Associate Editor   
Comments to Author:  
Dear authors,  
The reviewers and myself are happy with your revisions and believe the manuscript is now in a good position for publication. There is one small discussion point that a reviewer would like to see further amended, and I agree. Based on your own supplementary results and the type of data used here, the reviewer does not agree that the data demonstrates that herbivore-derived ecosystem functions (i.e., grazing) have been fully maintained in the study system. You can see more information in the reviewer comments.

We have revised our Discussion to clarify these issues (L458-468), please see our response to referee 1 below.

Reviewer(s)' Comments to Author:  
  
Referee: 1  
  
Comments to the Author(s).  
The authors have done an excellent job of carefully and comprehensively addressing my initial critiques. The manuscript is now much clearer, more compelling, and more rigorous. It is also now of greater interest to the broad readership of PRSB. Excellent work, well done.  
  
I have only one remaining comment, which can be easily addressed through text revision.  
  
While I appreciate a Discussion regarding the alignment of conservation and fishing goals for herbivores (lines 451-462; lines 546-551) and I agree that the data in this manuscript solidly show that herbivore productivity is often sustained under fishing pressure, I take issue with the suggestion that these data somehow also demonstrate that herbivore-derived ecosystem functions (i.e., grazing) have also been simultaneously maintained in such systems. There are no grazing data in this manuscript, and in fact, many of the reefs studied here were covered by fleshy macroalgae (Fig. S6), which are well known to negatively impact reef-building corals and limit reef recovery. As such, I think these two paragraphs need to be revised to more clearly state that a herbivore fisheries-function trade-off likely does exist in certain places and/or contexts, and that more studies are needed to assess this trade-off question.  
  
Otherwise, I think this manuscript is ready for publication in PRSB.

Thank you for the positive assessment of our revised manuscript. We agree that we were not able to quantify grazing – and this was an overreach of our discussion. We have revised the discussion to say that fishing management protected herbivore contributions to biomass production (not grazing or functions), but that we did not have data to quantify changes in grazing. We clarify that herbivory can be maintained despite light exploitation if herbivore size structure is rebuilt, but that grazing functions are context dependent (Fox & Bellwood 2007, Hanmer et al. 2017, Humphries et al. 2015) and can be uncorrelated with productivity (Schiettekatte et al. 2022). This may explain why fleshy algae dominated at some reefs in all four countries. These edits are in L458-468, and we no longer discuss grazing in the concluding paragraph (L551).