

The paper has improved significantly since the first publication and is a novel manuscript, providing insight into groundwater biota beneath urban areas and the surrounding landscape. The work is very interesting, however more time needs to be invested in correcting issues highlighted below to meet the high standards of HESS.

1. I have difficulties in establishing the types of landuses, some 'forested' areas appear very close to the urban areas on figure 3c. Further clarification and a statement that distinguishes or helps classify landuses would be helpful
2. Did you consider looking at stygobite vs stygoexene ratios, this may have provided more insight into the biotic differences
3. You mention using detritus as a measure, but there is not mention of methodology, unit of measurement is not included, and you have referred to this inconsistently throughout the results
4. It would be good to get an indication of the flow of GW particularly in the areas where forest and urban areas are close. This would help the statement made in line 233 (see below)
5. Whilst language and grammar have improved since the first version, this still requires a good proof-read to remove grammatical and punctuation errors.

Line 51-53: incorrect grammar. Remove 'etc' and combine sentence on line 53 to above paragraph

Line 104: it would be great to see a hypothesis here...

Line 225: One sentence doesn't make a paragraph, combine with previous paragraph

Line 233: 'no impact of GW originating from the urban areas on the wells in forest areas is observed' how does reader interpret this as we do not know flow direction of aquifer?

Line 238-241: this seems to be in the wrong section. Talk about biota in the below section

Line 244: The 'biotic' communities sounds better

Line 274: Also need to clarify that n=8 in ? forested areas. (this should also be stated in the methods section ie 8 wells in forested areas X wells in urban areas)

Lin 295: missing a comma

Line 306: How did you measure detritus (should be in methodology) and what does (>2) mean? What are the units here?

Line 381-383: mention 31 wells in urban and 8 wells in forested areas

385: I would mention that Amphipod were much more abundant in forested wells than in urban areas

Line 403: remove the 'etc'