This paper reports on the performance of Sitka spruce and Scots pine 30 years into a replicated experiment of varying proportions of the crop and nurse species. The resulting recommendations will be important to management of plantation forests on nitrogen deficient soils.

The analysis seems sound; I don't have a better idea for how to handle the repeated measures when there is not a consistent pattern over time. After reviewing a lot of papers with bad statistical models (and bad English), this paper was a pleasure to read. I have minor suggestions for improving your delivery.

I am not sure that the hypotheses add much to the paper. They detract quite a bit from the discussion, because you were asking us to refer to them by number back in the introduction. It would be better to just tell us whether the results were as expected, in each regard. The hypotheses themselves are not very interesting because you tell us that you are expecting to find the same results as before, in the case of the first two hypotheses, and in the third case you gave us a null hypothesis. Null hypotheses are never interesting!

Having read your paper, I now understand "over yielding" and "under yielding". They meant nothing to me when I read the abstract. It's important that your abstract be understandable to a general audience, so I suggest you avoid using these terms, or else define them.

Rates of windthrow should be reported, in the methods section if they aren't important.

Minor comments

62 I wondered if this was for all species, or the commercial species.
102 we were in the British Isles, and you neglected to tell us that we left.
113 a projection doesn't sound like a result, maybe there is another way to state this?
115 is the optimum the same as the maximum? Maximum would be less confusing.
162 I can't believe it's the rock type that's considered nitrogen deficient. Not many rock types supply much nitrogen.

Tables 2 and 3: Change the second column heading to "Species" and list the species rather than shading out a cell, which would need to be explained somehow.

Table 3 lacks units. Cm? Table 2 told us it was m. Defining "marginal" would help readers who start by looking at your figures and tables.

Figure 1 y axis label: give units of concentration. Label the areas "optimal", "marginal", etc, maybe with pale colors—going from green to red!

Figure 3. 2 digits is plenty for a P value. Don't make us read sideways. The x axis could be labeled as "Spruce proportion of mixture (%)" so you could avoid the arcane labeling system--

and they should be in increasing order. This figure requires too much close reading; following conventions will make it more legible at a glance.

Reconsidering your word choice may help you reach a broad international audience. Language that I am not familiar with:

110 outturn

153 replacement series

176 Scottish plus trees

183 "would have" sounds to me like a counterfactual

382 row mixtures

602 marginal heights, 604 marginal mean diameters

156 1.9 - 2.0