General comment on introduction: I think we should give a bit more of a background and context to the reader, I have tried t

Comment 1

…was found since early afterglow observations with BeppoSAX, when the presence of a structured outflow has been considered for explaining some of the temporal breaks observed in the light curves of a number of GRBs (Panaitescu and Kumar 2003, Apj 592: 390, Panaitescu 2005 MNRAS 362, 921). Candidates for structured jet exhibit a variation of the decay index at the break smaller that that expected for a top-hat spreading jet ($\Delta\alpha \approx 0.8)   and larger than that induced by the crossing of the cooling frequency (\Delta\alpha=0.25). Energy injection by a long lasting central engine can also induce temporal breaks, either flattening or steepening. Other effects such as transition to non-relativistic expansion, the transition from wind-like to ISM (Piro et al. 2005, Apj 623 314) or the emergence of an Inverse compton component (Corsi \& Piro  [2006A&A...458..741C](http://adsabs.harvard.edu/abs/2006A%26A...458..741C)) can also produce breaks, in these case associated with a flattening of the light curve.

More recenlty Ryan et al (2015) presented evidence of a structured jet in a sample based on SWIFT observations. Considering the number of processes that can produce breaks mentioned above, no undisputable observational evidence of a structured jet became available till the observations of GW170817. Real jets …..

Comment 2

Why GW170817 allowed us to pin down the presence of strucutured jet as opposed to a simple tiop-hat model? Because for all the GRBs available before GW, the view was nearly on-axis, thus the bulk of the emission dominated by the core of the jet. On the contrary GW1708917 was viewd off axis, i.e. at an observer’s angle larger that the initial opening angle. Thus the early emission was dominated by the jet profile at large angle, thus allowing us to determine the presence of a complex structure.