Reviewer's comments on plants-2454816

General comments:

The topic is simply interesting but has many flaws. The authors presented the findings in a complex way, which made it difficult for the general reader. However, I have the following comments and suggestions:

1. Abstract part should need to be modified. The authors should write a short description of the methodologies used in this study. The coefficient values of the allometric equation should not be put into the abstract part. Instead, the authors should give specific description of allometric equations for determining the AGB (aboveground biomass) and root biomass with mentioning proper references for Eucalyptus stands and native Cerrado vegetation in the methodology part.
2. In the Abstract part, the findings (results) and conclusions of the study were not well written. There is also no clear message for the future use of this study.
3. In the Introduction part, there is a lack of the study's aim (s) of which the study is targeting to address. Only research hypotheses are not enough. The Introduction part needs to highlight the relevance of standing biomass and soil carbon on carbon offsetting to reduce GHG emissions.
4. After the Introduction part, the 'Materials and Methods' part should come there. Without knowing the methodologies, the readers can not follow the findings of the study since these are highly technical terms.
5. The GWP of all GHG gases i.e., CO_2, CH_4, N_2O and their conversions should give proper references. Are they for a 100-year lifetime basis?
6. Who produced Table 4. Is it produced from the study or from another source (Ref. is missing)?
7. 4.1.1-4.1.5, appropriate method (s) or allometric equations with reference (s) should be given.
8. Needs detail on estimation of root biomass and their amount of C (section 4.1.3).
9. Section 4.1.6, line 459-467, reference mission for F value (used for the conversion from CO_2 to C).
10. Section 4.7. Reference missing on estimation of Total carbon.
11. Does the sign 'Mg' mean million grams? If it is so, then what are the differences of Mg mentioned in line 31, 125 and many other places with Mg of Table 4?
12. Please use CH_4 instead CH4 (line 208).
13. Based on the findings of AGB, Root biomass and their GWP, the authors could develop the corresponding Model (i.e., allometric equation). Then the study would be more attractive.
14. It is well known that half of plant biomass is generally composed of organic carbon (Table 1 and Table 2). However, the authors could simply estimate the C content from AGB, root biomass and soil carbon, and then tabulate the GWP by using the corresponding default value of the GHGs (i.e., CO_2, CH_4, N_2O).
15. Please use the term CO_2eq. emissions instead of Ceq. emissions throughout the text by calculating the appropriate value. The use of CO_2eq. emissions is the most straightforward term while describing the emissions or GWP.
16. The Conclusion part also needs to be modified in accordance with the concrete findings. It is also needed to mention the limitations and applicability of this study as well as recommendations for future research.

Final comments

The manuscript needs major revision.