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Summary:

Focus:
- Does the paper clearly identify the problem it is addressing?
The paper clearly identifies the problem it is addressing which is a synthesis of recommendations and findings introduced following the Fukushima nuclear accident.
- Does the paper clearly explain related work and their limitations?
Yes, the paper explains the related work and its limitations. The related work in this area has been very limited one reason for which may be the disaster being very recent.
- Does the paper identify its key contributions?
The contributions section is present but is quite short. The paper does show that this section will have more content later.
- Does the paper present any evidence to support the contribution claim?
As of now the paper does not include any evidence to support the contribution claim.

Technical Evaluation:
- Is the literature survey complete?
Owing to the limited literature on this topic, the literature survey seems complete and thorough.
- Is the work novel relative to the literature? Explain.
The work is novel relative to the literature. This body of work brings together multiple perspectives namely the private energy sector, the public regulatory governing body and the independent private group and there has been no work which includes this.
- As a reviewer do you agree with the contribution claims? Explain.
Yes, we agree with the contribution claim. There is a limited body of work which exists in this area and there is a need to present one synthesized set which has content from all perspectives.
Readability and Organization:

- Is the paper easy to read and understand to students in this course (Csci 8715)?
  Though the paper is easy to read and understand, the relevance to the course may be included in the paper.
- Is the paper self-contained?
  Yes, the paper is self-contained.
- Is the paper length reasonable?
  The paper as of now contains quite a few sections with dummy text for addition later. The paper length is reasonable once that text gets filled in.
- Does it include sufficient number of figures and tables?
  Owing to the unique nature of the topic, the paper has suitable number of figures and table.

Strengths:

The strengths of this paper are:

- Novelty and the limited material which exists in this area.
- Recent event and societal importance.
- Easy to understand language with in depth analysis.

Areas of Improvements:

Suggestions for Improvement:

- The contributions section needs to be expanded and elaborated.
- The paper can include some visual display in terms of table/chart of the output as it increases the understanding of the reader.
- The paper has some missing sections which should be completed.
- We had some confusion to the relevance of the paper to this course, which may or may not be required to include in the paper.