

Notes from Granger Morgan on MARSAME review.

Sorry to be slow.

The report needs some editing. English is often not the best

On page 9 the report says that MARSAME is intended for a "technical audience having knowledge of health physics and an understanding of statistics." If this is a direct quote, then it strikes me that all the committee's arguments that there needs to be discussions for semi-technical users etc. should be made more in the form of recommendations and less as firm conclusions.

The report says on page 9 that this is "an excellent technical document for guiding an M&E survey." SO, why does the letter say the document is "a potentially useful document"?

In the letter the first recommendation has been generalized from the text that appears in the report on the top of page 2 of the report. The letter should adopt the same text as on page 2 of the report.

In that text the word must should read should (page 2 of the report lines 15 and 18). This is advice. SAB has no veto power.

The third recommendation in the letter is scrambled. It says they should not be called case studies and then says they should be rewritten to be more like case studies.

Why does line 13 on page 2 of the letter start with the word "collect"? Should it say "develop"?

The text on lines 12-16 on page 8 of the report might be modified to go in the letter (perhaps in place of some of the existing more detailed suggestions there).

Line 22 page 8 "documented" should read "identified and explained"

Page 13 line 7 drop the word "sheer"

Page 14 lines 13-14. Why "appears...to the extent observable" Seems unnecessarily conditional. Do you have a reason to think it does not?

Page 14 "comprehensible" seems stilted.