

Subject: Manuscript #07-229 - Review Package
Date: Mon, 11 Jun 2007 15:20:37 -0700
From: "Cdn Journal of Forest Research" <cjfr2.office@ubc.ca
To: <rdyanai@syr.edu

Dr. Ruth Yanai
State University of New York
Faculty of Forest and Natural Resources Management One Forestry Drive
320 Bray Hall Syracuse, NY 13210-2788 USA United States

Dear Dr. Yanai:

Re: Manuscript [title and author omitted]

Thank you for agreeing to review the above-referenced manuscript. The manuscript is attached as a PDF file. Please remember that manuscripts are confidential until they are published.

Please critically examine the manuscript and advise whether it is, in your opinion, suitable for publication in the Canadian Journal of Forest Research (CJFR).

A "Review Criteria for Research Manuscripts" is provided (below) to assist you with your review. We have also attached an article from the Council of Science Editors entitled, "Responsibilities and Rights of Peer Reviewers" which is also instructive. Once a decision is reached on the manuscript, we will inform you via email to which we will attach copies of the Editor's decision letter to the author, copies of the comments of the other referees, and the Associate Editor's recommendation. This information will be blind copied to you via email.

Your identity will not be revealed to the authors unless you clearly state otherwise.

The Canadian Journal of Forest Research is making a concerted effort to provide authors efficient and timely peer review and publication. Thus we request that you return your review via email to cjfr2.office@ubc.ca by 2007-07-02. Alternatively, you can use the following:

username [omitted]

password [omitted]

to log onto the following site: [omitted]

and place your review directly onto our Osprey Online Peer Review System. Please note that because this is a secure server you will be automatically logged out after one hour and all changes will be lost, therefore we recommend that you compose the review beforehand and copy and paste it into Osprey. We appreciate your assistance.

If comments are marked on the manuscript please send it via mail to the CJFR Editorial Office (address below) or use the online system noted above. Please then destroy all copies of the manuscript.

Thank you for performing this service to the forest science community.

Sincerely,

Cindy Prescott
Doug Maynard
Co-Editors, Canadian Journal of Forest Research

CANADIAN JOURNAL OF FOREST RESEARCH - Review guide for referees

Some of the following questions may help you to assess the manuscript. The author is most likely to consider your views objectively if they are constructive and stated diplomatically. Please confine any harsh words to a CONFIDENTIAL letter to the Editor. Matters of form are primarily the responsibility of the Editor and our Editorial Offices, but comments on form, including non-standard abbreviation, are useful. Do you have previous or current connections with the author(s) that could prevent you from providing an objective review? If so, please immediately return the paper unreviewed.

Review Criteria for Research Manuscripts*

Title, Authors and Abstract

- The title is clear and informative.
- The title is representative of the content and breath of the study (not misleading).
- The title captures the importance of the study and the attention of the reader.
- The number of authors appears to be appropriate given the study.
- Essential details are presented in the abstract.
- Results are clearly and accurately presented in the abstract.
- The conclusions in the abstract are entirely justified by the information in the abstract and the text.
- There are no inconsistencies between the abstract and the text.
- All of the information in the abstract is present in the text.
- The abstract overall is congruent with the text; the abstract gives the same impression as the text.

Problem Statement, Conceptual Framework, and Research Question

- The introduction builds a logical case and context for the problem statement.
- The problem statement is clear and well articulated.
- The conceptual framework is explicit and justified.
- The research question (or hypothesis) is clear, concise, and complete.
- The variables being investigated are clearly identified.

Relevance

- The study is relevant to the mission of the journal or its audience.
- The study addresses important problems or issues.
- The study makes a significant contribution to existing knowledge of the subject.

- The study is generalizable.

Research Design

- The research design is defined and clearly described, and is sufficiently detailed to permit the study to be replicated.
- The design is appropriate for the research question.
- The sampling procedures are sufficiently described and techniques are appropriate.

Data Analysis

- Data analysis procedures are sufficiently described to permit the study to be replicated.
- Data analysis procedures conform to the research design; hypotheses, models, or theory drive the data analyses.
- The assumptions underlying the use of statistics are fulfilled by the data, such as measurement properties of the data and normality of distributions.
- Statistical tests are appropriate (optimal).
- The assumptions underlying the use of statistics are considered, given the data collected.
- The statistics are reported correctly and appropriately.
- The number of analyses is appropriate.

Presentation of Results

- Results are organized in a way that is easy to understand.
- Results are presented effectively.
- Results are contextualized.
- The results are complete.
- The amount of data presented is sufficient and appropriate.
- Tables, graphs, or figures are used judiciously and agree with the text.

Discussion and Conclusion: Interpretation

- Findings and inferences are clearly distinguished.
- Speculation is limited to what is reasonably well supported by the findings.
- The conclusions are clearly stated; key points stand out.
- The conclusions follow from the design, methods, and results; justification of conclusions is well articulated.
- Interpretations of the results are appropriate; the conclusions are accurate (not misleading).
- The study limitations are discussed.
- Alternative interpretations for the findings are considered.
- Statistical differences are distinguished from meaningful differences.
- Practical significance or theoretical implications are discussed; guidance for future studies is offered.

Reference to the Literature and Documentation

- The literature review is up-to-date.
- The number of references is appropriate and their selection is judicious.

- The review of the literature is well integrated.
- The references are mainly primary sources.
- Ideas are acknowledged appropriately and accurately.
- The literature is analyzed and critically appraised.

Presentation and Documentation

- The text is well written and easy to follow.
- The vocabulary is appropriate.
- The content is complete and fully congruent.
- The manuscript is well organized.
- The data reported are accurate (e.g., numbers add up) and appropriate; tables and figures are used effectively and agree with the text.
- Reference citations are complete and accurate.

Scientific Conduct

- There are no instances of plagiarism.
- Ideas and materials of others are correctly attributed.
- Prior publication by the author(s) of portions of the data or study is appropriately acknowledged.
- There is no apparent conflict of interest.

* adapted from Science Editor - March - April 2002 - Vol. 25 - No. 2.
Excerpted from: Joint Task Force of Academic Medicine and the GEA-RIME
Committee. Bordage, G., Caellegh A.S., co-chairs.) Website address:
acadmed@aamc.org. Review criteria for research manuscripts. Acad. Med.
2001:76:897-978. Reprinted with permission.

Mailing address:
Canadian Journal of Forest Research
#2005, 2424 Main Mall, U.B.C.
Vancouver, B.C. V6T 1Z4
Tel: (604) 822-0358
Fax: (604) 822-0214
cjfr2.office@ubc.ca