
Review Form 3

Journal Name:	International Journal of Environment and Climate Change
Manuscript Number:	Ms_IJECC_121222
Title of the Manuscript:	Carbon Stock Estimation of Compensatory Afforestation Plantation Work in Balod District of Chhattisgarh
Type of the Article	

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript is a valuable contribution to the scientific community as it enhances our understanding of carbon stocks and biomass estimation in forest plantations using allometric equations. By providing accurate methods and validation for these calculations, the study supports efforts in climate change mitigation and sustainable forest management. I appreciate the manuscript for its rigorous methodology, comprehensive analysis, and potential to inform better forest management practices. However, I would have liked to see a broader range of species and regions included to improve the generalizability of the findings.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Yes, the title of the article is suitable, clear, and descriptive. It effectively communicates the main focus of the study, which is the estimation of carbon stocks in a compensatory afforestation plantation project in the Balod District of Chhattisgarh.	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	It seems that the abstract of the article should be reworded to make it more concise while retaining the essential information. It could be improved as follows: 1-Avoid repetition: - The summary repeats the objectives of afforestation multiple times, particularly the enhancement of the local environment and socio-economic benefits to the local community. - The mention of <i>Terminalia arjuna</i> is repeated twice in a similar context, which could be condensed to avoid redundancy. 2- Lack of Clarity in Objectives: - It could be useful to clarify the specific objectives of the study at the beginning rather than introducing them in a scattered manner.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	The manuscript is well-structured and comprehensive. The subsections and overall organization effectively convey the research process and findings.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	This manuscript demonstrates scientific correctness through its rigorous methodology, including the use of established allometric equations and robust statistical analyses to estimate biomass and carbon stocks. The authors provide clear, replicable procedures and validate their results with field data, ensuring the reliability of their findings. Additionally, the manuscript includes a thorough review of relevant literature, situating the study within the broader context of forest carbon estimation research. These factors collectively indicate that the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. -	The references in this manuscript include both recent ones from 2024 and older ones dating back to 1942, covering a wide range of studies on biomass estimation and carbon stock assessment. They encompass foundational works and contemporary research, ensuring a comprehensive bibliographic foundation.	

Review Form 3

Minor REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	In general, the language and quality of English are appropriate for scientific communication	
Optional/General comments	The manuscript particularly the introduction is relatively long and could be made more concise by deleting details that are not essential to the overall understanding of the study. Suggestions are indicated in the manuscript.	

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?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Lakhdari Kaouthar
Department, University & Country	Scientific and Technical Research Centre for Arid Areas, Algeria