

Andree Desiree Wilson and Richard Wilson <wilson5@fas.harvard.edu>  
10/22/2003 10:31:07 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Mabel E. Echols OMB\_Peer\_Review/OMB/EOP, John Graham/OMB/EOP

cc:

Subject: Comments upon "Peer review and information quality"

I asked my seminar on  
"Quantitative Aspects of Public Policy Decisions ' for comments.

They ALL found reading the proposal very heavy reading. (so did I) They did not find the guidance to be "transparent" although (we cannot tell) it may be "reliable and independent".

Some suggestions to improve it:

Please make it clear where the Preface stops and text begins.

Could there be a table of contents?

Could there be a summary in one or two paragraphs of the main points?

The text in several places goes into detail which may be of interest in that it comments on something a particular agency is now doing, but one loses thereby the thread and thrust of the process. Maybe this could be the "legal" document, and have another better written and readable document that can tell everyone what it is all about. It would be better if it were one document. After all it is only "Guidance" and not legally binding so a very careful dotting of i's and crossing the t's should not be necessary. Readability is.

Richard Wilson  
Mallinckrodt Professor of Physics