

RAPID Data Entry Form

1. Research Project ID (ex. RP.FY2x.xxx)
2. Primary Research Area Product (ex. SSWR.403.1.1)

Sub-product is in RAPID

Sub-product is not in RAPID

This subproduct is not related to a StRAP Task

Select Non-RAP Category

Does this non-RAP Sub-Product relate to any of the National Research Programs

Yes No If Yes, select related program

3. Subproduct is:

Required – Sub-Product is essential to meet the needs/request of the customer and will be delivered to the customer as part of the final Product.

Optional - Sub-Product is non-essential to meet the needs of the customer, but is associated with the Product. It will not be delivered as part of the final product, but may be shared with the customer separately. Examples include presentations at a conference regarding the Product or additional publications resulting from the research but not required to meet the customer's needs.

4. Sub-Product Title
5. Subproduct Lead
6. Abstract

7. Sub-Product Type and Subtype

If "Other", describe

8. QAPP ID

9. Authors (In the order that they are listed) external authors **REQUIRE** both an organization and email address

10. Impact / Purpose Statement *(should provide language that will resonate with the reader, be a one paragraph, high-level, common language description of 1) the environmental or health problem addressed by the study, 2) a general description of the work and results, 3) the long term importance or significance of the findings, and 4) who would be interested in or could apply the results (e.g. program or regional partners, general public, local communities).*

11. Science Inventory Access EPA Only Public

12. Does your product include material copyrighted by someone else? Yes No

If **Yes**, attach permission (required).

13. Does this sub-product have data associated with it? **(N/A to abstracts/posters/presentations)**

Yes, EPA Data

Yes, Non-EPA Data

Yes, Both EPA and Non-EPA Data

No

14. Data Description **(N/A to abstracts/posters/presentations)**

Primary / secondary data “owned” by EPA through in-house or EPA funded efforts

Work conducted prior to EPA employment

Model use / test data

Review, editorial or opinion

Publicly available data used to inform / develop the product

15. Does the data contain PII/CBI? **(N/A to abstracts/posters/presentations)**

Yes

No

16. Keywords (separate by commas, minimum of 4 required)

17. Citation Information

Abstracts/Posters/Presentations

Name of Meeting

Location (Country, State, City)

Start Date

End Date

Journal Articles

Journal Name

18. Is this an abstract/poster/presentation

Yes - **stop here no additional information required.**

No – please answer questions 19 - 31.

SDMP - Information is required for all peer-reviewed Journal articles with primary/secondary data "owned" by EPA through in-house or EPA-funded efforts.

19. Explain the type of metadata you have used to describe and organize your datasets. Include information on how the datasets you will upload to ScienceHub connect with the metadata. *Examples: You have uploaded a data dictionary separately from the datasets. You have provided metadata in the dataset files.*
20. Where do you maintain the records related to your research effort (i.e., the study file as required in agency records schedules)? This can include electronic or paper files. (ex. c:/one drive/data/samples)
21. If different from your study file location, where do you plan to maintain the final datasets that underlie your publication? Please list locations you use or will use in addition to ScienceHub. You do not need to list ScienceHub. *Examples: ORD network drives, digital storage media, websites, any locations potentially accessible to EPA staff. (ex: c:/one drive/data/samples)*
22. Current/Future Value of Data: Some types of data, such as trend data, historical data, and national survey data, can be reused by other researchers to conduct different analyses. Are your data unique? What is the potential for reuse? Who is likely to use your data in the future? Include information on known users and potential users beyond your team.
23. Public Accessibility: To make your datasets accessible to the public, have you used, or do you plan to use venues other than or in addition to ScienceHub? If yes, list and describe the location(s). *Examples: website, open-access journal, discipline-specific repository.*

Metadata - Information is required for all peer reviewed Journal Articles except those articles that are Review, Editorial or Opinion; Model use/test data or work conducted prior to EPA employment

