List of suggested changes:

1. Figures 5 and 7 have a squished aspect ratio.
2. Fig. 8: the text in the figure is sloppy – ill-centered and/or obscured by figure elements.
3. Fig. 11 will be problematic in black and white.
4. Page 21 – subsection heading should be “Loop # 3” to be consistent with the others.
5. In the Acknowledgements section, please use my three initials (TJG) as opposed to (T).
6. On page 27 immediately prior to the equation, Ref. F-3 should be used in addition to S-12 (otherwise it is an orphaned reference.) I argue that it should also be referenced at the end of the first sentence of the third paragraph of Section 11. As it stands now, the discussion of the Padé procedure beginning in the first full paragraph of p.27, is ill-motivated. Why (the reader may well ask) are you going to all of this trouble, given that the Wegner form has been so successful, as has been discussed several times throughout the paper?
7. Table 3. Why do you not consider the Sherman function calculation to be a systematic error? If the calculation says that at 5 MeV the Sherman function for our experimental angle and energy is 0.5102, but in reality the true value is 0.5113 (well within 0.5%), we are *always* going to be off by that amount in any measurement we make, barring new theoretical input. My practice has always been to add systematic uncertainties linearly, because they don’t contribute to the standard deviation of the distribution of a large number of measurements we might make of the same beam polarization with the same apparatus. At least some of my nuclear physics colleagues feel the same way. In this regard, the four items currently listed in Table 3 under “Systematic Uncertainties” are a mixed bag. Certainly the energy cut, scattering angle, and beam energy are systematic uncertainties, but electronic pickup is a random (albeit probably not statistically-distributed) uncertainty.