

Survival, growth and carbon content in a forest plantation established after a clear-cutting in Durango, Mexico

General comments

The paper addresses the role of reforestation (forest plantation) in carbon sequestration or climate change mitigation, which is an important subject in forestry. However, the authors did not completely develop the research insights in the Introduction, rather they included not relevant information (see specific comments below). They should state clearly the research question, for example, are there differences in the contribution of individual species in carbon sequestration? Is it reasonable to expect any synergistic response of both species together in the reforestation? In this sense the Introduction section is not complete.

The hypothesis is rather general and it was not fully proved since their findings does not suggests that reforestation, by itself, are efficient way of mitigating climate change or increasing carbon sequestration, because species response varies with site conditions, seedling history, etc.

For data analysis (Anova) they should state clearly what treatments effects are testing for and why. For example, why comparisons among species was carried out for most variables but not for survival? The authors could improve the Discussion section considering that *Pinus cooperi* survival was clearly lower than *P. durangensis*, since this might have important implications for results in all other variables.

Addressing these comments, the manuscripts contribution could be substantially improved and therefore could be accepted for publication in the peerj journal.

Specific comments

Introduction

Lines 51-62: this information is not relevant for this study context.

Lines 71: advantages of clear-cuts are mostly economics, not ecological.

Material and Methods

Line 118: not clear how crown width and 1.3 m diameter were analyzed or used in the study.

Line 141: please state and explain treatment effects for Anova.

Results

Line 186: please define BD

Discussion

Line 202: writing correction required: “the our”

Conclusions

Lines 238-240: not conclusive, total survival percentage does not show species performance. *Pinus durangensis* did better than *P. cooperi*.

Lines 240-242: not relevant and not based on results of this study.

Lines 242-244: not based on results of this study.