Dear Katarzyna Rutkowska:

kasia@if.pw.edu.pl

Thank you very much for your comments and corrections for the improvement of our document. We have follow them through a thorough revision of the article. In some cases that meant additional improvements that we have considered necessary in order to present the concepts in a clearer manner. Let us be more specific

1. We have clarified our previous statement “the most classical looking state”. Indeed the coherent state is the most classical QED state. However, its atomic inversion is not our most familiar classical picture and its revivals and short time decay have become CQED landmarks. Still, the Fock state atomic inversion had retained its semiclassical image.
2. In the text we specified that we are working in the symmetric case ****. In equation 6 (Our previous equation 7), we have named the constants and after the work of J. R. Ackerhalt and K. Rzazewski where similar constants are defined in the context of the JCM. This quantity shows in the photon number operators when they are written in terms of the pseudomodes A and B, its dynamics and interpretation deserves special attention that will be reported elsewhere.
3. We have made clear the previous statement “In our proposal such distribution depends on the orientation of the atomic dipole” by arguing on the physical interpretation of the  parameter. The parameter  now reads as  . To clarify this relation we explicitly define ****
4. The Figures now are called in the main text in the appropriate sentences.
5. The Figure 2 now has an equation that describe the curves in it and there are appropriate comments about this figure.
6. The statement “all those new QED features where collapses and revivals were obtained even in those states where they are unexpected” is related to the statement that we have clarified, discussed and pointed out appropriate references in the point 1.

In addition we considered all the linguistic and editorial suggestions specially: Explaining the abbreviation “two-level atom (TLA)”, the lack of punctuation in equations and corrected the unknown characters in the reference 7(our previous reference 6).

We have made a change in the scale of the figures 1 and 2 in order to make our point clearer: now in each case the scale of the x axis is  .  denotes revival time in the coherent state limit. A revival time closer to 1 means that the state is better described by a Poisson distribution (Coherent state limit).

Sincerily yours

Julio César García Melgarejo