

Guidance Note of the Role of Review Editors of the Working Group I Sixth Assessment Report (WGI AR6)

The role of Review Editor

Review Editors (REs) are critical for achieving the IPCC mandate of producing comprehensive and objective assessments. Two to three REs have been selected per chapter of the WGI report, reflecting the topics covered in the chapters, in order to provide a balanced representation of scientific, technical and socio-economic views. Their role is to ensure that the chapter authors address the comments provided by expert reviewers on the chapter drafts, and in particular, to assist the authors in tackling contentious or controversial issues where there might be disagreement between reviewers.

The REs are encouraged to inform the WGI Co-Chairs if they identify issues that are potentially contentious or controversial. REs may also suggest that the TSU contact additional reviewers for their entire chapter or for individual sections therein for the expert review of the Second Order Draft.

The role and responsibilities of REs are described in Annex 1 of the IPCC Procedures (Appendix A to the Principles Governing IPCC Work¹).

The role of RE is distinct from the role of Author. Authors have sole responsibility for the chapter text. REs must not be involved as authors (or expert reviewers) in material for which they are a RE. They may, however, serve as expert reviewers for other chapters, the Technical Summary or the Summary for Policymakers of the SR15, as well as of the AR6 Synthesis Report, and may be involved in the preparation of the report Glossary, Technical Summary and Summary for Policymakers.

REs should read all comments on their chapter to identify critical issues that will require discussion with the chapter author team. This should include focused attention where review comments are inconsistent or contradictory, where considerable rewriting may be needed, and where scientific controversies exist.

It is not expected that REs submit input to their chapter teams before the LAM3. Any direct follow-up communication with Expert Reviewers can be done through the WGI Technical Support Unit (TSU), not by authors nor REs. The preferred mode of working, both within the group of REs on a chapter and for the REs with the chapter authors, will be defined together as an outcome of the LAM3.

¹ <http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/ipcc-principles/ipcc-principles-appendix-a.pdf>

Review Editor tasks

REs are invited by the WGI Co-Chairs to assist the chapter teams in identifying potential expert reviewers for an informal review of the internal draft chapters.

When the review comments on the First Order Draft (FOD) and the Second Order Draft (SOD) are received, they will be compiled by the TSU and sent to the chapter Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs) and the REs.

REs are required to attend the Third and Fourth Lead Author Meetings (LAM3 and LAM4) where the writing teams consider the results of the two formal review rounds. REs should come prepared to the meetings to report on their evaluation of the review comments and to ensure that the author teams fully and appropriately address the review comments and fairly represent the full range of scientific and technical perspectives.

The REs will be asked to provide three written reports: two interim (internal) reports and one final report. The first interim report will be requested after LAM3 and the second one after LAM4 (exact dates to be confirmed). Each of the interim report is submitted by the REs to the CLAs and the WGI TSU. Interaction between the CLAs and REs is encouraged throughout the process since REs are a valuable resource for chapter teams to consult in responding to review comments and to ensure that the evolving chapter content is fully reflective of the input provided by review comments.

Reporting:

The First Interim Report summarises:

- (i) the *main areas of concern* arising from the review comments;
- (ii) the *contentious or controversial issues* that need to be addressed in the next draft and how to handle them;
- (iii) areas or sections of the chapter that appear to be *under-reviewed* or where there may be gaps;
- (iv) suggestion of names of *targeted reviewers* who could provide a review of the areas and sections identified in (iii) for the SOD.

The Second Interim Report summarises:

- (i) the *main areas of concern* arising from the review comments;
- (ii) the *contentious or controversial issues* that need to be addressed in the next draft and how to handle them;
- (iii) feedback on whether the substantive comments received during the FOD review had been afforded appropriate consideration in the author responses;
- (iv) feedback on whether the revisions of the text adequately reflected any controversies and contentious issues arising from those comments.

The Final Report is submitted prior to the WGI Session of the IPCC and is provided to the IPCC as part of the WGI report approval documentation.

In this report REs are asked to comment on any significant differences of perspectives on scientific issues, how these were reconciled during the drafting and review processes and covered in a balanced way in the text. In the preparation of the Final Draft Report.