Parent PDF	Page	Section	Comment	Response
20190409	6	1.1	Mention the random load in the objective	I believe this section already mentions the random input load. The second sentence reads “Furthermore, the study will seek to incorporate treatment of uncertain input loads in the solution method. “
20190409	7	1.2.2	Why are the loads not the same from the first to second list? (Clarify about quartering the beam)	Since we are only analyzing one quarter of the beam, the loads are quartered to keep the stress responses in line with the loading of the full beam.
20190409	7	1.2.2	Add “or” in the list of load units to make more clear.	Agreed.
20190409	8	1.2.4	Consider adding a section 1.2.5: Design variables.	Agreed that the design variables need to be called out, will evaluate best place to put them
20190409	8	1.2.3	“relation to reliability” written under 2(b).	Need to discuss this as I’m not terribly sure what is meant here.
20190409	11	2.1.1	How is convergence obtained?	At the moment, convergence is not tested for. The analysis runs for a fixed duration.
20190409	12	2.1.2	“Child vector” circled should be parent vector.	Agreed.
20190409	13	2.2.2	“Relation to reliability” written under equation 2	Need to discuss this as I’m not terribly sure what is meant here.
20190409	16	2.3	Summarize finite element modelling	Agreed.
20190409	22	4.2.1	In subsection “Identify Load Cases”, “How to name them (the loads)? How to select each load?	Need to discuss this as I’m not terribly sure what is meant here.
20190409	22	4.2.1	“final Pareto Front” should be clarified to be in acordance with equation (1)	Agreed.
20190409	22	4.2.2	Change “Figure 5” to Table X.	Agreed.
20190409	23	4.2.2	Change “Figure 5” to Table X.	Agreed.
20190409	24	5	“Based on population size and number of generations” written under intro paragraph.	Need to discuss to make sure I am clear on intent
20190409	24	5.1.1	These parameters should reach convergence?	Convergence is not evaluated in this code,
20190409	25	5.1.1	Reconfigure table to visually seperate design variables from objective function results.	Agreed.

20190409	25	5.1.1	How are these values converted to stress?	These parameters are converted to stress by the methods I mentioned in my e-mail response from earlier in the week.
20190409	26	5.1.2	Why is it 17 generations, not 200?	The two solutions were crafted to have a similar wall clock time for solution. The idea was to compare tim-for-time to check relative performance. At 200 generations, the g2 solution takes over 27 hours to solve.
20190409	26	5.1.2	Are the stress values the same from figure 7 to 10?	No, because they represent different loading conditions as mentioned in 5.1.3
20190409	28	5.1.2	These plot points are not the same as the other figures. Why?	The difference in points is because the 2 seperate plots represent represent different loading conditions as mentioned in 5.1.3
20190409	28	5.2.1	Do these values converge?	Convergence is not evaluated in this code.
20190409	29	5.2.1	“Stress??” Written on the figure 9	Need to discuss details of this request
20190409	30	5.2.2	Not long enough to converge at 2 generations?	Convergence is not evaluated in this code, but per the graphs below 2 generations still provide reasonable results.
20190409	31	5.2.2	Compare runs short-to-long also.	Agreed.
20190409	32	5.2.2	Is Figure 11 a cut of figure 10?	The difference in points is because the 2 seperate plots represent represent different loading conditions as mentioned in 5.1.3