Dear Editor and Reviewer:

We appreciate your insightful comments on our paper. The comments offered have been immensely helpful. We have responded to every question, indicating exactly how we addressed each concern or problem and describing the changes we have made. The revisions have been approved by all authors. The point-to-point responses to your comments are listed below in blue.

Point 1: The English language needs to be improved thoroughly. The authors need to check the text carefully to avoid some confusing sentences.

Response: Thank you a lot for the insightful suggestion. We have rewritten some words and sentences in our revised manuscript. Please see the revised manuscript for more details.

Point 2: It is better to have a name for the datasets, for example, RapeseedPA10m

Response: We greatly appreciate your careful review. We have named the database 'RapeseedMap10'. Also, we revised the title ' The RapeseedMap10 database: annual maps of rapeseed at a spatial resolution of 10 m based on multi-source data'

Point 3: In line 21, 'overexploiting fossil fuels will exposure human increasing risks' should be 'overexploiting fossil fuels will expose human increasing risks'

Response: We have modified the sentence. For more details, please see lines 21-22 in the revised manuscript.

Point 4: In line 81, 'This work identified rapeseed planting areas' should be 'We identified rapeseed planting areas'

Response: We have modified the sentence. For more details, please see line 87 in the revised manuscript.

Point 5: The legend in Fig3c is confusing, is it a time range? the caption does not explain clearly either, please use an example to clarify it.

Response: Yes, it is a time range. Thank you a lot for the insightful suggestion. We have revised the legend of Fig.3c in the revised manuscript. Also, we have added some relevant content in the caption to describe the details of the time range. Please see lines 225-231 in the revised manuscript for more details.