

Review Form 1.6

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_88412
Title of the Manuscript:	Estimation of Carbon Sequestration in a Forest: A case study of Bhawal National Park, Gazipur
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.journalijecc.com/index.php/IJECC/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)
<u>Compulsory</u> REVISION comments	1.The research content has some application and reference significance, but carbon estimation by biomass is a common research method in academia, and the overall article seems to lack of Novelty. 2. Please explain whether the rootstock ratio of 0.26 mentioned in the paper is applicable to Bhawal National Park, Ghazipur, $BGTB = AGB \times 0.26$, whether AGB is AGTB and whether there is any writing error. 3.The article is about the amount of carbon sequestered in the forest, and all the tree species in the sample plots were sampled, so there should be other types of trees besides Sal trees, but only Sal trees are shown in the results. If the majority of the trees are Sal trees, then the types and percentages of the 240 trees should be shown to fully explain the results. 4. The biomass calculation itself includes tree height and diameter at breast height, which are inherently correlated, so what is the significance of the correlation analysis in 3.5? What does it tell us about the problem? It is not explained in the article. 5.There is only a conclusion part in the article, which lacks certain discussion and reflection. The overall analysis process of the article is less, basically the presentation of panel data.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments	1.Can the approximate locations of the plots P1,P2,P3be shown in the map, not just the coordinate locations. It is suggested to add a map for illustration.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments		

PART 2:

	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)
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Qiang Yu
Department, University & Country	Beijing Forestry University, China