First round remarks:

1. Overall, we think the results are significant, but we are not sure the paper is the current stage presents a strong case for PRL.
2. The paper reads like 2 or 3 three people wrote separate parts – transitions are lacking.
3. Below are some detailed comments, but a thorough read and restructuring by the authors would be desired before we provide more detailed comments.

Some General Comments:

1. Abstract: The abstract is a bit weak for a PRL paper. Also, "The final state .....missing mass of proton" doesn't really belong there. "missing mass of proton" is wrong as well.

?

2. "This experiment is a unique opportunity". Which experiment? This is quite an abrupt introduction of the experiment without actually giving any details. This seems a random injection of a sentence / paragraph by itself.

Gary

3. What are the reasons behind the different approaches by Laget, Mathieu and others? They were presented together as a group, yet have different prediction powers? How so?

we have to dicsuss

4. The "quark counting rule" is presented, incorrectly, as a model. But it really is not a model. It is usually referred to as the "constituent counting rule", is it not? We think a brief overview of this "rule" is warranted, and the implication of it, as well as the explanation of why at certain regions the deviation is expected probably could be discussed a bit.

agree

5. "very large systematic uncertainties .... recent tagged CLAS g1c": it is not necessary to "play down" the quality of the g1c data, which really are not that recent. And the quoted 5% systematic uncertainty of g1c results doesn't seem "very large", especially compared with the current results reported here. It is true, that the new results have much more statistics and coverage – that should be emphasized.

backround

Michael

6. The experimental details are lacking. When was the data taken? How are the particle ID done. What was the timing resolution and how was it determined? How were the confidence level cuts set? These details do not take much space; previous CLAS PRL paper can be used as a template.

7. There is no "conservation of mass"! *ok*

8. We should not reference internal CLAS notes, which may not be available to readers.
kunkel?

9. Many people use error and uncertainty interchangeably – this is wrong. *✓ ?*

Gary?

10. When the dips in Fig. 4 are discussed, it seems like our data is consistent with the models; why was the term "surprising" used. Also, is the first dip around 0.6 or 0.9 GeV^2? The figure suggests 0.6GeV^2, but the text refers to 0.9-1.2 GeV^2. Are we missing something here?

11. What are the largest contributions of the systematic uncertainties? Values? How were they determined? They should be discussed.

Kunkel   summary table?