Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
Reviewer: 1  
  
Comments to the Author  
NA  
  
Reviewer: 2  
  
Comments to the Author  
Overall, I think the manuscript titled “Effect of winter cover cropping on soil water storage varies by site” has some good information provided and is fairly well written.  I do like the analysis the authors have carried out, I think it shows the well-rounded nature and details they have looked into for this paper.  There are a couple of changes I would suggest to improve the overall quality and readability but these are generally minor in nature.   
Line 1: I think the authors could provide a better title that summarizes the work.  It is generally a decent working title but I think prior to publication and more descriptive one of the work could be provided.  
Line 34: I do not think the “respectively” is needed.  
Lines 38-39: This is my overall largest issue with this paper.  I think the authors could phrase this a little better in the abstract.  In the conclusions, the authors do a really good job highlighting that this is the next step that needs to be taken as some of the other factors did not provide a good correlation to the document.  However, I think it is a little off-base here in the abstract.  I suggest rewording to have a similar context to that provided in the conclusions.   
Lines 81-82: I think this sentence needs to be reworded a bit.  It is a little confusing to follow.  
Line 95: This is only done in the introduction it seems but if it is this important that it continues to need to be restated, don’t put it in parenthesis.  
Line 111-112: This has confused me throughout the manuscript.  It has this done for the USDA site but then the samples were following the corn phase.  But the other sites are different.  I would condense here where each site was collected just so it is not in two different parts of the manuscript.  
Line 115: I do not know how I feel about the higher use of supplemental information.  I would prefer to have them within the document.  However, if the authors and editors think this is fine, I am okay with it. As a reader I would prefer to just have information within the text.  
Line 131: would it be more appropriate to term this depth instead of length.  
Line 226-252: I am a little confused why such a major point is being made from differences with treatment to soil texture.  I think this would be better set highlight why it should be used as a covariant instead of highlighting the significant differences at each location.  
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(There are no comments.)