good suggestion for now, but perhaps you have.

I have reworded these sentences somewhat, and cut down the number of times "assume" or "assuming" is used.

- Fig.1: can one remove the two extra captions directly below the figures and if necessary move to the "big" one?

- L168-173 (new part describing the two-particle correlation function): I think the description of "particles a and b" (L173) needs to be moved up after the first sentence (or included there).

- Table 9: Why "PA" is italic (several occasions in the table and its caption)?

- Fig. 4: I know that it was my suggestion, but now I am doubting, if it is enough to have [10] and [11] in the figure. But this can be discussed during collaboration round.

- L411: "In Figure" -> "In Fig. "

- L411: "Ref. [10]" -> "[10]", same later for [11]

- Eq. 14: “.” missing after equation  
- L453-472: this part is much improved now, well done. I am wondering, if one should add a reference to the decomposition (if somebody wants to have more information about it)? Is there a standard femto-paper one could cite?

- Table 11: I guess this table style is improved during collaboration round (together with remaining comments on figure styles)

I have tweaked the tables to make them more cohesive, but probably further refinement will occur in the next rounds.

- Appendix B: I am still wondering if this is needed. If the IRC feels yes, then I would at least expect that this appendix is cited somewhere in the text (I found it just in introduction).

It is briefly mentioned also in Section 3.3. This is not vital to the overall analysis, so I am fine if it stays or goes. Although, together with the other additional sources of systematic uncertainties discussed above, using the experimental  $\Xi K$  data vs. the simulation (described in App. B) in the treatment of residuals could/should be included as a source of systematic uncertainty. In which case, the inclusion of Appendix B is probably more justified.

Best regards,  
Michael