

Interactive comment on “The KM3NeT project: status and perspectives” by A. Margiotta

A. Margiotta

margiotta@bo.infn.it

Received and published: 10 December 2012

Thank you very much for your interesting comments. I go through them : 1) already replied to ref.1 2) I did not provide many constructive details because they are not completely defined yet. A full discussion on the different possible options would require more space and would go beyond the main objective of this workshop, I think. I tried to give a general survey of the project, whose details (the number, the type and the characteristics of PMTs, for example) are subject, unfortunately, to the amount of funding that will be available. The decision about the 10" PMT or the multiPMT optical module is not made yet because we need to fully validate the latter option. Also the QE of the PMTs is not defined at this time because some tests are in progress on high QE prototypes. Anyhow I will modify the text in order to address some of the raised questions. 3a) I will modify the text specifying that, as in the case of the ANTARES detector, a complex statistical analysis allows to define the significance of the signal. 3b)

C321

you are right that the statement $\gamma=3.7$ is not rigorously correct because of the charm component. I will change. 4) The site strategy for the future is strictly connected to funding, which in general is regional. 5) ok 6) ok 7) this is true, in a general sense, though the complexity of the multiPMT is better justified with the use of the string. I will add a table showing the equivalence in sensitivity of the different designs.

I will do my best to search for better quality images and modify the text according to the suggestions.

with my best regards Annarita Margiotta

Interactive comment on Geosci. Instrum. Method. Data Syst. Discuss., 2, 575, 2012.