Peer Review Summary Document

(05/20/2013)

Peer Review Plan

http://www.usgs.gov/peer_review/docs/lakes_muskingum_river_watershed_ohio.pdf [16.4 KB PDF].

Title and Authorship of Information Product Disseminated

An Analysis of Potential Water Availability from the Atwood, Leesville, and Tappan Lakes in the Muskingum River Watershed, Ohio, by G.F. Koltun.

Peer Reviewers Expertise and Credentials

Peer Reviewer #1 – Ph.D. in civil engineering from the University of Indiana. Postdoctoral scholar at Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution. U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) Hydrologist since 2008. Areas of interest include environmental fluid mechanics, integrated synoptic surveying of lakes and reservoirs for bathymetry and spatial distributions of velocity and water-quality, contaminant tracking, and hydroacoustics.

Peer Reviewer #2 – M.S .in geology from Michigan State University, B.S. in statistics from Virginia Tech. Hydrologist, working for the USGS since 1992. Areas of interest include water use, streamflow modeling and estimation, groundwater modeling (including simulation-optimization modeling), and groundwater/surface water interaction.

Charge Submitted to Peer Reviewers

The reviewers were asked to make an objective evaluation of the research.

Summary of Peer Reviewers Comments

Reviewer #1 Comments:

1. The abstract is long and reads, at times, like a methods section. Suggest shortening it and simplifying terminology.
2. While the results and discussion section includes conclusions, perhaps the conclusions can be summarized in a separate section.
3. The report could benefit from a section that includes all the definitions and terminology used in the analysis.
4. If any comparison of the outflow data from the USGS streamgages and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers estimates from rating has been completed, it should be briefly summarized in this report.
5. There are a few paragraphs in the results section that I had to read several times to understand. While they may simply be difficult concepts to convey to the reader, perhaps they could be improved.

Reviewer #2 Comments:

1. The abstract is too detailed and the terminology is a little confusing without having read definitions in the report.
2. The color coding in figures 12-15 is very helpful in highlighting differences and trends in the data. Using this in a couple other tables would make the differences and trends more apparent.

Summary of USGS Response to Peer Reviewer Comments

Responses to Reviewer #1 Comments:

1. The abstract was shortened and terminology simplified.
2. The intent was to present the results of the various withdrawal and flow-by scenarios in an understandable fashion and point out and/or explain certain trends. This was conveyed in the results and discussion section. Conclusions about how much water should be withdrawn and when it would be best to withdraw it are left to the reader.
3. A glossary was added so that the reader can quickly look up the terms.
4. A paragraph was added that discusses a comparison of the concurrent data.
5. The indicated paragraphs were revised to make them simpler and clearer.

Responses to Reviewer #2 Comments:

1. The abstract was shortened and terminology simplified.
2. Tables 12-15 are the only tables that show differences from base conditions and therefore are the only tables for which this type of color coding is both meaningful and relatively simple to grasp. All other tables present basic data or statistics.

The Dissemination

The published information product will be released in a USGS Scientific Investigations Report publication series and will be available at http://pubs.er.usgs.gov/.