Dear Dr. Ezenwa,

Thank you so much for your very constructive comments on the last version of our manuscript and your willingness to see a revised version of this manuscript.

We addressed the major criticisms from both yourself and the reviewers in five key ways:

1. We clarified our use of “biomass”, removed the discussion of “overyielding” from the manuscript, and tried throughout to better highlight where results for productivity differ from those for biomass.
2. We extended our discussion of the second hypothesis in the introduction and better incorporated the results pertaining to this hypothesis throughout the manuscript.
3. We clarified our terminology for explaining the differences between within species richness treatment results vs. across species richness treatment results.
4. We clarified how our function-dominance correlation results relate to existing measures like the selection effect and the sampling effect.
5. We explored the impact of these results for other functions and services, as well as for a broad general audience in terms of management, conservation, and restoration.

In the attached manuscript, changes made in response to the reviews are highlighted in green text. We found the reviews to be helpful and constructive and believe that incorporating them has made the manuscript much stronger.

Many thanks again for your constructive oversight over this process!

Best regards,

Dr. Michael Crawford, also on behalf of the authors