

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_93108
Title of the Manuscript:	Above-ground carbon stocks of Tectona grandis and Gmelina arborea plantations in Njala University, Southern Sierra Leone
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajraf.com/index.php/AJRAF/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
Compulsory REVISION comments	<p>The work can be published after a major review that responds to the following problems:</p> <p>1) clarification of the measured data and those calculated in the model;</p> <p>2) specifying the volume of the shaft sample and approximation of the forecast errors depending on the total population of trees in the experimental situ;</p> <p>3) The dimensional control of the equations used their numbering and writing them with the editor of the text publisher, Word.</p> <p>For results and conclusions, it is very important to specify if, apart from DBH (D), H (measured) and the density of wood (from literature) there were other independent sizes. With these data, it was calculated by linear relations <i>AGB</i>, <i>AGC</i> and <i>BGB</i>. It is not understood how to calculate or measure <i>T_{AGC}</i>, <i>T_{BGB}</i> with which <i>T_{CS}</i> and <i>TCO₂</i> are then calculated. This procedure (through the calculation relationships makes superfluous the affirmation of a very close correlation between <i>AGB</i> and <i>BGB</i>, because they are calculated according to the other through a linear relationship (2.4.2). Only if <i>AGB</i> and <i>BGB</i> were measured, then the correlation would be interesting. The situation is the same for the correlations between the other variables related to linear relationships. The authors must clarify this aspect.</p> <p>4) The authors must also review the conclusions, depending on the above statements and also regarding the statement regarding the decrease of the carbon stock in the soil generated by the ageing of the plantation.</p> <p>5) A control of the English language is recommended with the text editor but also using independent sources (for example Grammarly Free or Higher version, or other programs). The publisher is recommended to specify the version of the English language approved by the journal (the UK, US, India, etc.).</p> <p>In the reviewed manuscript, attached to the review, I noted the locations of some of the problems to be demanded above.</p>	
Minor REVISION comments	-	
Optional/General comments	<p>I suggest to the authors the introduction of several images with the plantations evaluated in the research and the measurements carried out. We also suggested possible GIS maps, which, also with the text map (fig. 1) have the advantage of being developed as a database (with prospects of monitoring plantations and implicitly carbon storage) And also, with the perspective of the possibility of using very modern working tools - imaging or outlawing satellite images to obtain vegetation information.</p>	

[Review Form 1.6](#)

PART 2:

	<u>Reviewer's comment</u>	<u>Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</u>
<u>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</u>	<u>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</u>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Cardei Petru
Department, University & Country	INMA Bucharest, Romania