

This is the second review of *Forest structure and individual tree inventories of north-eastern Siberia along climactic gradients* by Miesner et al.

The authors addressed almost all of my concerns and, with a few minor revisions, I think the manuscript will be suitable for publication.

General comments:

- (1) The use of the terms ‘plot’ and ‘site’ interchangeably is unnecessarily confusing because those terms generally mean different things. Please chose one and use it consistently throughout.
- (2) The authors note in the main text that multiple regression is not a valid tool because the predictor variables are correlated among each other (line 251). I agree with this assessment, so I wonder why it is included at all in the manuscript. Either multiple regression analysis is appropriate (in which case, more needs to be done to ensure it is being used correctly), or it is not appropriate (in which case, it should not be included in the manuscript). The authors seem to want to have it both ways: they want to use the R² value from the multiple regression model while simultaneously calling such an analysis ‘not advisable.’ It is not statistically appropriate to use metrics from an analysis that has not been carried out correctly. I suggest removing all mentions of the multiple regression analysis from the manuscript.

Line-by-line comments:

L64: It is not clear to me that an exception would necessarily be above, as the authors indicated in their response. If this is what you mean, change to ‘Annual precipitation is generally below 300 mm, although this is sometimes exceeded towards the boundaries of the area.’

L 77: For clarity, change to “the exact position of the survey plots was finalized on-site....”

L156: update should be ‘updated’

L223: ‘the’ is missing...should be ‘the significance and explanatory...’

L224: ‘value’ should be plural

L224: p-value of 0.021 is significant and R²=0.33 is fairly decent for ecological data, so consider removing the part about significance and explanatory values not being high.

L311: In the previous review of this paper, I mentioned that one should be able to rearrange the equation relating DBH to height to compare data from the literature. The authors responded that this would be circular reasoning. Let me be more clear. The authors use the following equation:

$$DBH = a_1(H-1.3)^{a_2}$$

We can rearrange this equation to relate height to DBH:

$$H = (DBH/a_1)^{(1/a_2)} - 1.3$$

However, I briefly looked at the Alexander and Delcourt papers, and I was unable to find evidence that they relate DBH to tree height. Instead, they both relate DBH to biomass. I suggest the authors either compare the results directly or delete this sentence.