

From: [Anne-Berry Wade](#)
To: irenen@mindspring.com
Bcc: [Mike Murray](#)
Subject: Additional information from USGS
Date: 03/26/2010 12:57 PM

Hello Irene,
As promised, I wanted to provide further explanations to some of your questions and comments in previous emails. Again, my reply is in red.

You asked:

And were at least two of them "qualified scientists who have no stake in the outcome of the review, who are not associated with the work being performed, and who are without conflict of interest," as required by the USGS Peer Review Policy? **The answer remains YES that the peer review for each chapter had at least 2 impartial reviewers and for some chapters there were more than 2 reviewers. Chapter 1, for example had 6 reviewers...one of whom was Walker Golder. He was selected because of his expertise in the biology of piping plovers. He was an employee of Audubon in 2005, and that was not a conflict of interest. Note that the peer review predated the lawsuit filed by Audubon by a couple of years.**

You asked: What comments did they have when they reviewed the protocols and how were the comments addressed? **In 2005 when the USGS prepared the original report for Cape Hatteras National Seashore, there was no mechanism to catalog peer reviewer comments in one central location. It was the USGS policy then and is the policy now that authors address and resolve all peer review comments and modify the manuscript where warranted before supervisory approval for publication is given. Also, as a matter of policy and practice, the USGS does not give peer reviewer comments to the public.**

And your last concern/question: Many of the others listed as peer reviewers, also have work cited in the acknowledgments -- so they peer reviewed their own work?
It's not uncommon for an author to cite a publication for a scientist who later ends up being a peer reviewer. While striving for a strict independence and neutrality of opinions and the avoidance of possible bias in the selection of reviewers, we also want a cross-section of the most knowledgeable scientists who can objectively critique the science contained within a given manuscript. The community of experts is sometimes large and other times smaller depending upon the subject. So, to select a peer reviewer whose work is also cited is not unusual and, in no manner, would this imply that they "peer review their own work"

A.B. Wade
USGS
Eastern Region Communications Chief
703-648-4483 office
703-477-2851 cell

0025812