Associate Editor  
Board Member: 1  
Comments to Author:  
Thank you for your submission to Proceedings B.  
  
The manuscript has been assessed by two expert reviewers and myself.  
  
The reviewers and myself all found the manuscript to be of high quality and of high interest within the field. One reviewer has questioned the breadth of topic appeal across the broader PRSB readership. Concerns were also raised around the strength of the findings based on literature values and community snapshots.  
  
I believe that the topic is of general appeal to a broader ecological audience and this is evidenced through the cross-disciplinary approach of the questions and research approach. Perhaps more could be done to frame and discuss the topic in a wider context of investigating ecological services across productivity and trophic gradients.  
  
I do think that it is import to address concerns about the leap from snap-shot community surveys to calculating fish productivity, turnover, and nutrient content, based on literature values. The authors could better speak to the efficacy of this approach, as well as acknowledge and discuss some of its caveats.

Thank you for your positive review of our manuscript. We have added a new introductory paragraph that places our study in broader ecological context, including XYZ. We have also added a paragraph to the Discussion that considers the limitations of snapshot underwater surveys in estimating dynamic rates, and note that this remains a widespread approach to empirical coral reef science.  
  
Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
  
Referee: 1  
  
I enjoyed reading this manuscript. It is well written and interesting (to me, given my area of study). The analyses are sophisticated, and the interpretation of the data is generally sound (within the confines of the study design, see below). Therefore, I have little to say about the technical aspects of the manuscript, other than one substantive concern: at its core, the approach to this study was to take count data from in situ visual surveys and use published/grey literature values to extrapolate all the way up to fish productivity, turnover, and nutrient content. That’s a big leap to go from “snapshots” of fish community structure to calculating rate-based processes. As such, I would like to see a section in the Discussion that more clearly acknowledges the limitations of this approach and the associated interpretation. I’d also like to see the authors strive for less self-citation throughout the manuscript.  
  
On a larger note, I question whether this manuscript will be of general interest to the broad readership of PRSB. That is for the editorial team to decide.  
  
Technical comments:  
-- Please use continuous line numbering when submitting manuscripts to journals – doing so makes it much easier for reviewers to provide pointed and meaningful feedback. Thank you.

Apologies for this oversight in the original submission. Line numbers added.  
  
-- Please more clearly delineate when you are talking about human consumption of fishes and impacts to human health vs. environmental/ecological responses. This is especially important given the broad readership of PRSB.  
  
-- Please format all figures and tables per PRSB style, and check to make sure that sufficient information is provided in the figure legend.  
  
  
Referee: 2  
  
The authors explore the nutrient productivity of coral reef fish using data from four different countries.They combine biomass, growth and nutrient concentration data to explore how the trophic composition of reef fish communities impacts on the potential nutrient productivity of coral reefs.  
  
In this study the authors provide an important step forward for research in this area. They build on studies linked to the nutrient content of standing biomass in fish communities by exploring how productivity of these communities influences the potential nutrient yield from local fisheries and how different fishing regimes and habitat conditions may modify these nutrient yields. In light of the increasing interest in fisheries to support micronutrient deficiencies the findings of the paper are important and timely.  
  
I found the paper well written and extremely thorough in its analysis. My comments primarily revolve around increased clarity in some areas to support the general readership of this journal. These comments can be found in the attached pdf.  
  
I recommend publication once these minor comments are addressed.

##### Thank you for your positive assessment and recommendation to publish. We have addressed all minor comments in your pdf. These include: