
As for a point-by-point reply to the comments, see our earlier answer to the editor and reviewer questions where we addressed all points.
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In this revised manuscript with tracked changes we have addressed all comments according to our answers in the above documents except in one instance: Referee 2 gave the following comment:

Comment: The section “The novelty of the developed maps” could be and merged with conclusion section. Some text can also be moved to other parts of discussion.

To which we answered: We will consider this in our revised manuscript.

Our new response is: We have seriously considered the suggestion by referee #2. After thoughtful digestion of the two sections we prefer to keep them as is. The two sections addresses two different focuses. The section “The novelty of the developed maps” addresses the relation between this study and the recent progress internationally attempting to improve mapping of peatlands. The section “Conclusions” detail out what peat cover characteristics that can be described by the approach described in this article, not possible by earlier approaches. Thus the two section have similar, but still clearly different, focuses and thus we prefer to keep them as is.

In addition to addressing the comments we also:

- Clarified the calculations of peat in Table 3. In the methods we now write “6) peat with no thickness restriction (i.e. peat if organic layer ≥ 30 cm + peaty mor with organic layer < 30 cm)” and changed Table 3 to “6. Peat coverage with no peat thickness restriction according to upscaling from SFS!”.

- We also revised the reference list and added article no, doi’s, etc.

- We provide 2 new figures (Fig04 and Fig 05)

We hope the manuscript can now be accepted for publication.

Sincerely, Anneli Ågren and co-authors.