

Thank you for your useful comments, answers below:

General remarks

- I think the paper is nicely written
- The comments are mainly English, but please clarify the physics in places.

Specific comments

Title page. I think the calibration policy is : X.Surname, on behalf of the LHCb Collaboration

>> if you mean putting the LHCb collaboration in the same line of the name in bold, I think that in our collaboration putting it below (as it is the case here) has been accepted/validated.

Page 1

Section 1: which matrix -> whose matrix

>> You are right, for non animated objects, one tends to think that which replaces whose, but it seems modern english requires whose or "of which" (sometimes).

Move the sentence beginning “This is referred to” to immediately before the sentence beginning “On the contrary,”

>> this cannot work, the sentence you are proposing to move is about LFUV. This has to be set after the sentence “On the contrary,” where the violation of LFU is mentioned, while the sentence before it treats the SM case where there is no violation.

“is proposed” -> “is described below”

>> Ok

Page 2

I don’t know what “external” branching fraction means.

>> since the relevant channel is explicitly mentioned, “external” is removed then.

Figure 2 caption needs expanding. “R(D) and R(D*) measurements compared to the SM average [6].”

>> Done

Section 3 At quark level, these transitions -> At quark level, b->s ll transitions

>> Done

End of first paragraph. [add] , and the charge conjugate states.

>> I have added rather: “(charge conjugation is implied)”

The data is => The data are

>> changed

S5 and FL definitions – there are two parameters but you only define one.

>> simply because S5 is one of the coefficients of an angular formula, and has no simple physical explanation attached to it.

Page 3. There are 2 lines at the top pf the page. Maybe re-format so the figures appear at the top ?

>> Done

Fig 4 caption. “vetoed” – I know what you mean, but not a great word. I would write “excluded from the analysis”.

>> excluded would suffice then

Same caption. band -> bands

>> Fixed

Fig 5 right. There is written “flavio”. Is this an approved figure?

>> **This is an approved figure where flavio code (Ref [31]) was used to produce it. We thus choose to mentioned it in the figure as well.**

Page 4. First paragraph numbers -> measurements

>> **since measurements is already used in the beginning of the paragraph, I would prefer e.g., “measured quantities” to vary.**

Figure 7. You say a 6 sigma deviation from SM. Am I supposed to see that from the figure? What is the SM expectation on these plots?

>> **the 6 sigma number comes from a global fit performed in Ref[18]. The SM expectation on the plots is zero, since once is shown the NP contributions to the Wilson coefficients.**

Page 5. Table 1. The caption needs a full stop.

>> **Done**

In the caption, specify whether the precision is just statistical or statistical + systematics

>> **those are projections from Run 1 results where all uncertainties are accounted for.**

Added: “The numbers are taken from Ref{cite{RX_UpgradeII}} and are projections based on Run 1 results where statistical and systematic uncertainties are combined.”

Section 4. For these purely -> For the purely

>> **Changed**

Section 5 lead -> leads

>> **rather led (past tense), changed.**

R(H_c) Should this be R(H_b) ? Same applies to the caption of Fig 8. If this really is H_c and you are talking about charm LFV here, than please define H_c (ie spell it out). It would also be good to start a new paragraph in that case.

>> **This quantity is clearly defined in equation 2.1, Section 2.**

Page 6.

Last sentence move “the” to in front of “B_c+”

>> **Agreed, done.**