

Response to Reviewers

General comment: We have taken into account all the reviewers' linguistic corrections. We have also added the necessary citations.

Reviewer #1:

1. *At the Gołębiewo sites the maximum accumulation rate were 1.85 mm/yr and 0.36 mm/yr (Pędziszewska and Latałowa, 2016).*

We corrected:

At the Gołębiewo sites the maximum accumulation rates were 1.85 mm/yr and 0.36 mm/yr (Pędziszewska and Latałowa, 2016).

2. *Nevertheless, in the Prussian partition, planned forest management permanently changed the composition of Polish largest forest complexes, which were [...]*

We corrected:

Nevertheless, in the Prussian partition, planned forest management permanently changed the composition of Poland's largest forest complexes, which were [...]

3. *As a result of changes related to forest management, lake to peatland transition occurred rapidly.*

We corrected:

As a result of changes related to forest management, the lake-to-peatland transition occurred rapidly.

4. *An infestation of the *Panolis flammea* occurred at that time (Schütte, 1893).*

We corrected:

An infestation of *Panolis flammea* occurred at that time (Schütte, 1893).

5. *Applying of simple remote sensing indices enabled the detection of spatial differences in the condition and water stress of vegetation in the Okoniny peatland.*

We corrected:

The application of simple remote sensing indices enabled the detection of spatial differences in the condition and water stress of vegetation in the Okoniny peatland.

Reviewer #2:

1. *Page 25, line 596: You say: “There are only several peatlands in Poland for which...” Please, check if this should be “There are only few peatlands in Poland for which....” Please, check and correct.*

We corrected: Now the phrase looks:

“There are only few peatlands in Poland for which...”

2. Page 26, lines 627-629: Please, add here a reference to this information.

We added citations. Now the phase looks:

With the first partition of Poland in 1772 by Prussia, regulations for planned forest management began to be introduced. The main planting species was Scots pine, which over time began to dominate the forest, replacing deciduous admixture species (Broda, 1993).

Page 28, lines 700-701: Please, consider adding here some justification or reference on why you make this conclusion. This is most probably the case, but note that also the preservation environment changes at this time, which might have some effect on the preservation or the accumulation of the stomata.

We added explanations and references. Now this paragraph looks:

Moreover, *Pinus stomata* were also present in palynological samples at that time, pointing to more frequent needle falls. The presence of *Pinus stomata* has been suggested as a possibly important proxy for insect outbreaks in palaeoecological records in previously published studies from another Pine monoculture forest in Poland, the Noteć Forest (Barabach, 2015), where this phenomenon has been observed (Słowiński et al., 2019).