Point-by-point response to reviewer 2 comments

c1 = original submission line(s)	c2 = original comment	c3 = remarks about implementation in version 3	Response
L40, L43, L64, L66, L69, L85, L88	**Citations in Introduction need balancing: some are excessive/repetitive; others are missing. Reviewer specifically flagged support for pantropical allometries, H–D forest-type dependence, and the claim that wood density is often assigned from databases.**	**Partly implemented; mostly sufficient. The Introduction is cleaner and better supported in version 3. The statement on pantropical models is streamlined at v3 L60–L66; H–D variation among species/forest types is supported at v3 L79–L82; and the wood-density database statement now includes Fischer et al. (2026) at v3 L83–L86. The most obvious gaps were addressed, though some citation density is still fairly high in places.**	Thank you for helping us find a better balance with the references in the introduction. We have opted to keep the remaining citations as they currently are, as we prefer to over-cite than under-cite. We believe this will also help the reader to fully understand the challenges involved in accurate AGB estimation.
L239	**Use "data set mean" instead of "population".**	**Not implemented. Version 3 still says "population-level fit (or fixed effects)" at v3 L313–L315 rather than "data set mean." This is a minor wording issue, but the specific reviewer suggestion was not adopted**	This appears to be a mix-up, as the original comment on "population mean" was in reference to wood density and we had already changed this to "dataset mean" in the previous round of revisions as suggested (see **L324-326** in the revised manuscript).
Fig. 5 / original L368– L374	**There seems to be an artefact/banding in the height data; what were the methods used to measure height in the 4321-tree dataset?**	**Partly implemented; borderline sufficient. Version 3 adds much more detail on how H was measured in the larger H–D dataset, including the use of a Suunto hypsometer and**	Thank you for the comment. Fig. 5 from the first submission was replaced with one that shows how H-D relationships differ among dominant Miombo species (now Fig. 6, whereas the previous Fig. 5

		measurement precision to 0.1 m, at v3 L200–L205. However, the specific explanation for the apparent 'banding' in the plot is not clearly added in the manuscript text, even though it was promised in the response letter. The methods part is fixed; the interpretation of the figure artifact remains only partly addressed.	was moved to the appendix and is now Fig. S6). This new figure does not show the apparent "banding" caused by the rounding of height values to the nearest 0.1 m, which is why we did not refer to this in revising the paper. To ensure readers are aware of the cause of the banding in the data displayed in Fig. S6 of the appendix, we have now revised the figure caption to include the following statement: "Visual banding in the height data in panel **(a)** reflects the fact that height values were rounded to the nearest 0.1 m"
L388 / discussio n of ILUA2 applicabi lity at original L387–L398	**Are the ILUA2 calibration forests sufficiently similar in structure/species composition to apply the model here?**	**Partly implemented. Version 3 now explains that ILUA2 was built from 1319 harvested trees across Acacia, mopane and miombo, with the majority coming from dry and wet miombo, at v3 L249–L258. That helps, and the Discussion also notes forest-type/species effects at v3 L437–L445. Still, the manuscript does not state as directly as the response letter promised that the training data represented the same species/forest types plus other woodland types. Good**	Thank you for the feedback. To further support our use of the ILUA 2 model as a comparison, we have added the following statement on **L254-256** of the revised manuscript: "Further, the dataset used to develop eq. 2 covered the majority of the tree species (73%) that were harvested to measure AGB in our study".

		improvement, but not fully explicit.	