0025859

 From:
 Anne-Berry Wade

 To:
 Sandy Semans

 Bcc:
 Mike Murray

Subject: Re: More press questions on the Cape Hatteras peer review document

Date: 03/31/2010 03:53 PM

Sandy,

I apologize for the slight delay. My responses to your questions and comments are below in red.

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

▼ Sandy Semans ---03/26/2010 04:15:44 PM---Could you please tell me who the Pea Island managers and biologists were who are listed in the ack

From: Sandy Semans <editor@obsentinel.com>
To: Anne-Berry Wade <abwade@usgs.gov>

Cc: IRENE C NOLAN <irenen@mindspring.com>, Joshua Bowlen <joshua.bowlen@mail.house.gov>,

Kendra Barkoff < Kendra_Barkoff@ios.doi.gov >

Date: 03/26/2010 04:15 PM

Subject: press question

Could you please tell me who the Pea Island managers and biologists were who are listed in the acknowledgments? I understand from Irene that she was told that those listed in the acknowledgments were the peer reviewers and so would like their names as has been provided for the others. The USGS was never given the individual names of the Pea Island employees who reviewed the manuscript. Here's why: The USGS sent our manuscript to the Pea Island Refuge and asked them to review the manuscript. Several biologists reviewed the manuscript and their comments were consolidated together and given back to the USGS collectively, rather than individually.

I do want to point out that usually peer reviewer names are not provided to the public, but for this report their assistance in the review was openly acknowledged.

My understanding thus far from Irene and other sources is that the original document did not go through the formal USGS peer review process and its guidelines, but instead, was reviewed by some scientists at the request of the authors themselves. I think you're aware now that the original document DID get peer reviewed. But, let me further explain that it is not uncommon for authors of manuscripts to identify peer reviewers. This is because they know who the technical and scientific experts are in their field. In many instances, someone that is a peer reviewer may also have themselves published relevant scientific papers which are cited in the manuscript under review.

I also understand that the version released this month, although now considered a USGS publication, also didn't go through the formal USGS peer review process. Is that correct? That is not correct. The original manuscript (Chapters 1 -5) was peer reviewed between April 2005 and Feb. 2006. There were no changes to those chapters between then and now, therefore there was no need to have them peer reviewed again. The introduction in the recently published USGS Open File Report was modified to provide some synthesis of the chapters so it (the introduction) did get a more recent peer review.

A notation in the new document states that there is no new science/ research included in the document as compared with the original but there are some citations for work/communications that have been in the past year to 18 months. Were these just clarifications or additional information? No additional information was added to any of the chapters. In a couple of cases, references which were originally given as "in press" were brought up to date to provide complete referencing information.

There has been controversy around this document for a long time and I'm really puzzled why it has taken three years for anyone to say it was peer reviewed since the question has arisen frequently. Why hasn't anyone spoken up before and explained that the acknowledgments were the list of peer reviewers? It wasn't until just a few weeks ago that the press has asked the USGS about the peer review process for this report and we have responded to those press inquiries as promptly as possible. Also, I believe that on June 12, 2008, the NPS notified all 50+ members of the negotiated rule-making committee of this fact. I would ask that you please verify that statement with the Park for certainty.

Thanks much

Sandy Semans Outer Banks Sentinel