

Template for comments and project leader observations

Date:	Document:	Project:
-------	-----------	----------

Reviewer <sup>1</sup>	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Project leader observations  <u>PZT response</u>
	3.4, 3.11, 4			te	PVr is mandated in 3.4 which is fine, but not defined until 3.11. Formal definition occurs in Section 4.	Suggest making preceding 3.4 with what is in 3.11 to make mention of PVr antecedent to definition of PV. Further, 3.4 should state the formal mathematical definition occurs in Section 4.	<u>Better to Keep as is. PVr definition includes concepts of Residual and Zernike fit that are introduced between 3.4 and 3.11. PVr is just in the note in 3.4 and includes a statement to see 3.11- keep as is. PVr definition also includes concepts of Residual and Zernike fit that are defined later. PVr is only in the note in 3.4 and it does include a statement to see 3.11.</u>
	3.10		Text and Note	te	We are defining a subscript x that is two so why not just call it t,i like the note does (or better yet m,n as stated next)?	Use rms subscript m,n if possible to be consistent with later sections.	<u>Not clear to me how this section follows from the referenced section in 14999-4. Needs another look. ?? Not clear to me how this section follows from the referenced section in 14999-4. Needs another look.</u>
	3.11		Note	te	Here we define the 36 term Zernike set, why not define it in 3.10? Suggest going with m,n notation to match approach in 14999-4 draft.	Define the 36 term set when first mentioned, Section 3.10, and possibly mention it again here.	<u>Philosophical point: It is not necessary to define the term before it is first used, as long as it is fully defined in a later section, as it is.</u>
	3.13.4		Note	te	The tolerance does not have to be very tight to make a near hemisphere calculation of the spherical approximation problematic. Using relative words like tight can be dangerous.	Suggest dropping tight tolerance and make the note directly warn about high NA surfaces (however one wants to define them). A qualifier that surfaces with tight tolerances have more potential for error would be good after the more blanket statement.	<u>Modified note to clarify NA term.</u>
	4		Notes 1, 3 and 4	ed	Punctuation typo after the word asphere in Note 1 and at the end of Notes 3 and.	Revise	<u>Done</u>
	4.1		First	ed	Punctuation typo at the end of Note 1.	Revise	<u>Done</u>

Formatted: Font: Bold

<sup>1</sup> Enter the reviewer's initials

<sup>2</sup> Type of comment: ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and project leader observations

Date:	Document:	Project:
-------	-----------	----------

Reviewer <sup>1</sup>	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Project leader observations  <u>PZT response</u>
			paragraph				
	4.2.4		Equations	ed	Equation formatting should be cleaned up. Looks all mushed together.	Revise	<u>Done</u>
	4.2.6 to 4.2.8		Section ends	ed	Spacing between sections is not consistent	Throw computer off high building into a river and reformat	<u>Bonzaiiiiiiii!!!!</u>
	4.2.8		Equations	ed	S(rho, theta) should be consistently written in text and equations	Revise	<u>Done</u>
	4.2.10		Note	te	A reference would be good or more information on which terms do not satisfy the stated PV condition with respect to the coefficient.	Suggest adding in a reference or be more specific about which coefficients are different.	<u>[Chris – please address this]</u>
	4.2.11		First paragraph	ed	Meridional is misspelled	Revise and figure out who this annoying reviewer is so you can delete them from holiday card lists	<u>Done. Well done.</u>
	4.2.13		4.2.13	ed	“Chris will edit this.”	Ha ha	<u>Oops.</u>
	4.5	All	Equations	ed	Consistency needed in spacing after equations.	Edit as needed	<u>Done</u>
	4.5.3		Second paragraph	te	Check expression using c in the text for correctness. Repeat of a Z1 <sup>-1</sup> ?	Edit as needed	<u>Fixed</u>
	4.5.3		Second paragraph	ed	The rarely seen double comma erroneously employed.	Zing!	<u>Yikes.</u>
	4.6.3		Note 1	ed	imay is improper use of Pig Latin.	Repeat second grade	<u>Oy vay!</u>
	4.7		Fourth paragraph	ed	Minor typo as it should say “than either”	Revise	<u>STET</u>
	4.7		Seventh paragraph	te	When mentioning bandwidth, may want to rigorously state “spatial bandwidth” although it is implied.	Revise	<u>Done</u>
	4.7		Fifteenth paragraph	ed	Paragraph formatting	Revise	<u>Done</u>
	4.7		Note 2	ge	Stated documents here are good. Should they also be included in the references at the end?	Revise	<u>Need to renumber refs to do this.</u>
	4.10 to		Section	ed	Formatting of these definitions is inconsistent with	Delete the colons, :	<u>??? Looks OK</u>

<sup>1</sup> Enter the reviewer's initials

<sup>2</sup> **Type of comment:** ge = general te = technical ed = editorial

Template for comments and project leader observations

Date:	Document:	Project:
-------	-----------	----------

Reviewer <sup>1</sup>	Section	Sub-section	Paragraph/ Figure/ Table/	Type of comment <sup>2</sup>	Comments	Proposed change	Project leader observations  <u>PZI response</u>
	4.11		headers		the rest of the section.		
	5		Text		General formatting for listed item a) second line, d) additional lines, and after the table.	Revise if warranted.	<u>Done</u>
	6		Equation	ed	Equation spacings are not consistent and last paragraph formatting should be fixed	Reformat	<u>Done</u>
	B2		Last paragraph	ed	Formatting went wonky	Reformat	<u>Done</u>
	Annex C		Example 3		Stray comma after the two references	Fix 'er up	<u>Done</u>
	Bibl.		Reference 7		There is a newer version of Malacara from 2007. ISO14999-4 updated their reference list to this version of the book.	Change if still applicable	<u>Later</u>

1 Enter the reviewer's initials

2 **Type of comment:** **ge** = general **te** = technical **ed** = editorial