1) I do not understand the first sentence. "...changes its properties"? Our pseudo-Stokes delays, etc., are not linear polarization. Both pseudo-Stokes and PolConvert use linear pol data as a starting point to estimate Stokes-I quantities. Figure captions and labels should be revised accordingly.

2) Give a few particulars about the session: name, stations (including their correspondence with 1-letter codes), source(s) observed, scan durations and cadence. Knowing the cadence will help in understanding the plots, e.g., does a trough contain just one scan or multiple scans? (One could also handle this issue by plotting data points with symbols larger than the thickness of the plotting line, but that could make for messy plots.)

3) Do the offsets between each pair of curves in Figures 1 and 2 close? That is, are the biases station-based?

4) The first sentence in Section 2 implies that a nonzero difference signifies an error in the PolConvert results. But pseudo-Stokes is also prone to error (and may be even more prone to error than PolConvert).

5) In captions for SNR Figures 3 and 6, remove "(ps)".

6) Somewhere in the Section 2 text, it would be helpful to state the MBD and SBD undifferenced sigma for a representative SNR. E.g., sigma\_MBD = x ps for SNR=2000.

7) Rather than (or perhaps in addition to) plotting SNR differences, try plotting fractional SNR differences, i.e., 2\*(snr1 - snr2)/(snr1 + snr2). That will make the comparison more sensitive at low SNR.

8) Correct me if I'm wrong, please, but in each histogram plot, I assume the printed value for sigma is estimated in the standard manner. The fact that the observed distributions are tighter than the normal distribution for that value of sigma may, in some cases, simply reflect the fact there are more "outlier" points that have a large effect on the estimated sigma value. However, there are cases where there are few outliers and yet the observed distribution is too tight. So I am puzzled by the histograms. Just how are the sigma values calculated?

9) How do the sigma values in the plots compare with the typical undifferenced standard errors?

10) Frankly I'm surprised the distributions look so gaussian. I don't see why they should be.