

A response to feedback document (can be a Word or PDF file) where you provide a summary of the feedback and how you implemented the feedback. If certain pieces of feedback were not implemented, there should be an explanation as to why.

- The reviewer noted the lack of emphasis on the connection to logging in our abstract. The abstract was updated to reflect a clearer connection to logging.
- It was noted that our introduction was longer than average for a paper of this kind. We slightly edited portions of the introduction in response to this feedback, but overall kept the majority of what was written because we felt that for our specific topic it was important contextual information. In our editing we aimed to clarify the reason for suspecting potential effects of logging on the A horizon.
- The materials and methods were updated to include more details on the process of coding while ensuring the data was described rather than technical jargon. An additional note on the basics of PICRUST2 was added as per the reviewer's suggestion.
- It was suggested that we review our results observations section to better reflect the primary takeaways and reduce generalizations. We took this into account and heavily updated this section to include missing details, revise the figure legends, and better reflect the takeaway of each section.
- The discussion was slightly tweaked to clarify our interpretations and add additional information for reader understanding. We chose not to remove the paragraph about catechol degradation, but rather to adjust the phrasing to fit with our actual data, because we believe that this would be an interesting avenue to explore further in the future and our research could act as a baseline for studies wishing to address the question of catechol pollution in timber harvesting sites.

- The conclusion was updated to address the experimental question and we updated the study limitations to include the lack of pre-logging samples as suggested by the reviewer.