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General comments

This discussion paper is a valuable contribution to solving problems fen regeneration in densely populated areas, such as The Netherlands. I find the mix of quantitative and qualitative hydrological analyses very convincing. It is also clear that the present work builds on much experience in the past, not only in The Netherlands, but also in the Biebrza area in Eastern Poland. The central theme is on local draining elements may sometimes frustrate regional restoration measures and they are sometimes not easy to detect in the field. In their case the closing down of groundwater abstraction facilities for the public water supply had much less effect on restoring the groundwater flow to...
the fens then had been anticipated some twenty years ago. That is rather bad news for
the regional authorities that once took that decision. The authors suggest that regional
measures that enhance groundwater flow to the fens be assigned a lower priority then
local measures that support the transport of available upwelling groundwater up to the
fen surface. Although this may seem a logical conclusion, I do not support such rea-
soning in general. It may be a strategically sound decision to first stop the regional
threats (if there is political support) if local influences cannot be changed (for instance
due to local owners that do not want to cooperate) within a short time span, but on a
longer time span they can be purchased with relatively little money. What would the au-
thors suggest if local measures would have priority and later it turned out that regional
influences, which usually are very costly to remove, frustrate the fen regeneration? So,
I think the conclusion should be that you identify both local and regional influences
as good as possible and then discuss with different parties what would be the best
solution to the problem during the immediate future and also on the long run.

Detailed comments

I would suggest to insert Lamers his work here. 2) Page 4388, line 18. reference
is made to a high load of tritium in alien surfacewater. May be some explanation is
needed here. Table 1 shows that tritium content of alien surface water is 45 TU. In
figure 2 shows a number of 7499 units. What happened, someone dropped an atomic
bomb again in the atmosphere? And why is the concentration in alien surface water
then 45 and not > 45 TU? 3) In figure 3 the notions a,b and c should be indicated in
the figure. Now you can only infer what is meant on the tiny text on the y-axis.
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