Interactive comment on "Coffee and shade trees show complementary use of soil water in a traditional agroforestry ecosystem" *by* Lyssette E. Muñoz-Villers et al.

Lyssette E. Muñoz-Villers et al.

lyssette.munoz@atmosfera.unam.mx

Received and published: 18 October 2019

We thank Daniele Penna for his positive comments on our manuscript. Please find below our response to each comment.

Minor comments and technical corrections

[1] 42-43. This sentence is not immediate to understand without reading the paper. I suggest rephrasing.

Reply: The sentence will be rephrased.

[2] 45. Double negation (limitation: : :absent): I suggest simplifying the sentence.

Reply: We will correct this.

[3] 64. Complex sentence, rephrase.

Reply: The sentence will be rephrased.

[4] 149. I suggest to change into ": : :prevails over competition: : :" or, in any case, to include both the terms "complementary" and "competition" because the latter is logically linked to the second research question.

Reply: We will follow the suggestion.

[5] 268. Did you consider using the Normalized Antecedent Precipitation Index (NAPI, Heggen, 2001), instead of API? Heggen, R.J., 2001. Normalized antecedent precipitation index. J. Hydrol. Eng.

Reply: No, we did not consider it but we can always explore the method. Thank you for the suggestion.

[6] 385-405. I suggest to condense this part and let the figures talk for themselves.

Reply: Ok. We will follow your recommendation.

[7] Fig. 3. Caption: why panel (c) shows the GMWL whereas panels (a) and (b) the LMWL?

Reply: We will correct the text in the figure caption to say that in panels (a), (b) and (c), the solid line represents the GMWL.

[8] Fig. 4. I suggest to replace "(a)" and "(b)" with "2014" and "2017" for more immediate understanding.

Reply: We will make this replacement.

[9] Fig. 5. What do error bars represent? Why are there only in panel (a) and not in panel (b)?

Reply: The bars represent the standard deviation; we will add this information in the figure caption. These bars are not showed in the panel (b) because the values in the y axis were normalized and expressed as ratio to their maximum values.

[10] Fig. 8. I think that the result and discussion build around this figure should be taken with a bit of caution because based on few point only. I suggest to discuss this limitation in the manuscript.

Reply: Agree. We are going to be more careful with this result and mention its limitation in the discussion.