

Review of: "Untangling Magellanic Streams"

Denis Leahy¹

¹ Physics and Astronomy, University of Calgary, Canada

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Review of "UNTANGLING MAGELLANIC STREAMS"

Overall, the paper is very nicely written, well-organized, and has excellent figures to support the arguments made.

Detailed comments:

Abstract:

Can you define H3-selected here, briefly?

Page 2, 2nd paragraph: It would be useful to specify what waveband the H3 survey is in, and whether it is photometric, spectroscopic, or other. I see you have done this at the start of section 2.1 - I recommend moving that sentence to Page 2, 2nd paragraph, and adding "spectroscopy of likely halo stars" to the mention of H3 in the abstract.

1st paragraph, section 2.1 "see the H3 survey papers": it would be more useful to replace it with "see .." and give the specific references (many will not know what the H3 survey papers are).

Section 2.1, 2nd paragraph: it would be useful to state that L is specific angular momentum.

Sec 2.2: you could explain the purpose of Fig.3 more clearly: i.e., the proper motions are not distinctive; the color-mag diagram shows they are distinctive: why show proper motions? Can you give the number of full sample stars inside and outside the blue box for the lower panel? The selection boxes miss 2 and 3 of the selected stars - isn't that a significant proportion?

Fig. 5: it is not clear to me why the red dots are claimed to follow the spur and not the main MS. Can you add a comment clarifying this to the text around Fig.5?

Fig. 6: you mean "larger fluctuations in position"?

Fig. 7: can you expand the abbreviation GSE?