

Conflict of interest guidelines for reviewers of *Rangelands* (10/2019)

Sound scientific research and the peer review process rely on transparency and objectivity. To ensure that transparency and objectivity are maintained the following situations are considered conflicts of interest for reviewers of manuscripts being considered for publication in *Rangelands*. [Karl et al. \(2019\)](#) also provides information on conflicts of interest. If any of the following situations apply to you regarding the manuscript you have been asked to review, please contact the Managing Editor (Jocelyn Aycrigg, aycrigg@uidaho.edu) or the Editor in Chief (Jason Karl, jkarl@uidaho.edu).

1. Financial conflicts
 - a. Reviewer will receive professional or personal benefit from reviewing this manuscript.
 - b. Reviewer has a direct or indirect financial interest in the manuscript being reviewed.
2. Conflicts of commitment
 - a. Reviewer has co-authored a publication with at least of one of the authors in the past 3 years.
 - b. At least one of the authors has been reviewer's colleague in the same section or department or similar organization in the past 3 years.
 - c. Reviewer is currently mentoring or supervising the graduate work of at least one of the authors.
 - d. In the past 3 years, reviewer has mentored or supervised the graduate work of at least one of the authors
 - e. Reviewer is currently being considered for a position in the same section or department or similar organization as the one or more of the authors.
 - f. Reviewer will receive professional or personal benefit or harm from publication of this manuscript.
 - g. Reviewing manuscript could potentially impact (positively or negatively) current research being conducted by reviewer
 - h. Reviewing manuscript could be in direct competition with the research being conducted by reviewer (i.e., the manuscript topic is too similar to the reviewer's current research).
 - i. Reviewer has provided data, advice, or input into publication.
3. Personal or intellectual conflicts
 - a. Reviewer has a personal relationship (e.g., family or close friend) with one or more of the authors
 - b. Reviewer has strong opinions regarding one or more of the authors (e.g., reviewer detests one or more of the authors, reviewer is reluctant to provide a critical review of a paper by one or more of the authors or reviewer is participating in a heated scientific debate with one or more of the authors).