

We extend our thanks to Anonymous reviewer 3 for making the following remarks:

Reviewer 3 wrote:

Miesner and coauthors compile a data set of forest surveys from expeditions to the north-east of the Russian Federation. Data collection spans a long time period and includes about 10 tree species. They reported forest attributes, such as tree height, DBH, etc. They also compared their data with remote sensing datasets of forest height, biomass, and forest loss, and found the limitations in these remote sensing data. This dataset is invaluable to understand boreal forest conditions and their impacts on high-latitude carbon dynamics. In boreal forests, many tree species are short and are often classified as shrubs. In this work, how did the authors separate forests from shrublands?

Our response:

In our inventories, we did not aim to make a qualified differentiation between forest and other vegetation types like shrublands or forest-tundra. Instead, all sites were considered as forest, as long as any trees grew there, independent of their height or density. The column “Forest type” in the plot data base refers to the predominant growth form of the trees, and not to the vegetation types. Indeed, several sites in our data set do not qualify as forest according to common definitions, due to the low heights of the trees and/or their sparsity, as can be seen in plot data base columns like for example “Height quantile [m] (Quantile (90<sup>th</sup>))”, “Height max [m]“, “Tree BA [m\*\*2/ha]”.

Reviewer 3 wrote:

In the abstract, it is necessary to indicate the time period of data collection.

Our response:

Suggestion adopted:

*We compile a data set of forest surveys from expeditions to the north-east of the Russian Federation, in Krasnoyarsk Krai, the Republic of Sakha (Yakutia) and the Chukotka Autonomous Okrug (59-73° N, 97-169° E), performed between the years 2011 and 2021.*