In response to your Request for investigation on reported results about a paper (Iye et al. 2021, ApJ 907, 123), the committee in National Institutes of Natural Sciences have verified your claim and the paper's main conclusion. The followings arethe results.

## Verification of your claim

From your web site, we have downloaded the data that you mentioned in your request. We understand that the data is provided by the Authors through ApJ editor Brad Gibson. The number of $S / Z$ galaxies in each hemisphere you defined are summarized below, which is consistent with what you showed in the request.

Table 1: Number of galaxies in the downloaded data

| Hemisphere(RA) | Number of Z : $N_{z}$ | Number of S: $N_{S}$ | Total $N$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (I) $70^{\circ} \sim 250^{\circ}$ | 23037 | 22442 | 45479 |
| (II) $<70^{\circ},>250^{\circ}$ | 13660 | 13749 | 27409 |
| Total | 36697 | 36191 | 72888 |

You claim that $N_{z}$ is larger than $N_{s}$ in Hemisphere (I) by more than two sigma. We will try to verify this statement, here. We first consider the binomial distribution whose probability is $p$ $=1 / 2$. Because the number of sample, $\underline{\mathrm{N}}$, is large enough, binomial distribution can be regarded as Gaussian distribution where the standard deviation is $\sigma=p \sqrt{ } N$. In this case, the significance of the statement $N_{z}>N_{s}$ is calculated as,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{N_{z}-p N}{\sigma}=2.8 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we consider Bonferroni-corrected probability, where we have two independent observables when we divide the hemisphere into two, the significance is calculated to be 2.3. In each case, the significance exceeds 2.0. Therefore, your claim is verified.

In Hemisphere (II), the large and small relationship is in reverse, $N_{z}<N_{s}$. However, its significance is much smaller; $0.54 \sigma$. This suggests that if non-uniformity exist, it is NOT likely to have a dipole-like structure.

## Verification of the paper's main conclusion

Iye et al. estimated the significance of the 0 -th and 1 st-order terms (DC and dipole) of the Legendre expansion of the non-uniformity.
Without splitting the samples, and substituting, $N_{z}=36697, N=72888$ from Table 1into Eqn (1), we obtain the significance of 1.87 . This is the significance of the DC component, and is consistent with the statement in Iye et al. saying "Number dominance of Z-spirals over S-spirals is also
only at the $\sigma_{N}=1.87$ level". The smaller significance compared to $2 \sigma$ is natural consequence of the opposite $N_{s} / N_{z}$ larger and smaller relations of the two Hemispheres.

The dipole component is defined as $D_{\max }$ in Iye et al. We also calculate $D_{\max }$, which we think the paper's main evaluation index, independently from authors. The result is $D_{\max }=0.0053490$ and this is consistent with what they show (0.00535) in Section 3.2. In the paper, authors estimate the significance from simulations. Because it is hard to verify the detail of simulations, we here calculate the analytic solution by Chandrasekhar (1943) which assumes uniform samples in the hemisphere. The comparisons of the analytic solution and the simulation results of lye et al. are shown in the following.

|  | Analytic Solution | Simulation by Iye + |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Average $<D_{\max }>$ | 0.003412 | 0.00336 |
| Standard Deviation $\sigma$ | 0.001440 | 0.00154 |
| $\left(D_{\max }-<D_{\max }>\right) / \sigma$ | 1.35 | 1.29 |

We find no significant difference between those two and the deviation would be explained by the non uniformity of sample distribution.

We consider that the low significance of $D_{\max }$ is consistent with the low significance of $N_{z}-p N$ in Hemisphere (II) as we already mentioned at the end of the previous section.

## Conclusion

We verify your claim and paper's result. It turned out that both are correct. The claim and Iye et al. uses totally different methods and the sensitivity of a method depends on the nature, in this case how the S and Z galaxies are distributed in the sky. Therefore it is quite natural that two methods give different results. We consider that this is directly connected to scientific considerations which should be argued on papers.

