```
Bogdan 9/27

There are several suggestions to this paper.
1) The title could be more specific. The counting DAQ is also includes the stand
ard system at HRS.
In PVDIS the system is a scaler-based. Title could be: A Scaler-based ...
2) The abstract does not present results and achieved parameters. It states the
requirement. Â However,
the paper is about results! The main result is the high rate capability with low
 systematic uncertainty for the PV asymmetry.  Presenting key achievements in th
e abstract is very useful.
3) The paper has many details, so need a paragraph about the paper structure at
the end of introduction.
4) The line 60 and line 219 have different A^m and A_m - Is it a typo?
5) The line 224 reference to NIM paper should not be used, because in the HRS st
andard analysis the Gas Cherenkov data used off-line. The rejection factor by GC
 needs more discussion.
6) Fig.4 titles need improvement. The plots present the shower-based pion reject
ion factors. It is not clear from the caption and plots that Gas Cherenkov rejec
tion is not included.
7) In the summary will be useful to tell that demonstrated low systematics allow
s to perform even more accurate experiment with such type configuration of DAQ.

Bob - 9/27/2012
Ok, that's pretty good. Â You gave more details of what A4 and G0 did, but kept
it brief.

I think there's one more ref for A4 which you are missing.

Â Â  S. Baunack {\it et.al.}, Phys. Rev. Lett. {\bf 102} (2009) 151803.

Your G0 refs are for NIM articles (a good thing), but perhaps we also want to ci
te the physics articles.

Â Â  D.H. Beck, Phys. Rev. D {\bf 39} (1989) 3248;
Â Â  D.S. Armstrong {\it et.al.}, Phys. Rev. Lett. {\bf 95} (2005) 092001;
Â Â  D. Androic {\it et.al.}, Phys. Rev. Lett. {\bf 104} (2010) 012001.

And in general, where there's both an arXiv article and a publication (e.g. refs
 13 - 16) you want to drop the arXiv citation and only cite the peer-reviewed jo
urnal publication. Â At least, that's what's been drilled into me.
```