**Questions**

**[@kinney2008autism]**

**# Intro**

[which part of? all? coastal?] Louisiana for 1980--1995.

**# Temporal Scale**

[The study links exposure by the day of the storm (true?), but since it is linking to gestational period (measure of week of gestational period is probably as refined as you can get on that), a week-leveltemporal scale would have probably worked fine for this study.]

**# Spatial Scale**

In other words, intensity was measured based on a storm's central track passing through the county [?]

[Were storm exposures still considered, even if the track didn't pass through the county? I'm assuming so if they compared high and low intensity based on the track crossing the county. If so, how did they pick which storms to look at for a county at all?]

**# Exposure**

[Does this mean that they took the date of birth and counted backward to see what week of gestation the baby was in during the storm?]

**# [@bayleyegn2006rapid]**

# Spatial Scale

[Was this based on a qualitative assessment, or on any type of measurements? If the latter, let's include any quantitative measurements they used here.]

# Exposure

[No further analysis was used to quantify the intensity of exposure in the study areas?]

**# [@hagy2006effects]**

**# Temporal Scale**

[Could you clarify? Is it that there was this tighter schedule right after the storm, and then it moved to a monthly schedule for the following few years?]

**# Spatial Scale**

Water quality surveys [was it a survey, or testing? (maybe the language here is discipline-specific...)] conducted at up to 15 sites located on two transects within the Pensacola Bay system. [Did they have a latitude and longitude for each of these sample sites? Or was it based on something like "center of the bay, about one mile from the ocean" kind of specificity for the sites? (in which case, it would be trying to sample a certain type of site each time, but not necessarily have the same lat/long for the site from time to time)?]

If sample sites are given with lat./long., having point-level exposure data could help inform a study like this. Otherwise, watershed-level data (as well as, perhaps, data on a spatial scale linked to the water system, like "bay", "inlet", "river") might be more helpful.

**# [@lieberman2017self]**

**# Exposure**

[Does this mean that they had a point location---latitude and longitude---for the home of each study subject?]

**# [@grabich2016hurricane]**

**# Exposure**

[Could you check on this---did they use the wind field value for the county, for example from H\*Winds, or did they use the central wind of the storm as the approximation, which they would have gotten from HURDAT?]

**# [@scaramutti2019mental]**

**# Spatial Scale**

[Do we know if they had the exact address of each participant? Or did they only know that they were in Puerto Rico and whether they were in the city or a rural area, without knowing which city or area?]

**# [@bianchette2009ecological]**

**# Spatial Scale**

[Do we have any idea how fine the spatial resolution for the Landsat images were? We could probably look that up in documentation for Landsat 5, too. I'm assuming they got a pretty high-resolution picture of tree mortality?]