Corrections on: Correlation study of multi-wavelength transient emission of selected CRTS cataclysmic variables

H Szegedi, A Odendaal and PJ Meintjes

Department of Physics, University of the Free State, PO Box 339, Bloemfontein, 9300, South Africa

E-mail: szegedih@ufs.ac.za

Note: The corrections below was applied to the content. Layout corrections have been done and accepted on 2016-08-10.

1. Corrections applied to first referee's comments (2017-07-30)

1.1. Reviewer remark:
I ask that the author corrects a misunderstanding in the 3rd paragraph of the introduction where it states that novae are classified as non-magnetic CVs. There are plenty over classical novae that are strongly magnetic (polars, e.g. V1500 Cyg = Nova Cygni 1975). Please modify the discussion in this paragraph to reflect that.

Correction: Paragraph 3 was rewritten to clear up the misunderstanding.

2. Corrections applied to second referee's comments (2017-08-07)

2.1. Referee remark:
Note that the mentioned SU Uma class of dwarf novae should be abbreviated SU UMa (capital M).

Correction: All references of "SU Uma" in the text were corrected to "SU UMa".

2.2. Referee remark:
Figure 3 seems a bit out of place, since it shows a very unusual CV (AE Aqr), quite atypical of most CVs.

Correction: Although AE Aqr is atypical the figure is included to demonstrate that there is evidence that a CV can emit energy over the whole electromagnetic spectrum. The reference to AE Aqr has been changed slightly to reflect this.

2.3. Referee remark:
In section 2, the sentence reading "The sample criteria involved identifying sources in the CRTS database which were classified as CV candidates, were observed for more than a year by the CRTS, and exhibited variability of more than 2 magnitudes" needs to be written more clearly. Better wording would be "The criteria used to select CV candidates from the CRTS database

for further study were: 1.) they were observed for more than a year by the CRTS, and 2.) exhibit variability of more than 2 magnitudes".

Correction: Rewritten the sentence as suggested by the Referee.

2.4. Referee remark:

The sentence "transforming unfiltered magnitudes to Landolt V magnitudes" is not correct, it should state "transforming unfiltered magnitudes to standard (Johnson) V magnitudes using Landolt photometric standards" (although Johnson is optional).

Correction: Rewritten the sentence as suggested by the Referee.

2.5. Referee remark:

The section title "Conclusion" is not really a conclusion but a description of further work in progress, so should be altered to reflect this, I think.

Correction: The section title "Conclusion" was changed to "Prospects for future work".