

## **## Answer to editor**

Dear authors,

Thank you for the thorough work revising this manuscript. Both reviewers are satisfied with the changes, and agree that this manuscript would be a nice addition to the literature. One of the reviewers mentions - however - that there are still some typo's in the current version. Could you revise thoroughly for these small errors, and then resubmit please?

Thanks in advance,

Marijn

Authors' answer: Dear editor, we are glad that the previous revisions fulfill the quality expected by your journal. We revised carefully the manuscript searching for typos or other minor errors and corrected them accordingly. Further, in the answers to the referee 2, we cite the lines where these corrections were made. If there are any further adjustments necessary to make, please just let us know. Thank you for your interest in our work.

## **## Answer to reviewer #1: Vallicrosa, Helena:**

I am satisfied with the effort made by the authors in addressing the raised concerns in the previous round of reviews. I believe that this contribution is now suitable for publication as is.

Authors' answer: Dear referee, thank you very much for your contribution to the previous versions of the manuscript. Your revision contributed to the improvement of our work.

## **## Answer to reviewer #2: Hauser, Emma:**

The authors have nicely revised this paper to improve language regarding the study's scope and implications. The paper now highlights that this study is specific to forests and aboveground productivity, which ultimately makes the authors conclusions stronger. I especially appreciated revisions to the introduction to include a discussion of soil nutrients and a more nuanced conversation surrounding elementomes and the role of C versus nutrients in plant growth. The introduction was much more streamlined and sets the stage for the results very nicely.

It was also great to see the authors discussion of root and soil variables in the discussion/caveats section. This would be a nice step for future work and it's helpful to have this included to keep the conversation going in the research community.

There were a few remaining typos, so it would be good to do a technical double check before the final publication, but I have no other substantive suggestions to make. This manuscript makes a nice contribution to our understanding of aboveground elemental cycling, its interaction with environmental variables, and its predictive capacity for forest productivity.

Authors' answer: Dear referee, thank you for your feedback on our previous revision. We also acknowledge your detailed review that allowed us to improve the points and topics you mentioned. We have carefully reviewed the manuscript and corrected any typos or

minor errors and made minor and minor adjustments to verb agreement. Below we cite the lines where these corrections were made.

Lines:

- L29 (deleted the duplicate of the word 'drive')
- L41 ('45% in bark and woods' replaced by ('45% in bark and wood')
- L71 ('effects of the tree nutrient stocks' replaced by ('effects of tree nutrient stocks')
- L147 ('...tree diameters' replaced by '....data on tree diameter')
- L149 ('access' replaced by 'see in detail')
- L160 ('was' replaced by 'were')
- L163 (added 'values of the stocks')
- L188 ('smoothed' replaced by 'smooth')
- L189-190 (added the word 'functions' to the follow the term 'spline (Edf)')
- L197 ('elementome' replaced by 'elementomes')
- L232 (added the proper parenthesis to cite Fig. 1a).
- L272 ('...were unable to predict...' replaced by '...did not significantly predict...')
- L289 (Figure 4, deleted '\* Indicates significant coefficient')
- L297 (Figure 5, deleted '\* Indicates significant coefficient')
- L311 ('stocks aboveground' replaced by 'aboveground stocks')
- L385 ('above ground' replaced by 'aboveground')
- L390 ('below-ground' replaced by 'belowground')
- L410-411 ('...were the most positively correlated...' replaced by '...showed the strongest positive correlation...')