ALS Comments

TYPO & CORRECTIONS
text to add in [ ]

GENERAL
* do a global search et al. -> \etal so consistently in italics.

Abstract
* w = ... -0.22 should be subscript. probably {} is wrong. occurs elsewhere

1.
* first sentence: perlmutter 98 is the Nature paper (but that did NOT have evidence for Lambda, I believe). Did you mean AAS mtg? that is not in references
* "99\% confidence the ..." suggest to add "confidence level the "
* "each of these measurements are sensitive" are-> is
* "Omega_Lamda close to ..." close to -> which is approximately
* "0.35 < z " -> 0.36 < z
* "These color [errors] usually dominate " add "errors"
* "this approximation should be a good one" informal. say "is valid" or "is appropriate"

2.1
* "Sne Ib/c" -> SNe
* "a given supernovae observed" -> given supernova
* bg(u,v)is a constant ... -needs a 3rd argument. should be "bg(u,v;a) "
* "there exists {some} ground-based" delete "some"

2.2
* the first 90 days -> table has 100 days
* ~40-50 days after maximum" which was it? state definite cut-off value

2.3
* "different telescopes, icolor different telescopes" typo
* table 3: "f: The indicated supernovae were excluded" - should be singular as there is just one that was excluded

2.4
* the text describing subsets is INCONSISTENT with table. Text describes 15 dropped from Subset 1, table has 14.
* "excludes six supernoave" - spelling
* "1994G, 1994al, 1995a1995aq, 1995at, and 1997K)" There is NO 1994G IN TABLES. ALSO "1995a1995aq" MESSED UP

2.5
* The effects of such a dispersion should be included" change "should be" to "is" or "is, in principle"

3.

* “between the reddening high and [low] redshift supernovae” - add low
* “this figure graphically shows” – delete “graphically” or make it “clearly shows”
* delete sentence : “It is possible that the problem was cuased by an assumed intrinsic \mbox{U-B} that was too red.” - this sounds like speculation on your part

4.1

* “are inlcuded in all fits,” - spelling
* “high-redshfit” – spelling
* table 8: “high-redshfit” – spelling
* “from this paper Fit 2)” – missing “(“
* “hence tightents the constraints” spelling
* “corrections, Figure~” should be a period, not comma after “corrections”

4.3

* “By themselves, the supernova data sets” should be “By itself, …”
* “the mild vairation of “ – spelling
* “in a different sense from those of the” should be “…sense from that of the“
* “we measure a limit on w” – should be “we obtain a value of w”
* “of other constat-w” spelling

5.

* Figure 8 is EVERYWHERE mislabelled as Figure 5.
* “identfied systematics” spelling
* “maximum-liklihood” spelling
* “identfied systematics, we identify the shift” – change second “identify” to “determine”

5.1

* “this is still well less” – change “well” to “much”
* methodologices – spelling

5.2

* “All subsets of supernoave” – spelling
* “contimation” – spelling
* “to estimate the effects of this” – should be “… the effect of this”
* “w gets larger by 0.0;” value missing

5.4

* “templated” – spelling
* “shows affect on“ should be “shows the effect on”
* “this bluer assumption amount” should be “…about”
* “a significant about – should be “…amount”

5.5

* “the limits of a flux-limit survey” should be “flux-limited survey”

5.6

* “is unappropriately applied” should be “inappropriately”
* “We incorperate the” spelling
* “galaxy exctinction” spelling

5.7

* “Gravitation lensing” should be Gravitational
* “We adpot 0.01” spelling

5.8

* “morphologically-segragated” spelling
* “Schmidt 1999) has demonstated very good” should be “has been demonstrated to be in very good..”
* 2nd paragraph is too long. needs paragraph break
* “studies based on nearby SNe Ia of strongly” delete “of”
* “This plot shows graphically that..” delete “graphically” or make “clearly shows”

5.9

* “this smaller than our statistical” should be “this is smaller…”

6.

* figure 10: NO DASHED LINES APPEAR ON PLOT (AT least not my printout).
* “was provided by NASA though rants HST” perhaps “NASA grants” would be better
* I now have the offical LBL acknowledgement. Sentence should be: “This work was supported by the Director, Office of Science, Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC03-76SF00098.”

A.

* “thumbnail of the a the F675W” delete “a the”
* eqn A1 must be wrong – some fluxes are negative, so how can you take log?

Fig 11 and Fig12

* don’t forget to remove your comment “not clear to me…”

References

* Kim A., Linder… is now astro-ph/0304509
* Perlmutter 1997, 483, 565 should read “1997, ApJ, 483, 565”
* spaces missing before year in Perlmutter 1999, Richmodn 1995 (you probably need to do “\etal\ “

SUGGESTIONS/COMMENTS/QUESTIONS

Title:

* add “w” – this is as important as the two Omegas.

abstract

* state redshift range in first sentence
* "only one or two of the …" – which is it? state "only one of the …"

2.1

* first par: The discussion in 5.5 about 9/11 discovered at max should be given here or at least stated that this will be discussed in 5.5
* you often mention "high-quality photometry". Can you be quantitative – e.g. give S/N?
* can you give the separation from host?
* can you say something about magnitude of host galaxy ?

2.2

* in describing 4 parameters, shouldn't you add "at maximum in R" to R-I color
* why give template to day 80 if you don't use past 50 days?
* fits systematically less peaked than the data. Is that a worry?

2.3

* table 3: 1997ek – is error on stretch .002 correct?
* table 6: what is z of SNe – is that relevant?
* at the end of the section I really didn't know what conclusion I was supposed to draw.

2.5

* what is value of M_B?
* can you give the equation for d_L?
* can you give the equation showing where E(B-V) is used ?

3.

* hard to follow. it would be helpful to mention at the beginning the corrections steps you will be making.

4.1

* did you ever do the fit with E(B-V) corrections on Subset 2? when you do it on subset 1, the errors blow up. But that set has 2 or 3 extra highly reddened ones. One wonders how much of the effect is due to those.
* Figs 4 and 5 are out of order
* pardon my ignorance, if we believe the E(B-V) correction, our main results should be done with it. Seems like we talk a lot about it, but then don't trust for quoting our result. Am I missing the point here?

4.2

* "However, this fit should be approached with some caution" – this section sounds like we're waffling

5.

* I agree with Ariel that grey dust should be mentioned

5.5

* in the paragraph "Since Malmquist bias results ..." I was a little surprised, after reading the 4 previous paragraphs, by the sentence: "The selection effects for the current high-redshift SNe are not sufficiently well-defined, nor are the constraints on the dark energy equation of state sufficiently strong, to warrant modeling of this effect with the current datasets." This seems like it is just asserted but could use some justification. Can anything quantitative be said?

5.6

* "and hence also in the deceleration parameter" – where did that come from? first mention of q comes out of the blue. suggest to drop it.

5.8

* last sentence talks about "stretch/luminosity relation" but the figure doesn't seem to show much of a relation to speak of.

Don's lightcurves

* labelling is confusing. I was expecting rest frame days but "Observed days from peak" sounds like observer day. Label as rest frame or Observer frame days.
*