Few comments raised at the SRC presentation on May 12.

* Need plot showing the p\_miss resolution and Mx\_miss^2 distribution in simulation compared with the data Mx2 distribution to justify the statement that resolution effects are taken into account in the QE p\_miss simulation spectra
* Provide two dimensional distribution of E\_miss vs p\_miss for mean field simulation to justify SRC selection ranges in E\_miss and p\_miss.
* Clarify seeming contradiction between the claimed high efficiencies in the upstream / downstream detectors (MWPC/Si and DCH) ~97% and the track reconstruction efficiency of ~50%
* Make comment in the paper about possible contribution to B10 from B11 -> B10 and losses of B11, B10, Be10 reaction due to interactions after the target in MWPC/Si/GEM detectors
* If anti-BC3high was indeed included into the IT logics of the main SRC triggers SRCT Full and SRCT2 Full, than its efficiency to accept events with final B11, B10, Be10 has a rather big impact to the measured ratio of (p,2p) A-1,A-2 / (p,2p). Vasilisa Lenivenko measured the antiBC2high efficiency for Z<=4 final states of only 46%.

Comments to the draft version jinr\_v15

Line 585 : 3 x 10^5 -> up to 2 x 10^5

Line 621-622: 90 degree -> put right angular acceptance range

Line 647: z position (along the beam line)

Line 667: choosing -> excluding the strong peak

Line 679: QFS is defined only at line 773

Line 770: the uncertainty is obtained from examining different energy-deposition cuts of 2 - 5 sigma. What does it mean?

Line 806: Emiss = mp – emiss should be defined much earlier to describe Fig.2

Line 856: proton time-of-fight resolution is 0.9% ???