Hi Joao,

indeed, I got sucked into the Phase-II review (we are freezing documentation and talks in a week for the NSF PDR, and are doing rehearsals in these days). I reviewed the calorimetry chapter of our own CMS Phase-II Technical Proposal, just to see if some of the questions I had made sense. I mostly had the two comments I mentioned during the review, and I suspect could be considered useful for the CDR; they are about a couple of topics that are currently missing from the Calorimeter chapter:

- engineering constraints: after all, in the CMS TP we did have some finite-element-analysis results demonstrating the feasibility of the endcap calorimeter. At the moment, there are no words about how the calorimeters can be built and held in place, if I remember correctly.

- radiation damage: a ballpark estimate is that it will be about 2 orders of magnitude smaller than LHC calorimeters, which essentially means that there are no problems. The CDR currently does not mention at all the topic, I believe it should be explicitly stated that some thought went into it.

On the subject of grammar, I did find some typos and strange translations here and there, but I think there will be a general review of the grammar/language when the document is closer to completion. Best,

Alberto

From: Joao Barreiro Guimaraes Da Costa
Sent: Tuesday, November 21, 2017 3:08 PM
To: Alberto Belloni

Hi Alberto,
Are you planning to send us your comments on the CDR soon?
We are having our regular meeting tomorrow at 3 pm Beijing time to have the first discussion of the minireview outcome. It would be good to have your comments.
I assume that will be difficult but can you let me know when you plan to send them?

Thanks,
-Joao

_____

Joao Guimaraes da Costa
Professor, Institute of High Energy Physics
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing

via Newton Mail