

## General comments to phrasing, style, etc.:

- You still capitalize „silicon“ in some places, do a „query and replace“
- I prefer the original „n-in-p“ over „n<sup>+</sup> on p“, but I know where the change comes from... However, there seems to be a very big spacing after „n<sup>+</sup>“, which looks strange (in the title in particular)
- Author list: remove the full-stop after the last author
- Please check your distances between number and unit. Some do not look good, e.g. line 297.
- Also very big distance in „~ 3 cm“, in the abstract and in line 23
- Always put a comma before „respectively“

## Section 1:

- line 25: lumi is slang, write “luminosity”, please
- line 64: “In the present case” does not look optimal to me, maybe “In the sensors used for this study”, or similar

## Section 2:

- line 87: I don't like „as those of the...“. Perhaps „ $\mu\text{m}^2$ , matching the pixel size of the...“ or similar
- line 98: I think it should be „anomaly that can be ...“ (in particular, no comma)
- line 119: „on top“ would sound better than „on the top“ here
- line 124: no hyphen in „readout chip“
- Fig. 2: „The drawing...“ : remove „the“, just „Drawing of ...“
- Fig. 3: „provides a sketch“ sound better than „the sketch“

## Section 3:

- line 145: Your degree symbol in “-20°C” is now correct, but the distance to “C” is very large...
- line 157: typo in “orthogonally”

## Section IV:

- lines 201 and 207: “100 $\mu\text{m}$  thick sensor”
- Figs. 5 and 6: “The colored bands reflect the uncertainty”, not “the dahed lines”...!
- line 217: no hyphen in “leakage current”
- line 225: no hyphen in “hit rate”
- Fig. 7: no hyphen in „bias voltage“
- Consider to split Fig. 6 into two separate plots, and place the now lower figure after what is now Fig. 7. This would match the order of discussion in the text, and there is no strict need to have the two figures in one plot.
- Fig. 8
  - I still think that a z axis label, e.g. „Detection efficiency“, would be good!
  - In the caption, the last sentence is still messed up (“The efficiency clearly results affected...”). It should probably be “The measured detection efficiency is clearly affected by...”

#### Section V:

- Figs. 9 and 10: “while the colored bands reflect...” (same as above)
- Fig. 11: “ while the second to” → „ while the bottom plot refers to...”
- Fig. 13: „ while for the other sensor is“ → „ while for the other sensor **it is**“

#### Section VI:

- line 299: „at the level of“ → „to a level of“

#### References:

[5] separate documents with a comma, i.e. before “CMS-TDR-014”  
I think the canonical way to format NIM is “Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A”