## SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



## **SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

EDITORIAL COMMENT'S on revised paper (if any)	Authors' response to editor's comments
1. The authors have incorporated the reviewers suggestions in the body text, a few suggestions are provided to the authors to incorporate/clarify	Thanks for your comments and request for clarification. We have highlighted the corrections in yellow colour in the manuscript.
before it goes on final decision.  Please see the Attachment	We greatly appreciate the articles you suggested, which have helped enrich our results and discussion section. They have been incorporated into our manuscript.
	into our manuscript.  The author's citation for the two tree species' names has been included in the text in the abstract and introduction sections.  Also, total tree height means the height from the bottom of the tree to the tip of the crown of the tree, from our understanding. We chose to use total tree height because there is also merchantable tree height, which is the height from the tree bottom to the point on the trunk that is useful for timber, poles, or other products.
	However, we have decided to remove the word "total tree height" and use "tree height" because our work is also intended to be read by non-technical persons from the general population.
	Also, to clarify the aspect of carbon capture in relation to tree species and experimental sites. Yes, indeed, other factors, such as tree species variation, site conditions, and even age, have a significant influence on carbon capture, according to some literature. However, in our study, both tree species types ( <i>Gmelina arborea</i> and <i>Tectona grandis</i> ) did not influence carbon capture. Also, the experimental site (spacing trial and plantation trial) did not influence carbon storage. For our study, there was no difference between the two species regarding carbon capture. However, there was also no difference between the experimental sites in terms of carbon capture. The experimental sites are practically on the same land area. The entire plantation forest was just divided into the spacing trial and plantation trial. Since both trial plots are in the same area, it could be possible that the site conditions are the same. Maybe if the two trial plots were located at a far distance from each other, then there might be a significant difference in carbon capture that will be caused by site conditions in the different locations. However, there are differences in carbon capture between the two tree species ( <i>Gmelina arborea</i> and <i>Tectona grandis</i> ) and between the experimental sites (spacing trial and plantation trial). But these differences in carbon capture are not statistically significant at a 95% confidence level.  That is why we mentioned in our concluding statement that <i>Gmelina arborea</i> accumulates more carbon stocks in their biomass because despite there being no statistically significant differences between the two tree species, the values for AGB, BGB, TCS and TCO2 are still higher in quantity for the <i>Gmelina arborea</i> than the Tectona grandis (see Fig. 5 & 6).
	In the conclusion section, we are referring to total carbon stocks (AGC + BGC), which is the sum of both total above-ground carbon (TAGC) and below-ground carbon (TBGC). This has been changed and corrected. Thanks for picking that up.
	Also, since you mentioned and we agree that BGB is a fraction of AGB and so we can not infer any significant difference between the two. We

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.5 (4<sup>th</sup> August, 2012)

## SCIENCEDOMAIN international

www.sciencedomain.org



## **SDI EDITORIAL COMMENTS FORM**

have decided to remove areas in the manuscript where we predicted the correlation of their relationship in the abstract section and section 3.3.
Finally, please, the numbering of the equations should be moved to the far right of the page. This will prevent the numbering from looking like part of the equation. The format in equation 5 is better because it is far away from the equation. Thanks.
Thanks for your comments, and we hope we have satisfied them accordingly in our knowledge.

Created by: EA Checked by: ME Approved by: CEO Version: 1.5 (4<sup>th</sup> August, 2012)