

Attn: Peer reviewers of Data Notes

Editor-in-Chief  
Journal of Forest Research

Thank you very much for agreeing to review Data Notes submitted to the Journal of Forest Research. Please find below the journal's review policy and other important items for Data Notes.

## 1. Scope

The Journal of Forest Research publishes original articles, reviews, short communications, and data notes. It covers all aspects of forest research, both basic and applied, with the aim of encouraging international communication between scientists in different fields who share a common interest in forest science.

## 2. Review policy

The following aspects should be considered when reviewing Data Notes:

- ① relevance of the **field**
- ② data **validity**
- ③ data **reliability**
- ④ data **reusability**,
- ⑤ **logicality**

We aim to publish as much valuable data related to forests and forest management as possible, while ensuring the quality of the paper. To this end, we ask that you conduct a rigorous review based on the following criteria. Please note that the editorial office will confirm that the data have been deposited in a general-purpose data repository upon submission.

### ① **Field:**

#### **Consistency with the journal scope**

\*The editorial board judges this in advance and, if the field is not consistent with the scope, tries not to send out such papers for peer review. However, while reviewing a manuscript if you think the field is inconsistent with the scope, leave a comment to that effect.

### ② **Validity:**

#### **Whether the data would contribute to the development of forest and forestry research, or forest management**

When reviewing a paper, be aware that the scope of validity may be limited due to the nature of the field. Since this is an international journal, the Data Notes published in it should focus on topics that would be of interest to international readers and present convincing arguments. However, in many cases, especially in field science papers, the research subject is inevitably restricted to certain regions. Therefore, try to avoid assessing the research contents' universality too harshly solely because the case studies are from a specific area. Additionally, if the paper has a certain degree of internationality,

review it positively for publication even if the case studies are domestic. Conversely, even if the case studies are important, be rigorous in your evaluation whether the research contents are of interest to international readers in the relevant field, and whether this is well described based on a thorough review including international literature.

### ③ Reliability:

#### **Whether the data has been obtained through appropriate methods**

Since the suitability of the methods for collecting data is an important aspect in terms of the publication of Data Notes, please review it rigorously.

#### **Whether the data quality information is presented in the Dataset Validation or a relevant section**

Data quality information, such as data distribution or errors, is included in the Dataset Validation or relevant section should be confirmed.

### ④ Reusability:

#### **Whether the data description is sufficiently detailed for other researchers to use the data**

Please confirm that all necessary information is described to enable data use in other research.

#### **Whether the data description is consistent with the actual data**

Please confirm that the dataset in the data repository matches the data description in the manuscript.

### ⑤ Logicality:

#### **Clear development of the argument, and clear and concise statements**

As this is the most important aspect of the publication of Data Notes, it should be reviewed rigorously.

### 3. Other points of note

- 1) Indicate whether your comments are general comments or specific revision comments.
- 2) Indicate all required revisions and other comments in the first round itself. If you deem the paper not worthy of being published even if it is rewritten, please decide on rejection at the outset.
- 3) The final decision will be made based on the opinions of all peer reviewers and the editor-in-charge. Therefore, leave the paper's acceptance or rejection to the committee. Moreover, even if you recommend rejection, the editor-in-charge's decision may result in the paper being revised and reviewed again. In this case, you may be asked to review the revised manuscript.
- 4) English will ultimately be proofread by an expert; however, if the language in the manuscript is so inadequate that it is difficult to review it, please send it back to us as is.
- 5) For Japanese reviewers: Write your comments in English—even if all the authors are Japanese, other peer reviewers or the editor-in-charge may not understand Japanese.