

Manuscript: Chapter 5 - Framework

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 **75** 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?

Use of examples in reviewing scenarios, key points.

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

This chapter sets the scene for the following chapter. In this respect it meets expectations.

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?

Although the chapter discusses the objective of the framework, it really doesn't discuss the objective of the chapter.

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.

Page 8. The paragraph directly above the Ecosystem Indicator heading mentions PIs for domestic, municipal and industrial uses, but Table 5-1 on page 7 says no PIs were used.

Page 16. In view of the comment re sequence 7, it's not clear to me why it was selected.

Page 24. The text of the footnote could use some editing. I would say the IGLD is a "... fixed vertical reference used ...". In the second sentence I would say, "... has its zero

reference elevation as mean sea level near Rimouski ...”. That would make it a little clearer to the reader that the datum uses Helmert heights, not dynamic heights.