



**SDI Review Form 1.6**

Journal Name:	<a href="#">Asian Journal of Research in Agriculture and Forestry</a>
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJRAF_46922
Title of the Manuscript:	Assessment of total carbon stock in Swietenia macrophylla woodlot at Jhenaidah district in Bangladesh
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:

(<http://www.sciencedomain.org/page.php?id=sdi-general-editorial-policy#Peer-Review-Guideline>)

**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)
<b>Compulsory</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Too much information on the abstract, which should have been on the Result and Discussion.</li> <li>Author has mentioned on belowground Carbon but nothing mentioned on the method part what is measured and how its further analyzed.</li> <li>Author has mentioned a instrument called <b>Spigel Relaskop</b>. How it is not mentioned for what purpose???????</li> </ul>	Yes, I agree with reviewer's comments and I corrected the manuscript and highlight that edited part in the manuscript.
<b>Minor</b> REVISION comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under Secondary data collection author has highlighted on bullet points. However, I feel that in academic writing it should be mentioned in a paragraph.</li> </ul>	Yes, I agree with reviewer's comments and I corrected the manuscript and highlight that edited part in the manuscript.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>As mentioned above abstract should be clearly and concisely written</li> <li>Problem statement under the <b>Introduction</b> need to be clear (meaning, why this research being carried out- elaborate more than what is there in the text already)</li> </ul>	Yes, I agree with reviewer's comments and I corrected the manuscript and highlight that edited part 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?	(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)	No



SDI Review Form 1.6

Reviewer Details:

Name:	<b>Anonymous Reviewer, Reviewer preferred to be anonymous.</b>
Department, University & Country	