

Manuscript: Chapter 6

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 chapter presents a logical sequence of identifying regulation plans, evaluating them and recommending a specific plan. The key points and recommendations flow naturally from the text.*

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

*The selection of the recommended plan is critical as, if the recommendation is adopted, that plan will be the basis of IJC regulation of Lake Superior for many years to come.*

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

*The discussion of proposed changes to the IJC Orders on Lake Superior regulation assumes a considerable knowledge on the part of the reader. Improvements could be made to provide the requisite background.*

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? *no*

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: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: 2012 02 26

### **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. Page 1, second paragraph, last sentence, need space after em dash. Suggest wording change "... plausible and both possibilities must be ..."
2. Page 1, bulleted section at bottom of page. Some slight changes could be made to indicate that, indeed, this is the purpose of the chapter. That is "approach" could be "objectives".
3. Figure 6.1. Note that, in general the figures use "meter" while the text uses "metre". One consistent spelling should be used throughout the entire report.

4. Page 6, last sentence. Perhaps say "...monthly historical simulation." as a reminder to the reader of the meaning of "HI" used in the figure captions in 6-7.
5. Figure 6-7. Would it be better to simply put the more generic labels on the individual figures, ie preproject, natural etc. The equations for the various best-fit lines are very difficult to read and likely are not too useful in any case. Would it be instructive to simply show a new plot of all six regressions in the space available in this figure? This at least would show how much scatter there is in the equations.
6. Page 8, item 4. For the first three plots, it is easy to relate the plot to the discussion. This section refers to Plan 1.21 (Table 6-1 also refers to plan 121) and indicates that there are variants called 121 to 130. If the present labeling of the plots is maintained add a sentence to the second paragraph indicating that the plot shown in Figure 6-7 is for 129. I am assuming that the last plot is for the current operating plan 1977A. Should that be stated explicitly? Some reader may think it has something to do with water banking.
7. Figure 6-8. Although one can assume the plots are as for Figure 6-7, the text doesn't actually say what is being plotted.
8. Page 10, 6.3.3. Change to read, "Using the approaches described earlier in this section ..."
9. Tables 6-4 to 6-13 and 6-15. Need to ensure that the reader can discern what is intended by each of the criteria. For example, would it help to refer to coping zone C?
10. Figure 6-12. Comments for Figure 6-7 apply.
11. Page 33 ff. In general I find this section a little terse. Perhaps providing a little more elaboration of the existing orders in the second paragraph would help set the scene. As an example of where a little more detail might be needed is item 4 (page 35). The equation cited from 5.1.2 is described in that section as relating to low flows while item 4 mainly discusses high flows.