|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **CRU Reviewer Nomination and Appointment Form** | | **USGS IPDS No.** |  | |
| Manuscript or Product Title: | | Evaluation of shoreline rotenone application to control Largemouth Bass recruitment in small impoundments | | |
| Intended Outlet | | Fishes | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **First USGS Appointed Reviewer (required)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Name: | Wray Gabel | Title: | Wildlife Biologist | Affiliation: | Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission | | | | |
| Qualifications of Reviewer (why nominated): | | Expert in ecology and density-dependent effects, with multiple peer-reviewed publicaitons focused on mixed-effects ecological hypotheses, which this paper revolves around. | | | | | | | |
| 1. Does the reviewer have a stake in the outcome of the review? (a direct user of the information?) 2. Has the reviewer helped or been associated with the project or product? (e.g., provided funding , technical assistance, etc.) 3. Is the reviewer a first line employee or supervisor of one of the authors? 4. Is the reviewer a student for which any of the authors serve on the student’s graduate committee? 5. Is there any reason that this potential reviewer might not be considered an independent, outside reviewer of the product?   *If you answered yes to any question above, please explain:* | | | | | | Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes |  | No  No  No  No  No |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Second USGS Appointed Reviewer (not required for peer reviewed manuscripts unless requested by your supervisor)** | | | | | | | | | |
| Name: |  | Title: |  | Affiliation: |  | | | | |
| Qualifications of Reviewer (why nominated): | |  | | | | | | | |
| 1. Does the reviewer have a stake in the outcome of the review? (a direct user of the information?) 2. Has the reviewer helped or been associated with the project or product? (e.g., provided funding , technical assistance, etc.) 3. Is the reviewer a first line employee or supervisor of one of the authors? 4. Is the reviewer a student for which any of the authors serve on the student’s graduate committee? 5. Is there any reason that this potential reviewer might not be considered an independent, outside reviewer of the product?   *If you answered yes to any question above, please explain:* | | | | | | Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes  Yes |  | No  No  No  No  No |  |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

Based on the above information provided by the authors, I appoint the above named persons as credible and appropriate reviewers for this manuscript/product as per SM 502.3.6. I see no conflicts of interest between the selected reviewers and the project and/or its authors.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Signature and Title** |  | Date: |  |