

Manuscript: Chapter 8

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 key points at the end do a good job of tying the chapter together and laying out the justification for the final recommendation. The study is very well documented.*

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

*The report contains a lot of detail that is in some places difficult to digest. However, it does provide excellent documentation leading to the final recommendation.*

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

*The figures need to be improved for 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.

Signature:     Peggy A Johnson     Date: Jan. 17, 2012

**Comments for Transmission to Authors**

Although I thought the document could be a bit more readable, their final recommendation is well documented and justified. I think the chapter does a really thorough job of showing the costs vs. advantages over the existing situation, which led to the final recommendation to do nothing.

The key points at the end were very helpful. I thought that helped a lot to bring it all together.

The figures are not very readable and will need to be improved. Many are too small, fuzzy, etc.