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.


C1
Reply: We will correct this.

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.

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.