

Dear Editor,

Thank you for the formal acceptance of our manuscript for publication in "Biogeosciences". We are pleased that the revised manuscript meets the journal's standards.

While preparing the production file upload, we carefully cross-checked the manuscript. We corrected one affiliation in accordance with the latest university guidelines (L. 21) and addressed a typographical error (L. 7). To ensure consistency, we added acronyms for all institutions (L. 20, 22, 23). We also included information on data availability (L. 1381–1382) and the corresponding reference in the reference list (L. 2452–2454). In the "Financial support" section, we added one project that was previously omitted (L. 1413) and removed initials mistakenly ascribed to one of the projects (L. 1414). We completed the "Review statement" section (L. 1417–1418).

We are grateful for the Reviewers' expertise and your editorial guidance, both of which were vital in bringing this work to its final form. We are delighted with the outcome and stand ready to assist with the final publication steps.

Sincerely,
Ewa Zin

Dear Reviewer, prof. Katarzyna Marcisz,

Thank you for your follow-up review and for recommending our manuscript for publication. We appreciate your thoughtful feedback throughout this process, which has undoubtedly strengthened our work.

Specific comments:

[1] I appreciate Author's detailed description of the hiatus phase and presentation of their way of thinking about this issue. This explanation included in the text will be a valuable part of the paper as hiatuses are often recorded in peat records and various explanations are possible.

We are pleased that the additional explanation of the hiatus phase was helpful. We agree that providing a clear rationale for these common features in peat records adds significant value for readers.

[2] Regarding the use of historical data for interpretations – in my initial review, I did not mention that historical data are not useful, only that the proportion between palaeoecological data and historical data in the original manuscript was in favor of historical data, and so palaeoecological data were a bit lost in between historical information. I value the changes made by the authors. Also, the sub-headings incorporated in the discussion make it much easier to navigate and follow the line of interpretation.

Thank you for your clarification. Your initial feedback helped us achieve a better balance in our discussion, which we appreciate. We are satisfied that the new sub-headings have improved the manuscript's readability.

[3] I do not agree that high engagement, measured by the sum of downloads of the preprint, is a reliable measure of the quality of the manuscript. The internet is now flooded with preprints and the notifications about new preprints pop up in many social media platforms,

e.g., ResearchGate. This encourages researchers to view or download these preprints, mainly to stay up to date with other researcher's work. The number of downloads is often higher for preprints with many co-authors specializing in different fields of research, simply because their social circles on social media platforms do not overlap, and the more people involved in the study the more of their contacts will get notification about the new preprint. Yet, the sum of downloads does not say anything about these reader's assessment of the study – just by seeing the numbers one has no idea how they evaluated the manuscript after reading it (that is, if they read the entire text at all).

Thank you for raising this important point. We fully agree that high engagement metrics are not a direct proxy for peer-reviewed quality or rigorous scientific assessment. We appreciate this perspective and will be more mindful of how we contextualise these metrics in the future.