

I.44

I still think that the footnote could be confused with the affiliation "FBK" appearing as 1 on the same page, since you talk about a production process and FBK is by change a producer...

What about "...single-sided process being both the pixel implants and the guard-rings on the same side."?

I.85-86

Looking in Bichsels article on Tab.V I would derive higher number:

$80\mu\text{m } 255\text{eV}/\mu\text{m} = 70.8\text{e}/\text{h}/\mu\text{m} \rightarrow \sim 7080\text{e}/\text{h}$ in $100\mu\text{m}$

$160\mu\text{m } 272\text{eV}/\mu\text{m} = 75.6\text{e}/\text{h}/\mu\text{m} \rightarrow \sim 9800\text{e}/\text{h}$ in $130\mu\text{m}$

How did you do it?

Please, consider that the real active thickness is $90\mu\text{m}$ or $120\mu\text{m}$ as written at line 81. In addition, you should use the Bichsels formula for the calculation of the most probable energy loss in a thickness t , e.g. $\Delta E = t (100.6 + 35.35 \ln(t))$ for $13\mu\text{m} < t < 110\mu\text{m}$.

I.87ff.

I still do not get here if those sensors (the ones with biasing structure) are the ones you tested, or if you describe a subset only.

Some of them have bias punch-through structures, others do not. Their impact on the performance are explicitly given. For instance, at line 196 the detection efficiency of sensors with and without these structures are reported. At line 220 and in Fig 8 the effect of these structure within the cells is discussed for irradiated and non-irradiated sensors

Fig. 5, 6, 9, 10

You refer to dashed lines twice: for the limits and for the uncertainty. The latter ones are bands?

You absolutely right!

Fig. 6

I still think that the used threshold should appear in the plot or caption and not only in the text, since it is an important parameter for efficiency.

Will do in the captions

I.332

The guy's last name is "Hoß"

Will check