- Please take care that values and units are in one line
- done
- In abstract a suggestion for improvement "For the current experimental phase, LEGEND-200 utilizes a Water-Cherenkov-Veto system to actively reduce background noise from radioactive isotopes and cosmic radiation, such as muons."
- done
- Maybe you meant something like "It uses photomultiplier tubes (PMTs) as light sensors in a water tank covered with a reflective foil to enhance the collection of light inside the water volume."?
- done
- No need to introduce abbreviation in abstract if you reintroduce it later in the text again - done
- In 3. first sentence suggestion for improvement "Muon-induced events are identified in the collected data through the application of two distinct cuts." ?
- done
- "Figure 3: Integral light as a function of multiplicity with cuts (left) and muon event rate of each PMT as a function of time (right)."
- done
- Fig. 3 red box region line is not very visible when printing. You can enlarge the line or pictures (title page is not included to the limit)
- Done, enlarged it to two figures.
- Would be good to add one sentence about two periods before the fig. 3 mentioned. To have more understanding of the measurement campaign
- done
- Peak on the fig. 3 right should be also mentioned in the caption.
- done
- "The coincidence rates of muon events in both the LAr/HPGe detector system, and the muon veto are stable during the runs." -> were stable
- done
- "Pillbox (PB)" introduced twice?
- Done, removed the second introduction.
- At the end you say "a different reflective foil to reduce accidental coincidences.". Do you want to keep it? Before in the text you didn't mention any issue with the foil. Or?
- In the sentence " First, a multiplicity cut is used to remove events caused by scintillation of the reflective foil..." (section 3), I mentioned shortly the issue with the reflective foil. Should I extend that a bit/remove the comment at the very last sentence or is it fine to keep it like that?

