

DISCUSSION ON THE PAPER BY **DANESE** ET AL. (p.489)

**Cristiani** : Why did you choose to normalise the soft flux to the hard and not viceversa ?

**Franceschini** : Simply because both measurement of the XRB spectral intensity and the HEAO-1 hard X-ray sample are part of the same experiment. On the other hand, we have also verified that the HEAO-1 flux scale is essentially consistent with that of all other hard X-ray experiments (Ariel V, Einstein MPC and UHURU).

**Schmidt** : Since the HEAOI-A2 contains only one quasar (3C 273) with  $M_B < -23$ , the Schmidt-Green LDDE cannot be really applied.

**Franceschini** : Note, however, that our analysis also takes into account the Medium Sensitivity Survey sample, which contains a large fraction (~50%) of true Quasars.

DISCUSSION ON THE PAPER BY **CAVALIERE** ET AL. (p.491)

**Schmidt** : In your model of BL Lacs, would a uniform distribution of these objects in Euclidean space yield  $N \propto S^{-3/2}$  ?

**Vagnetti** : Literally it would, since at high luminosities the LF (however for beamed sources) cuts off or declines parallel to the parents'. In a realistic cosmology, the Euclidean limit may apply at high (possibly statistically irrelevant) fluxes and the counts bend over toward low fluxes. This tends to occur faster and at higher fluxes for the beamed population than for the parent one, as the former's LF is flat up to higher luminosities than the latter's.

**Bregman** : Do violently variable quasars have the same distribution as the BL Lac sources ?

**Vagnetti** : If the OVVs are a beamed subset of the QSOs, one expects flatter counts than the latter's, provided the evolutions (including activity lifetimes) are comparable. Quantitatively, the counts may differ from BL Lac', because of possibly different boosting parameters. Both facts might be interestingly tested, if reasonable sample completeness could be defined.

## DISCUSSION ON THE PAPER BY ZHOU ET. AL (p.497)

**Cristiani** : Extracting from catalogues the fraction of quasars discovered by means of their radio emission (see poster Barbieri et. al) we may hope to have a largely unbiased sample from the point of view of preferential redshifts. From this sample there is no indication of statistically significant redshift periodicities.

**Zhou You-Yuan** : The radio quasars still have some peaks, although they are lower. It may be caused partially by the selection effect of the line identification in the redshift measurement. As to the periodicities we should confirm or deny them only after considering the selection effects.

**Burbidge** : I showed in 1977 that while there were some selection effects which can affect the  $z$  distribution, comparatively sharp peaks ( $\Delta z \lesssim 0.1$ ) cannot be explained in this way.

**Zhou You-Yuan** : Our results show quantitatively that both the  $p(z)$  and the selection effect play important roles in the redshift distribution. I expect to explain possibly the peaks with  $\Delta z \sim 0.1$  in the further calculation. I agree that the problem about peaks with  $\Delta z < 0.1$  is still open.

## DISCUSSION ON THE PAPER BY HE ET AL. (p.501)

**Drinkwater** : The surface density of your quasars increases towards the position of the centre of the Virgo Cluster. I expect that this corresponds to the galaxy-quasar clustering you observe. Could this be a consequence of an increase in sensitivity to quasars towards the centre of the Schmidt plate ?

**X.T.He** : No, infact the average surface density of quasars does not systematically increase towards the position of the plate centre. There are only a few bright galaxies in the centre of the cluster associated with quasars.

## DISCUSSION ON THE PAPER BY DRINKWATER (p.503)

**Peterson** : What is the limiting magnitude of your survey ?

**Drinkwater** : The prism spectra go down to 19.5 but few of the selected candidates would be this faint. I have not yet put an accurate magnitude limit to the candidate list but would estimate it to be 19.