L40 - This is common enough to not need an explanation. i.e. no need for abbreviation.

L48 – Secale cereale

L50 - Avoid using first person pronouns.

L53 - This suggests several depths were sampled. If so, what was the extent? If not, please clarify that only 10-18 cm depth was sampled (rather than an increment.

L63-64 Please rephrase. Something along the lines of "At two trials, soil water content at field capacity under CC management was 2.5 and 2.4% higher, respectively, compared with NC".

L89 - Since this is the first Nichols et al., 2020 in the manuscript, shouldn't this be 2020a?

L120 - Soil textural analysis will be a very good addition to the data. Although the soil series were identified, it is important to remember that the translocational and depositional processes can affect the current particle size distribution.

L128 - This should be Nichols et al., 2020b

L128 - At what depths?

L130 - The map is not clear (the highlighted counties are very clear and it makes it difficult to understand what is going on here)

L139 - A brief explanation (before referring the readers to another publication for detailed explanation) will be helpful for readers.

L145 - Please state how many days for clarity since this will be dependent on soil texture, among other things.

L149 - Why was this depth chosen and not any other depths?

Soil surface conditions play a huge role on water movement and retention. Why was the surface not sampled? It could provide important information.

L158 – 159 - Not really important. Please delete.

L170-171 - Please be careful here. The method in the cited study is for the determination of bulk density in forest soils (this study was not conducted on forest soils so this citation is not accurate). Please use this statement and citation instead "Soil bulk density was analyzed using the core method (Grossman and Reinsch, 2002)".

Grossman, R. B.,& Reinsch, T. G. (2002). Bulk density and linear extensibility.

In J. H. Dane & G. C. Topp (Eds.), *Methods of soil analysis:*

*Part 4, physical methods* (pp. 201–228). SSSA. https://doi.org/

10.2136/sssabookser5.4.c9

L175 - This does not need to be a stand-alone subsection. Just mention the method used for the analysis with the citation and include it in the subsection just above this. Further, the percentages need to be presented (either in a new table or added to the current Table 1)

L181 - See comment above for soil textural analysis. Just state the method and citation. This will enhance brevity.

L187 - "Analysis" is a better term.

L198 - Biologically meaningful? What does this mean?

L218 - It also depends on other soil intrinsic factors.

L220 - Higher matric potentials

L220 - These values are not assumed. They are measured values in most cases. Please be careful here.

L222 - Please be careful here too. It is a leap to go from -33 kPa soil water pressures not being an accurate measure of field capacity to -10 kPa being a better approximation. It is not supported by data. I suggest removing this sentence. The sentence before this is enough justification

L236 - This should have been added to Table 1 rather than having it in the form of a figure. Also, this figure does not tell the reader anything about the depths.

Also, this is presented in such a way that makes it seem like the CCs had any effects on the soil texture. This is not true.

L258 - It was just not significant. This will enhance brevity.

L267 - Why measure water content at different pressures and not present the moisture retention curve. That is a better way of presenting this data rather than the current table.

L282 - This sentence suggests that you need to cite more than one reference here)

L284 - Why was it higher? Any causal mechanism?

L284 - 2% is just fine (delete the 'vol')

L318 - How does below-ground biomass measurement get into your model if it wasn't measured in the first place?