

New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science
Policies and Processes
January 2019

1. **Conflicts of interest**
2. **Peer review**
3. **Misconduct**
4. **Complaints Process**

1. Conflicts of interest

All submitted manuscripts must include a 'competing interests' section at the end of the manuscript listing all competing interests (financial and non-financial). Where authors have no competing interests, the statement should read "The author(s) declare(s) that they have no competing interests". The Editor may ask for further information relating to competing interests.

Editors and reviewers are also required to declare any competing interests and will be excluded from the peer review process if a competing interest exists.

A competing interest exists when the authors' interpretation of data or presentation of information may be influenced by their personal or financial relationship with other people or organisations. Authors should not only disclose any financial competing interests but also any non-financial competing interests that may cause them embarrassment if they were to become public after the publication of the manuscript.

Financial competing interests

Financial competing interests include (but are not limited to):

- Receiving reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of the manuscript, either now or in the future
- Holding stocks or shares in an organisation that may in any way gain or lose financially from the publication of the manuscript, either now or in the future
- Holding, or currently applying for, patents relating to the content of the manuscript
- Receiving reimbursements, fees, funding, or salary from an organisation that holds or has applied for patents relating to the content of the manuscript.

Non-financial competing interests

Non-financial competing interests include (but are not limited to) political, personal, religious, ideological, academic, and intellectual competing interests. Please contact the journal at nzjforestryscience@outlook.com if you think you may have a competing interest.

Commercial organisations

Authors from chemical companies, or other commercial organisations that sponsor trials, should declare these as competing interests on submission.

2. Peer review

All submissions are assessed by an Editor, who will decide whether they are within scope and are of suitable for peer review. Where an Editor is on the author list or has any other competing interest regarding a specific manuscript, another Editor will be assigned to assume responsibility for overseeing peer review. Submissions felt to be suitable for consideration will be sent to the appropriate Section Editor. The Section Editor will make a further assessment of the submission and will send it out for peer review by independent experts if appropriate. The Section Editor will then make a recommendation to the Editor based on the reviewers' reports and the Editor will make the final decision. The Editor will send the authors his editorial decision on their manuscript and associated reasoning as well as the referees' reports. Note that serious concerns raised by a referee may result in the manuscript being rejected even if other reviews are positive.

The *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science* operates a blind peer-review process where the reviewers know the identity of the authors but the authors do not know the identity of the reviewers.

Authors may suggest potential reviewers but use of these is at the Editor's discretion. Authors should not suggest recent collaborators or colleagues who work in the same institution as themselves. Authors who wish to suggest peer reviewers can do so in their covering letter and should provide institutional email addresses where possible, or information which will help the Editor to verify the identity of the reviewer (for example an ORCID or Scopus ID).

Authors may request exclusion of individuals as peer reviewers, but they should explain the reasons in their covering letter on submission. Authors should not exclude too many individuals as this may hinder the peer review process. Please note that the Editor and Section Editor may choose to invite excluded peer reviewers.

Intentionally falsifying information, for example, suggesting reviewers with a false name or email address, will result in rejection of the manuscript and may lead to further investigation.

3. Misconduct

Corrections and retractions

Corrections to, or retractions of, published articles will be made by publishing a correction or retraction note without altering the original article in any way other than to add a prominent link to the note. In this way, the original article remains in the public domain and the subsequent correction or retraction will be widely indexed.

Removal of Published Papers

The preservation of scientific research is a cornerstone of science and as such we will use our best efforts to ensure that material published by the *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science* is preserved and remains available for access. However, Scion reserves the right to remove published material from its site in the exceptional event that material is considered to be fabricated, plagiarised, defamatory or infringes any intellectual property right, or is otherwise unlawful. The publication will remain indexed in such cases but the following statement will appear in place of the content:

"This article is no longer available due to legal issues with the content".

Citations

Articles must cite appropriate and relevant literature in support of the claims made. Excessive and inappropriate self-citation or coordinated efforts among several authors to collectively self-cite is strongly discouraged.

Authors should consider the following guidelines when preparing their manuscript:

- Any statement in the manuscript that relies on external sources of information (i.e. not the authors' own new ideas or findings or general knowledge) should use a citation
- Authors should avoid citing derivations of original work. For example, they should cite the original work rather than a review article that cites an original work
- Authors should ensure that their citations are accurate (i.e. they should ensure the citation supports the statement made in their manuscript and should not misrepresent another work by citing it if it does not support the point the authors wish to make)
- Authors should not cite sources that they have not read
- Authors should not preferentially cite their own or their friends', peers', or institution's publications
- Authors should avoid citing work solely from one country
- Authors should not use an excessive number of citations to support one point
- Ideally, authors should cite sources that have undergone peer review where possible
- Authors should not cite advertisements or advertorial material

Plagiarism/Duplicate publication

Any manuscript submitted must be original and the manuscript must not be under consideration by any other journal. In any case where there is the potential for overlap or duplication, the Journal requires that authors are transparent. Authors should declare any potentially overlapping publications on submission and, where possible, upload these as additional files with the manuscript. Any overlapping publications should be cited. Any 'in press' or unpublished manuscript cited, or relevant to the Editor's and reviewers' assessment of the manuscript, should be made available if requested by the Editor. The *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science* reserve the right to judge potentially overlapping or redundant publications on a case-by-case basis.

In general, the manuscript should not already have been formally published in any journal or in any other citable form.

Text recycling

Authors should be aware that replication of text from their own previous publications is text recycling (also referred to as self-plagiarism), and in some cases is considered unacceptable. Where overlap of text with authors' own previous publications is necessary or unavoidable, duplication must always be reported transparently and be properly attributed and compliant with copyright requirements. If a manuscript contains text that has been published elsewhere, authors should notify the Editor of this on submission.

Abstracts/posters

Published abstracts should be cited. Prior publication of abstracts presented at, or published as part of, academic meetings may not preclude consideration for peer review of a full manuscript but will be considered on a case-by-case basis depending on length and content.

Misconduct

The *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science* takes seriously all allegations of potential misconduct. It may be necessary for the Editor to contact and share manuscripts with third parties, for example, author(s)' institution(s) and ethics committee(s) in cases of suspected misconduct relating either to research or publication. The Journal may also seek advice from the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) <http://www.publicationethics.org> and discuss anonymised cases in the COPE Forum.

In cases of proven research misconduct involving published articles, or where the scientific integrity of the article is significantly undermined, articles may be retracted.

4. Complaints Process

Anyone with a concern or complaint should contact the Journal at nzjforestryscience@outlook.com and provide details of their complaint.

A complaint must relate to something that is within the responsibility of the *New Zealand Journal of Forestry Science* and involve a failure of process. A disagreement about an editorial decision is not grounds for complaint if reasons for the decision have been provided. Issues relating to published content can be addressed by submitting a Letter to the Editor.

Complaints are resolved through a process of response and escalation:

- Wherever possible, complaints will be dealt with by the journal manager, escalating to a Section Editor if required.
- In the case that this initial response is insufficient, the complainant can request for the complaint to be escalated to the Editor, whose decision is final.
- If a complainant remains unhappy after what the editor considers a definitive reply the complainant may complain to the Committee on Publication Ethics, which publishes a code of practice for editors of scientific, technical, and medical journals <http://www.publicationethics.org>. It will consider complaints against editors but only once a journal's own complaints procedures have been exhausted.