

Response to Referees

Andrey A Popov et al.

May 26, 2022

1 Response to Reviewer

“ As a final comment, I would suggest a small reformulation of the paragraph right before Section 5.6 : I am not sure to fully understand what is the difference between the "radius" and the "internal parameter". ”

We have added a citation clarifying the appearance of this internal parameter.

2 Response to the Editor

“ L. 51. It might be useful to mention at the start that the weights w_j must be positive and must sum up to 1. ”

We have added a clarification to this.

“ There seems to be an inconsistency of notation between the definition of X_f (l. 48) and later equations such as (2), (3), (5, first line) and others (xf_j or $X_f j$?). Please check. ”

We have changed the definition to be better in line with the rest of the text.

“ L. 277, All reported results are for differences that are two or more standard deviations apart. The meaning is obscure. ”

We have changed this to “All reported results are for statistically significant differences.” We hope this alleviates any confusion.

“ L. 285 (and elsewhere) trace-state normalized matrix. Meaning ? ”

We have added an equation to clarify this.

“ . L. 158, do you mean ... with respect to $\pi(X^f | P)$, or what ? ”

Yes, this has been fixed.

“ . L. 148. Exponent of R, $n \times N^f$

”

We have instead opted to say $N = N^f$ and $N^a = N + M$.

“ List of references. Reference to Popov et al. (2020) incomplete.

”

We have re-exported the reference.

“ L. 15, constraints → constrains

”

We have corrected this.

“ L. 394, ... the authors' experience ... (plural, I presume)

”

This has been corrected.

“ L. 284, ... over that of the whole manifold ...

”