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This data set and its description is useful, and I can foresee its use in many different ways. My specific comments are as follows:

1. In the introductory paragraph about seagrass ecosystem functions and services, consider adding water purification/filtration to the list. Suggested references: Lamb et al. 2017 (Science), Ascioti et al 2022 (Ecosystem Services).

2. In section 2.1 (literature search), the stated search terms did not include Syringodium, but this species was in the results. The term 'exten' in the search - should it be 'exten' or 'extent'?

3. In section 2.2, the last paragraph (line 120) seemed out of place because it described the way natural history reporting has evolved, not a method. You may want to consider moving this to the Results and Discussion section.

4. I found it difficult to differentiate between species because of the colour gradient in Figure 3 - the yellows/oranges in particular (Amphibolis, Cymodocea, Enhalus), were harder to make out than the rest. On this note, I'd suggest checking for the use of colorblind safe gradients in ColorBrewer (https://colorbrewer2.org/#type=sequential&scheme=BuGn&n=3). I think this map is useful for summarizing research hotspots and gaps at a glance, and it would be a shame if the reader did not get the full experience of it.

5. Section 4 (Line 196): there is a mismatch between the text and abstract. The text says, "...the least number of data was related to seagrass reproduction (9% of data)" but the abstract says it's production that has the least data points, at 10%.
6. Nice work in building this data set - this was a tremendous effort. I did notice some missing papers. In many of the papers with such seagrass data, the titles and keywords often don't use the search terms you've selected. We often use terms such as 'condition' or 'status', so this is possibly why some papers were not picked up in your search. Here are some additional papers that have the data you're after but are not in your list: