

The revisions addressed all my questions and made the paper shorter and easier to read. I would certainly recommend publication at this point. I did notice some very minor things on this reading, noted below; the authors or editors could decide whether these are worth altering before publication.

Page 5, line 52: the presence of fringing is odd here since normally neither photometry nor dome flats exhibit fringes. Is this because the dome flats are being made with a monochromatic source (as suggested later in the paper at 8/19)? If so, it might be worth changing this sentence to say "fringing from the monochromatic dome-flat illumination..."

10/14: here is says a diagonal pattern "is seen in g and r" - since these panels are no longer being shown, and also I think the banding is absent from Fig 3 because it's been high-passed, the reader can't actually "see" this. You might clarify the wording to keep people from expecting looking for it in the figure.

12/27: I think you want a comma in "with the strongest systematic tree-ring effects, to yP1,..."

12/28: do you mean that smear & astrometry are different from each other, or that these two are different from the other two?

16/8: someone who knows device physics better than me would not ask this question, but: if the voltage is the integral of the electric field, how can the higher space charge change the electric field while keeping the same voltage?