Dear authors

The subject of the paper is a current and very important topic since it assesses the forest ecosystem quality in the Lancang Mekong Basin from 2010 to 2020.

This article is detailed and well organized. However, there are some doubts and shortcomings in the current article.

1. In the "2. Materials and Methods" section, I recommend adding a schematic diagram that provides an overview of the study's research process. This diagram could encompass the data and methods utilized in the study, aiding readers in understanding the content and significance of the research.

2. Regarding the EQI classification criteria presented in Table 2, it would be helpful to elucidate the basis for these criteria (see references [1] https://doi.org/10.3390/su141811742 ; [2] https://doi.org/10.1007/s11356-021-17978-2). Please provide further details in the relevant section of the article.

3. Section "2.2. Ecosystem assessment methods" serves as a pivotal part of this paper's research methodology, yet it relies on only one reference. It is advisable to include a suitable number of global research articles to support the accuracy of the research and assessment methods presented in the paper.

4. The study effectively evaluates the forest ecosystem quality in the Lancang Mekong Basin from 2010 to 2020 using three key vegetation parameters, which holds substantial real-world significance. Nevertheless, there seems to be room for further enhancement in this research. For instance, incorporating indices such as the ecological environment pollution index (EPI), ecological environment management index (EMI), and ecological environment quality index (EQI) could facilitate a more comprehensive evaluation and analysis of the temporal and spatial evolution of the ecological environment in this region. Alternatively, considering the latest land-use conditions, separate EQI assessments for different areas like forests, cultivated land, and wetlands could enhance the practical significance. I recommend engaging in speculative discussions about potential future work and insights in the "Discussion" section.

Additionally, there are some formatting and content presentation issues in the manuscript:

1. In the "2.1.2. Remote sensing products" subsection, it is advisable to include the country names for the organizations from which the data was sourced.

2. Table 1 appears overly condensed. I suggest expanding it across the entire layout to provide a clearer depiction of indicators, their meanings, units, and valid ranges.

3. The parameter description paragraphs beneath the formulas in the "2.2.2. Ecosystem quality indicators" subsection require scrutiny for formatting and grammatical accuracy.

4. Some unit labels in Table 4 are truncated. Adjusting the line spacing appropriately would allow readers to clearly comprehend the content of the table.

5. Kindly verify whether the titles for the vertical and horizontal axes in Figure 4 are accurate.