Instituto de Física
UNAM
Ciudad de México, México

August 18, 2017

Thierry Forveille
Editor in Chief
Astronomy & Astrophysics

Dear Sir:

A recent review of the paper AA/2015/27256 titled "MAGIC observations of the February 2014 flare on 1ES 1011+496 and ensuing constraint of the EBL density" by members of the MAGIC Collaboration revealed an error in the values of some parameters given in the Section 3 of the paper, where we report the fits of different functions to the observed spectrum of 1ES 1011+496 measured by the MAGIC telescopes.

In the paper we report "The estimated *intrinsic* spectrum [...] can be fitted with a simple power-law function (PWL) with probability 0.35 (χ^2/d.o.f.$= 13.2/12$) and photon index $\Gamma = 2.0 \pm 0.1$ and normalization factor at 250 GeV $f_0 = (5.4 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-11}$ cm^{-2}s^{-1}TeV^{-1}". A few lines below we also report "For the SBPWL (smoothly-broken power-law), the normalization factor at $E_0 = 250$ GeV is $f_0 = (4.2 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-11}$ cm^{-2}s^{-1}TeV^{-1}, the first index is $\Gamma_1 = 0.35 \pm 0.01$, the second index $\Gamma_2 = 1.7 \pm 0.1$, the energy break $E_b = 298 \pm 21$ GeV and the parameter $g = 12.6 \pm 1.5$ [...] The photon index for the LP (log-parabola) is $\Gamma = 2.8 \pm 0.1$, curvature index $\beta = 1.0 \pm 0.1$ and normalization factor at $E_0 = 250$ GeV $f_0 = (3.6 \pm 0.1) \times 10^{-11}$ cm^{-2}s^{-1}TeV^{-1}". In the cases of the fits to the PWL and LP functions, the normalisations are wrong and in the case of the fit to a SBPWL function, the normalisation and the indexes are wrong. This error was originated in a confusion of using functions intended to find the correct parameters for the differential energy spectrum but using data from the spectral energy distribution. Despite the quoted parameter values do not correspond to the differential energy spectrum, the fits were correct, and in particular the fit probabilities were not affected. Since the paper focuses in constraining the EBL density, the parameters describing the intrinsic gamma-ray spectrum are just nuisance parameters, and therefore the results and conclusions of the paper remain unchanged. The codes used for the results shown in the section 3 are not the same used for the constraining of the EBL density. After a thorough review of the paper we are certain that this error does not affect the results presented in the sections 4, 5, 6 and 7, neither affects what is shown in all the Figures.

The correct values for the fitted functions are:

- the estimated intrinsic spectrum fitted with a PWL has photon index $\Gamma =$

2.03 ± 0.03 and normalization factor at 250 GeV $f_0 = (8.70 \pm 0.17) \times 10^{-10}$ cm^{-2}s^{-1}TeV^{-1}

- the observed spectrum fitted with a SBPWL has normalization factor at $E_0 = 250$ GeV is $f_0 = (6.23 \pm 0.28) \times 10^{-10}$ cm^{-2}s^{-1}TeV^{-1}, the first index is $\Gamma_1 = 2.35 \pm 0.08$, the second index $\Gamma_2 = 3.69 \pm 0.09$, the energy break $E_b = 298 \pm 21$ GeV and the parameter $g = 12.6$. The uncertainty quoted for g in the paper (1.5) had a typo; it should had been 15. The g parameter is actually poorly constrained by the data its uncertainty range includes 0, a value for which the functions is ill-defined, so we prefer now to fix it at the value we quoted (12.6) and provide the best-fit values for the rest of the parameters.

- the observed spectrum fitted with a LP has photon index $\Gamma = 2.84 \pm 0.03$, curvature index $\beta = 1.00 \pm 0.05$ and normalization factor at $E_0 = 250$ GeV $f_0 = (5.75 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-10}$ cm^{-2}s^{-1}TeV^{-1}

Sincerely

The corresponding authors:
Adiv González Muñoz
Abelardo Moralejo
Priya Bangale