

ReviewForm3

JournalName:	AsianJournalofAdvancedResearchandReports
ManuscriptNumber:	Ms_AJARR_129958
TitleoftheManuscript:	DiameterDistributionModelsandCarbonSequestrationPotentialofAfiForestReserve,CrossRiverState,Nigeria
TypeoftheArticle	

PART1:Comments

	Reviewer’scomment	Author’sFeedback(Pleasecorrectthemanuscriptandhighlightthatpart inthemanuscript.Itismandatorythatauthorsshouldwritehis/herfeedback here)
<b>Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.</b>	This research provides valuable tools for forest managers by developing diameter distribution models that enable informed decisions about silvicultural treatments, harvesting schedules, and sustainable forest resource utilization. By estimating the carbon potential of the Afi River Forest, the study highlights its role in mitigating climate change through carbon sequestration, contributing to global efforts to reduce atmospheric carbon dioxide. Also, assessment of tree species diversity and distribution supports the protection of forest ecosystems, helping to maintain biodiversity and the ecological balance in the region	Thanks for the comments.
<b>Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</b>	Yes, the article title is suitable and matches with the content of the manuscript.	Thanks for the comments.
<b>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.</b>	Yes, the abstract is clear and provides essential information about the study, the length is also reasonable with 253 words. However, it could be refined for better readability and flow. The following are the areas to be improved 1. Flow and Conciseness: The abstract could be more concise by eliminating some repetitive details, such as the description of sample plots 2. Significance of Results: The implication of the results, such as how the models and carbon potential estimates contribute to forest management, could be emphasized more. 3. Clarity on Model Significance: The statement "None of these selected models was significant" could be clarified further to explain what this means for the study's validity or application.	Noted thanks for the kind comments.
<b>Is the manuscript scientifically correct? Please write here.</b>	The manuscript appears to be scientifically correct based on the abstract provided. Here's a detailed assessment, however there are some improvements to be done. These improvements are: - 1. The manuscript should provide additional context on why none of the models were statistically significant and how this affects the reliability of the results. 2. Include more details on the validation process for the models and the metrics used to evaluate their performance. 3. Clarify whether the findings are specific to the Afi River Forest or if they can be generalized to other regions with similar conditions. Also, follow the identical numerical system for example decide to use fixed number of decimal places see Table 1	Thanks for the comments.
<b>Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form.</b>	Yes, the references are sufficient and recent.	
<b>Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</b>	Yes, the language of the article is suitable for scholarly communications, however the author can check and clear punctuation errors so as to attract the readers of this research.	Thanks for the comments.
<b>Optional/General</b> comments	No any additional comment.	

ReviewForm3

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)	