

Comments:

It is a very interesting work.

In Abstract : please indicate how the macrofauna was evaluated, also by litter bag?, please indicate it.

Introduction:

Row 53, also incorporated the references of Gonzales and Seastdt 2001; Dechaine et al. 2004;

Material and Methods

Row 87: explain briefly why the Pampas is one of the most productive areas of the world

Row 96: Can you indicate please more less the size of each site?

Row 111: please indicate how many bags per meter square have you used, and how many bags per each treatment per replica

Is it possible to have a drawing of the location of the different sites, with the respective litter bags?

It is important to indicate that this method is only for evaluating mainly epigeic soil fauna, endogeics are evaluated with another methods.

Results

Row 143: change differed to different

Good figures, but I suggest to rephrase the information (row 150-167).

Highlight the most important ie. that there was not a significant effect of the land-use (table 1), except for the microfauna (Figure 4) and it was possible to differentiate the relevance of the activity of each group, in each land-use...

Conclusions

It is important to emphasize that this study only evaluates mainly the activity of the **epigeic** animals, macro, meso or micro fauna, it is important to mention it in the discussion. Also it is important to mention the quality of the litter in each system, is it possible to give information in that respect?, that influence on the type of soil invertebrates that are going to be found in each land use.

It is important if possible that the authors can give information of previous works about what kind of epigeic soil invertebrates (meso and macrofauna) is possible to find in the study area, in order to enrich the discussion.

