

Tree-Ring Research: Journal Ethics and Expectations

Tree-Ring Research is committed to upholding ethical publication standards to ensure the rigor and impact of tree-ring science is maintained. As the flagship journal of the Tree-Ring Society, all individuals involved in publication in *Tree-Ring Research* - including authors, reviewers, and editors - are expected to uphold the standards outlined in the Tree-Ring Society's [Code of Ethics](#) and [Code of Conduct](#) and the expectations described below.

Tree-Ring Research uses a single-anonymized system for review, in which the author identity is known to reviewers, but reviewers' identity is not known to authors.

Author Expectations

Artificial Intelligence: Should any Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools be used for data analysis, please cite the tool as you would any software. If AI tools are used to assist with writing the manuscript, please include a statement to this effect in the acknowledgements. We expect writing to be completed primarily by the authors.

Authorship: Authorship should be claimed only by individuals who have made an intellectual contribution to the paper. Customary intellectual contributions would include at least one of the following: conceiving the conceptual framework, central ideas, or experimental design; participating in executing the study; analyzing and interpreting data; or writing/revising the manuscript. Providing funding does not automatically guarantee authorship.

Author contribution statement: Authors are expected to provide an author contribution statement in the Cover Letter.

Citations: All data and text, where relevant, should be properly attributed and cited. Authors are encouraged to draw from diverse literature that is relative to the topic and avoid overenthusiastic self-citation.

Co-authorship: All co-authors must agree to the content in the final version of the manuscript.

Conflicts of interest and disclosure: All authors must declare to the editor any potential or perceived conflict of interest, and if applicable, how this conflict has been or is mitigated. A potential or perceived conflict of interest may include, but is not limited to, a financial or social relationship or competing interest that may prevent objective and original work or inappropriately influence the work.

Concurrent or duplicate publication: By submitting a manuscript to *Tree-Ring Research*, authors confirm that the manuscript is not under consideration at another journal concurrently, nor has it been published elsewhere.

Cover letter: Authors are expected to submit a cover letter alongside their manuscript. Please see the Instructions for Cover Letter for elements to include.

Errors in published works: It is the authors' responsibility to notify Tree-Ring Research immediately upon discovery of an error or omission in a published paper.

Inclusive language: Authors should strive to utilize inclusive language throughout the paper. Inclusive language helps to uphold principles of respect, diversity, and equity that are core to the Tree-Ring Society's goals of supporting the global dendrochronology community.

Originality and plagiarism: By submitting a manuscript, the authors agree that they have not committed plagiarism and that the data and ideas are original unless properly cited. Authors will always provide appropriate citations for the work/ideas of others or your own published work. Authors must receive permission to reproduce any copyrighted images.

Recourse: Breaching any of these expectations may result in action by the editor in consultation with the Tree-Ring Society Executive Council.

Reviewer Expectations

Fairness: Reviewers should not purposefully delay publication of a manuscript nor recommend rejection to gain an advantage over the manuscript's authors.

Confidentiality: Reviewers will treat all manuscripts under their revision as confidential, recognizing them as the intellectual property of the authors.

Inclusive and respectful language: Reviewers should strive to utilize inclusive language throughout their review. They should also ensure that any critiques are warranted and targeted at the content of the manuscript, not the authors themselves. Inclusive and respectful language helps to uphold principles of respect, diversity, and equity that are core to the Tree-Ring Society's goals of supporting the global dendrochronology community.

Objectivity: Individuals should not serve as a reviewer if they have a conflict of interest with any author or any authors' institution that would prevent **objective evaluation** of the work. Reviewers should declare a potential or perceived conflict of interest to the Editor who will make a final decision as to whether the reviewer is able to make an objective evaluation. A potential or perceived conflict of interest may include, but is not limited to, a financial or social relationship or competing interest that may prevent objective and original work or inappropriately influence the review.

Recourse: Violation of any of these expectations may result in action by the Editor.

Relevant citation suggestions: Reviewers should only recommend citations of their own work if they are directly relevant to the work. Reviewers are encouraged to recommend citations from diverse authors.

Reviewer guidelines: Reviewers will be provided with guidelines for reviewers upon agreeing to review a manuscript.

Editor Expectations

Equity: An editor (or Associate Editor) will evaluate manuscripts based on the content without favoritism or prejudice.

Confidentiality: Editors will treat all manuscripts under their revision as confidential, recognizing them as the intellectual property of the authors.

Inclusive and respectful language: Editors should strive to utilize inclusive language throughout their communication and will ensure that critiques are warranted and targeted at the content of the

manuscript, not the authors themselves. Inclusive and respectful language helps to uphold principles of respect, diversity, and equity that are core to the Tree-Ring Society's goals of supporting the global dendrochronology community.

Objectivity: Individuals should not serve as a reviewer if past or present connections with the author or the author's institutions, or other potential conflict of interest, may prevent objective evaluation of the work.

Recourse: Editors will review any potential breaches of these expectations and recommend an action commensurate with the gravity of the breach. Any potential breaches by an editor will be reviewed by the Editorial Board in consultation with the Tree-Ring Society Executive Council.

Tree-Ring Research acknowledges the resources provided by the [Council of Publication Ethics](#), the [American Geophysical Union](#), the [Journal of Pediatric Pharmacology and Therapeutics](#), and the [International Journal of Recent Technology and Engineering](#) to develop these expectations.