

Från: Strömberg, Bo
Skickat: den 2 mars 2021 15:11
Till: tim hicks; Tamara Baldwin (tdb@galson-sciences.co.uk)
Kopia: Egan, Michael
Ämne: LOT review report

Hi Tamara Tim

A few additional suggested revisions. We have native speaker at SSM so we eventually found a few typos and just very minor suggested clarifications.

Throughout a search and replace: Should it be suppress instead of supress?

Summery first para, "a heated copper tube"

"models of barrier behaviour" maybe better phrased as "model for initial evolution of engineered barriers"

Summery second para, "work related to the licence application" maybe "work related to the concept development and implementation (including licence application)"

Summery fifth para, "SKB had planned to recover" maybe "SKB had originally planned to recover"

Summery, fifth para, SKB RD&D programme form 2016? (as the most recent one prior to the LOT S2 and A3 work??)

Summery, eleventh para, "the total average corrosion" maybe clearer if "the total average accumulated corrosion"

1 introduction, fifth para, "work related to the licence application" maybe "work related to the concept development and implementation (including licence application)"

Page 3. I think they write it Swerim rather than SWERIM

Page 16. Under 3.1.4, last sentence first para, "the viability of the KBS-3 concept associated with the long delay in the project. Has the viability and the delay anything to do with each other in the way this sentence is formulated?"

Page 18, first para "to be elevated within the base metal", should it be "within the body of the metal" since base metal is something different than copper

Page 31, first para after bullet list, "with the analysis utilised" maybe "with the analysis method utilised"

Page 39, first para under 4.7.1 "corrosion rate to support his argument" maybe "corrosion rate to support this argument"

Page 39, second para under 4.7.1. "It was considered that" is it "SKB considered that" ??

Page 43, fourth para, “Thus it hard to draw conclusions” maybe “It is therefore hard to draw conclusions”

Page 46, under 5.1, “SKB had originally planned” and SKB’s RD&D programme 2016 (see previous comments)

Page 48, third para, “The total average accumulated corrosion” (see previous comments)

Hope that these makes sense to you. Note it is just a few suggestions for clarifications.

Best regards

Bo



Bo Strömberg, PhD
Strålsäkerhetsmyndigheten
Swedish Radiation Safety Authority

Säkerhetsanalys
Safety Assessment

Avd. för radioaktiva ämnen
Dept. of Radioactive Materials

SE-171 16 Stockholm
Solna strandväg 96

Tel: + 46 8 799 41 63

Fax: + 46 8 799 40 10

Web: www.stralsakerhetsmyndigheten.se