Comments/suggestions on Udara's paper

1. Last line on page 2
   “In this paper [comma] we also discuss...”

2. Line 6 on page 2
   “In this paper [comma] we develop a new experimental...”

3. Line two on page 3
   “These models can be constrained either by studying individual pulsars in detail or alternatively [comma] by using the collective properties of... ”

4. First line on page 4
   “Using this ratio [comma] we obtain the dependence of...”

5. Second sentence of second paragraph on page 6
   “In both cases [comma] the SEDs of these sources were measured...”

6. First sentence after eq. 5 on page 13
   "This relation is a mathematical identity which is valid for each individual pulsar and its associated pulsar [period] This identity [comma] however [comma] cannot be used to derive f_omega for a given pulsar [comma] because..." 

7. Last sentence of page 13
   "Instead [comma] we intend to obtain...”

8. First line of second paragraph on page 15
   "For PWNe Mattata et al. (2009) discussed the correlations between E and PWN X-ray luminosity [comma] as well as E and PWN TeV luminosity"

9. Third line from bottom of page 16
   "Since [comma] the slope is consistent with zero [comma] we fit a constant to...”

10. Second sentence of second paragraph on page 16
    "This is directly related to the models of PWN flux as a function of E [period]"

11. Last line of first paragraph on page 16
    "Even though the error bars are large [comma] a reasonable correlation is obtained with a linear correlation coefficient of R= 0.82, which we judge to be sufficiently encouraging to proceed...”

12. First line of section 6 on page 18
    "As a summary of Sections 4 and 5, we proceed with...”

13. Second line on page 20
    "We see that although these deviations represent the information..."

14. Last line on page 21
    "This result is in agreement with the idea that the scatter..."
15. Last line of first paragraph on page 24
   "However, a comparison of our results with an improved model simulation could provide
tighter restraints"

16. Line 5 on page 25
   "Under this model [comma] the slope sigma=0.125 and slope becomes 0.405 +/- 0.03".
   Is there a mistake in the wording?