

Author reply to referee comments on MR-2021-50

My submission was refereed by Art Palmer and an anonymous referee. While Art found the article clearly written, the anonymous referee found parts of the effort unclear. This appears to be a situation of different theoretical backgrounds for the two reviewers. I have added some language to point out that the confusing Section 2 is from a “differential perspective” as contrasted with the usual “transformation solution” perspective in the hopes that it will be of some help. As I already suggested, a certain amount of thoughtful digging is almost always required when reading scientific papers, and some effort at recreation is important. The salient aspect for the author is to provide sufficiently tillable soil, so that the digging is not too onerous. I believe I have been successful in that regard. For example, I avoid all the mathematical theorem entry points, which are usually used, even in expositions titled as introductions. These are so very stylized as to obscure the structure underlying the basics. At least that was my experience, coming to the topic of Lindblad. Since the author is paying charges himself, keeping the submission short is of some interest.

The minor typographical errors have been corrected and I thank the readers for catching them. I also corrected a glaring error in the part where the secular approximation is applied. All are highlighted in color in the revised file