

Abstract okay except various acronyms not defined.

Page 2 line 9: IPCC uses the familiar acronym LULCC. You should adopt the same or specify how and why yours differs from the expected community term. Check all uses of LUCC vs LULCC.

Page 2 line 11: Usually, instead of citing the entire WG I report of AR-5, authors cite a specific chapter or even a page number?

Page 2 line 21: List of acronyms (e.g. SAGE, HYDE, PJ and KK10) need definition. Given the range of acronyms used in this manuscript, from old Swedish sources to modern satellite products, authors should consider a table of acronyms with definitions as an Appendix?

Page 2 line 29: If Le Quéré et al., 2018 is supposed to represent most recent global carbon budget, more recent versions exist (e.g. Friedlingstein et al. 2020) exist.

Page 3 lines 1 through 5 “There uncertainties were unneglectable in regional applications” ?? Following sentence adds to confusion rather than clarifying. This means that uncertainties acceptable in global context become too large in regional products? “There” or ‘their’? Confusing. I think you mean that assumptions made in global products become unacceptably large at regional contexts? But, for IPCC at least, most LULCC and AFOLU estimates come from most-recent national reports of varying quality and reporting date? If you want to declare a need to validate more carefully on regional scales for historical cropland changes, you have not made the point clearly.

Page 3 line 7: ALCC - what’s this? Not defined. Same as AFOLU in IPCC terms? Or do you mean ‘anthropogenic land-cover change’ ala PAGES. If different, how and why justified?

Page 3 line 8: PAGES LandCover6k mostly focuses on paleoclimate indicators (e.g. pollen) and not exclusively on regional patterns. Here you focus on small region (Scandinavia) with unusually-good historical records? How does this work fit with PAGES paleoclimate projects?

Page 3 line 10: “Errors” in regional reconstructions or in global products. Need clarity here.

Page 3 line 16: farmers-are-were, please make careful and consistent use of past tense.

Page 3 line 30 to page 4 line 1: “importance .... could fail to be determined precisely” What? Confusing!

Page 4 lines 15 to 19 - finally, a clear statement of intent. This text could replace much of what precedes it. Dataset will provide? Better: dataset provides!

Overall, good helpful description but methods, data and results sections need careful scrutiny and occasional re-write!

Page 36, around line 30: Reference list not in alphabetical order. Please check entire reference list for similar errors.

Typesetters and proofreaders from Copernicus will apply very careful very good language services for this manuscript but they will have many questions! Two changes suggested here: careful reading and re-writing by a native English speaker and careful definition of all acronyms (consider a list of acronyms as suggested) will make their job easier and your product better!