

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

Proposal number: 2001-K221

**Short Proposal Title: Food resources for
zooplankton**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?

Summary of Reviewers comments:

2 reviewers: Yes.

Reviewer: Yes, but unclear what constitutes “more nutritious” copepod.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: site location may be problematic: there are no sites in the low salinity zone. Unclear what is meant by “integration site”; needs description. Description of tasks lacks detail. Proposal says nothing about dry weight measurements, which will be needed for biomass calculations.

Other reviewer: yes. Good combination of field and lab experiments.

Reviewer: Controls (using known foods instead of seston) should be instituted for feeding experiments.

Panel Summary:

Panel concurs with reviewer’s concern about distribution of sampling sites. Why was Suisun Bay avoided? To evaluate historical changes in copepod distribution, more comprehensive sampling probably a good idea. Panel concurs with comment about instituting controls in feeding experiments.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

Reviewer: Yes, but how system might be managed is another problem.

2 reviewers: yes.

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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

Summary of Reviewers comments:

1 reviewer: see 1b2 for problems with monitoring plan.

1 reviewer: should do more sampling per season to see changes in plankton community.

1 reviewer: "n/a"

Panel Summary:

Yes.

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:

Reviewer: data analysis not as well described as it should be.

Reviewer: Yes, but I'd like to see more about long term storage and disposition of data.

Reviewer: analysis of proteins or amino acids might be useful to characterize seston.

Panel Summary:

Concur with comment about analysis of proteins or amino acids.

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 1: Very good

Reviewer 2: Very good

Reviewer 3: Good

**Overall Evaluation
PANEL SUMMARY COMMENTS**

Panel Comment:

One or more peer-reviewed publications are expected as a result of this study. Panel views this as a high “bang for the buck” project.

Summary Rating

- Excellent
- Very Good
- Good
- Fair
- Poor

Your Rating: VERY GOOD