Comments from Myungguen for v3.0 and Responses

Great, see the comments below

2016. 11. 6. 16:52, Myunggeun Song <Myunggeun.Song@cern.ch> 작성:
Some of my comments are already replaced in version3.

anyway,

in abstract, line 15
the initial conditions or eta/s and the small eta/s -> is a bit confused ,
replaced already in version 3.

line 148
symmetry plane correlations (nonlinear coupling) can also contribute to symmetric cumulants
=> As far as I know linear response is the collective motion which comes from direct initial condition geometry ($v_n \propto \varepsilon_n$) while non-linear response is the contribution of other harmonics of ε_n, So, I'm not sure whether we can use
"symmetry plane correlations (nonlinear coupling)" .
Also I think "SC obeservables" are better than "symmetric cumulants " for consistent
더 보기
2016. 11. 6. 16:52, Myunggeun Song <Myunggeun.Song@cern.ch> 작성:
Some of my comments are already replaced in version3.

anyway,

in abstract, line 15
the initial conditions or eta/s and the small eta/s -> is a bit confused ,
replaced already in version 3.

line 148
symmetry plane correlations (nonlinear coupling) can also contribute to symmetric cumulants
=> As far as I know linear response is the collective motion which comes from direct initial condition geometry ($v_n \propto \varepsilon_n$) while non-linear response is the contribution of other harmonics of ε_n, So, I'm not sure whether we can use
"symmetry plane correlations (nonlinear coupling)" .

Also I think "SC obeservables" are better than "symmetric cumulants " for consistent

this is correct, I would leave it for IRC comment.

line 305.
0.2 to 1.5 -> 0.2 to 1.5 GeV/c (unit needed)

done

line 312
This suggests that the p_{T} dependence of SC(m, n) does not solely result from the correlation between flow harmonics but results from the different values of p_{T} dependent individual v_n values. ->
This may indicates that the pT dependence of SC(m,n) is not from the correlation, but from the pT dependence of individual single flow vn values.

i would change to
This may indicate that the pT dependence of SC(m,n) does not solely result from the correlation between flow harmonics but results from the pT dependence of individual single flow vn values.

line 346
the sign of the normaliised NSC -> the sign of the NSC

done

line 372
where the hadronic rescattering make NSC(4,2) slightly smaller.
-> i don't understand this

comparing string melting vs string melting w/o rescaterring

string melting w/o rescaterring is for see the effect of the hadronic rescattering on the sting melting version.
NSC(4,2) gives different trend than others.

line 390

NSC(5,2) and SC(5,3) are quite sensitive to both the initial conditions

and the η/s parametrizations
-> How about SC(4,3)?

it is described differently 393-394. I think it is ok since SC(4,3) trend is similar but the magnitude is slightly different between models.

line 392

the sign of the normalised NSC(4,3) in these models is opposite to the data in 0-10% central collisions.
-> the sign of the NSC(4,3) in some of models are opposite to the data in..
Some of models are not suitable, but I don't know how to express these trends of VISH2+1 results in 0-10

you say “some” while i wrote these models. I was wrong, MC glauber with eta/s=0.2 is negative.
Let’s see if we want to emphasize this or not.

These are all of my comments at this moment.
Also I need more time to revisit my thesis version6. I'm now working on it, and try to put RAA-Flow in appendix to.
I aim to finish update up to wed.

ok

the figures what you asked (NSC(5,2)>NSC(4,2)>NSC(5,3)) will be ready soon.
I think only (AMPTwith default) and (VISH2+1 with low eta/s, ampt) is needed. right?

+ ampt string melting.

Cheers,

DJ