

Panel Scientific and Technical Review Form
(Note: Review comments will be anonymous, but public.)

Proposal number: 2001-K210

Short Proposal Title: Health monitoring of juvenile chinook

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

No – proposal lacks stated hypothesis, and connection between study results and management.

Panel Summary:

No hypothesis explicitly stated; general objectives given.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: Supporting rationale given but no explicit model given.

Reviewer: Yes. Objectives clearly stated etc.

Panel Summary:

No. There is no conceptual model given. Underlying basis must be inferred.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: In absence of clear description of how data will be analyzed, utility to management questionable.

Reviewer: Field methodologies etc. well planned.

Reviewer: Sample sizes are those recommended by AFS, and are adequate. Needs more explanation of how some lab work will be done.

Panel Summary:

Yes and no. As a pilot exercise to explore the physiological variation among groups of juvenile salmon, this project will clearly succeed. However, the suitability of this approach as a means of resolving rigorous hypotheses regarding the distribution of parasites etc. among hatchery and natural fishes cannot be evaluated on the basis of the sketchy information provided.

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: Unclear. As described, this is a monitoring project.

Panel Summary:

No. The proposal does not clearly justify itself, in part because of its excessive brevity.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes – information should be used by managers in evaluating the health status of the fall-run Chinook population.

Panel Summary:

Yes. See reviewer's comment above. Some of the other reviewer comments seem off the mark.

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes – focused on monitoring and evaluation of pathogen presence and physiological status of natural and hatchery populations.

Panel Summary:

No. How data will be analyzed is not clearly described.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Details on analysis of data are absent.

Panel Summary:

Not particularly well-described; really lacking plans for data analysis and hypothesis testing.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

5)Other comments

Reviewer: Very Good

Reviewer: Excellent

Reviewer: Very Good

Reviewer: Well justified.

Proposal's greatest weakness is its brevity and lack of detail. The proposal would have more strength if it were based on a stated hypothesis and accompanied by a description of the necessary analysis enabling the fulfillment of its loosely stated objectives.

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

A quantitative assessment of incidence of disease is desirable independent of whether additional information can be developed. Proposal does not score well in categories on this form, but collecting the data would valuable anyway.

Summary Rating

Excellent

Very Good

Good

Fair

Poor

Your Rating: VERY GOOD (proposal appears to have high "bang for buck")