

**“Isotope effects of coupled nitrification and denitrification during a river flood event”, by
Juliane Jacob, Tina Sanders, and Kirstin Dähnke**

The main points raised in previous reviews have been addressed. I still disagree with some of the argumentation (e.g., steady-state assumption during a flood), but overall the manuscript has improved a lot by avoiding overstatements and discussing a broader view of N cycle processes. In my opinion, the main point of this paper should not be to report isotope effects of single processes (because it is simply impossible to do so with the data in hand), but to present the isotope data (which is a truly nice set of data) and discuss the processes that led to those signatures (like it is done in the 3 scenarios). You can present numbers of apparent isotope effects, but make sure to be clear at all times that those are at best (i.e., steady-state assumption is true etc.) apparent isotope effects of net nitrate and nitrite consumption (including co-occurring production processes). Accordingly, I suggest not to state in the title that reporting isotope effects is the main point of the article.

Minor comment:

I suggest to report $\delta^{18}\text{O}:\delta^{15}\text{N}$ enrichment as is usually done, and not vice versa (e.g., page 7). And accordingly plot $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ on x-axis and $\delta^{18}\text{O}$ on y-axis in fig. 3.

Check for typos, specifically regarding citations in the text.