

# USGS Peer Review Checklist

IP Number: IP-

Senior USGS Author:

Title:

Please complete this form and return it to the author by: \_\_\_\_\_

Do not include routine editing in your review with the exception of critical or sensitive areas where technical meaning or policy is an issue. Include any additional materials, such as the marked-up copy of the report and additional comments.

Your name: (print) \_\_\_\_\_

Your title, affiliation, and location: \_\_\_\_\_

Date you finished your review: \_\_\_\_\_

Your review rating:    Approve    Approve with minor changes    Approve with major changes    Reject

In your peer review memo, please be sure to elaborate about any aspect of the report you have rated as needing work.

**Please Note: Completing just this form does not constitute a review.**

	A	MI	MA	NA
<b><i>Introductory Elements</i></b>				
<b><i>Title:</i></b>				
Does it accurately convey the contents?				
<b><i>Abstract:</i></b>				
Does it provide an accurate overview of the report?				
Does it summarize major accomplishments?				
Does it inform the reader about critical features of the report?				
<b><i>Introduction:</i></b>				
Does the Introduction establish a need for the report by highlighting gaps or disagreements in the literature?				
Does it include sufficient historical and background coverage?				
Is the discussion of previous work comprehensive and an appropriate length?				
<b><i>Body of Report</i></b>				
<b><i>Theoretical framework, development of hypotheses, or approach:</i></b>				
Are the study's propositions, hypotheses, and assumptions clearly articulated?				
Is the approach well documented and technically sound?				
Are the basic arguments of the report technically sound?				
Are key terms defined?				
<b><i>Methods and analysis:</i></b>				
Are data collection methods described adequately?				
Is the sampling strategy explained?				
Has uncertainty been quantified appropriately?				
Is there evidence of data quality, reliability, or internal consistency in the study?				
<b><i>Results:</i></b>				
Are the findings adequately and accurately described?				
Are results clearly related to original propositions, hypotheses, research questions, and data analysis?				

A, adequate; MI, needs minor work; MA, needs major work; or NA, not applicable.

	A	MI	MA	NA
Do tables provide sufficient and accurate data to allow the reader to reach independent conclusions?				
Are figures and appendixes used effectively?				
Are mathematical expressions clear and well defined?				
Are units of concentrations consistently used?				
Are appropriate QAQC data included?				
Are the data consistent with the information and data points in the text and figures?				
Are all columns of in the data tables relevant and necessary?				
<b>Discussion:</b>				
Has the author adequately considered alternative explanations for the results found?				
Does the discussion section introduce new and relevant topics? (It should not simply restate the findings)				
<b>Conclusions</b>				
Are the most important components and contributions of the study highlighted?				
Are the Conclusions supported by the results of the study?				
Are all contributing factors taken into account?				
Is there something new in the Conclusions that has not appeared elsewhere in this report?				
Would a reader looking only at the Introduction and Conclusions understand the contribution and significance of the report?				
<b>References</b>				
Is material in the text cited when necessary?				
Is each citation in the report listed in the References Cited, and vice versa?				
<b>Appendixes</b>				
Is appendix material adequately selected and arranged?				
Do you feel a glossary of terms should be included?				
<b>Figures and Tables</b>				
Are figures and maps introduced appropriately in the text?				
Is the number of figures adequate for this report?				
Is there too much information in the figures or maps?				
Is there insufficient information in the figures or maps?				
Are tables introduced appropriately in the text?				
Is the number of tables adequate for this report?				
Are table headnotes and footnotes fully explanatory?				
Are headings of columns and rows presented in a logical order?				
<b>Discipline Considerations</b>				
Is sufficient information on, description of, the study area included?				
Are the purpose and scope of the report adequately presented?				
<b>Policy Issues</b>				
Does the introduction include an appropriate statement of cooperation?				
Are the conclusions within ethical and legal boundaries?				
Has the appropriate publication outlet (journal, USGS report, book chapter, etc.) been selected?				
Have the appropriate media for publication been selected (print, CD, Web, etc.)?				

**Non disclosure prior to publication.** In agreeing to be a peer reviewer for a USGS information product, reviewers must agree to be bound by the strictest scientific ethics in ensuring confidentiality of the science that is being reviewed and to not disclose or divulge any results or conclusions, or to make any public statements regarding the science before it is published and released.

**A**, adequate; **MI**, needs minor work; **MA**, needs major work; or **NA**, not applicable.