General Comments

I thought the draft was very well organized and the flow of ideas was generally very clear. The edits I suggest are just a small handful of places where ideas are brought up or terminology is used in ways that are surprising or unexplained.

Specific Comments

The line numbers I refer to are the line numbers in the left margin of the draft.

line 25

You use the term longitudinal instead of temporal as on line 21. I'm guessing these have essentially the same meaning in this context, so it might be better to stick with one or be more explicit about their equivalence (or the distinction, if there is one).

line 27

I can't tell what "after accounting for ... over time" refers to. This seems like a separate idea from the list of possible ways the network can evolve, so maybe it should be in a separate sentence.

line 28

The topic of existing statistical methods seems to be new but is at the beginning of the sentence, so in the spirit of *old information to new information* it might be better to rephrase to something like "Static networks, observed at a single point in time, have been the focus of most existing statistical methods for network analysis."

line 39

The initialism "ERGM" is used without saying what it means.

line 43

The discussion of network statistics seems like a new topic, and I can't tell how it relates to ERGMs (maybe this is clearer to someone more familiar with network analysis?) or how they will be used.

lines 131-134

In the first sentence I think item i. refers to reciprocity and item ii. refers to transitivity, but then in the next sentence the two implications are listed in the reverse order - as "transitivity and reciprocity".

line 149

The sentence "LSM is arguably appealing..." seems out of place here. It might fit better in the first paragraph of the section, when describing the benefits of the model at a high level.