

Dear Dr. Sybille Hassler, dear colleagues and reviewers,

thank you for reviewing our manuscript “Individual tree point clouds and tree measurements from multi-platform laser scanning in German forests”. We incorporated the last technical corrections and suggestions. Below, we provide our responses to the comments in *italics and blue* and excerpts from the updated manuscript in *italics and orange*.

In addition to the revised manuscript, we provide a version with highlighted changes as PDF file.

Besides the requested technical corrections, we corrected the specification of the vertical field of view of the TLS acquisitions (L 142 in the version with tracked changes):

Each scan had a vertical field of view of 100° (+60°/-40° from the horizontal plane) and ...

Furthermore, we added an additional affiliation for one of the authors, Nina Krašovec.

Yours sincerely,

Hannah Weiser

On behalf of all co-authors

Referee comment 2

Thank you for the revised version of the paper alongside your comments on the 1st review. The manuscript has improved greatly as a result of this process. I am satisfied with the quality of the data, its description and its presentation for use by third-parties.

Re-reading the manuscript as part of this second review I have some further minor suggestions that the authors may wish to consider, please see these below. Nevertheless, I can recommend the publication of this manuscript in a close form to the revised submission.

Technical corrections/ suggestions

- Line 12: available for download, **hosted by** the PANGAEA ...
- You might consider combining tables 1 and 2 and including the information for the TLS scanner also (currently held in lines 164 onwards), this would allow direct comparison and be a bit more compact.

We combined the tables according to your suggestion. Table 1 now shows scanner specifications and acquisition settings for TLS, ULS and ALS.

- Centre dashes in Table 4
- Thanks for including Table 6, this is an improvement. **Consider replacing 0 values with dashes** to aid readability, also ensure the “total” row is all on one line

We kept the two rows for the number of trees per data source for all plots (“All”; last two rows) in Table 6 (now Table 5). This is because we want to display both the sum of trees for which ULS leaf-off data is available as well as the sum for the separate times of leaf-off data acquisition (Autumn 2019, Spring 2020). Because the 503 trees in BR01 were acquired in both autumn and spring, providing just the total leaf-off number (1173) might confuse the reader, because it is not clear how this sum is formed from the numbers in the columns above. We added an explanation to the caption:

Note that most trees were measured from different platforms and at different times. ULS leaf-off data is available for 1173 trees. Of these, 133 trees were measured in autumn 2019, 537 trees were measured in spring 2020, and 503 trees were measured both in autumn 2019 and spring 2020.

- Line 374: replace “good” with “high” or similar, good is too subjective
- Line 496: Weiser et al 2021 should maybe be Weiser et al 2021c (also line 505 and line 720)
As we had to correct the year in two of the references, it is now Weiser et al. 2022b (for the PANGAEA dataset) and Weiser et al. 2022a (for the PANGAEA metadata document). We fixed some other references which had a “wrong doi” (i.e. [https://doi.org/https://doi.org/...](https://doi.org/https://doi.org/)) or missing author list and marked them in blue. Lastly, we updated the URLs in the references for the sensor datasheets to the documents we uploaded as supplement to our data repository.
- Table A1, please add a header for relative tree count values, please also tidy up column widths and header justification. Otherwise a great addition.