Dear Paul,

I have finished looking at the draft of your paper. I am sorry that it took so long, but in the end I made a some large-scale changes to the paper as shown in the attached file. The were some substantial problems with repeated text, confusion about what should be in a paper versus a thesis, unclear descriptions of the process, and inconsistent information. Luckily, I was able to get sections 1-3 in a relatively good state. Unfortunately, sections 4-5 still need substantial work. I made as many changes as I could without detailed information about your procedures.

We will need to have an extended discussion during (preferred) or after the group meeting on Wednesday in order to figure out what discussion should be included in section 4. In order to have a chance to submit it before March 31, you will need to send me a revised draft by Friday, March 25. That draft will need to be in a highly polished state.

There were still some significant issues to resolve:

* You will still need to implement Prof. Chirayath's comments, which are given in the attached file. He had a lot of comments on the abstract that should be easy to fix, but the rest apply to text that has been substantially changed. I leave it to you to find the corresponding new sections and make the changes.
* The problems with repeated text and extraneous information were significant. Please do NOT add back anything that I deleted; all of the changes were carefully considered.
* Equations 5 and 6 are extremely confusing, and I have doubts about their correctness. Can anything be done to improve their readability and correctness?
* Why does figure 1 only discuss up to two contacts when the experiments had up to four contacts? Also, see my other comments on the figure in the margins.
* Error bars are missing from too many values in the paper.
* Figure 2 has numbered steps that are never referenced in the main text.
* All of my other comments in the margins that need to be addressed.

Best regards,

Prof. Folden