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*-Science:* 11 very interesting Earth science highlights are presented (mostly about Earth’s mantle rheology).

About 84% of the proposals were in earth science, comparable to last year (about 88%).

Does the 2017 pub list correspond to this review period?

11 pubs in 2018 (it is more than last year – 6), but one is an abstract (LPSC).

Most pubs are in Earth science journals and two with Editor’s highlight (Li et al., 2018, Rucks et al., 2018).

*-User community:* Allocation of beamtime to COMPRES users is not clear (they should improve the way they present statistics – p.15-16). In 2018, it seems that all users were from COMPRES member institutes (?)

Several grad students involved, 3 PhD theses involved working at this facility.

It seems that this year again, the diversity of the crowd of users is still quite limited: it seems that it is a pretty small group of people that uses the facility (from the names listed in the tables). Is this facility sufficiently advertised?

Outreach: 1 workshop has been organized, with 59 attendees (Envisioning the Next Generation of In-situ Synchrotron X-ray Techniques in Large-Volume High Pressure Apparatus for Mineral and Rock Physics).

*-Management team:* COMPRES support at 100% for Chen and Whitaker, 25% for Huebsch.

Both Chen and Whitaker submitted clear personal reports and are very productive.

M. Whitaker lists 6 pubs for 2018, many abstracts, and is involved in proposal writing.

The involvement of H. Chen as part of publications has improved (4+1 abstract vs 2+1 abstract last year). She is part of one GUP.

Their respective number of pubs seems a bit low compared to the number of users they both assist. Some pubs listed do not have M. Whitaker or H. Chen as co-author….

*-Facility:* The timeline for MAXPD development could focus on the current review period and the future steps (not past items). In general, this report is very lengthy (44 pages) and it seems that the same amount of useful/relevant info could be presented in a more succinct way.

MAXPD development projection section: some things are for 2017, not 2018 (?).

Plans come as too vague. For instance, the plan to acquire a 3-D tomography system for 6-BM-B requires more details than what is said in 2 sentences. Why would this instrument be useful? What would it bring to the facility? What would be the expectations in terms of numbers of users and science conducted? Who would maintain it and train users? This should be explained.

DT25: is there any plan for new development/improvement?

*Budget:* it is a bit surprising to see a request for salary support for PI Weidner (as acknowledged in the report, this is the first time) – it is not clear to me what is new in the PI’s role compared to previous years that would justify this support.

Is there a rule about PI support? Who are the other PIs (if any) that get salary support from COMPRES?
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