First, we thank Editor and Reviewers their comments about the relevance of our Datapaper. We have addressed all the constructive criticisms and suggestions made on our manuscript. We have uploaded a new versión of the datapaper with the changes and corrected versions of figures 2 and 3.

**Revierwers’ comments:**

**Reviewer 2 Katia Cezón García**

We thank to reviewer for her comments and we appreciate the helpful suggestions provided by this reviewer.

A main concern of this reviewer was the related with the mismatch between the dataset and the taxonomic coverage described in the text (Comments 4 to 16). We appreciate her detailed review at this point. We think those have improved the quality of the information described by this datapaper. The problem was that we uploaded to GBIF a version of the dataset with two mistakes (two erroneous records of *Juniperus*). We have corrected the mistakes, and uploaded an updated version of the dataset with a revised quality control (taxonomic). We have rewritten the calculations included at “Taxonomic coverage section” and the numbers referred to total records included in the “abstract” and “Resource citation” section. We have corrected some erroneous numbers (comment 8) at figures 2 and 3, and we have uploaded an updated version of these.

Another concern of the reviewer was the related to the information included at “Study extent description” section (comment 17). We agree with the reviewer’s suggestion. We have removed the redundant information and we have put the information of the ecosystem in the General spatial coverage section (see L165-207). We have also improved the description of the “Study area description” (Project section) (L61-78).

One more concern of the reviewer was the elements of DarwinCore (comments 22 to 26). We thank to reviewer the exhaustive review about the fields mentioned in the text. We have checked the dataset and the text, and we have removed the fields not included in the dataset. We have also mentioned in the text those were not in the old version.

Regarding to the comments of this reviewer about the references (in-text and bibliography; see comments 18 to 21 and 27 to 32) we have exhaustively reviewed the manuscript. All the references were revised and we have corrected the mistakes. For the references list we have deleted the references that were not cited in-text.

We also have addressed the minor changes indicated by the reviewer in the text as follow:

*Comment 1: Suggestion: this title could be a bit confusing about the paper content. Please, specify that the paper is a description of a dataset eg. Dataset of Phenology of Mediterranean high-mountain meadows flora database (Sierra Nevada, Spain)*

Response: We thank the suggestion about the title. We have modified the title to avoid confusion about the content of the manuscript.

----

*Comment 2:*

*Review inconsistences with the thousands separator*

Response: We have reviewed all numbers with thousands throughout manuscript and we have homogenized them

----

*Comment 3: Is it a reference??*

Response: No. “c.” is an accepted abbreviation of the latin term “circa” which means “around, about”.

----

*Comment 33: Describe “SN”*

Response: Done. See Table 1

**Reviewer 4 Quentin Groom**

We wish thank to reviewer for his constructive comments. This reviewer wrote that *“I enjoyed reading through this manuscript, it is well written and laid out. The data collected is useful and important for the conservation of these rare habitats and taxa.”*

Below we provide a point-by-point explanation including the Reviewer’s comments and our response in turn.

*Comment: Normally, in English I think we would write "the Sierra Nevada" rather the just "Sierra Nevada". There are several places in the text where the is relevant.*

Response: We are not fully agree with the reviewer at this point. Although the formal way to write could be “the Sierra Nevada”, this mountain has been referred as “Sierra Nevada” in the vast majority of the scientific literature of different disciplines (see for example: Blanca et al. 1998; Molero-Mesa 1999; Méndez and Gómez 2006; Lorite et al. 2007; Gómez and Hódar 2008; Puerta-Piñero et al. 2010; Souza et al. 2010; Benito et al. 2011; Jiménez-Moreno et al. 2012; Navarro-González et al. 2013; Gómez-Ortíz et al. 2014; Oliva et al. 2014; Zamora and Matías 2014; Pérez-Luque et al. In press; among others).

---  
*Comment: In the methods several words are in bold, but it is not clear why.*

Response: These words were in bold to distinguish the different parts of this ecosystem. Anyway, we agree with reviewer and we remove the bold format to avoid confusion.

---   
*Comment: The data on GBIF doesn't seem to have a Geodetic Datum associated with the coordinates. It would be better to complete this.*

Response: We have included the geodeticDatum term in the dataset and we have uploaded it to GBIF. In the Datapaper the datum was included at “Quality control description section”.
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