


# AMERICAN JOURNAL OF Botany



## AJB Instructions for Reviewers



Log in to [Editorial Manager](#) as a Reviewer and access the manuscript under “Pending Assignments.”

Under the “Action” link for the manuscript click "Submit Recommendation."

Please rate the overall aspects of the manuscript. Insert your Comments to the Author and Confidential Comments to the Editor in the appropriate boxes. Your review will be anonymous unless you sign the comments to the author—and we encourage you to identify yourself to the authors by signing the review.

You may embed comments directly in a digital copy of the manuscript and upload this as an attachment. When you click “View Submission” there is a link to the manuscript in its original word processing program, which you may download to edit. All annotated manuscripts are "sanitized" [i.e., all identifying information is removed] automatically by Editorial Manager, and that is the only copy the authors may access. If you edit the manuscript, please also summarize your main points in the comment box to the author.

When you have completed the review form and selected a recommendation from the pull-down menu at the top of the screen, click "Proceed."

### **CONTENTS OF YOUR REVIEW:**

In addition to providing detailed feedback for the authors, please consider the following as you evaluate the paper:

- What are the major contributions of this paper (what significant question has been addressed, what hypothesis tested, what conceptual advance made)? Would you recommend this paper to a colleague to read? Why or why not?
- Is the research question novel and interesting within its botanical subdiscipline? Is it clearly stated in the abstract and introduction (in the form of hypotheses), and revisited in the discussion?
- Is this paper also of interest to a non-specialist reader of *AJB*? If so, is the general message included in the abstract, introduction, and discussion?
- Are the methods (e.g., experimental design) sound and repeatable? If statistics are used, are they appropriate? Are the statistical values, dfs, and p-values reported (either in the text or in tables)?
- When appropriate, are voucher specimens included (either in the text or in an Appendix)?
- Are the tables, figures, and online supplements (when included) accurate and useful? Are they clearly presented? Are the titles and legends self-explanatory without referring to the text? Is anything missing that would be helpful to the reader? Should any data be moved from tables to online supplemental material?
- Do any portions of the paper need shortening, deleting, expanding, or rearranging? Please provide specific suggestions.

In the **Confidential Comments to the Editor**, please state what is the most significant contribution of this paper. Please also include a summary of the most critical points supporting your recommendation. Thank you for your support of the peer-review process!