

MD-DE-D.C. DISTRICT COLLEAGUE REVIEW FORM

Please complete this form and return it to the author through the author's Program Chief.

<u>Author</u>
Name: _____
Program Chief: _____
Report title: _____ _____
Report series: _____
RTS number: _____

<u>Reviewer</u>
Name: _____
Title, affiliation, and location: _____ _____
Date report received: _____
Date report returned: _____
Hours spent on review: _____

*Please answer each of the questions below as follows: **A**, adequate; **MI**, needs minor work; **MA**, needs major work; or **NA**, not applicable. In your colleague review memo, please be sure to elaborate about any aspect of the report you have rated as needing work.*

Introductory elements:	A	MI	MA	NA
Does the title accurately and fully describe the contents of the report?				
Is the title consistent with the first-order headings in the report?				
Does the abstract indicate what problem or question the study addressed?				
Does the abstract provide a complete and accurate overview of the report?				
Does the abstract summarize the major findings of the study?				
Is the abstract informative rather than indicative (for interpretive reports)?				
Does the introduction adequately define the problem addressed by the study?				
Does the introduction establish a need for the study, and for USGS involvement in it?				
Does the introduction include an appropriate statement of cooperation?				
Does the introduction provide the appropriate amount of background information to "set the stage" for the report?				
Does the purpose and scope accurately and fully answer the question, "What will the reader find in this report?"				
Is the description of the study area both adequate and relevant with respect to the purpose of the report?				
Is the discussion of previous work comprehensive and appropriate in length?				

Body of report: Approach and methods	A	MI	MA	NA
Is the approach well documented and technically sound?				
Are the sampling strategy and data-collection methods appropriate and adequately described or referenced?				
Are QA/QC methods appropriate and adequately described?				

Body of report: Results and discussion	A	MI	MA	NA
Do the results clearly address the question(s) posed in the introduction?				
Are all relevant data either presented in the report or adequately referenced?				
Are units of concentration accurate and consistent throughout the report?				

Are the results of QA/QC adequately presented and considered (if not already covered in the Methods section)?				
Has uncertainty been quantified appropriately?				
Were the appropriate statistical analyses performed?				
Are the findings accurately and adequately described?				
Are the basic arguments of the report technically sound?				
Are the results of the study discussed with respect to the results of previous work and other, similar research?				
Are all factors that might have contributed to the results adequately considered?				

Figures and Tables	A	MI	MA	NA
Are all figures and tables necessary and tied appropriately to the text?				
Are all figures and tables clear and easily understood?				
Do all figures and tables convey the intended message?				
Do all figures and tables "stand alone"?				

Summary and Conclusions	A	MI	MA	NA
Does the summary summarize the entire report (not just the results and conclusions), including a brief discussion of its background, and mention the cooperator?				
Is all information in the summary also found in the body of the report?				
Are the conclusions justified by the data?				
Are the conclusions free from speculative statements?				

References	A	MI	MA	NA
Are all data and interpretive statements that are not results of the current study or commonly accepted scientific knowledge attributed appropriately in the text by means of citations?				

Appendixes	A	MI	MA	NA
Is all information in appendixes clearly related to the study but not essential for an understanding of the report and its conclusions?				

Policy Issues	A	MI	MA	NA
Have any homeland security concerns been handled appropriately?				
Does the report refrain from criticizing other agencies or previous work?				
Does the report refrain from making recommendations or appearing to be biased in any way?				

General	A	MI	MA	NA
Is the report technically correct?				
Are the study's propositions, hypotheses, assumptions, and limitations clearly articulated?				
Are new or unusual terms defined?				
Are mathematical expressions clear and well defined?				
Is the report easy to understand and appropriate for the intended audience?				
Has the appropriate report series been selected?				
Is the report logically organized?				
Are the title and contents consistent?				
Are the abstract, purpose and scope, and conclusions consistent and tied together?				
Have the objectives of the report been met?				