

David Rosenberg

From: em:jrnwreng.0.86902f.f6f5376f@editorialmanager.com on behalf of J. of Water Resources Planning and Management <em@editorialmanager.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 8, 2023 10:25 AM
To: David Rosenberg
Subject: Revise for Editor Only - [EMID:5457434052a8559f]

Ref.: Ms. No. WRENG-5893R2

Lessons from interactive, immersive online modeling to discuss more adaptive reservoir operations
David Rosenberg

Dear David,

Your Case Study, listed above, has completed a review for publication in ASCE's Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management. The editor has requested that minor revisions be made based on the reviewers' evaluations (shown at the end of this email) and submitted for re-review by 10-22-2023. This revision will only be seen again by the editor and will not undergo the entire review process.

Also, please note in order to clarify math for copyeditors, please ensure that you use boldface for matrixes, vectors, tensors; italics for all variables, including variables that are subscript and superscript; roman for all numerals and Greek characters, and mathematical operators; and Helvetica for all dimensionless numbers (Froude, Weber, Prandtl, etc.).

ASCE is now encouraging authors to add a Practical Applications section to their paper. The Practical Applications section is a concise plain-language summary (150-200 words) of the paper written for non-academic or practitioner audiences to identify the results, relevance, or potential applications the research describes. You can read more about requirements for the Practical Applications section in the Peer Review Process section of the [ASCE Author Guide](#).

Please submit the revised manuscript and a detailed response to the reviewers' criticisms by logging onto the Editorial Management system at <https://www.editorialmanager.com/jrnwreng/> and clicking on the "Submissions Needing Revision" link.

For your convenience, there is a calendar entry item attached that works with electronic calendars in the iCalendar format (e.g. Outlook, iCal, Google). To use, click to open the attachment, and then save it to your calendar. Be advised that the editor may request further revision or decline your revised version if all of the reviewers' comments have not been adequately addressed.

Comments from the Editor and Reviewers can be found below.

We look forward to receiving your revised manuscript.

Sincerely,

Susan O'Connor
Editorial Coordinator

Reviewers' Questions & Answers:
Reviewer's Responses to Questions

This manuscript was submitted as a Case Study. Does the reviewer think this is the appropriate article type? To see descriptions of the article types, [Click Here](#).

Reviewer #1:

- Yes. The author is using the correct article type.

Editor Comments:

Editor: Based on the reviews, it is recommended that the author should revise and resubmit the manuscript. The author is encouraged to review the past JWRM publications on this subject and to take the reviewer comments into consideration in improving the paper. However, please submit a list of changes or a rebuttal against each point raised by the reviewer with your revised manuscript. Please note that the earlier we receive your revised manuscript, the earlier we can process it. Thanks for your interest in the Journal of Water Resources Planning & Management. We look forward to receiving the revised manuscript from you. The reviewer comments are listed below.

Reviewers' comments:

Associate Editor comments: This manuscript has undergone several reviews. Reviewer 2 elected not to review the second revision. Going with one reviewer on this second revision is sufficient.

Reviewer #1: I first note that my previous comments were well considered and adequately addressed, though upon second review several concerns remain.

The lessons are substantially improved in both organization and explanation.

While I do not agree with the use of the term "First Nations" in the present context, for various reasons, this is more a question for the journal. If the use of the term Tribes in water planning and management is indeed a shared concern, including in particular by the people represented by such a term, then this should very much be raised by the journal itself, perhaps in an editorial. In any case, the added clarifying statement that First Nations is used to refer to the Tribes is useful and sufficient if no further change is made.

Writing grammar and style needs significant further improvement. I suggest a thorough review of 1) tense, 2) spelling (use spell check, including in the appendix), 3) grammar (e.g.: use em dash instead of " -- "; seasons as used herein are not capitalized in English; some periods (.) are inadvertently bold, etc.), and 4) style (formal vs informal/colloquial)

Double check the spelling of "Google Sheet": Is this supposed to refer to the online application as a whole, or just a worksheet within the application? Note that the application name is plural: "Google Sheets".

In general, the revised term for the modeling approach ("interactive, immersive online modeling session") makes sense. However, 1) it could be helpful to identify what these mean, as, for example, WEAP is also interactive, and the term "immersive" is not really explained (this could refer to, for example, virtual reality or augmented reality, which I imagine we'll see in future modeling exercises). Is there literature to refer to on this? If so, reference that, and if not, this warrants further elaboration on what is meant by these terms. I also note that occasionally the term "collaborative" is

injected into this sequence, and I believe that the real-time collaborative nature of the Google Sheets platform is really one of the most exciting aspects of this type of collaborative modeling exercise; it's worth noting this aspect. 2) The term can likely be subsequently more concise within most of the remainder of the article once defined (e.g., "the modeling sessions").

The term "synchronous" ("sequential" is also used), as used, is somewhat ambiguous, in that it is unclear which component is synchronous. It would be helpful to explain what synchronous means in this context.

I suggest explaining what the "Upper Basin" and "Lower Basin" refer to for readers who may not be familiar with the Colorado River basin management regime.

Lines 113-115: Do the colors of the cells matter other than they are different? If so, what are the implications for colorblind participants/readers? I suggest just indicating that these were clearly differentiated, in case the colors don't matter.

Lines 136-137 and 315-316: This description of Article III(d) is a bit ambiguous. When I first read this I thought "every back-to-back 10-year period", which of course is incorrect. Deferring to the Compact language might help: "every period of 10 consecutive years" to avoid ambiguity (I wouldn't be surprised if the Compact writers considered this potential ambiguity).

Lines 162-163: I suggest reconsidering the term "status quo" here, as the status quo in the basin already results in warmer release temperatures from Glen Canyon Dam due to overdraft on the system. Perhaps describe this as "...temperatures that would further threaten native, endangered fish..."? I'm not sure what the right language is, but "status quo" should not be used to imply that current operations are not a threat to endangered fish.

Note Fig. 3 needs cleaning up (i.e. fit text in appropriate spaces).

In compliance with data protection regulations, you may request that we remove your personal registration details at any time. [\(Remove my information/details\)](#). Please contact the publication office if you have any questions.