

Manuscript: Chapter 6

Author(s): Study Team

Name of Reviewer: P.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 **85** 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 provides sufficient descriptions of each of the plans that were evaluated, how they were evaluated, and the process of selecting a single plan. The key points were very helpful in pulling all the material from the chapter together.

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

*The selection of **Plan Lake Superior 2012** as the recommended plan is most critical and how that plan will be adopted.*

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

The purpose of several of the figures was not clear. Additional explanation of the importance of the relationships would help the readability.

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.

Peggy A Johnson

Signature: _____ Date: March 1, 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.

- Fig. 6.7 is hard to follow. Without searching through document, it's difficult to figure out what the various graphs are showing.
- What is the interpretation or meaning of Figure 6.8?
- Table 6.2 is a bit difficult to follow. The time line is not really helpful.
- The key points are really well written and helps pull the whole report and complicated decision process together.