*See responses in italics below.*

I reviewed the revision, and while it is much improved, a few issues with this manuscript remain, and I provide a few suggestions below that will improve the clarity and credibility of this paper.  
  
LIne 24: Add “Five years following removal treatments,”

*Text added.*  
  
Line 26: Add, relative to control plots

*Text added.*  
  
LIne 27:  I would be more cautious in your claim since the pattern you observed could arise from “not always being elaiosome limited” or simply that the effectiveness of your removal treatments declined over the 5 years that went by between removal treatments and revisiting ant communities, as your plant survey suggests.

*I changed these two sentences to:*

*“Ant forager abundance was not impacted by the treatments five years after the removal of elaiosomes. In sum, Aphaenogaster populations may not always be limited by the availability of elaiosomes or myrmecochorous plants produce can recover quickly (<5 years) to provide enough food for these ants.”*  
  
LIne 61 minor grammatical error

*I thought this sentence was overly complex, so I changed it to:*

*“Spring ephemerals have short leafing and flowering times, often senescing before the forest canopy closes.”*  
  
Line 70: you’re not really referring to a question here– This is more of an objective.

*Fair point. I edited the sentence to be clearer on this objective.*

*“Demonstrating whether or not seed dispersing ants are limited by the availability of elaiosomes is an important objective for the protection of ant-dispersed plant communities.”*  
  
119-122: I’m not finding the methodological detail requested by the reviewer in the appendix.  It’s still not clear if you noted the presence/absence or abundance of each of the plants in your survey.  Also, I know it’s not exactly the same site, but if you presented the 2010 survey as a pie chart similar to Fig 1, that would be much more useful for readers.  I don’t understand the purpose of your species accumulation curves.  The primary value of those “pre” surveys is showing what an unmanipulated community originally looked like way back when.

*I added the line transect methods to the body of the manuscript since its applied across multiple figures in the appendices and important for showing the before and after composition.*

*I also changed Figure S2 to be a pie chart style figure. I agree this is a great way to show the “before” conditions.*

*I kept the other surveys as species accumulation curves since the goal was to show the diversity and richness at other similar secondary forest sites in Connecticut.*

Line 239: Do you mean forest loss?  
  
Somewhere in the discussion, I would like to see the author qualify their conclusions with a clearer acknowledgement that the non-significant reductions in aphaenogaster might simply be due to the fact that the elaisome removal treatments were barely detectable 5 years out.  Perennial plants appear robust to disturbance, and this seems like a more likely explanation than the claim that mutualisms are robust to disturbance (made at 234)  
  
Line 256:  Please add some additional acknowledgement that your study lacks baseline data needed to confirm that ant-myrmecochore mutualisms are indeed robust to disturbance  
  
Line 282:  Why? The purpose of this sentence is unclear  
  
Line 283:  Explanation for what?