

**Instructions for Peer Review of U.S. Climate Change Science Program (CCSP)
Synthesis and Assessment Product (SAP) 1.2**

May, 2008

Thank you for agreeing to participate in the review of: CCSP 1.2: '*Past Climate Variability and Change in the Arctic and at High Latitudes*'. Your review of the document is very much appreciated and is vital to ensure the integrity of the final report and the success of the U.S. Climate Change Science Program.

A. The Review

Please be mindful that this report is not intended for a scientific research audience, but for a scientifically literate audience of policymakers and public. In your review, please focus on 1) the chapters which are most closely related to your area of expertise and, 2) other parts of the document, as your time and expertise/experience may allow. You can access the full report and/or each chapter separately from the following website:

SAP 1.2 Home Page

http://www.usgs.gov/global_change/sap_1.2/default.asp

Navigate to the password-protected peer review area by clicking on the yellow box.

Direct Link:

http://www.usgs.gov/global_change/sap_1.2/peer_review/1.2_peer_review.asp

Login information is as follows:

userid: 12peerreview

password: R3view2008

Please use care entering the userid and password. If one individual fails to log in correctly it will lock everyone else out for 15 minutes. **Your completed review is due back at USGS by cob Wednesday, May 28.** Please email your review comments to Joan Fitzpatrick: jfitz@usgs.gov

The prospectus for this report outlines the topics and rationale, and approaches taken for this report. Please consider the following review questions as you evaluate this report:

- Are the scope and intent of the synthesis and assessment report faithful to the intent of the Prospectus and clearly described in the report? Are all aspects of this charge fully addressed? Do the authors go beyond this charge or their expertise?
- Are the conclusions and recommendations adequately supported by evidence, analysis, and argument?
- Are the information and analyses handled completely?
- Are uncertainties or incompleteness in the evidence explicitly recognized?
- Are the report's exposition and organization effective? Is the title appropriate?

- Is the report appropriately balanced?
- Is the report's tone impartial and devoid of special pleading?
- Are any of the report's findings based on value judgments or the collective opinions of the authors? If so, is this acknowledged, and are scientifically defensible reasons given for reaching those judgments?

Note that the peer review draft has gone through an initial copy edit, but not a more detailed layout edit. As such you may find some typos, grammatical errors and graphics that need higher resolution. Please do not focus on these shortcomings during your review, as they will be cleaned up by USGS technical editors in the next draft. Instead, please focus on the science and conclusions in the report as they relate to the questions above and the specifics you deem worthy of note. In addition to pointing out what you think is wrong with this SAP, the authors would greatly benefit from hearing from you on points you think they got right. And of course any additions to the document to clarify points will be greatly appreciated.

Please prepare your review using word processing software (e.g. Microsoft Word, text file, etc.) referring to page and line numbers with your specific comments. As a reminder, the complete set of expert reviews will be made publicly available. Your review comments will be compiled with those of the other reviewers and individual comments will not be attributed to individual reviewers. In addition, reviewers will be identified for the document as a whole, not by chapter.

B. Additional Items:

1. Please complete the attached conflict of interest form. This includes attaching a copy of your curriculum vitae. For your information, this form is derived from the U.S. National Academy of Sciences Policy on Conflict of Interest and it applies only to the time during which you will be reviewing this document.
2. Because your identity and credentials as a reviewer will be made publicly available, we ask that you enclose a short biographical paragraph citing your credentials qualifying you as a reviewer of this report; this will ensure that the paragraph appears according to your preferences. An example biographical paragraph is included below for your reference. Please submit your short biographical paragraph and the review electronically to Joan Fitzpatrick (jfitz@usgs.gov) no later than *May 26*. Please fax your completed and signed conflict of interest form to my attention at 303-236-5349 or mail it to the following address:

Joan Fitzpatrick
USGS, MS-980
Box 25046, DFC
Denver, CO 80225

Thank you, again, for your participation in this peer review.

Sample short biographical paragraph:

Sample Bio

Dr. John Doe
Professor
State University
3010 University Hall
Anytown, USA 01234
E-mail: john.doe@state.edu

(515) 123-4567 Phone
(515) 123-4567 Fax

Dr. Doe received his B.A. degree in Physics and Mathematics from Luther College in 1968 and his Ph.D. in Solid State Physics from the State University in 1973. He is Professor of Atmospheric Science in the Department of Geological and Atmospheric Sciences and Professor of Agricultural Meteorology in the Department of Agronomy at State University. His research involves regional climate modeling with emphasis on plant-soil-atmosphere interactions. He has approximately 150 publications and conference presentations relating to atmospheric modeling and measurements at the regional and micro-scale. He is co-director of the Project to Intercompare Model Simulations (PIMS), an international consortium of modelers seeking to advance the quality of regional modeling, and chair of the Working Group of the Water Modelers Panel of the International Climate Research Organization, which promotes regional climate modeling for the purpose of better understanding water and energy cycles.