

Peer Review Amanda, Section 5.3, 5.4, 6.

Francesca Matano

Section 5.3

In section 5.3 you claimed the robustness of the Log-Linear Model to Expressed Confidence Level (ECL). If I got it correctly, the ECL are use as threshold for decision making in eyewitness identification. The major concern of this section is the variability in the expressed confidence level within witnesses. For studying this variability you permorm a simulation study. You assume a distribution for the variability of confidence across a given witness, then you compute all your quantity of interest, ROC curve, log-linear model and G^2 as measure of goodness of fit. You repeat the experiment 1000 times, changing the distribution, going from what you define to be the most optimistic to the least optimistic.

I think you do a very good job in this section. You start giving the motivation for the simulation study, you then explain how the simulation works for people that want to replicate it, and you finally draw the conclusions. I guess my only concern is about the distribution for the ECL. This is coming from someone that has zero knowledge in this field, so it might make no sense at all, but is there any way you can give more details of what you mean by optimistic and least optimistic distribution? I guess the key is that, when you simulate the same ECL 80% of the times, there is less variability in the way you simulate ECL, that is what it means, in this context, to be more optimistic.

Section 5.3

In section 5.4 you want to prove that the Log-Linear Model does not depend on the experimental assumptions. I like the way you structured the section. It's not that long but it's clear enough.

The only thing I would add here is an explanation of the difference between the three designs that you have in the table. You mention them, but I would probably refer more at the labels that they have in the table. The key seems to be the cell ID Suspect cross Target Absent, so I would say something like : "This has important implications in the analysis of the data, and there is a need for analysis methods that can handle the difference between designs. In the ideal settting...." In other words, I would drive the eye of the reader on those cells that really differ among designs.

Section 6

In this section you want to summarize your results. You splitted the section in three paragraphs. In the first one you criticize the use of the ROC curve in this type of analysis. In the second paragraph you propose the alternative to the use of ROC curve, this is where you discuss both your contribution your conclusiona. In the last paragraph you mention possible future work to keep improving the analysis of eyewitness identification.

The language is incredibly clear and the paper is very easy to read. I like the division in paragraphs because it's nice to have them separated, since each one is making its point, but the transition between them is very smooth.

This section represents a summary of your work and I don't think I have enough experience with writing in english to suggest changes. It seems very good to me, very easy to read and very well structured, I hope the other reviewer is able to help more.