**Reviewer 1:**  
  
Comments to the Author  
I appreciate the effort the authors put in the preparation of this manuscript. It is very clear and the conclusions and discussion are supported by the data and analysis. Here are my suggestions:  
  
LN 87 I suggest replacing the word “managerial” with “management”

Done

LN 124 I suggest replacing “save” with “except”

Done

LN 242 “which may have better randomized spatial patterns in the soil”. I’m not sure what this means. Can this be reworded? I can guess, but the way it is written is not clear to me.

We changed the wording to be more explicit:

The Central site had several treatments in small plots and the blocks were quadrants within the field, which may have better randomized treatments with respect to natural patterns of soil texture variability spatially within the site.

LN 250. It is not possible to have 1.8 g of OM per g of soil. Is this per 100 g soil? So a 1.8% (or 4.6) OM.

Yes this was a typo, thank you for catching it. We changed the text to read: 1.8 to 4.6% for clarity.

LN 282 place a comma after do.

Figure 1 I suggest removing this figure; it is not very informative.

The figure was moved to supplementary material.

Figure 4. Could be more informative if the average for Cover vs. No Cover was included and the individual plots are being more transparent or grayed out.  
  
I would note that there is no reporting of yield or soil water - in this paper - so there is no evidence that the cover crops have actually impacted these cropping systems. However, I do understand that this is somewhat outside the scope of this particular contribution.  
  
Reviewer: 2  
  
Comments to the Author  
Dear authors,  
The manuscript had the potential to be useful to readers of this journal. However, it is not suitable for publication. The study was supposed to investigate the effects of CCs on soil water storage at various sites and to provide possible causal models. However, much time was spent explaining the effects of soil texture. There was very little discussion of the results (causes) and there were too many speculations not supported by the data presented. More detailed comments on how to improve the manuscript is provided in the attached document.  
Thank you.  
  
Reviewer: 3  
  
Comments to the Author  
See comments in attached file.  
  
Associate Editor's Comments to Author:  
Associate Editor: 1  
Comments to the Author:  
(There are no comments.)