

Reviewer 2

Although, the authors have been stating that they have included the text regarding the background and rationale, I would still like to see some more expectations/hypothesis at the end of introduction (as based on this one can also see, why the study was done at all).

RESPONSE: This was also pointed out by the editor. We dont think adding hypotheses retroactively is the best option here. Instead we re-wrote the “aims” paragraph and stated clear study objectives, which should help the reader to understand why we did the study. We believe this is a improvement compared to the previous detailed list of measurements and approaches, and it fits well with the current structure of the manuscript.

In discussion (new text dealing with logged vs. non-logged areas), while stating “ ..., but previous studies have not found clear evidence of increased soil C losses compared to unlogged areas”, I would not use reference from Mediterranean areas, as there are similar comparisons done also in Northern-Europe (for example: Parro et al., 2019, Journal of Environmental Management, 233, 371-377).

RESPONSE: Good point. We removed the reference and instead added Parro et al 2019.