Public justification (visible to the public if the article is accepted and published):
Dear authors,

Thank you for resubmitting your work. I did a final check on your manuscript, and found some smaller issues that still need to be fixed before I can accept this for publication in Biogeosciences. Could you check the below issues, and submit a new version with a short reply to the below points?

Thanks in advance,
Marijn

Comment - Line 168–169 gives the height range as "H = 4.2–25.0 m" while the abstract (line 25/100) says "H = 2.9–25.0 m." The 2.9 m appears to belong to the H–D dataset (Table 2), not the harvest dataset. Please check.

Response: *Thank you for spotting this error. We have checked and revised accordingly.*

Comment - "Chavel et al. (2014)" — typo for Chave, line 527.

Response: *The typo has been revised accordingly.*

Comment - "dividend into wet… miombo" → "divided" (line 121).

Response: *The typo has been revised accordingly.*

Comment - "norther Zambia" → "northern" (line 120).

Response: *The typo has been revised accordingly.*

Comment - Fischer et al., 2026" reference might need to be updated now that it is out?

Response: *Thank you for the suggestion. We have now updated the reference.*

Comment - Your local H–D model (eq. 7) carries a Baskerville correction, $\exp(0.240^2/2)$, but the regional Tallo model (eq. 8) is printed without one. If eq. 8 was applied as-is, its heights would be biased low relative to eq. 7 on back-transformation grounds alone — pushing imputed height, and thus AGB, downward in the same direction as your headline ~35% underestimation. The effect is likely minor and the regional model clearly does predict lower heights regardless (Fig. 6). But since any residual artifact points toward your main claim, please confirm both allometries were applied

consistently — either both corrected, or a note that the Tallo coefficients are already on the arithmetic scale — and state this in the Methods.

Response: *Thank you for spotting this discrepancy in the analysis. We have now included the Baskerville correction for eq. 8 (exp (0.384^2/2)) and updated the equation, texts, figures and tables in both the main text and supplementary materials where necessary. As noted this slightly diminishes the underestimation of biomass when using the regional height allometry (from -35% to -30%), but overall the results have remained as they were previously. Furthermore, we have included the Baskerville correction for eq. 2 (exp(0.299^2/2) and updated everything accordingly. This resulted in a slight improvement (~3%) in underestimation of AGB using this literature model. However, the overall results remained unchanged. Lastly, we have also updated the number of harvested trees used to develop the same literature model, eq. 2, from 1319 to 649 after careful examination of the literature source.*