

November 15, 2020

---

Revision 1 – NON-104197 / Gutkin et al

---

Dear editor

attached is the revision 1 of our paper that incorporates the edits suggested by the referees, together with the our responses to the referee reports.

Just one kvetch, of principle. Referee 1 is of the opinion that

*... the authors should attempt to convert the main results into theorems. If gaps of rigour obstruct this process, these should be spelled out clearly.*

*Nonlinearity* is a joint project of a math and a physics society for a reason. It is not a people's reeducation camp whose purpose is to turn physicists into mathematicians. We are here to meet here as sisters, loving, curious and respectful of our respective cultures and backgrounds. It would never occur to me to demand of a mathematician the she should write in the style customary to - lets say physical chemists. To cite our Constitution, so thoughtfully phrased by our eponymous fathers:

*Nonlinearity* scope: Aimed primarily at mathematicians and physicists interested in research on nonlinear phenomena, the journal's coverage ranges from proofs of important theorems to papers presenting ideas, conjectures and numerical or physical experiments of significant physical and mathematical interest.

We have now reformed the single cat statements around eqs. (27) to (31) into Theorem 3.1, and the spatiotemporal cat statements around eqs. (42) to (45) into Theorem 4.1, to humor the referee. But honestly, we doubt that such faux "theoremification" serves anybody well.

sincerely

Predrag Cvitanović