

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for your detailed comments on our submitted proceedings!

I have uploaded a revision that addresses all of your numbered list's suggestions specifically, and the broader comments above this list according to how I interpreted these comments.

In particular, I have defined all parameters and terms, the latter down to particle physics fundamentals like \sqrt{s} and p_T .

With respect to your concern regarding unjustified parameter value choices in our calculations, these were largely dictated by the observables we were comparing to.

As such, the momentum classes {low p_T , mid p_T , high p_T } simply match the choices made in arXiv:1305.3823, and the various centrality, \sqrt{s} , and rapidity values match whatever the data coming from an experimental collaboration had.

The 't Hooft coupling constant choices are justified in hep-th/0612143, which is referenced where we introduce these constants in our proceedings.

The reasoning for moving to POWHEG (improved statistical sampling) was made more explicit in the conclusion (but was already present in section 4).

I have filled in justification gaps in the physics reasoning in sections 1 & 2, where I could find them. I removed/abbreviated superfluous phrasings where possible so that the above changes were compensated for, and no figures comparing our predictions to data and other calculations had to be removed.

Where stylistic commas improved readability, I have now added them.

All the best,
Robert Hambrock