

[Developmental & Technical Editing Excerpts — U.S. Dept. of Interior Report]

Reviewer Comments — GAP Protocol

(Reviewer 7 — Mi Ae Lipe-Butterbrodt)

This report on GAP Protocol appears to have a fine start and a good overall framework. The level of detail in the Protocol, especially in the documentation section, is very thorough, and many options and reasons have been well-explained. The report would benefit from some greater layout creativity. Please note the following comments on individual sections:

Introduction Section

- This document delves into Protocol documentation rather quickly, with not as much background on the Protocol itself as might be necessary to give the reader a clear understanding of how the Protocol fits into the grand scheme of GAP Analysis.
- Would suggest expanding to give a general background of the GAP Analysis Program and WISCLAND, and their relationship.
- In your oral presentation during the Upper Midwest GAP Analysis Meeting & Workshop, you explained the parameters of this image processing protocol: developing a classification system and procedure applicable over very large areas (such as a tristate region), meeting the challenges of “scaling up,” discussing the drawbacks of the current database, and stating the requirements of a new classification system as pertinent to the GAP Analysis Program and the Upper Midwest area. Precisely this information is necessary to place this Protocol’s highly technical documentation in greater context. The Introduction already contains some of this information, but not enough.

Document-wide

- Single- or multi-author ownership needs to be claimed.
- The Wisconsin-oriented scope of the Project is somewhat misleading, especially when the Protocol is “proposed as a general framework” for GAP in Michigan and Minnesota as well. This document does an excellent job of outlining Wisconsin-specific aspects, but can any discussion be given on “the appropriate modification” necessary to make this truly a tristate effort?
- This current document’s formatting makes deciphering the text somewhat difficult. Would suggest the NOAA Technical Report NMFS 123, *NOAA Coastal Change Analysis Program (C-CAP): Guidance for Regional Implementation* for formatting ideas of many sections. This document is essentially a protocol report; many of the NOAA report’s styles would readily apply to this GAP Protocol report. I have attached some of the more applicable sections of the NOAA document for your convenience.

Summary Section

- The software commands given under the Methods section are confusing and may be unfamiliar to a non-ERDAS IMAGINE user; it is also unclear what terms such as “in-house” mean—this gives doubt as to whether more than one software system is being used. Would suggest clearly indicating what software or system these commands and options belong to (such as “Convolution icon option,” “Mask’ model,” “PC 16-8 bit adjustment model” “Layer Stack,” “in-house,” etc.)