

This Water Resources Division (WRD) manuscript routing sheet consists of **three parts**. Part one, on the front of the routing sheet, is a form for listing steps in the manuscript review and approval process. The back of the routing sheet consists of two checklists--one for colleague reviewers, the other for authors and supervisors. * **The checklists must be completed and signed or initialed in the spaces provided. Failure to complete the checklists will result in a return of the manuscript by Region or Headquarters.** All entries (except initials and signatures) must be printed or typed, and all entries must be made with black or dark-blue ink.

AUTHOR(S) LAST NAME FIRST, FIRST NAME (SPELLED OUT), MIDDLE INITIAL		WRD NO. (ASSIGNED BY HEADQUARTERS)	
		PROJ. CODE (ex. VA099)	Project-funding end date
TITLE		PRINCIPAL DISCIPLINE(S):	
		<input type="checkbox"/> GW <input type="checkbox"/> SW <input type="checkbox"/> WQ <input type="checkbox"/> Multi-discipline <input type="checkbox"/> Other	
Publication Contents <input type="checkbox"/> INTERPRETIVE <input type="checkbox"/> NONINTERPRETIVE	TYPE OF PUBLICATION <input type="checkbox"/> ABSTRACT <input type="checkbox"/> PROCEEDINGS <input type="checkbox"/> JOURNAL <input type="checkbox"/> REPORT <input type="checkbox"/> OTHER		DOES REPORT CONTAIN GEOLOGIC NAMES <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO
PUBLICATION SERIES/OUTLET		NO. ILLUSTRATIONS	NO. TABLES
COOPERATOR(S)		TOTAL NO. PAGES	NO. TABLE PAGES

	FULL NAME (Print or type)	DATE IN	DATE OUT	TOPICS REVIEWED	NO. HRS SPENT	STEP COMPLETED										ENTER NEXT ROUTING HERE (Print or type)
						AUTHOR	EDITORIAL REVIEWER	TECHNICAL REVIEWER	DIST/SECT/ PROJ CHIEF	REGIONAL HYDROL	GEOLOGIC NAMES	ADDITIONAL EVALUATION	BR. SCI PUBS	SIM	DIRECTOR	
1																
2																
3																
4																
5																
6																
7																
8																
9																
10																
11																
12																
13																
14																
15																
16																
17																
18																
19																
20																
21																

CHECKLIST TO BE COMPLETED BY TECHNICAL REVIEWERS

A thorough and competent review is essential for maintaining the technical quality of Water Resources Division reports. The purpose of the review is to give a technical evaluation that will improve the report and eliminate errors that may lead to embarrassment of the author and the Division. At least two technical reviews are mandatory for all interpretive reports. Some multidisciplinary reports require more than two reviews. Whenever possible, the reviewers should be selected on the basis of special knowledge or interest in the subject material of the report. At least one technical reviewer should be outside the District or Research Project office. **Please evaluate each report attribute or component listed below by assigning an A for acceptable or a U for unacceptable.**

Reviewers		Reviewers	
1 2 3 4		1 2 3 4	
— — — —	<i>Technical correctness</i> --The report's interpretations are valid. The conclusions are properly supported by correctly interpreted data. All computations are correct. Assumptions are reasonable and clearly stated.	— — — —	Report components --continued
— — — —	<i>Readability</i> --The report is written for the intended audience and with correct grammar, syntax, and a minimum of scientific jargon. Illustrations and tables are legible and readily understandable.	— — — —	<i>Abstract</i> --The abstract states the purpose of the report. It is informative for interpretive reports. It describes the study and summarizes pertinent results and conclusions.
— — — —	<i>Policy</i> --The report is free of statements that violate USGS policies on objectivity, impartiality, advocacy, competition with the private sector, and criticism of work by others.	— — — —	<i>Methods</i> --Appropriate techniques were used in the study. New methods are described.
— — — —	<i>Verification</i> --Values given in abstract, body of report, summary, and (or) conclusions, figures, and tables agree.	— — — —	<i>Body of manuscript</i> --The body is organized and presented in a logical sequence. The author provides enough evidence to justify the interpretations.
— — — —	Report components --	— — — —	<i>Illustrations and tables</i> --Illustrations and tables are necessary and present basic information clearly, emphasize relations, and are interpreted and referred to in the text. They are completely self explanatory and are understandable without referring to the text.
— — — —	<i>Title</i> --The title is explicit and reflects the main sections of the report as given in the CONTENTS and in the Purpose and Scope of the report.	— — — —	<i>Conclusions or results</i> --The conclusions present the principal findings of the study and answer each of the objectives described in the introduction. They are sound and properly documented. They are free of information that was not discussed in the body of the report.
— — — —	<i>Introduction</i> --The introduction clearly describes the problem(s) addressed by the report, states the purpose and scope of the report, presents pertinent background information, and acknowledges significant help.	— — — —	<i>References</i> --All citations in the manuscript are listed. All references are in the proper format of the intended publication. Pertinent references were not omitted in preparing the report.
Reviewers' Initials/Date <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between; margin-top: 5px;"> 1 _____ 2 _____ 3 _____ 4 _____ </div>			

CHECKLIST TO BE COMPLETED BY AUTHOR AND SUPERVISOR* BEFORE REPORT IS SUBMITTED FOR APPROVAL

Author's Initials/Date	
_____	Report title, major heading(s) in table of contents, purpose and scope, and summary/conclusions are in agreement.
_____	The abstract is informative (for interpretive reports) and presents report's findings in order of decreasing importance.
_____	The purpose and scope describes the objectives of the <u>report</u> and the extent to which the information is presented.
_____	Illustrations for USGS reports were prepared in accordance with guidelines given in Standards for Illustrations in Reports of the Water Resources Division, U.S. Geological Survey.
_____	Report meets project goals as defined in the project proposal.
_____	Report is technically and editorially correct.
_____	Author has responded, in writing, to colleague reviewers' comments.
_____	The report was given a thorough verification review--
_____	All abbreviated units of measurement, water-quality units, and the like are defined in the conversion table (or in the text where first used, depending on publication outlet).
_____	All acronyms are defined in the conversion table or in the text where first used. Acronyms follow the spelled-out form.
_____	Data points and distances between data points along traces of sections on maps match those in sections. Altitudes of land-surface and subsurface data, such as potentiometric surfaces, match in section and along map trace.
_____	All citations in text, tables, and illustrations of published or in-press writings are included in the reference list in proper USGS style (or in publisher's preferred style).
_____	All information/values given in abstract, summary, body of report, tables, and illustrations are in agreement.
_____	Manuscript package is complete, including--
_____	All review copies with author's responses.
_____	Letter of concurrence or memorandum of understanding that gives the USGS or an outside publisher permission to publish the results of studies funded by another Federal agency.
_____	Written permission from the <u>original</u> copyright holder to use a copyrighted illustration, table, or section of text.
_____	Manuscript routing sheet that is filled out correctly and completely.
_____	_____ <i>Signature of Supervisor*</i>

REASON(S) FOR NOT CHECKING REPORT COMPONENT OR ATTRIBUTE

REVIEWERS

Initials/Date

AUTHORS AND SUPERVISORS

*Section Chief, Project Chief, or other supervisor, as appropriate. Signature of Report Specialist also is acceptable.