

## Reviewer Guidelines

The enclosed manuscript has been submitted for publication in the *Journal of Forestry*. As a technical reviewer, we ask that you give special attention to the technical correctness and accuracy of material in the manuscript. We would also like you to assess its overall quality, importance, and appropriateness for the *Journal*. In addition, please comment on how the manuscript might be revised to better suit the *Journal*.

The *Journal of Forestry* follows a double-blind policy in the review process (identity of author is unknown to reviewer; identity of reviewer is unknown to author). **Please document all editorial comments on a separate page without letterhead and identify yourself by your reviewer number.** If you are unable to review the manuscript by the due date, please return it immediately so that we may seek another reviewer. Thank you for your time and attention.

**Reviewer Information:** Please provide this information so that we may acknowledge your contribution as a volunteer reviewer in the December *Journal*.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Reviewer # (for peer reviewers only) \_\_\_\_\_ Manuscript # \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

### Please use these guidelines for evaluating manuscripts.

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Is the manuscript of interest to a large number of <i>Journal</i> readers?  | 8. Has any material been left out that would be necessary to understand the topic?  |
| 2. Is the subject developed logically and effectively?   | 9. Is the length of the manuscript appropriate to the subject matter? (Note: There is a 3,000-word limit.)  |
| 3. Has the topic been put in context for readers who are not specialists in the field?                                   | 10. Can the manuscript be shortened without losing its impact? What would you delete?   |
| 4. Are the statements in the text and conclusion well substantiated? Can the results or implications be made more clear? | 11. Are all tables and figures necessary? Are the headings and units accurate? (Note: A total of 5 tables and figures are permitted in scientific papers; 2 in editorial features.) |
| 5. Are the calculations accurate? Can they be understood by a forestry professional not in the specialty discussed?      | 12. Is the illustrative material properly designed? Does it present the information in the clearest way?  |
| 6. Does the paper add anything new or lend a new perspective to the topic?   | 13. Does the manuscript contain only mathematics that are necessary to make a point?  |
| 7. If the manuscript is a "state-of-the-art review" does it define, elucidate, and survey the subject well?              | 14. Is the number of literature citations appropriate to the length and subject of the text?  |

### Recommendation: Choose one based on the average of your scores and your overall opinion.

- |  |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reject  | <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable with substantial revision | <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable without revision |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not acceptable without major revision, but encourage resubmission | <input type="checkbox"/> Acceptable with minor revision       |  |

Please rate this paper in terms of overall quality:

(worst) 1    2    3    4    5 (best)