

Response to Reviewer and Editorial Comments

Manuscript: "A gridded dataset of European Forest Types to support forest monitoring, modelling and reporting"

We thank the editor for the careful final assessment of our manuscript. We have addressed the requested minor corrections to be consistent within all manuscript.

Editor comment 1 – Figure 5 terminology

Comment: The terminology in the Figure 5 caption should not describe the two highest-ranked RPP taxa as the "two most abundant species" or interpret their combined RPP contribution as structural dominance.

Reply: We agree and have revised Figure 4 and Figure 5 captions accordingly. The caption now refers to the "two highest-ranked taxa" and to their "combined normalized RPP contribution," and it explicitly states that this pattern should not be interpreted as species abundance or structural dominance. To ensure internal consistency, we also replaced "dominant/co-dominant" terminology with "first-/second-ranked RPP taxa" in the immediately associated methodological wording, including Section 2.4.3, Figure 4, and Table 5 and the corresponding rule-based classification text and table headings. Moreover, the name of section 2.4.3.

Changes made in the manuscript (revised version): Line 328 title of Section 2.4.3. Lines 339-340. Captions of Figure 4 and Figure 5. Lines 350-355. Lines 370-372. Table 5 second column nomenclature and Rule 7a, Rule 7b and Rule 14.

Editor comment 2 – Beech/Mountain Beech mask definition

Comment: Tables 4 and 5 were inconsistent because Table 4 defines the MOUNTAIN MASK for areas below 500 m (Category 6) and the INVERSE MOUNTAIN MASK for areas above 500 m (Category 7), whereas Rule 7a in Table 5 referred to the MOUNTAIN MASK for Mountain Beech Forest.

Reply: Thank you for identifying this nomenclature inconsistency. We checked the mask definitions used in the manuscript and corrected Table 4 so that Rule 7a for Category 7 – Mountain Beech Forest now refers to the MOUNTAIN MASK correctly.

Changes made in the manuscript (revised version): Line 328 title of Section 2.4.3. Lines 339-340. Captions of Figure 4 and Figure 5. Lines 350-355. Lines 370-372. Table 5 second column nomenclature and Rule 7a, Rule 7b and Rule 14.

Editor Comment 3 - Final proofreading

Comment: A final careful proofreading for minor typographical and language errors is also recommended. Subject to these limited corrections, I consider the manuscript ready for publication.

Reply: A final limited proofreading was performed, focused on the requested passages and unambiguous typographical errors. In particular, the Figure 4 caption wording was corrected and two

clear typographical errors in the Results (“Macronesian” and “Mirne”) were corrected to “Macaronesian” and “Mire,” respectively. The remainder of the manuscript was left unchanged.

We thank editor again for these final comments. We hope that now the manuscript will be suitable for the publication.

Editorial notification – Esri attribution

Comment: Figures 1, 4, 6, and 7: as the maps originate from Esri, please add the required attribution text “Powered by Esri” (e.g. Sources: Esri, TomTom, FAO, USGS | Powered by Esri). Please see: https://publications.copernicus.org/for_authors/manuscript_preparation.html#mapsaerials -> "Maps and aerials" -> "3. Reuse of material from a map provider without requirement for a copyright statement: no copyright statement needed but a credit (e.g. Sources: Esri, TomTom, FAO, USGS | Powered by Esri) and <https://developers.arcgis.com/documentation/esri-and-data-attribution/#esri-attribution>.

Reply: The captions of Figures 1, 4, 6, and 7 have been revised to include the requested attribution in the form: “Background map source: Esri, World Terrain Base | Powered by Esri