

This is an interesting, well-conceived, and well-written paper.

I would like to see this published as soon as possible in almost the current form.

- I. My most significant concern is that I have no idea of the generalizability of the Dorset case in the selection of the sites. There are some inferences drawn later on in the Discussion to the whole of the UK based on this case. It would be helpful to know more about how typical or atypical the County is relative to the rest of Britain. Mention is made of “a wide range of conservation initiatives.” Some more information to contextualize this, the costs mentioned later (maybe average values of Dorset land versus other parts of the UK and of the entire country and labor costs if that is a variable) as well as the topography relative to the rest of the nation. Mention is made of the intuitive difference in Global North land costs and lower costs elsewhere in the Global South. Some basis for making similar comparisons between this case and the overall UK context would be helpful.
- II. The next thing is not required, but more for consideration. While this is a narrow topic, it does address policy areas and may consider drawing some broader policy recommendations on the basis of what has been determined.
 - A. First, it seems that more specific suggestions could be offered for the UK in terms of the subsidies and regulations needed to make these sort of conservation efforts viable.
 - B. Secondly, the Introduction mentions the 30% by 2030 formula but also notes that the potential yield of this is approach is limited. Coupled with the difficulties mentioned in the Discussion including the existing inadequacy of existing markets (lacking in transparency, efficacy, etc.) and the need for regulation and standards, it is probably fair to make the point that the ultimate potential for sequestration will remain more towards the “every bit helps” end of the spectrum until more serious and systematic efforts are put in place.
 - C. A reasonable corollary to this might be that more efforts at decarbonization will have much more immediate impact, especially as sequestration is ramped up.

Again, this is just a suggestion, but the paper does engage in policy analysis and has earned some broader policy suggestions related to its findings. Consider whether more policy prescriptions are merited.

- III. A minor point is that the sixth line in section 3.1.1. has a typo where “maintain” should be “maintained” to be parallel to “converted.” I was not proofreading but the mistake stood out so maybe a close proofreading should make sure there are no other typos.

In toto, this is nice work and I would like to see more of this sort of relevant practical research in print.