

USGS Peer Review Checklist for Influential Scientific Information and Highly Influential Scientific Assessments

Note: This form will be made public. When this form is made public your name and affiliation will be redacted from this document and your detailed review. You will be instead referred to as Reviewer #1, Reviewer #2 etc.

Please complete this form and return it by: _____ to the originating Science Center
IPDS IP Number _____

Peer Reviewer Name: _____

Peer Reviewer Affiliation: _____

Date peer review completed: _____

Influential Scientific Information

This information product is considered by the USGS as

Highly Influential Scientific Assessment
--

Please Note:

Substantive critical review comments on the manuscript text using the MS Word™ Review functions are also requested.

	A	MI	MA	NA
<i>Introductory Elements</i>				
<i>Title:</i>				
Does it accurately convey the contents?				
<i>Abstract:</i>				
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?				
<i>Introduction:</i>				
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?				
<i>Body of report</i>				
<i>Theoretical framework, development of hypotheses, or approach:</i>				
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?				
<i>Methods and analysis:</i>				
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?				
<i>Results:</i>				
Are the findings adequately and accurately described?				
Are results clearly related to original propositions, hypotheses, research questions, and data analysis?				
Do tables provide sufficient and accurate data to allow the reader to reach independent conclusions?				
Are figures and appendixes used effectively?				

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

	A	MI	MA	NA
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 in the data tables relevant and necessary?				
Discussion:				
Has the author adequately considered alternative explanations for the results found?				
Conclusions:				
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?				
References:				
Is material in the text cited when necessary?				
Appendixes:				
Is appendix material adequately selected and arranged?				
Do you feel a glossary of terms should be included?				
Figures and Tables:				
Are figures and maps introduced appropriately in the text?				
Are 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?				
Are the number of tables adequate for this report?				
Are headings of columns and rows presented in a logical order?				

Please Note:

Substantive critical review comments on the manuscript text using the MS Word™ Review functions are also requested.

Additional Comments:

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.