

## **Response to comments by Dr. L. Peter**

Item wise responses to comments by Dr. L. Peter are given below. We have also incorporated necessary corrections and additional explanations in the manuscript to address the comments made.

### **1. Minor technical changes**

**- On page 257, line 13/14 the publication " Suwandana *et al.*, 2012" is cited. The publication is currently not listed in the reference.**

Suwandana *et al.*, 2012 that was missing in the reference list has been added to the references

**- In Figure 16, three slope maps are shown. It should be considered to divide this Figure into three single figures to improve readability**

Regarding comment about Figure 16, we do not use this figure anymore. Instead, we use the slope, profile curvature and tangential curvature maps of fused DEM that has been integrated in the revised version of paper.

**2. Suggestion for future work: A cutline map delineating the outlines of the identified landform segments (as shown in Figure 10) overlaid over a satellite image or landuse map would be useful to asses possible bias such as sylviculture or similar**

We thank the referee for this suggestion for future work. We plan investigate the bias due to sylviculture by comparing the fused DEM and reference DEM with land cover and vegetation maps and this has been mentioned as one of the future works in the manuscript.