

Peer Review: Check the Technical Basis Before Release

Todd Jerome Jenkins | v1.0 | Reviewed October 9, 2026 | Discussion + field checks

Why this matters

A polished drawing or work package can hide an unsupported assumption. Technical peer review gives a suitably prepared reviewer time to examine the basis before release. It is different from watching someone perform a task: the object being checked here is the technical work product.

Objective: Trace an important conclusion to its input and acceptance source, then verify how a review concern is resolved.

Key hazards or failure points

Wrong revision; missing input; reviewer outside their expertise; shared assumptions; rushed review; an unanswered comment marked closed; review mistaken for final approval.

Practical controls

- Identify the product, revision, purpose and review scope. Assign a reviewer with the required subject competence and independence for the applicable process. Provide the governing requirements, inputs, time and access needed to do the review.
- Focus on conclusions that could affect safety or task readiness. Check their assumptions and supporting evidence against applicable requirements. Use required review aids and specialist reviews; an informal peer review does not replace them.
- Record concerns clearly enough for another person to locate the issue. Identify the responsible responder and required disposition. Keep technical review, document approval and permission to perform the work distinct.

Verify It in the Field

Using an authorized, deidentified example, select one consequential statement. Have the reviewer trace it to the actual source and revision. Ask what establishes applicability to this equipment or location; a copied reference number is not enough.

Check one material assumption against its supporting record or authorized safe field evidence. Record the criterion, method, finding and reviewer. If the reviewer lacks the necessary expertise, identify the specialist needed rather than guessing.

Follow one review comment into the revised product. Confirm that the authorized resolution addresses the concern, affected conclusions were rechecked and required approvals remain complete. Record the revision and closure evidence; an accepted email does not automatically update the working copy.

Stop and reassess

Hold release or affected reliance for an unresolved consequential concern, obsolete input, missing expertise or an unexplained revision. Route the issue through the required review process. Do not sign in advance or erase a concern to meet a deadline. Resume only after authorized disposition and required rechecks.

Ask the crew

1. Which conclusion most needs a traceable basis?
2. What assumption could change the result?
3. What evidence closes this review comment?

Use the task plan and required specialist decisions before exposure.

Sources: DOE-HDBK-1028-2009, Vol.2, pp.49,50; OSHA recommended practices.

Free next step: [JHA/JSA planning & field-verification worksheet](#)

Expanded guidance and separate forms: toddjeromejenkins.com/toolbox-talks/peer-review-technical-basis-before-release

Based on DOE-HDBK-1028-2009, Vol. 2 (June 2009). No claim to authorship or copyright ownership of original U.S. Government work. Todd Jerome Jenkins adaptation; no government endorsement implied.