Reply on CC1
Yang Wang et al.

Thank you very much for your detailed suggestions. The specific revisions are as follows:

1. In the Description sheet, the first “n” is the number of shrub samples used in equation creation, we revised it to “n in equation creation”; the second “n” is the number of shrub samples used in equation evaluation, we revised it to “n in equation evaluation”.

2. The first “R2[R]” is the goodness-of-fit statistics used in equation creation, we revised it to “R2[R] in equation creation”; the second “R2[R]” is the equation evaluation statistics used in equation evaluation, we revised it to “R2[R] in equation evaluation”.

3. In the General sheet, we revised “xx” and “mx” to “inf” and “equ” which are short for “information” and “equation”, respectively.

4. In the Equation sheet, we clearly illustrated the meaning of symbols in “Remarks” column, include “H”, “C”, “Ac”, “Vc”, “D”, “D10”, “P”, “N”, “Ma” and “M”.

5. Field measured data of shrubs were obtained from 2011 to 2013, we added this information in the Introduction sheet instead of demonstrating it for each equation.

6. In the General sheet, we added the longitude and latitude, or the longitude and latitude range in which the raw data was collected and corresponding equation was generated.

7. We revised the text according to your suggestions in line 40, line 148 and line 183.

8. In some cases, equations with small sample sizes lack validation, they are all from the literature. The lowest limit of the sample size of each shrub species obtained from field measurement is 16.