I understand this is revised submission, and hence my comments are limited to considering that status.

There is no methodology mentioned in abstract. "First global 30 m resolution distribution maps was produced from what and how? After this, add one to two sentences about how the study was carried out?

Line 50: clarify what is 'long-term distribution maps"

Line 64 -70: these are about method and better fits in section 2 Data and method not in section 1.

Methodology needs better explanation because results can be trusted based on methodology. Line 95: how many data sets used of Landsat, Sentinel-1. Similarly, procedure is too short, for example what was the process of noise removal, radiometric calibration, terrain correction – there are no theorical foundation nor procedure explained.

Line 171-172. " On the contrary, the NDVI of natural vegetation peaks". Incomplete sentence.

Section 2.4 what was references used for accuracy assessment.

Texts are often confusing and readability is hampered. Even in results section, the sentences are composed as if it is method section still describing the method, e.g. line 261-266, line 311, 321,…. Sentences could be better composed to reflect the contents of the respective section. Another example, when you say, in conclusion, the study proposed a new method, then follow-up with a sentence describing salient feature of that method WTCI, what and how to do. Also introduce the limitations, of the method if any, and the recommendation. The contents in conclusion section mostly reads as findings.