

Authors' response revision 3

Dear Editor,

In response to the addressed inconsistencies in the discussion, we have clarified the influence of site C2 on the effect of P reductions among the two-sided floodplain group and stated that the effect of C2 also is influenced by its perched culvert (lines 259-262, p 9). The sentence: "Our results suggest that PP reductions can be substantial in these systems and lead to decreased TP loads, adding to previous body of research from the US" was removed (lines 272-273, p 9).

Headline 4.1 was changed to "Influence of floodplain designs on P reductions in stream" to reflect the limited support for two-sided designs as the most important control of P reductions.

Sentence on load underestimation in discussion was clarified as "Further, flow-weighted average concentration load estimation from monthly water samples is generally conservative (Elwan et al., 2018), which also was the case in proximity of site C3 where loads based on monthly samples were 30 % lower than loads from biweekly flow-proportional sampling." (lines 266-268, p 9).

We also revised the phrasing of inundation effect on TP loads in discussion (lines 295-298, p 10; 393-395, p 13). TP loads were only significantly reduced during inundation events compared to base flows in site S8 and not across all sites as previously stated.

In the conclusion, we changed phrasing to "P reductions can be achieved with two-sided floodplains" instead of "floodplain designs controlling P reductions" (lines 435-438, p 14).

Line and page numbers refer to manuscript with track changes.