

Authors would like to thank the editor and reviewers for their contributions to this paper, which have significantly added to the content of the paper.

- Many of the line numbers referred to in your response do not match those in version four of the manuscript, so it is sometimes difficult to assess your responses adequately. **Authors would like to sincerely apologize for mismatching line numbers with responses.**
- I do not follow the discussion over the title and I don't think that what you have suggested actually reflects the suggestions of the reviewer. Please consider something like “Transpiration rates of fast-growing *Eucalyptus grandis* x *E. nitens* clonal hybrid and *Pinus elliottii* near the Two Streams Research Catchment, South Africa”. **Thank you for this suggestion and we agree. The title has been revised to “Transpiration rates from a mature *Eucalyptus grandis* x *E. nitens* clonal hybrid and *Pinus elliottii* near the Two Streams Research catchment, South Africa”.**
- Your response around the age of the trees to reviewer 2 is inadequate. You state that generally a eucalyptus rotation grown for pulp ranges from 10-12 years in South Africa. However, this is not true - although it may have been in the past. See for example <https://www.forestrysouthafrica.co.za/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/tree-rotations-1.pdf> which shows that 7-10 years is the typical drawing length for eucalyptus. As the reviewer points out they will harvest the trees when the growth rate is optimal as when it starts to decline there is a loss of profit and so the trees are harvested. That drop in LAI is not so severe then - this is well explained in Gush et al., 2002. **The Editor is thanked for this correction and references. The section at the end of the introduction (line 60 to 64) has been updated to reflect the information provided.**
- The response to the long-term catchment recommendations of the reviewers is not that clear and I really don't think that your conclusions i.e. ...”that, in contrast to common misperception, 1) *P. elliottii* can use more water than GN (depending on soil water stress)” is valid as 1) Almost all other literature shows that over a long rotation, eucalyptus does use more than pine, so it is not a misperception and 2) your study only takes place over two years and you showed higher water use by *P. elliottii* in only one of them. This means

your conclusions are in contrast to your discussion in lines 405-415. Overall, I have a concern that you are over-stating your results relative to the evidence supporting them. **Authors agree that the word misperception was not appropriate, and results are overstated in terms of the measurement period we have and the general body of research on eucalyptus and pine research. We therefore have a contrast between discussion and conclusion. Therefore, the abstract and conclusion has been revised (line 32 to 34, line 416 to 425) to try and fit our results into the broader picture research picture where other studies show eucalyptus to use more than pine over the long-term.**

- There are several cases of sloppy writing. For example, “doesn't” instead of “does not” etc. **We have revised and checked all the language of the paper.**