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

   *Explanations of the criteria were very good.*

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

   *The authors have done a good job of providing a primarily qualitative explanation of the framework for decision-making and how they came to this decision. They refer to the following chapter, which helps to understand what the importance of the criteria are.*

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

   *The explanations were quite good and assessing the analysis and modeling will be left to the next chapter.*

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?

   *I had to keep going back to the beginning to try to understand what the objectives were. It might help to make this more clear right up front.*
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**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.

*The document reads well and is comprehensive. However, the most important revision that could be made would be to provide a concise statement of the objectives at the beginning instead of the reader having to infer what the objectives are.*

*Also, the figures were fairly hard to read. A bit more explanation in the captions would be helpful in most cases.*