

**OGLE-2018-BLG-0022: A Nearby M-dwarf Binary
Response to Referee's Report**

We are grateful to referee Dr. Nick Rattenbury for his consideration of our work and his thoughtful feedback. We have addressed his concerns in the revised draft as described below, where we include his original remarks for context in italics (in the PDF-formatted version of this report) and our responses in plain text. Changes to the draft paper have been highlighted in bold font.

This is an excellent piece of work, setting out the analysis of a microlensing event observed by the ROME/REA Survey. I recommend the paper for publication. I waive anonymity -- this report is by N.J.Rattenbury.

I thoroughly enjoyed reading the paper, the style is engaging and the description of planetary microlensing presented in a polished fashion. There are a few hiccups in the otherwise excellent writing, probably a result of some editing errors. I've indicated these on my marked-up copy. Several of the figures are at low resolution -- this can be easily (?) amended.

We thank the referee for including the marked-up copy of the draft, which made it easy to identify and implement all his recommended changes throughout.

We believe that the low-resolution rendering of some figures was a result of generating the figures as PNG images and later converting them to EPS. To avoid this issue, we have re-generated all of the figures from scratch in either EPS or PDF format.

This had the side effect of producing much larger file sizes. While this was not a problem for most figures, the DE population map of chi squared figure exceeded the maximum that Overleaf can process. We addressed this by plotted every 2nd point in the dataset for this figure, and switched to PDF format. There is no visually-appreciable change in the results or distribution, but this results in a manageable file size.

I have also added some questions to the marked-up copy and I'll repeat these here.

s.2 -- I've indicated two other papers -- Bond (2001) and Sumi (2003) --- that are often used to refer to the the MOA project.

We agree these citations provide greater context for the MOA project, and are particularly relevant for their treatment of the photometric data, and we have added these references.

s.5 -- Can you please add a few lines indicating why the fit for coefficients a_0 and a_1 could not be constrained for most of the data sets presented in Table 3?

We have added a short paragraph to this section to explain the instances in which it was not possible to determine rescaling coefficients for a dataset. To summarize the reasons briefly here, there are a number of possible causes of this:

- 1) Some datasets, particularly those taken in reactive-mode, consist of data data taken just around the peak of the event. These data points are particularly sensitive to any residuals from the best-fit model, especially around the caustic crossings. The resulting scatter makes it very difficult to provide a reliable fit to the rescaling relation. Since this process is reliant on the use of an accurate model to fit with, we attempted to mitigate this issue iterating the model fitted with the rescaling process, to verify that the uncertainties of specific data points were not being excessively scaled, or an inaccurate model was being used.

- 2) In some cases, the photometric uncertainties spanned a relatively short numerical range (or had a few outliers while the rest of the points were clumped together) making it difficult to reliably fit the rescaling function.
- 3) For some datasets the residual scatter in the photometry was accurately represented by the uncertainties, implying that no rescaling was required.

Figure 2 -- this figure is suffering under an embarrassment of riches. There are a lot of data points covering the exciting parts of the light curve, which is great. I would like to see the behaviour of the residuals at these epochs, but I can't as the different coloured symbols overlap to an extent that makes any conclusion regarding coherent deviations impossible. May I suggest that several separate residual plots are offered, separating the data sets so that at least a qualitative assessment by eye of scatter is possible?

I'd also like to see a zoomed version of the peak of the main curve just prior to the first caustic crossing.

We agree that this plot needed to be made clearer. We have added multiple plots for the residuals, so that any remaining deviations for the individual datasets can be more clearly evaluated. In the interests of keeping the plot to a single page for easier comparison, we have plotted 3 datasets per residuals plot.

We have also added a zoomed inset to give more detail of the small pre-peak bump, as highlighted in the marked-up paper that the referee provided.

Otherwise, this was a very enjoyable paper to read and I look forward to its publication.

We thank the referee for his time and his constructive feedback on this paper.