

Comments on the revised version of the paper by Van Ranst et al. – “Technical Note: Nikon-TRACKFlow, a new versatile microscope system for fission track analysis”

General Comments:

The authors have substantively dealt with all of the recommendations that I made in my first review, and in particular the paper is now of a length suitable for publication as a 'Technical Note'. I therefore now recommend that the manuscript be published subject to correction of one small error (two different names are used for the same 'LSC Tool' on page 4 - compare lines 3 'LSC' and 15 'Durango' tool). The same error is found in Fig 3 where the tool is called 'DUR' in the diagram and 'LSC' in the caption. I also suggest that some very brief explanation is required on page 4, line 5, of just how the software 'automatically defines the bounding box'. I have further made a number of minor suggestions to improve the English expression, below.

Minor suggestions:

Page 1:

Line 25: '...commercialised by Autoscan...'

Lines 33, 34 and 37: 'amongst others' is used three times in five lines, including twice in one sentence, which sounds very cumbersome and the meaning is not clear. I suggest simply deleting the first occurrence in line 33 ('Both systems have the aim...'), changing the second one in line 34 to '...system, including to reduce schedule pressure.' and changing the last one in line 37 to '...they differ, amongst other things, in microscope brand...'.

Page 2:

Line 7: 'amongst others' appears once again and I suggest replacing it simply with 'includes' which is clearer and more direct.

Page 3:

Line 8: '...lenses in the case where a thin ED...'

Line 4: should be 'copper', not 'cupper'

Line 29: '...retain the same order.'

Page 4:

Line 12: '...recoordination, a second scan of the same...'

Line 15: '...tool but optimised for the EDs...'

Line 16: 'The main difference is that automatically so that this action...'

Line 20: 'Coordinate transformation is therefore included in the glass tool for this purpose.'

Line 27: '24/7' is a colloquialism that is inappropriate for a scientific paper. It needs to be spelled out or said in some other way, perhaps '...24 hours a day, 7 days per week.' (probably unrealistic, as no microscope is going to be used that intensively), or simply '...around the clock.', or just '... day and night.', both of which are common ways of saying the same thing.

Line 33: '...so as to deal with a mismatch of the focal plane level with...'

Andrew Gladow
7 April 2020