

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.

GENERAL

1. Is there sufficient new knowledge in the paper to merit publication in the Canadian Journal of Forest Research?
2. Is the scope of the topic suitable for this journal?
3. Does the manuscript make a conceptual advance, apply new methodology, or refine or reformulate a concept or hypothesis?
4. Are the findings, interpretations, and conclusions sound and relevant to the purpose of the study?
5. Is the contribution placed in the proper perspective concerning the state of knowledge of the subject?
6. Is the manuscript too long? If so, where can it be shortened?
7. Are all the tables and figures needed and grouped to facilitate comparisons?
8. Would any of the text be clearer if condensed?
9. Does the organization of the manuscript follow logically from the statement of purpose in the introduction?
10. Are the results presented in terms of the biology rather than the statistics (unless the contribution is in statistics)?
11. Are there inconsistencies between tables or figures and the text, or within the text?

PARTS OF THE MANUSCRIPT

12. Is the title informative and limited to what is documented?
13. Does the abstract reflect the essentials of the methodology and findings?
14. Is the introduction limited largely to the purpose, scope, and rationale of the study?
15. Is the review of the literature limited to defining the problem?
16. Are details of materials and methods limited to what scientists need to understand the design of the study and to judge the validity of the findings?
17. Are the results limited to answering the questions implied in the purpose of the work?
18. Are the findings and inferences clearly distinguished?
19. Is the discussion limited to interpretation and significance of the findings?
20. If there are loopholes in interpretation, are they acknowledged? Should they be overcome? Is speculation limited to what is reasonably well supported by the findings?