

Manuscript: Chapter 4 - Hydroclimate

Author(s): Study Team

Name of Reviewer: Peggy A. Johnson

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?

This is a well written document, nicely organized, with multiple summaries to help clarify the findings.

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

The authors made a clear case for continued and improved data and associated analyses, especially in light of climate change issues, to improve regulation of the lakes.

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

The analysis and modeling were quite good, no weaknesses identified.

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?

The document is well written and the summaries provide a nice way for those not as familiar with the details of hydrologic analysis to understand the key points.

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.

Signature: *Peggy A Johnson* Date: Feb. 9, 2012

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. The figures were very hard to read.