

Thank you for agreeing to review the enclosed manuscript.

I am coordinating this review on behalf of USDA's Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS). APHIS has two motivations for requesting this review. First, the agency is committed to using sound science and economic analysis in their programs. Second, the agency wishes to comply with the spirit and the letter of the Office of Management and Budget Peer Review Bulletin. That bulletin requires agencies to have influential and highly influential scientific information peer reviewed. The bulletin is available online at [http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg/2005/011405\\_peer.pdf](http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/fedreg/2005/011405_peer.pdf)

The charge to you as a reviewer differs from what you might assume when dealing with scholarly papers submitted for publication in an economics journal. You are asked to review the economic model in the manuscript for its suitability as an economic framework for analyzing welfare effects of regulatory changes. What you have before you is the theoretical model. The spreadsheet model is not included and is not part of your review. Your review should respond to the following questions. Is the theoretical model presented in equations, graphs, and narrative economically sound? Does the manuscript adequately report the appropriate scope for application of the economic framework and adequately note the model's limitations?

I am conducting this review by letter. A minimum of two other economists will also review the manuscript. I request that your review be in writing and addressed to me. Your review will be provided to the author and to APHIS. They will consider your comments and incorporate them as appropriate. You will be identified as a reviewer. I have not redacted the name of the author. This openness is consistent with guidance from the Office of Management and Budget. If all reviewers agree to be explicitly associated with their comments I will do so. Otherwise, I will transmit the names of the reviewers and comments without attribution to particular reviewers. Please let me know your position on attribution.

If as you proceed, you find that your expertise is not appropriate to review the manuscript, please notify me. Bear in mind that it is appropriate to limit your review to areas where you have expertise. However, this should be noted in your review. If you conclude that you have a conflict of interest or otherwise determine that you should disqualify yourself, please let me know.

My goal for completing the reviews is September 30. I can be reached at 202-720-8022.

The United States Department of Agricultural appreciates your willingness to participate in this review.

Sincerely,

James D. Schaub  
Director