

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS OR SUGGESTIONS FROM REVIEWERS

Comments/suggestions from Reviewer: Fifth Version

S/No	Comment/suggestion	Response
1	Firstly, -All soil and evapotrans. Data surely had more than one value per sample, implying that what we see documented here are the means, thus we could also see the SD or SE (LSD), and even error bars on the graphs. Otherwise if the results are from just one sample, then this is not representative. I know all about composite samples, and multiple data sets can be obtained from these in the laboratory.	Analysis has been performed and Tables 3 and 5 have been updated
2	Also on the issue of SOM quality, there is no evidence that this was tested (through mineralization studies), therefore I still think the determination of soil organic C was for concentration and not quality. You get C: N ratios from amounts and not quality. This should be re-visited.	These has been revisited as suggested
3	Finally, I missed this the first time round, i.e. the continual reference to Tables 5, then 3, and then 4. Normally this should be projected in a chronological order, for ease of reading.	The tables have been arranged chronologically as suggested
4	The repetition I meant concerning rating of total N values is still evident in lines: 170-171 and lines 172-174. What is the difference between these 2 lines?	It was not clear to me, because as far as these lines are concerned, I found nothing unusual.