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List of responses to the comments- SE-2016-149

Dear Editor, First of all, we highly appreciate your valuable comments and suggestions on our manuscript entitled by “Community-weighted mean traits but not functional diversity determine the changes of soil properties during wetland drying on the Tibetan Plateau” (No. SE-2016-149). Based on the reviewers’ comments, we have made a thorough revision on the original submission. The revision has covered all the questions raised from the reviewers. We hope you are satisfied with the revised version, however, if there is more question, we are willing to revise it again. The below are the detailed responses to the reviewers’ comments. Yours faithfully, Wei Li

C1

In answer to Reviewer #2 1. P2 Line 32 it should be community-weighted mean (CWM) traits...... Reply: In this revision edition, we have corrected it. 2. P2 Line 34 please add comma after swamp meadow. P2 Line 34 change comma to period after typical meadow. P2 Line 48 Change ‘and our results’ to ‘Our results’ Reply: In this revision edition, we have accepted and corrected them. 3. P3 Line 63 it should be “play a very important role......”. P3 Line 63 change “resources” to “resource” Reply: In this revision edition, we have accepted and corrected it. 4. P4 Line 104 change “thereby improving biomass production and nutrient cycling” to “thereby increasing biomass production and nutrient retention ” Reply: Thanks for your suggestions. In this revision edition, we have accepted and corrected them. 5. P4 Line 112 please add comma after leaf area (LA) Reply: In this revision edition, we have added the comma after leaf area. 6. Line 114 change “it is closely related with...” to “it is closely related to....” Reply: Thanks for your suggestions. We have revised it. 7. Line 176 please rewrite this sentence “Soil organic carbon was determined by wet oxidation with potassium dichromate (K2Cr2O7), both dichromate oxidation and dry combustion, .......” Check this sentence to make sure it is correct. Do you use the carbon analyser for both the wet oxidation and the dry combustion? Reply: Thanks for your suggestions. In this revision edition, we have re-written this sentence. Soil organic carbon was determined by the Walkley-Black method and a factor of 1.3 was applied to adjust the organic C recovery (Nelson and Sommers, 1982). 8. P7 Line 181 please add “2.4” before “Plant functional trait measurements” right? Reply: In this revision edition, we have corrected this. 9. P7 Line 186 please change individuals to individual Reply: In this revision edition, we have corrected this. 11. P7 Line 196 please change this title. P7 Line 208 please add comma after “FEve” P8 Line 216 it should be “a principal components analysis” Reply: In this revision edition, we have accepted your suggestion and corrected them. 12. P8 Line 223 please delete “the” Reply: In this revision edition, we have corrected it. 13. P8 Line 224-228 These sentences don’t make sense. Just present the % increase from swamp to typical meadow, assuming that swamp meadow is somewhere in between. Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. You are right, and in this revision
edition, we have deleted these content. 14. P9 Line 257 change between to among. P9 Line 262 “There were...”. P9 Line 266 it should be “there were significantly negative correlations”. P9 Line 267 it should be “significantly positive correlations”. P9 Line 269 please add a before negative relationship Reply: Thanks for your suggestion. In this revision edition, we have accepted and corrected them. 15. P9 Line 271 it should be “single functional traits level may play a crucial role in...” Reply: In this revision edition, we have corrected it. 16. P10 Line 275 it should be “and that there were also significant differences in species...” Reply: In this revision edition, we have corrected it. 17. P10 Line 285 change forbs to forb, Please correct other places. Reply: In this revision edition, we have corrected them. 18. P11 Line 303 please delete “first of all”, and change ‘functional diversity” to “Functional diversity” Reply: In this revision edition, we have accepted and corrected it. 19. P11 Line 304 you mean “differences of species” right? Reply: Yes, you are right, we have corrected it. 20. P11 Line 305 please rewrite this sentence. Reply: Thanks for your suggestion, and we have rewritten this sentence. Functional diversity may decrease when stabilizing niche differences of species are smaller than needed to overcome competitive exclusion, and may increase when stabilizing niche differences are greater than competitive exclusion. 21. P11 Line 311 please change this sentence to “the responses of functional diversity to fertilization and grazing are relative stable...” Reply: Thanks for your suggestion, and we have corrected it. 22. P11 Line 319 it should be delete. P12 Line 357 do you mean “some ecosystem models ...”. P13 Line 360 please delete positive. P13 Line 377 It should be “these results also suggested that functional diversity (traits taken in aggregate) may not be directly to...” Reply: Thanks for your suggestion, and we have accepted and corrected them. 23. P14 Line 393 please change “for” to “related to” Reply: We have corrected it.
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