

**Supplement to Cal/EPA External Scientific Peer Review Guidelines –  
Cal/EPA Interagency Agreement with University of California  
Gerald W. Bowes, Ph.D.**

January 7, 2009

**Guidance to Staff:**

1. Revisions. If you have revised any part of the initial request, please stamp "Revised" on each page where a change has been made, and the date of the change. Clearly describe the revision in the cover letter to reviewers, which transmits the material to be reviewed. The approved reviewers have seen your original request letter and attachments during the solicitation process, and must be made aware of changes.
2. Documents requiring review. All important scientific underpinnings of a proposed science-based rule must be submitted for external peer review. The underpinnings would include all publications (including conference proceedings), reports, and raw data upon which the proposal is based. If there is a question about the value of a particular document, or parts of a document, I should be contacted.
3. Documents not requiring review. The Cal/EPA External Peer Review Guidelines note that there are circumstances where external peer review of supporting scientific documents is not required. An example would be "A particular work product that has been peer reviewed with a known record by a recognized expert or expert body." I would treat this allowance with caution. If you have any doubt about the quality of such external review, or of the reviewers' independence and objectivity, that work product - which could be a component of the proposal - should be provided to the reviewers.
4. Implementation review. Publications which have a solid peer review record, such as a US EPA Criteria document, do not always include an implementation strategy. The Cal/EPA Guidelines require that the implementation of the scientific components of a proposal, or other initiative, must be submitted for external review.
5. Identity of external reviewers. External reviewers should not be informed about the identity of other external reviewers. Our goal has always been to solicit truly independent comments from each reviewer. Allowing the reviewers to know the identity of others sets up the potential for discussions between them that could devalue the independence of the reviews.
6. Panel Formation. Formation of reviewer panels is not appropriate. Panels can take on the appearance of scientific advisory committees and the external reviewers identified through the Cal/EPA process are not to be used as scientific advisors.
7. Conference calls with reviewers. Conference calls with one or more reviewers can be interpreted as seeking collaborative scientific input instead of critical review. Conference calls with reviewers are not allowed.

**Guidance to Reviewers from Staff:**

1. Discussion of review.

Reviewers are not allowed to discuss the proposal with individuals who participated in development of the proposal. These individuals are listed in Attachment 3 of the review request.

Discussions between staff and reviewers are not permitted. Reviewers may request clarification of certain aspects of the review process or the documents sent to them.

Clarification questions and responses must be in writing. Clarification questions about reviewers' comments by staff and others affiliated with the organization requesting the review, and the responses to them, also must be in writing. These communications will become part of the administrative record.

The organization requesting independent review should be careful that organization reviewer communications do not become collaboration, or are perceived by others to have become so. The reviewers are not technical advisors. As such, they would be considered participants in the development of the proposal, and would not be considered by the University of California as external reviewers for future revisions of this or related proposals. The statute requiring external review of science-based rules proposed by Cal/EPA organizations prohibits participants serving as peer reviewers.

2. Disclosure of reviewer identity and release of review comments.

Confidentiality begins at the point a potential candidate is contacted by the University of California. Candidates who agree to complete the conflict of interest disclosure form should keep this matter confidential, and should not inform others about their possible role as reviewer.

Reviewer identity may be kept confidential until review comments are received by the organization that requested the review. After the comments are received, reviewer identity and comments must be made available to anyone requesting them.

Reviewers are under no obligation to disclose their identity to anyone enquiring. It is recommended reviewers keep their role confidential until after their reviews have been submitted.

3. Requests to reviewers by third parties to discuss comments

After they have submitted their reviews, reviewers may be approached by third parties representing special interests, the press, or by colleagues. Reviewers are under no obligation to discuss their comments with them, and we recommend that they do not.

All outside parties are provided an opportunity to address a proposed regulatory action during the public comment period and at the Cal/EPA organization meeting where the

proposal is considered for adoption. Discussions outside these provided avenues for comment could seriously impede the orderly process for vetting the proposal under consideration.

4. Reviewer contact information.

The reviewer's name and professional affiliation should accompany each review. Home address and other personal contact information are considered confidential and should not be part of the comment submittal.