

# Manuscript Approval and Processing

FS-1600-1 (PNW)

SDA FOREST SERVICE RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

April 2016 revision

<p><b>Title</b></p>	<p><b>For CAP use only:</b></p> <p>Case file number: _____ Log-in date: _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> New submission <input type="checkbox"/> Resubmission</p> <p>Publication series/number: _____</p> <p>Notes:</p>
<p><b>Author(s)</b></p>	<p><b>Required from author</b></p> <p>Job code: _____ Override: _____</p> <p>or Deposit account number: _____</p> <p>Editorial review: <input type="checkbox"/> Request editing <input type="checkbox"/> Bypass editing</p> <p>Program/research work unit number(s) / Problem: _____</p>
<p>Primary contact (author): _____</p> <p>Phone: _____ E-mail: _____</p> <p><b>Proposed publication outlet:</b></p> <p>Station publication: <input type="checkbox"/> GTR <input type="checkbox"/> RP <input type="checkbox"/> RN <input type="checkbox"/> RB <input type="checkbox"/> RU</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> RMAP <input type="checkbox"/> Other (type) _____</p> <p>Non-station publication: <input type="checkbox"/> Proceedings <input type="checkbox"/> Book</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Journal article (name of outlet): _____</p> <p><b>Subject</b> for quarterly list of recent publications (select one):</p>	<p>Strategic Program Area (SPA): _____</p> <p>Research activity: _____</p> <p>Teams: _____</p> <p>(see <a href="#">Authors Corner</a> for definitions or instructions)</p> <p>Primary audience: _____</p> <p>Keywords: _____</p>
<p><b>Condensed abstract</b> (state purpose and objectives of study &amp; give concise summary of conclusions in 250 words or fewer):</p>	<p><b>Performance Accountability System category:</b></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Formally refereed <input type="checkbox"/> Informally refereed <input type="checkbox"/> Non-refereed</p> <p><b>OMB information quality:</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Not classified influential</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Influential Scientific Information (ISI)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Highly Influential Scientific Assessment (HISA)</p> <p><b>Manuscript processing</b> (station series):</p> <p>Color justification requested: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>(if yes, please include statement of justification for WO approval)</p> <p>Copyrighted material release: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Photo credits and permissions: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Pesticide mention: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p><b>Printing/distribution</b> (station series):</p> <p>Expected format: <input type="checkbox"/> Online only <input type="checkbox"/> Print</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> CD/DVD <input type="checkbox"/> Other _____</p> <p>Number of copies for standard distribution _____</p> <p>Number of copies to author _____</p> <p>Special printing or binding instructions:</p> <p>Other instructions/requests:</p>

**Research topic (national taxonomy — select up to three topics:**Climate  
ChangeEcology, Ecosystems,  
and EnvironmentEnvironment  
and People

Fire

Forest and  
Plant HealthForest  
ProductsInventory, Monitoring,  
and AnalysisNatural Resource  
Management and UsWildlife  
(or Fauna)**Reviews**

Statistical review (optional)

**Reviewer name, affiliation, date**

Technical review (minimum of three technical reviewers with at least one from outside PNW. Program manager has the option to waive this requirement for journal submissions that will receive adequate peer review.)

1. \_\_\_\_\_

2. \_\_\_\_\_

3. \_\_\_\_\_

**Reviewer name, affiliation, date****Approvals**

*I organized and wrote this manuscript and checked it for accuracy. I assume responsibility for the correctness of literature citations and all original data in the text, tables, and illustrations; for data analysis; and for the conclusions and recommendations drawn from the data. Each issue raised in technical review has been resolved or rebutted and made part of the written record. Agencies of coauthor(s) have approved the manuscript. **All parts** of the manuscript are attached.*

Senior  
Author:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Print name (if signed by hand) \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

Team  
Leader:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Print name (if signed by hand) \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

*I reviewed this manuscript for **conformance to Station policy** and approve it for publication. The manuscript received **adequate technical review**, and the author has responded adequately to those reviews. The manuscript is technically sound and has been properly prepared.*

Program  
Manager:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Print name (if signed by hand) \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

*I have edited this manuscript for economy and effectiveness to meet the standards of the outlet and the Station.*

Station  
Editor:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Print name (if signed by hand) \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

*I certify that publication of this manuscript is essential to the official business of the Forest Service and that it has been prepared to meet standards of economy and effectiveness.*

Publication  
Control  
Officer:

Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Print name (if signed by hand) \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_

## Instructions

**Statistical Review** may be required if:

1. The unit Designated Responsible Officer feels the scientific content of the manuscript may be highly influential or controversial;
2. There is no approved study plan;
3. The study has deviated substantially from the approved study plan without documented approval;
4. There is no evidence in the study file of pre-data analysis consultation with a qualified statistician; or
5. The study file does not include a completed Scientist Statistical Checklist.

### **Technical Review—**

Technical reviews can cover a wide range of purposes, including reviewing the use of statistics, research design, implementing experimental methods, thoroughness of literature review, presentation of findings, interpretation of results, and other technical aspects of the research to ensure maximum “quality, objectivity, utility, and integrity of information” (OMB Guidelines, Section 515, Public Law 106-554, Data Quality Act).

A technical review can be internal or external, will generally be regarded as a “peer review,” and may be done through a refereed or non-refereed process.

**Internal and external reviews** are generally technical reviews. An internal review is generally considered to be within the author's RWU, facility (lab), or organization (research station). An external review is generally considered to be outside this circle of peers, including another research station or outside of Forest Service R&D. Internal and external reviews are usually conducted as peer reviews. An external review may be refereed, if through journal, or not refereed if a Forest Service publication. An internal review is usually not refereed.

**Policy review** looks for manuscript content that compromises scientific integrity, credibility and objectivity. The reviewer looks for opinions on laws or policy, speculation without peer-reviewed experimental data and citations, and provocative statements inappropriate for scientific publication. The policy review will ensure that discussion of management implications, considerations, and potential outcomes are objective and do not advocate for or discriminate against particular management approaches. Reviews are generally conducted by the senior Forest Service author's DRO, but may be delegated to a similarly qualified senior manager.