

author={Adairson, F and Alzai, F and Akondi, CS and Annand, JK and Arenas, RJ and Azhobov, Ya I and Beck, R and Borisov, N and Braghieri, A and Briscoe, WJ and others},
 journal={Physical Review C},
 volume={92}, number={2}, pages={024617}, year={2015},
 publisher={American Physical Society}
 }

? Kinematic fitting, is a confidence level cut applied? How does fig2 correspond to KinFits?

kunkel

See fig 16 in Analysis note $CL > 1\%$ on 1C and $< 1\%$ on 4C + 75MeV Mx(p) cut. Should be detailed in paper. Actually also looks like 2C cut ** We think it is technically incorrect to do this. The 2C fit is essentially a cut on the invariant mass, this means you cannot reliably constrain the background under the peak from the fit. As the background is small the effect may be small.

? Might be better to show the $E_g > 3.6$ Fig 2 as you can actually see the background function Why 1C and 2C rather than just 2C?

OK (Systematic Uncertainties, relatively contributions should be made clearer i.e. in a table

OK "tagged JLab CLAS $g_{\pi\pi}$ measurements" $g_{\pi\pi}$ is not meaningful "previous CLAS measurements with $E_c = X \text{ GeV}$ "

OK Page 3 right para 1 : "In general the Regge approximation becomes less applicable below 3GeV and we focus mainly above this region here"

OK Fig 3-4 the models need further elaboration. At least author or model nickname given in caption.

? "The dip around $|t| = 0.9 - 1.2 \text{ GeV}^2$ " is not particularly clear in the plots, We think you need to zoom in. Also it is not clear if this is referring to data or models. Also the higher energy results Phys. Rev. D4 (1971) 1937.

+ book "This is surprising since there was no previous indication of this dip" apart from the models! OK

? "The Regge model predicts nonsense, wrong signature zeroes, where the Regge trajectories cross negative even integers. For the dominant vector meson Regge poles, these dips should appear at approximately $-t = 0.6, 3.0, 5.0 \text{ GeV}^2$, which agrees with the data." This should be referenced to the applicable model(s). Actually the following paragraph seems to go into more detail, but again it seems specific to 1 model, probably don't need this paragraph as well

? "That is why it is also important..." what exactly is that? Perhaps important->necessary "Simultaneously, Fig. 5 shows..." is fig 5 really used before here?

? "A significant increase in the comprehensiveness of the database for observables in the meson photoproduction process is critical to reaching definitive knowledge about QCD-based models of the nucleon. Studies that cover a broad range of c.m. energy s are particularly helpful in sorting out the phenomenology." Remove this paragraph or move it to introduction.

Gamy