final_compare

		Data	MCEEP	SIMC	$\dfrac{MCEEP}{SIMC}$	$\dfrac{Data}{MCEEP}$	$\dfrac{Data}{SIMC}$
(i)	Original simulations and cuts	9.521E+06	1.049E+07	9.656E+06	1.087	0.907	0.986
(ii)	No collimator simulations; 20% reduced acceptance cuts	1.036E+07	1.147E+07	9.806E+06	1.170	0.904	1.057
(iii)	Revise efficiency factors; no longer use preshower/shower cut	1.043E+07	1.167E+07	9.982E+06	1.169	0.893	1.045
(iv)	Replace Q^2-ω cut with cut on W^2	1.282E+07	1.350E+07	1.149E+07	1.175	0.950	1.116
(v)	Change MCEEP to use the JA form factor models	1.282E+07	1.251E+07	1.149E+07	1.089	1.024	1.116
(vi)	Change radiation option and energy loss models to '2' in MCEEP	1.282E+07	1.197E+07	1.149E+07	1.042	1.071	1.116
(vii)	Change radiation option in SIMC to 'rad_flag=3'	1.282E+07	1.197E+07	1.143E+07	1.047	1.071	1.121
(viii)	Subtract 'dummy' from carbon data at similar kinematics	1.138E+07	1.197E+07	1.143E+07	1.047	0.950	0.995

NOTE: The original 'cuts' were 15% and 30% inside nominal acceptance for theta and phi respectively; also a PID cut on the preshower/shower was used along with a tight Q^2-ω cut.

NOTE: The ratio of the hydrogen elastic cross-section given by MCEEP to the cross-section from data was about 1.18.

final_compare

	Data	MCEEP	SIMC	$\dfrac{MCEEP}{SIMC}$	$\dfrac{Data}{MCEEP}$	$\dfrac{Data}{SIMC}$
Dummy subtracted data						
W^2 dependence						
$0.85 < W^2 < 1.1$	1.142E+07	1.212E+07	1.164E+07	1.042	0.942	0.981
$0.85 < W^2 < 1.05$	1.138E+07	1.197E+07	1.143E+07	1.047	0.950	0.995
$0.85 < W^2 < 1.0$	1.121E+07	1.169E+07	1.110E+07	1.053	0.959	1.010
$0.85 < W^2 < 0.95$	1.081E+07	1.124E+07	1.060E+07	1.060	0.962	1.020
$0.85 < W^2 < 0.915$	1.015E+07	1.066E+07	9.986E+06	1.067	0.953	1.017