

Peer Review Plan

Title of Review: Ecology of Wild Bird Avian Influenza [] **Influential Scientific Information**

Agency: USDA, Agricultural Research Service [x] **Highly Influential Scientific Assessment**

Agency Contact: Erica Spackman, Ph.D., Research Microbiologist, (706) 546-3617, 934 College Station Road, Athens, GA, 30605

Subject of Review: As natural hosts for avian influenza virus (AIV), wild birds, particularly aquatic birds, are the primary reservoir for transmission of AIV to domestic poultry. Therefore understanding the dissemination and maintenance of AIV in wild birds is important for understanding the factors that contribute to transmission of AIV from wild birds to poultry. However, relatively little is known about the ecology of the virus in wild birds and the depth of data is inconsistent world-wide. Also, the biology of the virus itself is very important as AIV is a biologically and genetically diverse virus which is highly adaptable to different hosts and likely to the environment as well. Some insight may be gained from the Asian H5N1 highly pathogenic (HP) AIV which was first reported in 1997. Because of its wide geographic distribution and its impact on human and animal health, surveillance for this virus has increased considerably in wild birds worldwide since 2005. Also, numerous species which have not previously been represented in AIV testing have been included in surveillance for the Asian H5N1 HPAIV allowing for a more complete understanding of the distribution of AIV in wild birds.

Purpose of Review: We anticipate that the external peer reviewers will possess an in-depth knowledge of research conducted. Reviewers will be expected to focus on areas such as:

1. The evidence provided and whether the conclusions and inferences are correctly supported by the evidence.
2. Evaluate the methodology. Is the approach and process appropriate for the analysis?
3. Are there data or other evidence complete? Have any important data or considerations about the disease or pathway been omitted?
4. Are all important assumptions identified and uncertainties clearly stated?
5. Identify any relevant data or evidence not contained in the report.
6. Evaluate the quality and completeness of the individual components of the analysis.
7. Comment on whether/where the document is difficult to read or understand.

Type of Review: [] Panel Review [x] Individual Reviewers
[] Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review (Est.): Start: 03/2008 End: Completed: 06/2008

Number of Reviewers: [x] 3 or fewer [] 4 to 10 [] More than 10

