Most Type A comments implemented (some no longer relevant after changes from other reviewers).

**Type B:**

- We now specify that alpha is the angle of the device, and thus not necessarily the angle at which the proton hits.
- We prefer not to mention the mechanical restrictions of the rotating table, as it does not influence the results very much. The behavior at increasing angle is clearly described.
- We chose not to include the current tracker numbers.
- We’re now leaving the geometric measurements to the figure (to avoid cluttering up the paragraph with too many numbers). The fact that the sketch only shows a quarter can probably be omitted from the text here, as the point of the figure is just to describe the new Tracker.
- Added the full word for CBC.
- We’ve added that the strips will be parallel to the beam direction (we’ve avoided using the r/phi/z coordinates since we only uses them in the Figure).
- We’ve used the full name of LPGBT in its first instance.
- There is no “clean” citation for the test beam facility itself (and we hesitate to simply cite a website). Any curious reader can readily find the relevant information online.
- The HIP tuning mechanism was not implemented because of space restrictions on the chip, and to avoid making it overly complex. We prefer not to make a negative statement like this in the paper, so we’ll leave any mention off for now.
- We think a citation to the FC7 paper is sufficient here. We note that even in the paper no acronym is stated.
- We’ve specified that 2 planes of silicon are missing.
- We’ve added the range of angles to the Table 1 caption.
- We were asked to include the sensor thickness and inactive region, though we agree this information is not strictly needed.
- It’s not clear where such a spectrum might come from. We have no way of making this measurement in the data.
- The strips have no energy weight, just yes/no for a hit: the geometric center of the cluster is used (including half-strips)
- The efficiencies here are no the same, so we don’t want to confuse the reader by defining in 5.3 the one we will use in 5.4 (the threshold in 5.3 is set so low that the efficiency as described in 5.4 is nearly 100%).
- The word “path” was replaced with “line” from “data path”. It is now consistent with the initial description of the DUT.
- We are checking the Figure to make sure there is no other effect being accounted for, and will state the correct efficiency in the text.
- We’ve rephrased the sentence to “consider” rather than “remove” tracks (since in some cases tracks were being ignored that should not have been, so it’s not just the loss of efficiency from tracks that aren’t being counted).
- We’re not sure why the data isn’t symmetric, but don’t want to guess. No comment added.
• The inefficiency from the timing measurement is indeed already removed.
• Indeed this was for all angles, which we’ve now noted.
• We’ve corrected the values in the text.
• We’ve noted that two angles are shown on the plot.
• We’ve updated the sentence slightly to reflect that the rotated strip has a smaller effective pitch.
• It’s hard to add a resolution, but we have added the RMS from the fits.
• Again, the resolution is difficult to quantify (thus the plots), so we will not add anything further.