



GUIDE FOR REVIEWERS - *The Forestry Chronicle*

The following questions may help in your assessment. The author(s) is/are most likely to consider your views objectively if they are constructive and stated diplomatically.

General

- Is there sufficient new knowledge in the paper worth publishing in *The Forestry Chronicle*?
- Is the scope of the topic suitable for the journal?
- Are the findings, interpretations and conclusions sound and relevant to the purpose of the study described?
- Is the contribution placed in the proper perspective concerning the state of knowledge of the subject?
- Is the manuscript too long? If so, where can it be shortened? Would any text be clearer if condensed?
- Are all the tables and figures needed? Should they be grouped to facilitate comparisons?
- Does the organization of the manuscript follow logically from the stated purpose in the introduction?
- Are there inconsistencies between tables or figures and the text, or within the text?
- Is the presentation clear, concise, and unambiguous?

Parts of the manuscript

- Is the title informative and limited to what is documented?
- Does the abstract reflect the essentials of the methodology and findings?
- Is the introduction limited largely to the purpose, scope and rationale of the study?
- Are details of the materials and methods limited to what readers need to understand the design of the study and to judge the validity of the findings?
- Are the results limited to answering the questions implied in the purpose of the work?
- Are the findings and inferences clearly distinguished?
- Is the discussion limited to interpretation and significance of the findings?
- If there are loopholes in the interpretation, are they acknowledged? Should they be overcome?
- Is the speculation limited to what is reasonably well supported by the findings?
- Would combining the results and discussion under topic (research) headings simplify understanding of the work and convey the new insights more effectively?

MANUSCRIPT REVIEW FORM - *The Forestry Chronicle*

Paper Title:

Author(s):

Reviewer: (Reviewers remain anonymous unless they request otherwise. Reviewers are acknowledged each year in the November/December issue, without reference to the manuscripts reviewed.)

Overall scientific quality and contribution and Recommendation For Publication:

Would you recommend this paper for publication in *The Forestry Chronicle*?

Without modification

Major modification

Minor modification

Not acceptable

Comments: (Please fill in the attached form and use additional space as needed.)

GENERAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

1. Is this a new and original contribution or method of analysis of data?
Yes No Don't Know
2. Has a scientific hypothesis been tested and the conclusions unambiguously validated?
Yes No
3. Is the paper technically sound and free of mathematical, logical and technical errors?
Yes No
4. The objectives are clearly stated and represent worthwhile goals.
Good Fair Poor
5. The paper length is appropriate, concise and complete.
Good Fair Poor
6. Would others in a similar field benefit by this paper?
Major Moderate Minor
7. How well does the paper flow in a logical manner?
Good Fair Poor
8. Are the references complete? (If not, please indicate, if possible, references that should be included)
Yes No
9. Is the title an accurate reflection of the paper?
Yes No
10. Are the tables complete and necessary?
Yes No
11. Are the figures complete and necessary?
Yes No
12. Is the abstract complete, clear and concise?
Yes No
13. The conclusions are logically and clearly stated.
Good Fair Poor