Responses to referee comments   
  
As a general comment, the paper presents a qualitative, system-level description of the pixel vertex detector  
for the STAR experiment. However, a general lack of results is evident: no plots or tables with measurements  
are reported; just pictures or sketches of the system.  
The very positive statements towards the STAR PXL production phase should be supported by punctual data.

*This is certainly true. I have corrected the abstract to reflect the true nature of the limited scale engineering production that is actually taking place. The importance of this engineering production is that we do all of the groundwork to enable full production on the full detector to begin in the spring of 2013.This is now indicated.*

*One generally has to make a choice when fitting into a limited length descriptive paper. We have chosen to make more general descriptions and less detail, but to cover most all aspects of the detector design and fabrication. Had we chosen to spend time concentrating on one of the detector aspects in detail, we could certainly have included a wealth of detail, but that was not the primary focus of this presentation nor of the following write-up. Nevertheless, while testing results are certainly included in the body of the paper, it is possible to increase the detail without overly extending the paper length. We have endeavored to do so.*   
  
Pag. 1  
Authors list ñ LBNL authors affiliations are duplicated several times, please group them when applicable.  
Please indicate the corresponding author, instead of the ìspeakerî.

*This has been corrected. The corresponding author and speaker are the same person*.  
  
Pag. 2  
Abstract  
The authors refer to a future ì.. full production of detector ladders will begin in November 2012î, which is a past date.

*It is true that November 2012 has passed, and we have made significant progress since then. However, this conference submission was submitted before the* *original deadline and the contents reflect the progress made at the time. In any case, the updated text no longer refers to “full” production, as discussed above.*

The authors state that ìÖselected detector design characteristicsÖî ñ please specify which characteristics and why they have been selected (e.g. their impact on the detector design).

*The description of the characteristics has been moved into the end of section 2.1 and indicates that the requirements, as laid out, have been met in the design.*

The authors state that ìprototyping resultsî are presented ñ see general comment.

*Please see the general response*

Pag. 3  
Introduction  
RHIC ñ explain the acronym the first time of its use.

*Corrected*

Pag. 4  
Par 2.2 12+19GeV/Ö -> 12˜19GeV ?  
Par 2.3 Too long first sentence  
Par 2.3 Use "justified" as alignment style  
Par 2.4 The sensors that are described are already available? Or they will be re-designed and/or re-fabricated in a new high-resistivity CMOS process (0.35µm AMS?). Within thin respect, the sensor characteristics (160MHz, 185.6µsec) are design specifications or measured performances? The authors refer to sensors that they ìare usingî, at the same time stating that ìÖ sensors that WILL BE usedÖî.

*Some more clarifying information has been added to the text. In addition, a reference detailing the full and “as fabricated” sensor characteristics has been added.*

Pag. 6  
Par 2.6 Probe testing  
The test of thinned and diced sensors procedure is stated, but no results at all have been presented ñ see general comment as well.

*I have added a comment mentioning that the probe testing measurement of the sensor performance is consistent with the measurements obtained in the individual sensor testing done in reference [6]*

Pag. 7  
Once again, a substantial qualitative description of the mechanical systems is presented, just stating that the thermal behaviour is adequate, and that the vibration measurements are consistent with simulations, without presenting measurement data or simulation data.

*The measurements are reported in the text and are consistent with the requirements stated earlier in the paper.*

Par 2.8 Use "justified" as alignment style

*Corrected*

Pag. 8  
Par. 3  
The authors state that ìÖThe results from an extensive testing program indicateÖî but these results have actually not been presented through the paperî.

*We have updated the paper to show more results, generally in the text and not as additional tables or figures.*

Use "justified" as alignment style  
Par 4 Use "justified" as alignment style

*Corrected*

References  
Use the same font and justification for all the items.

*Corrected*