

Suggestions for revision or reasons for rejection

(visible to the public if the article is accepted and published)

The authors have considered all of my previous comments and changed the manuscript accordingly. I am happy with the answers and changes. Only the Conclusions may need another iteration, as some parts are still more Discussion than Conclusion to me. Maybe the authors give it another read and editing.

Minor issues:

Line 11: "pixels" comes a bit out of the blue, at least to me. If no sensor is mentioned, I would always use "grid cells" or "raster cells" which appear more general, while pixel to me would necessarily be related to an image/picture. But I am no native speaker. It may still, however, make sense to mention in the abstract that it was a sensor independent LAI product. (see also lines 82ff and actually the entire paper) > This comment is for the authors to freely decide!

Line 127: Only "functioning peatlands" or "wet peatlands" are a type of wetland – I would say.

Line 560: climate DATA (word missing)