This manuscript has been reviewed for data consistency. Below are detailed comments as well as some suggestions on the presentation of data which the authors might wish to consider prior to publication.

1. Page 2, FIG.1, the picture of the CGAC array seems too small.
2. Page 3, right column,
   1. In 2nd last paragraph, 3rd last line, JPI(4064)=16- is expected to be in “()” to keep consistent with (16-) in the level scheme in FIG.2 and TABLE I.
   2. Similarly, in the last paragraph, 2nd last line, 15- is expected to be (15-). E(gamma)=456 is expected to be 457 as shown in FIG.2, rounded from 456.7 in TABLE I.
3. Page 4, FIG.2,
   1. E(level)=2954 is expected to be 2955 as shown in FIG.5, rounded from 2954.5 in TABLE I.
   2. E(gamma) label=”334.0” from 2211 level is expected to be 334 to keep consistent with integer values of all other gammas.
   3. JPI(6229)=(19-) is expected to be (18-), as given in TABLE I, based on 1086g (M1+E2) to (17-).
4. Page 4, in the text at bottom,
   1. There are no ADO or POL data in TABLE I for 520, 125, and 597 gammas. So, it might be inappropriate to list them with other gammas with ADO data in the statement “considering the dipole nature of the 457-, 142-, … and the quadrupole nature of the 597-, …” which is then used to make JPI assignments of relevant levels. Actually, JPI assignments for levels where the 520, 125 and 597 gammas are from are made based on other gammas in the statement and the dipole or quadrupole nature of these three gammas are then implied from the JPI assignments.
   2. As pointed out in comment 3.c above, 1086 gamma is (M1+E2) as given in TABLE I based on ADO and JPI(6922) should be (18-) instead of (19-).
5. Page 5, FIG.3, it looks several different font sizes have been used for E(gamma) labels. It is suggested to use the same font size for consistency, unless specifically noted.
6. Page 5, discussion section, line 7, JPI(8795)=23- is expected to be (23-) to keep consistency with other JPIs here.
7. In TABLE I, on page 6,
   1. Why do only Ig(222.0)=155 and Ig(194.9)=72.5 have no uncertainties while all others Ig values have except for the only limit Ig value? It is suggested to use “~155” and “~72.5” if they are estimated values or list them as limit if they are limits. Otherwise, uncertainties are expected for them as well.
   2. At E(level)=2982.8 and 3900.9, JI ->JF is empty but JI and JF are given in the level scheme in FIG.2 and also in the text.
   3. JPI(1943.8)=9(-) is inconsistent with (9-) in FIG.2 and in the text, and JPI(2131.0)=10(+) is inconsistent with (10+) in FIG.2 and elsewhere.
   4. At E(level)=2131, E(gamma)=745.1, MUL=E2 is expected to be (E2) since there is only ADO data but no POL, to keep consistent with MUL=(E2) of other gammas with only ADO data.
   5. At E(level)=8795.1, E(gamma)=1353.8, MUL=(M1+E2) should be (E2), with ADO=1.51(49).
   6. Please check the footnote b which doesn’t look correct. Actually, the title “Ji to Jf” is self-explanatory and that footnote is not needed.
8. In the reference list on page 11, Ref [27] and [44] are duplicates; Ref [32] and [36] are duplicates.