

Dear reviewer, organizing committee,

Here are our answers to reviewer, the new version of manuscript is uploaded.

Length of Proceedings:

Following your advice, we have removed three figures and shortened the abstract to fit onto the first page. The revised version now adheres to the required format of 5 pages, plus the first page with the title, authors, institutions, and abstract.

Reviewer's Comment on Paragraph:

"Accumulated data indicate a strong correlation between observed electrical failures and a high electrostatic charge, reaching several hundreds of volts per inch, measured on the surface of the sensors and of the plastic sheets used for sensor mechanical protection during the initial reception test. The electrostatic charge enhances the occurrence of "Local trapped charge" events during handling procedures, manufacturing steps, and shipping, resulting in failed electrical QC tests."

Do you mean "kV/in"? And why not in SI units? In anycase, this would be the value of an electrostatic field, not a charge.

What is the difference implied in "Local trapped charge" wrt "electrostatic charge"?

The reviewer questioned the use of "V/in" and suggested considering SI units. We clarified that, as per the specifications of the Electrostatic Field Meter (DESCO), the measurement is in volts, and we adjusted the text accordingly. The static charge meter measures the electrostatic force between the static charge on the surface to be measured and the induced charge on the meter's sensor at a distance of several centimetres (inch) which is then translated into a voltage, hence the unit of volts.

"Hundreds of volts" is correct as seen from Fig. 1., example of readings shows 0.245 kV. (Figure 1 was removed in the new version due to the length).

During quality control (QC) measurements an elevated electrostatic charge is observed on the surface of some sensors. A "Local trapped charge event" is caused, for example, by touching such a charged sensor surface with the vacuum stencil or another tool. In such cases, the charge becomes trapped at the point of contact, causing interstrip isolation loss at that specific location. We included this additional information into the text.

The new version of the paragraph:

"Accumulated data indicate a strong correlation between observed electrical failures and a high electrostatic charge, resulting in potential of several hundreds of volts, measured on the surface of the sensors and of the plastic sheets used for sensor mechanical protection during the initial reception test. The electrostatic charge enhances the occurrence of "Local trapped charge" events during handling procedures, manufacturing steps, and shipping, resulting in failed electrical QC tests. This "Local trapped charge" event is caused, for example, by touching such a charged sensor surface with the vacuum stencil or another tool. In such cases, the charge becomes trapped at the point of contact."

The revised manuscript is uploaded (revised_PoS_VERTEX2023_Gamma_v5_Mikestikova.pdf).

We sincerely appreciate the time and effort you invested in reviewing our manuscript, and we hope that the revisions made align with your expectations. If there are any further suggestions or clarifications needed, please do not hesitate to let us know.

Thank you once again for your valuable input.

Best regards,

Marcela Mikestikova,
corresponding author

19.1. 2024