

Type A comments

- L28 & 29: proton going direction → proton beam direction, Pb going direction → Pb beam direction
- L147: use “scale factors” instead of “efficiency weights” to be consistent with L 145, L 152 & L176
- L 150 – 153: I find this long sentence hard to read, I would split it up in one sentence per systematic uncertainty for clarity.
- L182: “determined summing” → “determined by summing”
- Figure 2, caption: in several rapidities → in several rapidity bins or y_{CM} bins (consistent with caption Figure 3)
- all Figures, caption: fully correlated global uncertainty → fully correlated luminosity uncertainty
- Figure 4 & 5: shade the entire range for the global luminosity uncertainty as it's very easily overlooked.
- Figure 4: of the top left figure, put the two legends together at the bottom and perhaps put the headers next to the legend entries
- L 228: elucidating → elucidate
- L 233: $28.0 \text{ pb}^{-1} (\text{pp})$ $34.6 \text{ nb}^{-1} (\text{pPb})$ → $28.0 \text{ pb}^{-1} (\text{pp})$ and $34.6 \text{ nb}^{-1} (\text{pPb})$

Type B comments

- L38-39: I'm not sure what is meant with “may be compatible with”, I feel this is a statement that confers no information, either make a quantitative (or a more definite) statement on the compatibility or drop it if there isn't sufficient information to make such a statement.
- L90: “the oppositely charged muon pairs are further selected to...” → in the event selection section, it is not mentioned before this that the dimuon pairs are required to be opposite sign (only in the introduction at L47, but it should be specified in the event selection). I would rephrase as “The dimuon pairs are constructed from oppositely charged muons and are further selected to....”
- L91: standard identification criteria → standard identification and isolation criteria (at least I assume isolation criteria are applied?)
- L 124-125: can you quote the fraction of nonprompt contamination?
- L 207 & 238: drop “(yet systematically smaller than)” → as from the Figure 4 we can see that the third bin is not smaller than unity, so it's unclear what is meant with “systematically” in this context. The statement “consistent with unity” is enough.
- L 212: “in the same bin” → rephrase to same phase space or same range
- L 225: “comover interactions” I consider this jargon, perhaps rephrase to “such interactions with a comoving medium”?