in the data itself but rather in the data processing by ALP00. This is because in the present work we read the images anew and re-process them from scratch, obtaining basically the same results as those by PCM06.

2. Besides, the procedure to register the individual images into the Standard Frame of Reference, used in this work, through a third degree polynomial, yields basically the same results (although with lower errors) as those by PCM006, meaning that the above discrepancy does not arise from the registration process.

3. Our results here are in a better agreement with those by other authors, in particular with the result given by Kroupa et al. (1994), as well as with several theoretical models, when using the JKL94 LMC input parameters rather than the more recent ones by vDM02.

4. There might be systematic errors still present in some of the PM values using the "quasar method", in Table 5, which would account for some observed marginal differences (of the order of 2σ) in PM, especially in DEC.

5. In reference to the stream of galaxies orbiting around our Galaxy, which would include the LMC, SMC, Draco and Ursa Minor, and possibly Carina and Sculptor galaxies, proposed by Lynden-Bell & Lynden-Bell (1995), and according to the results in the present work, we can conclude that the LMC does not seem to be a member of the proposed stream, because our measured values for μ and θ are at least (considering both sets of LMC input parameters) 5.2σ and 8.9σ away from the predicted values of $\mu = +1.5$ mas yr^{-1} and $\theta = 90°$.

6. The marginal discrepancy of our results from those by CMP09 (especially in DEC) for the same QSO field, has so far no explanation. It might be interesting to note though, that between the present study and that by CMP09 there are important observing setup differences, among them, a different telescope, telescope setup and detector equipment as well as a different set of LRS stars, for the QJ0557-6713 field and, in the present work, a longer observing time baseline and a greater number of observing epochs, for the above field. It is also interesting to note that, despite the short baseline and the fact that only one LMC field was included in this study, the PM values determined by CMP09 are closer to recently measured values for the LMC center of mass than ours.

7. Summing up, our PM and space velocity values support the idea that the LMC is indeed gravitationally bound to our Galaxy.

M.H.P. is greatful of the support by the Universidad de Tarapacá research fund (project # 4721-09). The author wishes to thank to an anonymous referee for helpful suggestions which improved this paper. It is also a pleasure to thank T. Martínez for helping with data processing.

REFERENCES

Anguita, C., Loyola, P., & Pedreros, M. H. 2000, AJ, 120, 845 (ALP00)
Costa, E., et al. 2009, AJ, 137, 4339 (CMP09)
Drake, A. J., Cook, K. H., Alcock, C., Axelrod, T. S., Geha, M., & MACHO Collaboration 2001, Bull. Am. Astron. Soc., 33, 1379
Gardiner, L. T., Sawa, T., & Fujimoto, M. 1994, MNRAS, 266, 567
Geha, M., et al. 2003, AJ, 125, 1
Jones, B. F., Klemola, A. R., & Lin, D. N. C. 1994, AJ, 107, 1333 (JKL94)
Kallivayalil, N., van der Marel, R. P., Alcock, C., Axelrod, T., Cook, K. H., Drake, A. J., & Geha, M. 2006, ApJ, 638, 772
Kroupa, P., & Bastian, U. 1997, New Astron., 2, 77
Kroupa, P., Röser, S., & Bastian, U. 1994, MNRAS, 266, 412
Lin, D. N. C., & Lynden-Bell, D. 1982, MNRAS, 198, 707
Lynden-Bell, D., & Lynden-Bell, R. M. 1995, MNRAS, 275, 429
Murai, T., & Fujimoto, M. 1980, PASJ, 32, 581
Pedreros, M. H., Anguita, C., & Maza, J. 2002, AJ, 123, 1971 (PAM02)
Pedreros, M. H., Costa, E., & Méndez, R. A. 2006, AJ, 131, 1461 (PCM06)
Piatek, S., Pryor, C., & Olszewski, E. W. 2008, AJ, 135, 1024
Röser, S., & Bastian, U. 1993, Bull. Inf. CDS, 42, 11 (PPM)