-I think given that you did the search, it might be interesting to mention the other completeness notions and (being the first?) applying it to network might sound worthwhile credit. I would say keep it with italics/internal comments or something and Tom can make a call to keep it or not.

- I think the 2-D feasible QoI figure is good; could even provide a similar plot for another scenario (e.g. grid) if it is quick enough.

- Sorry I think I wasn't clear on some of the descriptions; I think you plotted one of the things I had in mind, but it definitely needs more clarification.

So I think I had two possible plots in mind;

(i) first you fix a completeness requirement. Than, you vary N and see the timeliness T which can be satisfied with 1-\epsilon probability, which in turn defines the maximum query rate per flow. Finally, you can multiply that rate by # of flows to get the max injected load that can be sustained for a given completeness. I think the figure you provided does that, just we might need to clarify that that is the total query rate injected in the network. I think such a plot could fit at V.C

an alternative plot which has similar info embedded which might be more natural is

(ii) first you fix a completeness requirement. then, you vary T and get the scalability N\_scal corresponding to C, T and epsilon. Finally, you multiply 1/T by N\_scal to get the total(network) query rate as a function of T.

I didn't mention this but one could also do

(iii) you can also fix the timeliness requirement (hence query rate/flow) and play with C to get different N, ultimately getting a timely completeness vs. total query load curve.

Either one of the plots would highlight some nonlinearities partially due to QoI (even though for clique and line almost constant). On the grand scheme of things maybe its not that interesting that the line scenario is constant since from the original symptotics paper scalability was roughly inversely proportional with per user load but for grid there was a square root dependancy, primarily resulting from the TF's dependence on N, similar for clique which is effected by CF.. Since we fix one of the QoI parameters we don't seem to observe much of an additional effect in terms of nonlinearity. (I have to do something else now but I'll try to put some more thought to this to see if we can highlight something more interesting)   So frankly speaking not sure how valuable they are, but (ii) and (iii) could fit on the impact section.

Overall, since our focus is primarily QoI satisfaction rather than throughput, perhaps all three would be redundant; perhaps one of them could be complementary in explaining the whole scenario, maybe (i) in V.C or (ii) in V.C or impact. We could also comment on the tie/sanity check with the original symptotics intuition.

- One other suggestion I had(which maybe you were going to implement anyway) was in the delay distribution plots,  pointing out the "maximum satisfiable timeliness" T's we assume for scalability determination (or T(epsilons)), but if you feel the plots already cover that and one could just intersect with the curve that's fine.

- I see that we're much more off for the grid case for strict timeliness compared to previous plots, is that due to using the  Chernoff bound? Regardless of the proximity, comparing with the scalabilities from the version last week the network sizes seem smaller for the same specs. Particularly for SS=0.5 (which is very small, a single image/query?) and low T its pretty off; even though it is really good for large T. We might also just start off from say 20 instead of 15, after all we don't discuss a specific application with a precise T so it might be ok.

- Another minor comment I previously pointed out was that the validation results have quite small sum similarities; I think the case was that when you increase sum similarities the scalable network sizes don't grow enough to have reasonable approximations. You are the one who explored this and knows how much time it takes, but given the latest issues in grid with SS=0.5, you think its worthwhile to swap that with a larger SS and relax the timeliness T to allow for larger network sizes to have a better match? You might have already tried these sorts of stuff before but maybe with the latest expressions we might have something better.

Overall, I understand trying all of these might take too much time so pick as you feel appropriate.

In case you have been holding the final deposit of your dissertation due to the ongoing work; it occurred to me that a few more reference issues might be there; - I'm talking based on the reference numbers in the pdf version I initially received and sent back; [68] and [78] are duplicate entries of the same paper of mine perhaps a latex duplicate entry. Also, [67] unfortunately encountered insanely long review-revision process etc., it might be better to cite my dissertation to complement it or instead:

Ciftcioglu, Ertugrul Necdet. "Wireless Relay Networks with Stochastic Arrivals." PhD dissertation., The Pennsylvania State University, 2012.

If you haven't you might want to double check any other double-referencing issues of papers cited in different chapters.

Another general suggestion in case you overlooked it is rather than/in addition to providing the publication version of your other (previous) chapters, mention the chapter in the dissertation.

For instance, [79] our milcom paper corresponds to Chapter 3. It is really relevant to Chapter 4, and from the ICCCN paper citing the MILCOM paper, I can see [79] cited in page 24. This is fine, but I think the mention/linkage of Chapter 3 in that paragraph would glue things better and make your dissertation more coherent. Maybe the other chapters are not as much correlated, but I feel are Chapter 3 and 4 are (to the extent that we contemplated on combining them as a basis for a journal paper with possibly limited channel info extension).