

Charge to Peer Reviewers

Peer Review of NOAA Arctic Report Card

1. At the Report Card workshop in May, it was agreed that since the Report Card is not a research publication, reviewers will be asked to focus on content, completeness of coverage and avoidance of bias, clarity and ease of use, selection of key points, and qualification of authors.

2. The Arctic Report Card is similar to 'The State of the Climate Report' of the Bulletin of the Meteorological Society of America (BAMS). It offers the following guidance (slightly modified to apply to the Arctic Report Card) to its reviewers:

Analyses contained in the report are restricted to previously peer-reviewed and widely accepted methods, data sets, and monitoring techniques. The data may be updated and treated with techniques already published or simple, widely used statistical analysis (e.g. creating anomalies etc). The report is not a venue for new types of analyses or research results. Sections within each chapter are tightly focused and summaries are relatively brief. In total, the peer review of this report is not expected to be time consuming or difficult.

You, along with several other peer review authors, were selected based on your expertise, specialty, and ability to conduct the review, which should be restricted to the following:

- . identify errors in the author's summary of conditions in 2010,
- . identify errors in the historical context with which the conditions have been described,
- . identify important points that may have been omitted, and
- . identify any assertions of environmental state, dynamics and data that do not reasonably appear to be founded upon previously peer-reviewed or widely-accepted methods, data sets, and monitoring techniques.

3. Please note that although each reviewer will have his/her own particular domain expertise, it would be ideal if all reviewers reviewed the entire Report Card. We would hope that reviewers will take a holistic view, appreciating the Arctic as a system, and will offer comments, where, appropriate, on connecting the essays via cross-references that the authors might have missed.