

Review of: "Reforesting_now"

David Lapola¹

¹ Universidade Estadual de Campinas

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The concept of the article is great, but I am sure it can be developed further, and discussion/conclusions could go way deeper compared to the current version. I respectfully suggest a thorough review of English language, to improve precision (e.g. kilometers square → square kilometers; amazonic → amazonian; incredible deforestation → acute deforestation).

Figure 1 and its explanatory text should make the biome divisions explicit. Most of what is shown in pink color does not belong to the Amazon biome and can confound readers. Moreover, can you please specify how much (in percentage) of original Marabá forests were lost since the 1970's?

At a certain point there is a mention that relates "reforestation" as a way back to "normality". I suggest avoiding that wording, otherwise the authors should explain what is understood by "normality". Prefer "back to a high forest/tree cover rate or percentage".

One suggestion for future work is to use real 3D models of trees that are created from laser scanning of forests (LiDAR technology). See for example: <https://www.ucl.ac.uk/news/2018/feb/laser-technology-reveals-weight-some-uks-and-worlds-biggest-trees>

The final parts of the paper could be better developed in terms of discussing the impact of the artistic intervention. For example, how many people have downloaded the app? Did they leave/did you collect any review about it?