24. Dataset Title:
25. Yes No This dataset was developed in collaboration with one or more non-federal organizations.
 IF YES, list of non-federal organizations that you collaborated with and **describe their role in this dataset.**

26. Data Description (Lets users get an idea of what your dataset is before accessing it)

27. Additional Keywords:

28. Date the dataset last updated (mm/dd/yyyy):

29. Data Dictionary (defines the fields or column headings for the data also known as a variable list)

Provided in the sources Attached Located at:

30. Additional documents (such as code, graphs, lab notebook pages, etc.)

N/A Attached Located at:

31. If additional documents are added, make them publicly accessible Yes No

Required Attachments

- EPA Form 363 – Technical Manuscript Review Form (Required for all products as listed below)

Sub-Product Type

Abstract, Poster, Presentation, Technical Newsletter, Extended Abstract
Journal Articles, Books, Book Chapters, Reports

of Reviews/Type

1 – Internal
2 – Both can be Internal

- Original version of the subproduct, pre-technical review – Required for all Sub-Products except abstracts.
- Marked up version of the subproduct, post-technical review/response to comments – Required for all subproducts except abstracts.
- Final version of the subproduct, ready for management review – Required for all subproducts.
- **Items requiring external peer review other than journal articles, books and book chapters (ex. Reports and Guidance and Scientific, Data, Software, and Models) require a completed/signed WECD Subproduct External Peer Review Plan (page 6 of this document)**

File Naming Convention

1. WECD contact author's name,
2. what [original, track, clean, if different],
3. where,
4. part of title or key word(s), and
5. date.

Example: Smith Abstract SOT SLC PFAS review 20240305

WECD Subproduct External Peer Review Plan

Title of Product

Principle Investigator

Subproduct Type/Sub Type

Audience (will this be delivered to a Program Office/outside group)

Peer Review Mechanism and Rationale (definitions see page 2 and 3)

Internal - EPA Review (must be outside of ORD (e.g. Program or Regional contact)

External – Letter Review (Organized by Clearing Author)

External – Letter Review (Organized by Agency Peer Review Contract)

External – Federal Advisory Committee Panel (SAB/CASAC/CAAC)

External – Panel Review (Organized by Clearing Author)

External - Panel Review (Organized by Agency Peer Review Contract)

Beta Test/Usability Review (internal/external)

No External Peer Review (Rationale required below)

RATIONALE

Project Lead (Recommended)

Branch Supervisor (Concurrence)

Division Director (Approval)

Product Type	Subproduct Type	Suggested External to EPA Peer Review Method
Reports and Guidance	Paper in Non-EPA Proceedings	Letter, panel or editor review (All papers)
	Extramural Document	Letter, panel or editor review (All papers)
	Handbook	Letter or panel review, contact you Peer Review Coordinator
	Manual	
	Methods	
	Report	
	Summary	
	Internal Report or Unpublished reports	
Scientific, Data, Software, and Models	Downloadable Application	Letter or Beta Test
	Database	
	Dataset (external)	
	Dataset (internal)	Generally, not peer reviewed
	Conceptual Model/Formula	Letter or Panel review
	Web-based Application	Letter or Beta Test
	Raw Code/Code Package	N/A
	Mobile Application (3rd party)	Letter, Beta Test or 3rd party review

DEFINITIONS

The peer review approach should match the importance and complexity of the Sub-Product.

Internal - EPA Review (must be outside of ORD (e.g., Program or Regional contact))

Review conducted by an EPA expert who is not in ORD – e.g., by a Program Office or Regional contact. Since this is a review internal to EPA, an EPA-363 form can be used to summarize the review. But there must also be some documentation of the reviewer's comments and the of the PI's response to the reviews as well. **Note:** this type of review will not be considered External Peer Review, as we are not going outside of the Agency for the review. Still, it may be an appropriate approach depending on the Sub-Product's audience. A justification for why this method is being used should be included on the form.

