

Oct 06, 12 15:04	comments_addressed_in_3.4.3.txt	Page 1/2
<p>Bob comments dated Oct 6th It looks much better now !</p> <p>In the abstract, I suggest you keep a consistent tense for the verbs; right now you switch between past and present tense, and it's preferable to use past tense.</p> <p>"one can extract" --&gt; "could be extracted"</p> <p>"need to be measured" --&gt; "needed to be measured"</p> <p>"measurement agrees with" --&gt; "measurement agreed with"</p> <p>My nitpicky comment made previously about the semi-colons appears to not have been followed; perhaps it's worth repeating ? One would write "... throughout the experiment; the systematic uncertainty ..." instead of "throughout the experiment; The systematic uncertainty ..." No capital letters after a semi-colon. However, if you used a period instead of a semicolon, it would be correct. It's a nitpick from the POV of a non-English native speaker, and it's admittedly one of those things an editor at Elsevier would catch, but we're supposed to catch it too.</p> <p>I think that a reader would begin wondering in the Introduction where the physics paper is, and of course we haven't published it yet. It might be a good idea to put a 3rd reference in line 30 in the phrase "The goal of this experiment [1-3] was to measure ..." where ref [3] is "A publication about the E08-011 physics asymmetries is in preparation". I think its standard practice.</p> <p>At line 81 we refer to "most previous parity violation experiments". This is problematic because parity-violating experiments are a bigger field including atomic parity, polarized proton scattering, low-energy nuclear experiments, etc. Also, even your list of electron-scattering experiments is not complete since it doesn't include much older ones. I think the easiest way to fix this and retain your meaning is to write: "Recent electron-scattering experiments, such as SAMPLE [4] at MIT-Bates, HAPPEX [5-9], and PREX[10] at JLab, focused on elastic ..."</p> <p>Line 113: I suggest you put in the Hall A NIM reference again: "... in the HRS [3] were used to ..." because you refer to a bunch of detectors that readers may want more info on, and they are well documented in that NIM article.</p> <p>Line 132: insert "the" before "HRS": "For the HRS, the two layers ..."</p> <p>The rest looks pretty good. I like the Summary much better now.</p> <p>sincerely</p> <p>Bob Michaels</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Bogdan Oct 3rd: Hello Xiaochao,</p> <p>Please see below a few comments:</p> <p>1) Introduction and the line 53 stated the goal. However, it is not explained why one need to measure the quark weak charges - currently the <math>\theta_W</math> is well measured. Could you add something to the motivation?</p> <p>2) Line 62 explained importance of the charged pions. It would be nice in the same paragraph to add a sentence about the neutral pion.</p> <p>3) Line 81: SAMPLE experiment had the pion background. It used the air Cherenkov counters which provided PID.</p>		

Oct 06, 12 15:04	comments_addressed_in_3.4.3.txt	Page 2/2
<p>4) Line 99 and 100 have specifics of G0 which requires a published reference.</p> <p>5) Line 140 described preshower of HRS-R than jump to the HRS-L. Could you move the sentence about HRS-L to the end of that paragraph?</p> <p>6) Fig. 2 indicates the signals of GC of 75-100 ns wide which for 500 kHz should lead up to 5% leak of the pion to the electron sample. It is not consistent with the table 1 where the pion rejection is as good as 400. Could you explain it?</p> <p>7) In several lines the values are presented with excessive accuracy: for example in caption to Fig. 4 - 94.626 - could be just 95.</p> <p>8) Typos: line 237 "detectror" table 1 has for pion twice the same value <math>Q_2 = 1.1 \text{ (GeV/c)}^2</math></p> <p>Best regards,</p> <p>Bogdan</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Bob Oct 3rd:</p> <p>In the abstract: after semicolons used to separate independent clauses the next word should not be capitalized. They would be after a period.</p> <p>I still think that you don't need to reference arXiv papers when you have the journal paper; but probably the editor of NIM will remove those when the edit the paper. (I mentioned this before but I guess you disagree ...)</p> <p>-----</p> <p>Ramesh Oct 3rd:</p> <p>Morning Xiaochao:</p> <p>While reading the summary, I got a potential typo in the following sentence in l ines 369 and line 370:</p> <p>Particle identification performance of the DAQ were measured and corrections are applied to the data on a day-to-day basis.</p> <p>Here "corrections are applied " could be "corrections were applied" I think.</p> <p>In line 474, does the line fragment "a <math>\sim</math>IM<math>^H</math> 0.2%" mean "about 0.2%"? If so , how about replacing that fragment by "about 0.2%"?</p> <p>I am not insisting these things should be implemented, but just an idea. Thank y ou.</p> <p>On Wed, Oct 3, 2012 at 12:20 AM, Xiaochao Zheng &lt;xiaochao@jlab.org&gt; wrote:</p>		