



Peer Review Plan

(Reference [Information Quality Act](#))

FS-1400-0003 (V.1.2) 5/16

☒ Influential Scientific Information Peer

☐ Highly Influential Scientific Assessment Peer

Agency

USDA Forest Service

Agency Contact (name/ email/ phone)

Wade Tinkham, wade.tinkham@usda.gov

Title of Review

Constraints on Mechanical Fuel Reduction Treatments in USFS Wildfire Crisis Strategy Priority Landscapes

Purpose of Review

To ensure scientific rigor of data analysis and the representativeness of management scenarios.

Type of Review

☐ Panel Review

☒ Individual Review

Internal technical and policy review selected by authors;
Formal, double-blind review from the journal, once submitted

☐ Alternative Process (Briefly Explain):

Timing of Review

02/21/2024

Start

01/08/2024

End

03/15/2024

☐ 3 or fewer

Number of Reviewers

☒ 4 to 10

☐ More than 10 or more

Primary Discipline/Types of Expertise Needed for Review

Forests planning and harvesting design

Reviewer Names and Affiliations

Yu Wei, Professor of Forest Operations, Colorado State University

Michelle Day, Biological Scientist, USFS, R&D, Rocky Mountain Research Station

Anonymous reviewers to be determined by the journal

Expected Publication Outlet (Science or Similar Peer Reviewed Journal)

Journal of Forestry, where the manuscript will receive additional anonymous peer review from scientific experts selected by the journal editorial board.

Reviewers Selected by: ☒ Agency

☐ Designated Outside Organization

Organization's Name: _____

Opportunities for Public Comment? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes, briefly state how and when these opportunities will be provided:

How: _____

When: _____

Peer Reviewers Provided with Public Commentary

☐ Yes☒ No**Summary of Peer Reviewers' Comments**

Both reviewers highlighted the relevance and timeliness of the research for contributing to management planning in the Wildfire Crisis Strategy landscapes. Neither reviewer expressed any concerns regarding the study methods or interpretation of results. Most comments were minor and sought to clarify the methods and connections to related fuels management planning tools and research. One of these changes included expanding the justification for the three scenarios mechanical constraint scenarios evaluated. Additionally, the discussion of how this work relates to unplanned ignitions and decision support tools for how managers can incorporate these constraints in fuel treatment planning were expanded. Finally, the reviewers pointed out a few minor editorial corrections to help with the papers readability.

Public Nominations Requested for Review Panel

☐ Yes☒ No**Other Comments**