

Manuscript: Chapter 4 - Hydroclimate

Author(s): Study Team

Name of Reviewer: R. A. Halliday

1. Are the objectives of the work clearly stated? 1 2 3 4 5
2. Are the methods employed valid, appropriate and sufficient to address the questions, hypotheses or the problem? 1 2 3 4 5
3. Are the observations, conclusions and recommendations supported by the material presented in the manuscript (e.g., data, model and analyses)? 1 2 3 4 5
4. Are the assumptions used valid and are the mathematics presented correct? 1 2 3 4 5
5. Is the manuscript well organized, material precise and to the point, and clearly written using correct grammar and syntax? 1 2 3 4 5
6. Are all of the figures and tables useful, clear, and necessary? 1 2 3 4 5
7. What is the quality of the overall work? 1 2 3 4 5

Recommendation (please circle your response)

A - acceptable

B - acceptable with suggestions for revision

C - acceptable if adequately revised

D - unacceptable

If you have selected **C**, do you wish to receive the revised manuscript for further review?

yes no

Rating (Circle the rating you would like to give this manuscript. Unacceptable work should be given a score of 40 or less.)

100 90 80 70 60 50 40 30 20 10 0

Comments (limit responses to one paragraph for each question; reference pages, charts, and data. Please distinguish if responses are of major or minor concerns.)

A. What is the best/most unique part of the analysis?

The authors have taken very complex material and woven a thorough, coherent narrative. The summary text boxes at the end of each major section are very useful.

B. What is the most critical aspect of the study/analysis? Why?

The findings presented concerning required changes to net basin supply are critical to future regulation of the upper lakes. The discussion concerning paleo findings is instructive.

C. Which aspect of the analysis/modeling is weakest? Why? How can it be improved?

n/a

D. Are there any other suggestions that are related to how this analysis may be used more effectively or the results explicated in a more understandable manner?

Some of the writing is fairly dense and would certainly be a challenge for a non-technical reader, for example, paragraph 3 in 4.3.1. Any simplifications that can be made during editing would be welcome.

Please indicate any confidential comments to the Co-Chair(s) of the Independent Peer Review Group in the space below. Comments for transmission to the author(s) should be on a separate sheet attached.



2012 02 08

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Comments for Transmission to Authors

It would be useful to have both general comments and specific comments for major and minor revision. Please use additional sheets should they be required.

1. I assume that clarity of figures will be improved in the final version and that the overall report will contain a list of acronyms.
2. Page 4, second line above lower box. Typo “watersheds”

3. Page 27, last sentence. There is a syntax problem in this sentence making it hard to understand. Since the sentence is repeated in the second last key point, some effort should be made to clarify it.