

Strenghts	Weakness
The proposal aims to obtain accurate NIR photometry of 50 Cepheids with accurate Gaia parallaxes and wide spread of periods in order to better determine the NIR Period-Luminosity and Period-Wesenheit relation. A companion TNG HARPS-N proposal will carry on high-resolution spectroscopy of a subsample of 12 objects observable from both hemispheres. The proposal is well written and the goal is important. Data are important for a PhD thesis.	More details about the possible improvement on the accuracy of the PL/PW relations would have help to access the general impact of the proposal on the determination of H_0 . The authors do not provide any indication about their previous experience with TNG or other instruments or any recent publication in the field.
The proposal is well explained and makes good use of REM, which is generally a rather low pressure instrument.	The scientific value is rather incremental, however given the general low pressure on REM is definitely worth time allocation
These observations would add more DCEP samples for the accurate determination of PL/PW relationship and therefore useful for improving the cosmic distance ladder in combination with Gaia parallaxes. The combination with HARPS observation is a further strength of the project. Observation and analysis techniques are pretty standard.	The scientific impact of the project is rather marginal, in the sense that it could help to reduce the noise in the PL/PW relationship but no dramatic impact on our knowledge can be envisaged. In particular, it is doubtful that acquiring less noise in the PL/PW relationship may solve the disagreement with H_0 derived from CBR analysis.
Expert and productive team. Timely science. Potentially important contribution to the current issue of the 'tension' between cosmic distance ladder and H_0 inferred from Planck observations (plus lambda-CDM model).	It is not clear how many of the proposed targets have information about duplicity from Genovali et al. (2015). I suppose the 12 targets for the parallel spectroscopic analysis don't, but what about the rest of the sample? Do we know the reddening of these targets from the same paper? I found the reference to Genovali paper a bit confusing in this respect.

Goal of this proposal is to observe 50 Classical Cepheids (DCEPs) showing Gaia parallaxes better than 20% in relative error and with a wide spread of periods. Gaia values are from the Data Release 2 (end of April 2018).

The targets will be studied in the NIR and simultaneously in the optical to:

- increase the sample of DCEPs with accurate Gaia parallaxes and NIR photometry by 13%;
- estimate individual reddening values for all targets;
- derive more accurate DCPEs Period-Luminosity and Period-Wesenheit (PL/PW) relations.

The team plans to double the sample of DCEPs with accurate Gaia parallaxes and NIR photometry by applying for a similar proposal in the next semester.

Outcomes from this proposal will contribute to better constrain H_0 .

The proposed investigation is timing and is a worthwhile exploitation of Gaia data.

The team has the necessary background to conduct the study.

Synergies with the parallel proposal to obtain high resolution spectroscopy with HARPS-N for a sample of 12 objects are partially discussed.

Very important basic science with cosmological implications.	None
The proposal timely exploits the release of new Gaia data by asking for IR observations of classical cepheids, either new ones or old ones with improved parallax measurements. IR observations are less sensitive to metallicity variations, and are important to decrease the systematic uncertainties in the measurements of the local Hubble constant. The proposing team is experienced and has a good track record of publications.	The proposal does not sufficiently discuss the expected results and how many targets are needed to improve current estimates of H_0. The lack of a feasibility study makes difficult to fully understand the impact of the proposed observing program, and how it compares to other parallel efforts. A couple of figures could have helped illustrating the predicted improvements. The proposal does not sufficiently describe the level of photometric precision needed. It mentions that a few % will be achieved, but there is no explanation that this level is actually adequate. The proposal mentions that special techniques will be used to reduce the optical data but gives no sufficient details (e.g a reference) to establish whether these techniques are suitable and successful.