# Response to Reviewer Comments

We would like to thank the reviewers for their feedback. We believe we have addressed their concerns. The original reviewer comments are included below with our responses in red.

Changes to the previous version of the manuscript have been marked in red in the latest revised version.

Reviewer 1   
Dear authors,   
You answered to my comments and made the adequate modifications.

Two minor corrections, first, you use the term Consumer's accuracy, which is not the most used term (for me the correct term is User's accuracy), second, in figure 5, you should expand RSR acronym (you do it in the text but the caption should be self comprehensive).   
These suggestions have been responded to in the manuscript.  
  
Reviewer 2  
As commented in the previous revision, the manuscript consists in the description of the techniques used for the classification and mapping of the vegetation conditions in a semiarid region at regional level, which is a very important problem. Although the novelties of the methodology are not many, the scale of the problem and the detailed description of the method is a factor to take into account since there are not many works of this type in the literature. Therefore, the description of the techniques used in the paper can be useful as a reference to similar studies.   
  
Although the paper is well written, there are procedure details that are difficult to follow. One o more detailed pseudocodes describing the steps of the procedure should be useful.

A flowchart depicting the classification and canopy cover estimation process has been added at the end of section 3.6. Specific details of the radiometric homogenization process can be found in the reference that is now included (D. Harris and A. Van Niekerk, “Radiometric homogenisation of aerial images by calibrating with satellite data,” Int. J. Remote Sens., 1–25, Taylor & Francis (2018) [doi:10.1080/01431161.2018.1528404].).