

Interactive comment on “Does drought alter hydrological functions in forest soils? An infiltration experiment” by K. F. Gimbel et al.

K. F. Gimbel et al.

katharina.gimbel@hydrology.uni-freiburg.de

Received and published: 30 November 2015

Please find our final Response to Referee #3 in the supplemented file.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.hydrol-earth-syst-sci-discuss.net/12/C5269/2015/hessd-12-C5269-2015-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 12, 7689, 2015.

C5269




Fig. 1. Figure 2: Soil horizons, texture, and rock fractions/stone content of the six experimental plots. Soil type classification according to the World reference base for soil (FAO 2006).

C5270




Fig. 2. Figure 4: Normalized cumulated sums of soil moisture of the drought versus the control subplots of the investigated soils. The green line denotes the 1:1 line.

C5271




Fig. 3. Figure 5: Mean and maximum water drop penetration times (WDPTs) of the control (green) and drought (red) plots. Orange lines and numbers refer to the WDPT classes after Bisdom et al. (1993) (see Table

C5272




Fig. 4. Figure 6: Comparison between stained path width (SPW) of pre-drought (2011) and control (2013) plot. The graphs show the proportion of the SPW of the total profile width. Blue shades indicate the SPW

C5273




Fig. 5. Figure 7: VD boxplots of the drought and the pre-drought pattern. Depth ranges are omitted, where one of the profile is shorter than the other.

C5274




Fig. 6. Figure 9: VD boxplots of the drought and the pre-drought pattern. Depth ranges are omitted, where one of the profile is shorter than the other.