External – Letter Review (Organized by Clearing Author)

A letter review is a written review of a product by independent experts focused on addressing the issues presented in the peer review charge. Each reviewer evaluates the product independently without consultation with other reviewers. This letter review is organized by WECD. The division POC, with assistance from the Clearing Author's supervisor and the Peer Review Coordinator as needed, selects a group of experts in the field related to the SubProduct. The number of peer reviewers will depend on the Sub-Product and will be determined during the peer review plan process – before clearance. The Division POC will be responsible for contacting the peer reviewers and collecting the reviews. The Clearing Author will respond to the reviewers' comments and make any needed updates to the Sub-Product.

External – Letter Review (Organized by Agency Peer Review Contract)

A letter review is a written review of a product by independent experts focused on addressing the issues presented in the peer review charge. Each reviewer evaluates the product independently without consultation with other reviewers. This letter review is organized by an outside contractor. WECD uses the ORD Peer Review Contract to run a letter review. A PR is created with a Statement of Work to specify what is needed in the Peer Review. The contractor finds the peer reviewers and organizes the reviews. The number of peer reviewers will depend on the Sub-Product and will be determined during the peer review plan process. The contractor will deliver the peer review documents to the division POC. The Clearing Author will respond to the reviewers' comments and make any needed updates to the Sub-Product.

External – Federal Advisory Committee Panel (SAB/CASAC/CAAC)

EPA has a number of scientific and technical advisory committees composed of non-EPA experts who provide advice and peer review to the Agency. All materials presented to and prepared for or by the committees are available to the public, and the public must be given an opportunity to present their views or provide written comments. The scope of work of each advisory committee is set out

in its charter, a formal document filed with Congress when the committee is established and renewed every 2 years. Reviews conducted by these groups are organized by a Designated Federal Officer who determines the method of the peer review and organizes the review. This process requires more time and resources and is usually only used for HISA/ISI subproducts.

External – Panel Review (Organized by Clearing Author)

A panel review is a review performed by two or more independent experts in consultation with each other and in response to the issues presented in the peer review charge. Group discussion occurs during a face-to-face meeting or via email or teleconference. Comments are provided individually or in a single report which may contain consensus advice. This panel review is organized by WECD. The division POC, with assistance from the Clearing Author's supervisor and the Peer Review Coordinator as needed, selects a group of experts in the field related to the SubProduct. The number of peer reviewers will depend on the Sub-Product and will be determined during the peer review plan process – before clearance. The Division POC will organize the meeting and collect the documentation of review. After the meeting, the clearing author will respond to the reviewers' comments and make any needed updates to the Sub-Product.

External - Panel Review (Organized by Agency Peer Review Contract)

A panel review is a review performed by two or more independent experts in consultation with each other and in response to the issues presented in the peer review charge. Group discussion occurs during a face-to-face meeting or via email or teleconference. Comments are provided individually or in a single report which may contain consensus advice. This panel review is organized by an outside contractor. WECD uses the ORD Peer Review Contract to run the panel review. The contractor finds the peer reviewers and organizes meeting of reviewers, the contractor will deliver the reviews to the Clearing Author. Clearing Author will respond to the reviewers' comments and make any needed updates to the Sub-Product.

Beta Test/Usability Review (internal/external)

Generally used for software, apps and related Sub-Products. A Beta/Usability test is a trial of a Sub-Product in the final stages of its development, to uncover any bugs or issues before general release. The Clearing Author will develop charge questions that enable each reviewer to understand what they should review and how. The reviewers will test the software/app to make sure everything is working. If the Sub-Product is going to be public facing, the beta testers should be from outside of the EPA (external). If the Sub-Product is internal, the beta testers can be EPA employees (internal).

No External Peer Review (Rationale required below)

External Peer Review is required for all Sub-Products being released to the public. There are situations where a particular Sub-Product may be exempt from peer review. For example, if this is a software update for an application that was already peer reviewed. Waiver of peer review must be justified and approved by management. This form will document that waiver and approval.