Find below my responses to the comments from the reviewers:

1. **Reviewer #3**

*Comment:* I greatly enjoyed reviewing your paper "Valuing ecosystem services for agricultural wetlands: A systematic review and meta-analysis." I found it to be very well written and on a subject that should be of great interest to the readership of Wetlands Ecology and Management. I found very little wrong with your paper. The techniques used seemed innovative and appropriate, and your interpretation of the results were well described. I only had a few minor comments and suggested edits that I have included in a marked-changes version that I will attach. I hope to see you paper in print soon.

*Response:*

This reviewer was very generous for including his suggestions in the main document. I will review his suggestions and accept when appropriate.

1. **Reviewer #6**

*Comment*: A nicely written article and generally understandable (even from a non-statistician). Any new effort to calculate values of wetland needs to be moved forward. My only suggestion would be to aim your discussion a bit more at managers rather than the rather technical approach that you have. It needs to be really clear what the benefits of this approach would be.  
  
Also, on Line 450 you write "Provide reference", so I guess you need to do that. :)

*Response*:

We will make sure that every technical term is explained well so that non-experts can understand, especially how our estimated models can be applied to estimate wetland values. I will also check line 450 to make sure everything is ok.

1. **Reviewer #4**

*Overall Comment*: Under the interference of global climate change and human activities, there is a need for a global estimate of the value of wetland ecosystem services within agricultural landscapes, which is of great significance for guiding regional planning and improving human well-being. However, the authors did not do a good job in this regard, especially the conceptual confusion, which needs to be revised. Based on the above reasons, this paper proposes a major revision, and the specific revision opinions are as follows.  
  
*Comment 1.*

Title  
The key word of the title is "Valuing the Ecosystem Services ", but most of the conclusions in the article are in the analysis of driving factors. It is recommended that the author reconsider revising the title of the paper.

*Response*: We also discuss the valuation of ecosystem services, including the errors in predicting the values. I think we must make sure the contribution of “valuation of ecosystem services” stands out in the manuscript.  
  
*Comment 2.*

Abstract  
(1) In the abstract, there is no estimate of the value of wetlands. It is recommended to add specific values.  
(2) Lines 41-42 in P2, "regulating (e.g., carbon sequestration, nutrient recycling, flood control) services.", "nutrient recycling" belongs to "Supporting services". The author needs to sort out the classification of ecosystem services to avoid conceptual errors.

*Response:* I will provide estimates of the value of wetlands in the abstract of the revised manuscript. But I will need help clarifying nutrient recycling as regulating service. I do not understand why the reviewer thinks it a supporting service.

*Comment 3.*

Manuscript  
(1) Based on the Millennium Ecosystem Service Assessment Report, ecosystems are divided into 4 categories, including provisioning, regulating, supporting and cultural services. However, Lines 146-147 in P7, "Ecosystem services were classified into regulating and provisioning ecosystem services, following Morris and Camino (2011)", Is this correct? It is recommended to revise or give a give a more reasonable explanation.

*Response:* We did not have data on the other ecosystem services or very few data points that would not allow for a model estimation. Therefore, we followed Morris and Camino (2011) to groups similar ESS together and to provide us with enough data points for model estimation.

*Comment 4*

Please add a meta-analysis of the wetland ecosystem service value evaluation flowchart in the

*Response:* We will do that in the revised manuscript.

*Comment 5.*

"Methodology" section.  
(3) The "wetlands within agricultural landscapes" is only mentioned in the "Introduction" and "Methodology" section and are absent from the analysis of results. Please note the words in the analysis of results. If I read only the results analysis, I could not distinguish whether the authors were studying wetlands in agricultural landscapes or other landscapes. Please add the words "agricultural landscapes" in "Results" section.

*Response:* This is a fair comment. We will do that in the revised manuscript.

*Comment 6*  
(4) What are the advantages of Meta-analysis compared with other evaluation methods? please add a discussion about it in the "Discussion" section.

*Response:* I think we did that; however, we will make sure we contrast meta-analysis with the mean value transfer in the discussion section.

*Comment 7.*

Artwork and Tables  
(1) Lines 184-185 in P9, the title of figures 1 should be placed below the picture.

*Response:* We will do that in the revised manuscript.

*Comment 8.*   
The scale was wrong (we recommend using latitude and longitude grid) in figure 1.

*Response:*

I do not understand this comment. But I will research more into latitude and longitude grid for more information and update the figure. I welcome any help in understanding the comment.

*Comment 9.*  
And the legend should be given in the picture instead of given a footnote in the title.  
Reference

*Response:* I will do that in the revised manuscript.

*Comment 10.*

(1) The list of references should be reunified and standardized. Including the page (e.g. "pp. XX -XX" or "XX-XX") and the standard abbreviation of a journal's name.  
(2) Please always include DOIs as full DOI links in your reference list (e.g. "https://doi.org/abc").  
(3) Line 663, remove "&"; Lines 631-632 remove "." (e.g. modified "Gardner, R.C.," to "Gardner, RC,")  
  
*Response:*

I will follow his suggestions and update the references accordingly. The only issue is that some of the references may not have the DOIs.