I am sometimes asked “What advice do you give to reviewers?” It occurs to me that the advice given to you is quite minimal. I ask you to advise me whether to: (a) publish the paper as it is, (b) publish it with revisions as indicated, (c) request major revision and encourage resubmission, or (d) reject it. Other than that, I ask you to make your comments as specific as possible and return the paper within four weeks. However, since you are also authors, you look at the manuscript I send you from that perspective, which usually works well. You do the job carefully and objectively as you see it. I have often had comments from authors thanking us for the improvement in their paper resulting from our comments and suggestions.

Perhaps it will be useful to consider in more detail what I look for in a paper and, clearly, what many of you do also. Beyond that, there are some aspects of the paper regarding which I look especially to reviewers for advice. In the following I will go quickly through a paper, indicating in bold those aspects to which I look especially to reviewers for advice, and in italics those aspects to which we should both give careful attention.

TITLE

Is the title a succinct and accurate indication of the subject of the paper? Is the subject suitable for publication in Wood and Fiber Science?

ABSTRACT

Does the abstract summarize the key findings of the study, rather than just review what was done and what the paper contains?

KEYWORDS

Are the keywords those you would expect to use in seeking references to the subject?

INTRODUCTION

Is the problem stated clearly? Is the most important literature related to the problem cited and interpreted correctly? Are the references cited listed in the REFERENCES section at the end of the text? Does the Introduction culminate in a clear statement of the objective of the research?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Are the sampling and the experimental techniques described clearly enough for someone else to replicate the study? Are the sampling and experimental techniques consistent with what is expected in this type of study? Are the techniques following the usual standards or are deviations explained and justified?

RESULTS

Are the results presented clearly in tables and figures and interpreted correctly? Are the tables and figures adequate and necessary or are they excessive? Could some be combined and consolidated without loss of clarity? Are the results described and discussed clearly? Are the results discussed and interpreted with reference to existing literature on the subject?
CONCLUSIONS

Are the conclusions stated clearly and succinctly and justified by the results?

REFERENCES

Are all references cited in the text? Are they cited correctly? Are they in the proper order?

TABLES

Are tables titled clearly and labeled accurately? Are data presented in a manner that is easy to understand and interpret?

FIGURES

Does the page of figure captions contain clear descriptions of all the figures? Do the figures present the results accurately and clearly?

GENERAL

Is the paper written clearly in good English? Is American spelling used? I do not expect reviewers to rewrite in their own words unless the original words are incorrect, ambiguous, or confusing.

Do the format and arrangement of the paper conform to the INFORMATION FOR AUTHORS inside the back cover of the journal?

Observing these guidelines should make for consistent, uniform reviewing while still allowing reviewers to add individual comments that will be helpful in further disposition of the paper.

BOB YOUNGS

Editor

WALLENBERG PRIZE WINNER

The winner of the Wallenberg Prize this year for outstanding contributions to forestry and wood science is Dr. Robert H. Leicester of the Division of Building Construction and Engineering of CSIRO, Australia. Bob has made major advances in wood physics and mechanics. The Wallenberg Prize is the “Nobel Prize” of this field. We congratulate Bob on this recognition of his work and of the significance of this field to the wise utilization of timber resources.