

Review

Piayda and Dubbert et al., 2016 Quantification of dynamic soil – vegetation feedbacks following an isotopically labelled precipitation pulse, *Biogiosciences Discuss.*, doi:10.5194/bg-2016-451

The authors made a commendable effort on improving their manuscript and I am pleased with the changes made having resulted in a high-quality research article. Some minor issues should still be addressed (see below). Thereafter I am happy to endorse this interesting work for publication in *Biogeoosciences*.

Minor Comments:

- a) The following points mainly regard implementation of requested changes in the manuscript being neglected and only addressed in the author's response:

Previous communication:

Page 3 Line 16: Please expand on possible effects of meshes used for bare soil plots on water infiltration

Page 4 Line 6: fresh material was harvested, what was the proportion of already dry material, particularly in comparison to previous study of Dubbert et al. during a non-drought year, and the different effects of plant cover on infiltration reported in the discussion. This may have also reflected on the event water use in transpiration.

Page 5 Line 5: Leaf sampling did not affect ET in the vegetation plots? How big was the reduction of leaf area through sampling? Could this have affected the temporal progress of T from event water? Please elaborate on this here.

Authors responded adequately. However, text on author's opinion on the effects of the meshes, proportion of dry material and leaf sampling on results being negligible should still be added to the manuscript, as this is information of importance to the reader.

- b) Check usage of brackets with citations throughout the manuscript: E.g. Page 10 Line 24: Dubbert et al. (2014c) instead (Dubbert et al., 2014c)
- c) Page 12 Line 28: I suggest citing Fig. A1 after "...in open areas"