# Editing Notes

1. Randy should also have the same footnote as you. Notice also that I made some minor changes to the USGS footnote text.
2. Spell out here. You haven’t defined the abbreviation yet.
3. I’m familiar with what the “bleeding edge” means, but it seems a bit over the top to use this jargon here, given that your readership may be broader than you expect.
4. We need to figure out how to code for proper em dashes. But, not knowing how at this point, let’s let the double hyphens stand as placeholders.
5. The word “provide” has been showing up a lot, nearing the point of overuse. I’ll try to find alternatives that are more apt (not just different words for the sake of difference).
6. Sorry. I can’t quite make sense of this sentence, and I don’t know how to fix it.
7. I thought that “important” could be axed because you certainly wouldn’t have acknowledged the support of unimportant entities. Otherwise, I tweaked the language to make it sound a bit less stuffy. Although the acknowledgments section used to be the last element of the introduction, current practice is to put the section right before the references or in the front matter of the report; the latter actually seems to be the more appropriate setting for your section.
8. You’ll have noticed by now that I’ve been deleting the hyphen in “soft-knowledge” where the term is used as a noun. Terms like this tend to be hyphenated in British English but not in American English.
9. I’m used to seeing “kriging” as lowercase more often than not. If you have a compelling reason for going with “Kriging,” then let it stand. Otherwise, search the document and replace with the lowercase form.
10. Figures 2 and 3, because they’re on the same page, clash in terms of type size. It would be nice if the type could be made to match. See more about this and related issues in the main transmittal memo.
11. Fun fact: The name was originally all caps in FORTRAN 77, but it went to mixed case with Fortran 90 and has been that way ever since.
12. USGS style is to *not* superscript the “th” in an ordinal number; also, the “th” should be straight type, not italic.
13. You use both “line search” and “linesearch” in the report. I suspect that the one-word form refers to the command and the two-word form to the operation in general, but I’m not sure these distinctions are made consistently. Please search for and examine each instance—shouldn’t take too long to do this.
14. In just this section, the font for the names PEST and bgaPEST is not the normal font but the one used for listing commands in the text. Please fix this.
15. Is some of this really a direct quote? If so, use a block indent to clearly indicate the quoted matter and distinguish it from your own writing. I suspected the paragraph starting with “The first line of a matrix file . . .” might be quoted, so I didn’t edit it.
16. “Whether” implies the “or not.” Inclusion of “or not” is common in casual speech, but it’s unnecessary in writing.
17. Can you insert “The designation” or some other appropriate spacer words to avoid the visually difficult “horiz\_ratio. p\_max”?
18. It would be better to say “In cases where spacing of [whatever] is constant . . . ,” but I’m not sure what the “whatever” would be here.
19. “In this work” is vague here. Do you mean “With regard to bgaPEST”? If not, see whether you can come up with a more specific introductory phrase.
20. The prevailing USGS convention in surface-water hydraulics is to express Manning’s roughness coefficient as dimensionless. Getting the units straight in formulas incorporating Manning’s *n* is typically taken care of by a conversion factor. I had a bit of difficulty deleting the units here, so please take care of that.
21. “Streamflow/flow” and “discharge” are equivalent in this example, so it would be best not to mix the terminology.