

Thank you again for the second reading, some answers below:

>> 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.

We would like to conform to a common format. I draw your attention to the following web page https://lhcb.web.cern.ch/lhcb_page/collaboration/organization/editorial_board/conference_proceedings.html Please can you write your name. Then underneath your name your institute. Then underneath that “On behalf of the LHCb Collaboration”. Thanks.

>> **Ok, Done**

>> 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.

You are completely correct. I am sorry. It is the word “this” that is ambiguous, in that it is not the BSM mediator which is the subject of LFUV. Please change “This” to “Any such difference”.

>> **This refers to the latest item mentioned (here the BSM effect). As such, it is correct. Since “Such an effect” is used to start the next sentence, I propose that we leave it as is.**

>> 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.

Accepted, sorry I misinterpreted this. But you might wish to clarify to the figure caption “... and LFUV. These coefficients are zero in the Standard Model. The fits are ...”. I agree it might be obvious, but it might clarify things.

>> **Since the first sentence of the caption mentions explicitly “New Physics contributions to the \mathcal{C}_{9S} and \mathcal{C}_{10S} Wilson coefficients”, I'm afraid adding that they are zero in SM is overdoing things.**

>> Section 5 lead -> leads>> rather led (past tense), changed.

Led is fine, but you didn't change it.

>> **sorry for the omission, fixed now.**

>> $R(H_c)$ 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.

Sorry, I accept that I missed the definition of H_c (although this definition is easily inferred). It is the non-definition of $R(H_c)$ that is missing. I would like you to provide a definition in words about what $R(H_c)$ is. It would help if you would start a new paragraph. This part of the text is very confusing and needs to be clarified. You talk about $R(D_0)$ and $R(D^+)$ etc in the previous sentence. Yet in Figure 8 you have in the indent RD , RD^+ etc in relation to $R(H_c)$. So you have multiple definitions which is very confusing to the reader. All you need to do is to explain $R(H_c)$ in words in the body of the text.

>> **H_b , H_c and $R(H_c)$ are all clearly defined in Section 2. As for the H_c as subscript in Fig.8, this is**

embedded from our paper in Ref [29]. The caption explicitly says that we are talking about the same $R(H_c)$ as defined in the proceedings, so there is no confusion.