1. Your response to Comment 2 has not sufficiently convinced me. Based on my prior experience in crop mapping, although a large proportion of cropland remains under stable cultivation, fields with alternating crop types are common. My main concern lies in your mapping pipeline: the use of a five-year composite image introduces a non-negligible systematic bias. This approach not only fails to capture short-term multiple cropping practices but is also inadequate for detecting multi-year changes in cropping patterns. However, the evidence provided in your response does not adequately address this concern. While I understand that, due to observational gaps, single-year Landsat imagery may not fully support rice mapping in certain years, the straightforward use of a five-year composite as a proxy for a single year is, in my view, not a responsible approach. Furthermore, the flood signal mentioned in your response is derived from a five-year composite (1993–1997) and therefore cannot serve as a valid reference for a specific year. In addition, unlike your study, which performs fine-grained crop classification, land-cover products such as GLC_FCS30 and CLCDs do not distinguish crop types in detail. As a result, crop rotation among different species does not affect the definition or spatial extent of the "Cropland" category in those datasets. Please also provide appropriate references for the methods or data products mentioned in your response for further consultation. Additionally, please include references for the methods or datasets mentioned in your response for reference.

   To help address this issue, I would like to suggest a possible approach. In regions such as South and Southeast Asia, where Sentinel and Landsat 8/9 data can be jointly utilized in recent years (e.g., 2020–2025), you could perform annual mapping using yearly composites. The denser observations during these years can alleviate data scarcity issues. You can then analyze interannual variations in rice distribution. If significant differences are observed, this would indicate that the earlier five-year composite approach introduces substantial systematic bias, and alternative strategies (e.g., multi-source data fusion) should be considered. Conversely, if the differences remain within an acceptable range—ideally smaller than the classification error introduced by the algorithm—then the impact of the compositing strategy on the final dataset quality may be considered controllable.

2. In your response to Comment 5, the figure numbering is inconsistent with those referenced in the response letter. I am also unclear about what is meant by the "Figure 5 panel labels" mentioned in the caption of Figure S5—whether this refers to Figure 5 in the response letter, Figure 5 in the revised manuscript, or Figure 6 in the revised manuscript. While occasional formatting errors in figures may be understandable as oversight, such inconsistencies appear repeatedly across the manuscript, response letter, and supplementary materials. This raises concerns regarding the overall rigor and professionalism of the work.

   I strongly recommend that you carefully review the entire document to eliminate such issues. As a suggestion, you may consider adopting a consistent naming convention to distinguish figures across different components: for example, using "Figure x" in the main manuscript, "Figure Rx" in the response letter, and "Figure Sx" in the supplementary materials. If necessary, the correspondence between figures can be explicitly clarified in the response letter, for instance: "The revised results have been updated in Figure R1 (corresponding to Figure 5 in the revised manuscript)."