

Interactive comment on “Experimental sand burial affects seedling survivorship, morphological traits and biomass allocation of *Ulmus pumila* var. *sabulosa* in Horqin Sandy Land” by Jiao Tang et al.

Jiao Tang et al.

772893336@qq.com

Received and published: 26 May 2016

RC1: The topic is good, but there are only effects of sand burial on seedling survivorship, morphological traits and biomass allocation. The burial effects on seedling survivorship may be results from burial effects on seedling morphological and biomass allocation strategies. So, I think that the authors should add the contents of burial effects on seedling survivorship based on seedling morphological and biomass allocation strategies. AC1: Thanks for your significant suggestions. And we have added some contents of burial effected on seedling survivorship based on seedling morphological

C1

and biomass allocation strategies in the discussion of the revised manuscript.

RC2: The burial effects on seed germination and seedling emergence may be focus on the effects of irradiance and temperature effects on seed germination and seedling emergence, so some discussion contents on these aspects should be added in the discussion section. Some references can be read, Seedling performance within eight different seed-size alpine forbs under experimental irradiance and nutrient gradients; Germination strategies of twenty alpine species with varying seed mass and light availability; Plant seedling performance traits impact on successful recruitment in various microhabitats for five alpine *Saussurea* species; Seedling recruitment of forbs species under experimental microhabitats in alpine grassland, etc. AC2: We looked up some relevant references and found that sandy elm had a higher transpiration rate and stomatal conductance with lower photosynthesis water-use efficiency and less sensitivity to high temperature and irradiance, compared with other native tree species such as *Malus baccata*, *Prunus padus* and *Pinus sylvestris*, especially in the midday. We have added it to the discussion section. The reviewer's recommended references are of importance for improving our manuscript. We have read carefully and several relevant sentences were cited in our revised manuscript.

RC3: There are some format errors in the text and in the references, suggest the author should avoid the appearance of these errors in all the text. AC3: We have checked and corrected the format in the text and in the references.

Thanks for your valuable advices for our manuscript.

Please also note the supplement to this comment:

<http://www.solid-earth-discuss.net/se-2016-55/se-2016-55-AC1-supplement.pdf>

Interactive comment on Solid Earth Discuss., doi:10.5194/se-2016-55, 2016.

C2