Biogeosciences
Discussions

Open Access

Interactive comment on "Evaluation of carbon stocks in above- and below-ground biomass in Central Africa: case study of Lesio-louna tropical rainforest of Congo" *by* X. Liu

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 21 August 2014

There may be value in these data, and I applaud the authors' wish to publish in English, but this text was not ready for review. While the topic of the study is arguably important the text itself falls far short of publication standards.

The text is very poorly written, suffers many basic errors, and lacks coherence. I am not sure such a paper should be sent out for review (who gains from this process?). I would support some kind of screening in which texts like this must first go through some back and forth editing with some kind of editing service. Perhaps a plagiarism checker can also be added at a central level (these are available).

As I am sympathetic to the challenge faced by such obviously non-English speaking

authors I tried to focus on the technical arguments (to assess if basic editing would reveal a strong paper concept) but these technical arguments are themselves hard to follow and thus to assess. If I assume that the principle idea is to add new estimates for forest biomass in an under sampled region of the tropics there are significant additional weaknesses. These include:

Poor framing (introduction spends time raising questions and issues that the study does not address, line 20 page 5 seems the key point). Analytical assumptions weaken the principle claims of the study (both above ground and below ground biomass are calculated from diameter data based on the assumed suitability of global summary approaches – no justification is offered and the implications are neglected). Poorly organized results (e.g. the reader is unclear why the various groupings are made or why they are helpful). Many points raised in the discussion appear flawed: e.g. very naïve (see line 25 page 12) or artifacts of the methods (line 26 page 12). Statistical weaknesses: the sample sizes are very small (implications are neglected, or perhaps misunderstood as suggested by line 25 page 12).

I will not attempt a list of text errors ... but a word processor grammar check would catch many.

I checked a couple of pieces of coherent text online and suggest the authors learn how to paraphrase or use quotation marks so as to avoid claims of plagiarism.