

Quality of Survey Criteria Scoring Guide

1. **FC, yes =1, no = 0.** A fish consumption survey is preferred to an angler survey for purposes of setting a regulatory FCR. The latter often assumes catch = consumption without verifying knowing and is rarely a random sample. A fish consumption survey is designed to quantify consumption, i.e. asks about meal size as well as frequency of consumption and often uses portion size models.
2. **Methods Reported, yes =1, no = 0.** A thorough method description should address:
 - a. Describe design oversight
 - b. Training of interviewers
 - c. Selection of interviewees
 - d. Pilot testing of survey instrument
 - e. How geographic and seasonal variation will be handled
 - f. How known sources of variability and uncertainty will be adjusted for or quantified.
 - g. How data is reduced and summarized.

This is a matter of some judgment. Suggestion is a score of 1 if at least 5 of 7 questions are addressed in the methods.

3. **QA/QC, yes =1, no = 0.** Discussion of QA/QC should be present and address sources of uncertainty. Another matter of some judgment; judgment coming in in how well QA/QC is done and uncertainty discussed. Suggest a 1 if QA/QC is reported and uncertainty is discussed or 0 if either QA/QC or discussion of uncertainty is missing.
4. **Representative Sample, 1 = yes and 0 = no.** First the population to be surveyed needs to be described. If the target population is not described score 0. Even if population is well described, a very small sample size, or non-random selection of those to be interviewed is unlikely to represent the population and survey should be scored 0.
5. **Seasonality, Annual yes =1, no = 0.** A year-round sample is more likely representative than a seasonal or more limited survey, although a limited duration survey can ask about consumption at other times if so designed. Suggest scoring a 1 if population survey was year-round or inquiry was made of year-round consumption, a 0 if just a seasonal survey and no attempt was made to account for seasonality.
6. **Details of species and preparation, yes=1, no =0.** The question here is not whether information on appropriate species was collected, but rather whether the information is present to post data collection parse out and analyze consumption by species, sources and meal preparation method. If this detail was collected and reported, score = 1, if no then score = 0.
7. **Was report peer reviewed, yes =1, no = 0.** Peer reviewed reports are more defensible. A report does not have to be published in a journal to have been peer reviewed, though it can be assumed a published Journal article is peer-reviewed. For other than Journal articles if peer-

review is not explicitly mentioned in the report, then assume it was not done. So, score =1 if clearly peer-reviewed or feel confident peer-review was conducted even if not mentioned (e.g. journal publication). Otherwise assume not and score = 0.

For calculating an overall quality score items 1, 2, 3, 4, & 7 above were given double weight (importance), that is, counted twice in summing.

The overall score gives a quantitative assessment of our evaluation of quality of each report. This allows ranking them in defensibility for an Idaho fish consumption rate.