

Checklist for Reviewers

Journal of Wood Science

for Review articles

This is a checklist to help reviewers to do their works smoothly and **does not have to be submitted**.

If you, a reviewer, check questions with “No” in this list, please enter your comments in detail on the questions in the field Reviewer Blind Comments to Author at the Reviewer Recommendation and Comments screen of Editorial Manager®.

(A) Form

1. Is the manuscript written and prepared according to *Instructions to Authors*? Yes. No.

(B) Title

1. Is the title brief, specific and informative? Yes. No.
2. Are 3 – 5 key words or phrases provided? Yes. No.

(C) Abstract

1. Does the abstract supply the essence of the whole article? Yes. No.
2. Is the abstract not more than 200 words? Yes. No.

(D) Tables and figures

1. Are the tables and figures necessary and enough for the article? Yes. No.
2. Are the style, title and note specific and informative? Yes. No.

(E) References

1. Do the citation in the text and the listing of the references follow *Instructions to Authors*? Yes. No.

(F) Content

1. Is each research reviewed fairly from a scientific point of view? Yes. No.
2. Are the researches on a topic covered well and nonautobiographically? Yes. No.
3. Are the current directions of research on a topic provided well? Yes. No.
4. Are the descriptions clear, concise and informative? Yes. No.
5. Is the English writing good? Yes. No.

(G) Synthetic evaluation

This manuscript is

1. acceptable for publication as it is. [Accept]
 2. acceptable for publication if it is modified according to the referee's comments. [Minor Revision]
 3. required to be re-reviewed by the referee after revision according to the comments. [Major Revision]
 4. not acceptable for publication. [Reject]

Please select your recommendation term in brackets for the field Recommendation.