

Dear Iuliia,

Thank you for your careful and detailed reply to the questions and comments the review committee raised during the first review round. We have now had time to consider your reply and we are satisfied that you have addressed in detail all of the points we previously raised. The changes you have made to the analysis review document represent a considerable and significant improvement.

One of the committee members noted, in relation to point 12, that timing shifts have been observed on a run-by-run basis in hydrogen data from the e1e run, taken in the same run period. i.e. the CLAS timing calibration was not completely stable. You have clarified that figure 2.8 represents the total statistics from the analysis. On inspection, we see no evidence in fig 2.8 of any additional ridges or of any significant smearing, which might be expected if there were run-by-run timing shifts for any particular paddles. This suggests that run-by-run timing shifts are not a problem with your data for the paddles shown. However, it might be worth making a further check of the timing spectra for all of the paddles.

Apart from this one point, we are entirely happy with your updated review document and we are ready to sign off this analysis review as complete.

Regards,
Douglas MacGregor