COMMENTS ON "The OPE makes no sense in this DV scenario"

Excerpt from Tables 12,13 in PRS JHEP'22 (Pich's slide 20)

V+A, $W_{21} = 1 - 3x^2 + 2x^3$

variation	Pert	$\mathcal{O}_{2(6),V+A}$	$\mathcal{O}_{2(8),V+A}$	DV	Exp
Default	0.0938 (5)	0.0029	−0.0019	−0.0001	0.0954 (3)
1	0.0952 (7)	−0.0001	−0.0004	−0.0000	0.0954 (3)

$s_0 = m_\tau^2$

DV { Default → $e^{-\delta-\gamma s}\sin(\alpha+\beta s)$; Model 1 → s^8 Default

variation	Pert	$\mathcal{O}_{2(6),V+A}$	$\mathcal{O}_{2(8),V+A}$	DV	Exp
Default	0.1010 (18)	0.0248	−0.0326	0.0062	0.0994 (4)
1	0.1043 (28)	−0.0006	−0.0071	0.0028	0.0994 (4)

$s_0 = 1.55\,\text{GeV}^2$

- There is nothing wrong with a $\sim 3\%$ condensate correction to Pert. Theory at $s_0 = m_\tau^2$ or a $\sim 20\%$ correction at $s_0 = 1.55\,\text{GeV}^2$. In fact, fits are done between these two scales: Default model is OK!
- Rest of PRS results in these tables based on contributions from $\mathcal{O}_{12}$ and $\mathcal{O}_{14}$. This is red herring, we never used those!

- In fact, according to Pich & Rodriguez JHEP '22 : "model 1 shows acceptable s_0 behavior with OPE contributions of reasonable size" but "OPE of Default model makes no sense".
- How reasonable is it that contribution of $O_8 \gg O_6$ (at $s_0 = 1.5\,\text{GeV}^2$ even by one order of magnitude!) in a "convergent" tOPE?

Pich's criticisms based on arbitrary (and inconsistent) standards

(P.S. Not to mention that numbers without errors are rather meaningless.)