

Comments:

A. English/Style/Formatting (including figures)

in formulas, please make sure that the space between the number and the unit of measurement is consistent throughout the article (for example, in lines 3, 10, 11 the unit appears to be attached to the number).

lines 31-44: the paragraph is constituted by very short sentences and, although clear, it does not sound fluent enough. A few linking words and/or a rephrasing might help.

lines 123-126: I would suggest to rephrase these sentences to make them clearer.

line 127: maybe link the two sentences instead of mentioning the Table 4 reference twice.

lines 131-135: I think it'd be clearer to let the reader know at the beginning of the sentence that a probable annealing scenario is going to be discussed. Otherwise misinterpreting the initial "could" can lead the reader astray.

line 263: maybe merge the two short sentences.

page 15, last sentence of the Table 9 label can be rephrased to make it clearer.

line 337: changing "ultimate" to italic/emph would help the reader to remember the fluence levels which were defined earlier.

line 351: same as before.

line 375: same as before.

B. Everything else (e.g. strategy, paper structure, emphasis, additions/subtractions, etc).

lines 56-57: deep-diffusion will be explained in detail a few paragraphs later and it is not clear here how it can reduce the active thickness. Would it be maybe wiser to move lines 84-87 here?

lines 180-187: if available, a photo or a schematic picture of the setup would be useful here.

figures 11-13: maybe the limits set by specifications can be shown as intervals in the plots as well as in Table 10, for clarity.