

My brief comment on each given comment is as follows:

1. My previous comment of major limitation about data validation and calibration is not explained satisfactory. In the revision, author had compared past statistical or other study dataset to compare their datasets at the grid level but that comparison do not add any value because the dataset developed by author has used baseline of the statistical data to allocate each value into grids. Since the baseline data used for mapping has itself used for validation (in this case areal comparisons at administrative level), which cannot be necessarily qualify validation. Thus, major limitation of this study still stands.
2. This study has mentioned that they have used CCI-LC maps of 2000, but revised paper has maps of 1690 to 1999, thus this study does not use any satellite data and has reorganized and spatially allocated the historical dataset where no validation is available.

To provide suggestion on validation, the developed dataset may not needed to validate for all the past years but if author can validate dataset using the satellite data maps from satellite such as Landsat where map can be developed at 30m resolution from 1980 to 1999 or at least from 1985 with some limitations of data and compare these maps with the allocated maps developed by this study: those results may be some kind of comparison and provide the base to validate the results of this study for some years at least.

3. As observed in this study, cropland data is collected from several studies and different governments : thus do not hold a single cropland definition and need further explanation. This study did not provide clear explanation on it. How did author combine all this datasets when cropland definitions of different dataset were different. What was the basis, how did it affect the fusion?
4. As I provided above solution about using those satellite dataset available in historical years like Landsat is available from 1985 , which can be used to check spatially accuracy and allocation for precision of maps. I suggest authors to implement this method rather than not validating the results and providing blind spatial allocations with no base.
5. This work still needed high level of English correction and organization of writing. For example, in revised version, discussion section has lot of methodological details and results and very less discussion. This paper has lot of scope to work on organizing the sections and restructuring the paper while providing English corrections.

6. This data is not high resolution maps: Author may call it spatial maps as previous dataset just have county level details but using high-resolution is not suitable. In remote sensing terms less than 10m pixel can be considered as high resolution according to definitions provided by several international research organizations such as USDA, UN,FAO.
7. Data reliability is still questionable as the validation and gap filling is not explained or analyzed properly. Although interpolation is the only way to gap fill data but the interpolated data need to be validate for further use.