
Response to Anonymous Report 2

Report

Authors have convincingly replied to the issues I have raised in my previous report and have revised the manuscript accordingly. There is, however, still one minor point related to the correlation function in Fig. 13. While authors have provided a better definition of the correlation function they should specify the system size in the caption to Fig. 13. For a NxN lattice the maximum distance is N/sqrt(2) along the diagonal. For a 60x60 lattice this would correspond to a maximum distance of \sim 42 and the correlation function for larger distances, i.e. 42+d, should be the same than for 42-d. This is what I meant with 'periodicity' in my previous report. So I guess that authors have used probably 100x100 for Fig. 13 but this should be specified.

Our response:

We didn't really consider the diagonal direction and we didn't consider the periodic boundary conditions when we calculate the correlation function. We only consider the four sites with distance r along the vertical and horizontal direction of the site 0, and do average with these four sites. Then we do average over 60x60 sites. So, the maximum distance is 59 for 60x60 lattice. We have specified the system size of Fig.13.

Requested changes

* Provide the system size in the caption to Fig. 13

Our response:

We have added the system size in the caption of Fig. 13 in the updated version.