Overall, I think this version is much more coherent and improved. I would suggest the approval of the paper after implementation of the following comments (unless it's a pure English language matter for which I think others might know better). I would not fight to death for them being implemented, but I don't see why the authors won't.

1. Abstract. "pi0 is identified … missing mass of proton". I find this sentence totally unnecessary and a bit in correct. I would have said "using missing mass technique", but it's not quite completely correct since there is also kinematic fitting involved. And "off of the proton" would be the better choice in my non-native speaking opinion. Why not just delete this sentence.

2. line 13-16: .. pi0 and eta … have always been a complentary tool…; Again, it is is "have", could we still follow that with "a tool". Maybe "a complimentary tool" can be changed to "complimentary tools" – I will defer this to the native speakers just in case.

3. line 35-36. I would suggest numbers, … 1—(rho, omega), and the 1+- (b1, h1).

4. line 57-58, "wrong-signature" Regge residues? Forgive my ignorance. But I suppose there will be readers who are equally ignorant and would appreciate a sentence here explaining what is "wrong signature".

5. line 59: I feel the first sentence is not needed . Why not remove the first sentence and start with "quite recently" and no point is lost.

6. line 79: "where t is…" I find it odd that t is explained here. If one feels the need to explain this variable, why wait so late after it has been used about half a dozen times?
7. Maybe I haven't read enough papers, but "451 (or 164) data points dsigma/dt(|t|)s" read strange.

8. line 198: "E_e+" etc, e+ and e- didn't' have correct superscripts. Although I don't find the equation necessary – that's just my personal taste.

9. line 219: I would like this sentence to be changed to "uncertainty varies between 9% and .. as a function of energy" and remove the "independent of angle". There is no need for that, and there is certainly different interpretations of the analysis review results in terms of that point.

10. line 261 -263: about the new dips? Didn't first new dip appear at Fig 4 (c) below 4GeV, instead of "above 4GeV"? Also that dip appears to be closer to 2.5GeV than 3GeV in |t| -- I think the authors can give a better number on that than ~3GeV – that's up to the authors. Also I'm not sure it's necessary to call the second new structure to be a dip. It's more like a plateau. Why not just call it a "possible new structure".