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- How: Public facing RMRS project page offers lead author’s email address to provide feedback
- When: Project available as of May 15, 2020
Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Commentary  ○ Yes  ○ No

**Summary of Peer Reviewers’ Comments**

Reviewers provided constructive comments, the resolution of which improved the clarity and readability of the paper. Reviewers also offered suggestions for future improvements, notably analysis of the systemic and longer-term impacts of disruptions to workforce capacity over the course of a fire season, which is beyond the scope of the current study but is the subject of future work. None of the reviewers expressed fundamental concerns regarding the basic study design, methods, or interpretation of results.

Requests for clarification included reducing fire jargon to better communicate the context with those outside the fire management community, explaining epidemiological terms and modeling to better communicate with those outside the epidemiology community, ensuring consistent differentiation of the virus (SARS-CoV-2) and the disease (COVID-19), clearly stating model assumptions (e.g., the number of infected individuals present at the beginning of each fire), and describing the breadth of possible interventions (e.g., wearing masks in addition to screening and social distancing).

Two reviewers recommended commenting on the general health status of firefighters and age distribution; in response we cited several studies addressing firefighter health, and added a paragraph in the discussion to note the uncertainty associated with COVID-19 symptoms in firefighters given their fairly unique health status. However we did not comment on the age distribution of firefighters as that data is sensitive and not available for general release.

Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel  ○ Yes  ○ No

**Other Comments**

Earlier versions of the paper were also shared with members of the USDA Forest Service’s Risk Management Council and the interagency Medical and Public Health Advisory Team; feedback was positive and supportive. Preliminary results have been briefed to the Forest Service Executive Leadership Team, as well as the Undersecretary (NRE), Deputy Secretary, and Secretary of USDA.