

Document Number	N/A
Document Title	Mid-term report
Document Date	2024.02.15
Document Revision	1.0



Review Panel	Affiliation	Acronym
Carlos De Breuck	ESO	CDB
Eric Villard (chair)	ESO	EVI
Ruediger Kneissl	ESO	RKN
Stephen White	USAF	SWH
Pavel Yagoubov	ESO	PYA

Observers	Affiliation	Acronym
Maria Diaz Trigo	ESO	MDT
Liz Humphreys	ESO	LHU
Tomek Kaminski	Lab. for Astrophysics in Torun	TKA
Hugo Messias	ESO	HME
Neil Phillips	ESO	NPH
Martin Zwaan	ESO	MZW

Responders	Affiliation	Acronym

Reviewer Comment Classes	Key
Typo	T
Review Item Discrepancy	RID
Review Item Clarification	RIC
General Comment	G
Other	O

No.	Page	Section	Reviewer Comment	Class	Originator	Severity	Response Study team	Feedback Reviewer	Description/Action	Issue closed?
23	15	4.2.4	The description of the mean of the fidelity image should be made more quantitative, statements as 'less spiky' are not very solid, and the difference in the mean values of 0.075 compared to 0.14 are not even mentioned. This is important to end up with a quantifiable go/no-go criterion	RIC	CDB	Major			AI Miro to define additional metrics to assess the quality of the reconstruction of the image of the Sun	No
34	30	7	A useful extension of the go/no-go criterion would be to extend the frequency bands to B1, B2 and B8-B10.	G	CDB	Major			AI Miro to determine go/nogo limits for B1/B2 (best effort)	No
35	11,18	4.2	With a simulated observation it should be possible to compare the phase solutions from calibration (phase referencing and self-cal) with the known phase corruption that was applied. The phase vs. time in Fig. 13 (only long time variations) doesn't look at all like the phase corruption in Fig. 4 (close to white noise). I suggest doing a comparison of the phase gain table obtained by self-cal with that that was applied to corrupt the data, and using the similarity (e.g.	RID	NP	Major			AI Miro to investigate the possibility of comparing the selfcalibration with the initial corruption (best effort)	No
37	29	7, 4th bullet	Related to my RIX 35, the testing of the WV extraction from the Band 5 data seems dependent on the self-cal solution reliability. Is there a feeling for how reliable this will be, and is it a risk to the WV testing? Could there be any independent means of testing, e.g. comparing retrieved WV with that from a WVR in a nearby antenna not pointing toward the Sun?	G	NP	Minor			AI Miro to work on this during second part of study	No
56	12	4.1.4	But an important factor for this question is whether multi-resolution clean was used: I can't find that stated anywhere. It should help to keep down the number of CC's needed.	RIC	SWH	Major			AI Miro to investigate the possibility of adding one more/larger size value to the multiclean command	No
61			Since I am no expert on solar observing could you please clarify what data products have scientific value in terms of small angular scale, such as low or high resolution images at different times, large scale range images at one instance, power spectra in corresponding scale ranges, etc.	RIC	RKN	Major			AI Miro to investigate the possibility of deriving a power spectrum from the visibilities	No
63	3	1	Maybe related to the uv dilution problem, if there was any value in only high spatial resolution information without a large range of scales on the solar structure then a single 12m configuration could be considered for the imaging, while the heterogenous array might be more difficult to use for imaging.	RIC	RKN	Major			AI Miro to simulate an observation+selfcal+imaging with just 12m configuration	No

[illegible]