CHECKLIST FOR DIAGNOSTIC PROTOCOL DISCIPLINE LEADS AND REFEREES

*(Status: approved by TPDP 2010 (annex 7 of report), noted by SC 2011-05; reviewed by TPDP 2012-11 and TPDP 2013-06)*

Background

This checklist was approved by the TPDP in its 2010 July meeting and it is used in several stages in the development of a diagnostic protocol (DP) and is used by:

* the discipline lead to cross-check the draft sent by the lead author;
* the referee;
* the discipline lead before submitting the protocol to the TPDP.

**Note:** The completed checklist should be provided to the TPDP together with the protocol.

A new step on the development of a diagnostic protocol was added in 2013 to ensure improvement on quality for the development of a draft DP in earlier stages, through inputs and feedback, in a scientific basis, from a wider number of experts worldwide not part of the DP drafting group. This step is named Expert Consultation on Draft Diagnostic Protocol on the International Phytosanitary Portal (IPP).

The comments column is intended for the reviewer to:

* give further guidance and suggestions on how the items should be modified;
* help identify technical issues in the protocol that should be mentioned for countries when sending the protocol for member consultation (i.e. to be included on the cover page of the protocol), especially those that raised discussion or debates during the development of the protocol.

Draft DP for: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Discipline lead: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Referee: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

Date: \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_

|  | **Section** | **Issue to be considered** | **Y/N** | **Comments Referee** | **Comments Discipline Lead** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Cover note | Does the draft include a cover note in the format and content required by instructions to authors (this should be in the draft at least when it is sent to the referee) |  |  |  |
| **1** | **General overview** |  |
| 1.1 | ISPM No. 27 | Does the protocol comply with ISPM 27 - are all the sections present? |  |  |  |
| 1.2 | Formatting | Is the draft formatted correctly – no SOP formats, no appendices, etc |  |  |  |
| 1.3 | Clarity | Is the protocol clear and concise; does it provide sufficient information for diagnosis of the pest and sources of further information |  |  |  |
| 1.4 | Global relevance | Does the protocol provide sufficient information for users globally e.g. inclusion of different types of methods (where appropriate) and their limitations and/or benefits; global rather than regional perspective, unless the organism only occurs in one region and is of concern globally) |  |  |  |
| **2** | **Pest information** |  |
| 2.1 | Length | Does the section provide a brief summary (no more than 1 page) of the general information on a pest? |  |  |  |
| 2.2 | Reference to datasheets/databases | Does the section refer to appropriate datasheets/databases (rather than replicating information)?  |  |  |  |
| 2.3  | Geographical information | Is any geographical information sufficiently general? |  |  |  |
| **3** | **Taxonomic information** |  |
| 3.1 | Format | Is this presented in the correct format? |  |  |  |
| 3.2 | Accuracy | Is the information accurate? Are appropriate references given for scientific names? |  |  |  |
| **4** | **Detection** |  |
| 4.1 | Appropriate information | Does this section contain appropriate information on methods for detection of the pest? (no information on procedures for inspectors) |  |  |  |
| 4.2 | Adequate description of the methods | Is there enough information for the method to be used by an expert? Does the protocol refer to manufacturers instructions when these are available? |  |  |  |
| 4.3 | Instructing NPPOs | Make sure the protocol does not instruct the NPPO on the methods to use |  |  |  |
| 4.4 | Sensitivity, specificity, reliability | Is there information on the sensitivity, specificity and reliability of each methods quoted, including details of the scope of any ring testing that is mentioned? |  |  |  |
| 4.5 | Confusion with other organisms | Does the protocol provide sufficient information on organisms or symptoms that could be confused with the pest? |  |  |  |
| 4.6 | Choice of methods | Where less commonly used methods are included, does the protocol indicate that these are for information? |  |  |  |
| 4.7 | Commercial kits/brand names | Where commercial kits are available, is the reason for the choice of inclusion of a specific kit rather than others given? If brand names are used, are they essential? Is the approved “disclaimer” included? |  |  |  |
| **5** | **Identification** |  |
| 5.1 | Minimum requirements | Does the protocol provide guidance on the minimum requirements for a positive diagnosis? |  |  |  |
| 5.2 | Instructing NPPOs | Make sure the protocol does not instruct the NPPO on the methods to use |  |  |  |
| 5.3 | Specificity sensitivity and reliability | Is there information on the sensitivity, specificity and reliability of each methods quoted, including details of the scope of any ring testing that is mentioned? |  |  |  |
| 5.4 | Combination of methods | Where a combination of methods is required, is there an explanation of the reason for this? |  |  |  |
| 5.5 | Commercial kits/brand names | Where commercial kits are available, is the reason for the choice of inclusion of a specific kit rather than others given? If brand names are used, are they essential? Is the approved “disclaimer” included? |  |  |  |
| 5.6 | Decision scheme | Does the text and flow diagram (if present) clearly present the options available to NPPOs? |  |  |  |
| 5.7 | Flow diagram (note: detection steps might also be included) | Does the protocol need a flow diagram (e.g. if several methods are needed for the diagnosis, and / or if many alternative methods are included)? Does it contain the minimum requirements for a positive diagnostic? Is it in line with the text? Is it accompanied by some explanation in the text, indicating the methods available and their advantages? Is it cross-referred to at the beginning of the identification section? |  |  |  |
| **6**  | **Records** |  |
| 6.1 | Additional requirements | Does the protocol indicate the requirements for records or evidence in addition to that listed in ISPM 27 that are essential for the pest species? |  |  |  |
| 6.2 | Cases where other NPPOs are involved | Does the protocol provide the specific records and evidence that should be retained in cases where other NPPOs may be involved (e.g. interceptions) |  |  |  |
| **7** | **Contact points**  |  |
| 7.1 | Suitable coverage | Are the contact points appropriate?  |  |  |  |
| **8** | **Acknowledgements** |  |
| 8.1 |  | Do the acknowledgements reflect those involved? |  |  |  |
| **9** | **References** |  |
| 9.1 | Complete | Are all the references in the text included in the reference list? |  |  |  |
| 9.2 | Accurate | Do all the references contain the information required in Instructions to Authors? (e.g. Do they have the year of publication, journal titles in full, page numbers etc) If more than 40 references, consider whether all are needed. |  |  |  |
| **10** | **Figures and photographs** |  |
| 10.1 | Necessary | Are all the figures necessary, or are they “nice to have”? |  |  |  |
| 10.2 | Colour photos | Are these required or should they be posted on the IPP for additional information? |  |  |  |
| 10.3 | Line drawings/photographs  | Are line drawings sufficient for diagnosis, or are photographs required? |  |  |  |
| 10.4 | All figures | Do the figures meet the requirements of the instructions for authors |  |  |  |
| 10.4 | Separate file for figures | Are illustrations separate from the text (2 separate files needed: Part 1 as containing only the text (as Word file); Part 2 containing all figures (including line drawings, photos, flow diagram) (as Word and PDF files) |  |  |  |