I have carefully reviewed the major revision and have enlisted below replies to each comment.

1. As per my suggestion, author has removed 'high resolution' term from the title: I am aware that Author has developed dataset which might be high resolution for the given timeline but by the remote sensing definition, it is still not high resolution and term proves to be unsuitable. Thus, I appreciate author decision to skip the term high resolution.

2. Author has successfully implemented my comment on validating data using currently available dataset using CLC dataset. To move forward, I would really like to see the comparison with SAGE cropland dataset as well as it was approximately developed using similar methods and similar timeline. I understand author has performed comparisons using HYDE dataset but SAGE dataset comparison would be more suitable.

3. Overall, author has sincerely worked on my comments and implemented the suggestions satisfactorily and I think this paper has improved significantly after it.

I have minor suggestions in the structure of paper as below:

1. In introduction, I would suggest to reduce introduction on global cropland mapping importance and focus on why it is important to provide cropland maps in your study area. There is background on agriculture in the study area but it is not clearly suggesting why grid based cropland mapping is necessary. I would suggest author to add a papragraph on it and reduce the other part focusing on global cropland mapping little bit.
Second, I am not getting the story in continuous manned while reading the introduction. My suggestion would be rearrange some information to get the flow of context.

2. You can remove the sub-divisions in data sources section. It just creating confusing and misreading the reader about usage of satellite data and other datasets. You have used some reference datasets and some statistical dataset, which can come under one hood of " available cropland data from the study area".

3. In methods, I would suggest just to have one flowchart covering all the steps rather than having many flowcharts in each section. In that way, it will be easier for reader to understand entire methods in one go. I am happy to review the new one flowchart if required.

4. Validation should go under results section. Also, time-series changes should be under one section and not two subsections if possible.

5. Discussion should discuss the limitations of the dataset clearly.

Overall, I am very satisfied with the author with all the changes. The above minor suggestions would hopefully help the readability of the manuscript.