Hi gents,

I've gone through the combined paper and there are a few recommendations I'd make for changes, and I have a draft of a conclusion that I'm working on and which will follow later.  I'll actually have a crack at implementing them in the LaTeX Eugene sent out and put my suggestions as a pull request to Eugene.

**Kevin's Section**

* My affiliation should include TUD as I was at ITTD when the work was carried out.  It should be double-barrelled, IMO.
* Should the abstract be written in passive voice?  We don't use "we" anywhere else in the paper, and while they're not as strict as they were about the tenses, I think we should be consistent.
* The YOUNG reference needs to be decapitalised
* We may need to be a little careful about the citation format, but that will depend on the journal, so it's not a top priority.  A final find/replace on \cite{ vs \citep{ vs \citet{ should fix that.
* Figure labels are doubled for some reason: Easy enough to remove the label from the text of the figure caption.
* Section 3 lacks introduction text.  In general, I don't think there should be sections without body text before the first subsection.  I think a short explanation of how the design will be explained could fit here before subsection 3.1 starts the specifics of the design.
* I recommend we use cos rather than cosine in Equation 1.  It's universally understood.
* Need a citation for Equation 1.  I used the reference below in the thesis, might be a better source out there.
  + M. Redmond, “A Review of Coordinates,” [Online]. Available: <http://spiff.rit.edu/classes/phys440/lectures/coords/coords.html>. [Accessed 3 October 2014]
* I think the explanation of Equation 2 (the paragraph directly below equation 1) needs to be reworded to be a little clearer, I can probably have a crack at that shortly.
* Not sure the "as" in equation 2 is clear what it refers to.  I think it's worth splitting it into two and giving brief explanations of each of the components.
* I think instead of the slightly ambiguous phrase describing the 1% accuracy for a FoV of 15' square by mathematically defining the accuracy measure e.g.
  + for R, S = 15' and |dec| < 66.5,   
    |R/cos(dec-S) - R/cos(dec + S)| / (R/cos(dec)) < 0.01
  + this can be cleaned up in the LaTeX to look neater, but it says the same thing as the prior explanation but without room for interpretation mistakes.
* Possibly worth a brief chat about the 360/0 and enchancements phrase.  I know I had been in favour of it, but seeing it in print, it looks a little awkward
* The equation labels seem to be separated a few times.  this should be easy enough to fix, will take a look at that.
* I think we should rationalise the subscripts in the equations to 1- or 2-letter versions to keep things simple.  I suggest the following
  + T for Target
  + r for reference star
  + C for corner point
  + L for limit
* The bullet points on subsection 3.3 need to be fixed.  I can do that shortly
  + Probably also worth including the mathematical definitions of the limits in mag and colour here, as they're nice and short. e.g.
    - mag(t) - Δmag < mag(r) <  mag(t) + Δmag
* Figures 3-5 are missing their backgrounds.  Is this deliberate?  If not, I can fix it fairly easily.  We might want to change the colours a little anyway: a point to discuss, perhaps?  I think they're also a little smaller than I'd like, especially figure 4.
* The subsection numbering seems to have gone missing, so we need to use appropriate crossreferences.  Part of this will depend on the journal style we're going for, but I think all of the ones we're looking at submitting this to use numbered sections.  Can fix this as part of a final pass.
* Equation 4 doesn't have a label
* Equation 4 should have RA(reference) - R'/2
* I think we should briefly specify that DirRA and DirDec are binary switches.
* Is there any way that the intersection between the loci can quickly be specified using maths rather than (or as well as) natural language.

**Eugene's Section**

* I think there needs to be a longer lead section explaining the purpose of the worked example, and the rationale for the choice of this target
* I think the section should closely follow the structure of Kevin's section.  Probably headings like these would be good
  + Target: give coordinates and specifications of the target
  + Candidate zone:
    - show calculation of R',
    - show the locus for the target  using Equation 2
    - show the boundaries of the CZ using Equation 3
    - show the SDSS navigate image showing the fields (?)
  + Identifying candidate reference stars
    - state number of candidates in CZ
    - show calculation of mag range from mag limit
    - show calculation of colour range from colour limit
    - show a worked example of the resolution limit (it seems there is one, so doing that for this target would do the trick)
    - state number of candidates that pass these tests
  + Identify effective locus
    - Using the two candidate references that actually lead to the final pointing, calculate their cornerpoints using the steps in Equation 4 and the directions of the lines from these points.
    - State that this was repeated for all 14 candidate references
  + Identify PoI
    - Work through the steps to show that they form a PoI.
    - State that this was repeated for all 14\*13\*2=364 possible combinations of cornerpoints
    - Show the calculation of the FoV centred on that PoI via equation 2
    - Show the list of candidate references in that FoV (can refer to SQL query here)
  + Identify best FoV
    - show the sum of the ratings of that FoV
    - State that this is the highest rating that was found
    - Show the final FoV
* Should the coordinates of the target be specified as decimal degrees or DMS (I think the former is correct as it is, but I want to raise the point.)
* Should the coordinates be specified with greater precision?  The FoV size is only 0.17 degrees, so 2 DP of position is probably a little low, especially given the resolution of 0.003degrees
* Figure 5 shouldn't be in this section.  I imagine that's LaTeX doing its best to fit that in somewhere, but if we can fix it, we should.  This is probably something to do later in the process, however, as it will change depending on other changes to the document and format
* The tables should have labels and captions making references to them easier.  I'll have a go at fixing this shortly for you if you like
* I think the parameters table (table 2) should include the colour difference limit parameter and the choice of band to focus on.
* Figure 6 needs a caption explaining its purpose

I hope these are useful points.

Oisin