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Thanks a lot for your helpful review. We appreciate your suggestions and will consider them for the final manuscript. We provide our replies to the comments below.

Basic stand metrics

- We think this is a good idea and will include such a supplementary data table.

Line 226/227; Circle/Ellipse fitting:

- We only had a few cases, where it was difficult to fit a circle or an ellipse due to the point cloud quality (e.g., AbiAlb_SP02_01 to AbiAlb_SP02_05). For transparency, we could add the figures of the points and the fitted circles/ellipses for each tree to a supplementary file/folder. We could furthermore point out a) for which trees we had to fit a circle for a slice different than the 1.28 m and 1.32 m that we mentioned in the paper (e.g., thicker slice or different vertical position) and b) for which trees the estimated DBH might be less accurate due to point cloud quality (e.g., few points on the stem).

Line 282:
We did not use a quantitative threshold, but discarded the ALS tree point clouds when they were not recognizable as a tree. This concerns only five trees, which had between 11 and 247 points. We can add this information to the manuscript.