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|  | Reviewer’s comment | Author’s Feedback *(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)* |
| **Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.** | The proposed Starlab is very important for the scientific community. If this system is actually implemented, it will be the hub for a geat many experiments and studies on orbit. I am not sure how important this particular manuscript is because it is rather thin, lacking detail, and provides only a very high-level overview. The figures are difficult to comprehend and the English needs upgrade. I suppose this manuscript would serve well as a marketing brochure but as a scientific document, I think not. It is not clear why the ISS needs to be retired in favor of a new system and I suspect that is needed but not explained in the writeup. The ISS had major problems with life support and used the so-called “orbital replacement units” for the frequently failing components of the recycling system. What would the new system do for life support? On the other hand, if this is only an abstract of a much longer article, I suppose my remarks above might not be appropriate. |  |
| **Is the title of the article suitable?****(If not please suggest an alternative title)** | Title is OK |  |
| Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here. | The question is whether this manuscript is THE ARTICLE or whether it is a shport abstract of a longer article. If it is THE ARTICLE then I have to say it is too thin and the figures are pretty but not readable. If it is an abstract of a longer article, I suppose it is OK, pending reading the longer article. |  |
| **Is the manuscript scientifically, correct? Please write here.**  | The issue of scientific correctness does not apply to this writeup but there are no scientific errors.  |  |
| **Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.****-** | Amazingly, SpaceX is never mentioned; yet this seems to be a sales brochure for SpaceX? The references are few, which Isuppose is OK for a sales pitch. |  |
| Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications? | The English is not very good but nevertheless t it is still readable. |  |
| Optional/General comments | I can’t make a recommendation. This is a chapter in a book. Which book? Is the book scientific or descriptive? How does it fit into the book?  |  |
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