Question: (section general) Is it appropriate to align your trait “bud\_lcation” with our trait “regen\_strategy”. The terms in regen\_strategy are loosely based on those in Pausus, Lamont et al. 2018. The trait values include both vegetation regeneration and bud locations for regeneration.

ANSWER: Yes this is fine.

Question: (section general) We have two “resprouting” traits, ‘resprouting\_proportion\_individuals’, defined as ‘Proportion of individuals that resprout following a fire across a population; this trait is generally used in studies looking at how many individuals resprout vs. are killed following a fire. The other trait, ’resprouting\_proportion\_stems’, defined as ‘Proportion of stems that resprout following a fire at an individual or population level; this trait is appropriate to use for plants that have many stems from the base (shrubs, herbs, graminoids) where the number of stems before and after fire is censused’. So far I’ve mapped in your data to the trait ‘resprouting\_proportion\_stems’, but I could ALSO calculated how many individuals within each treatment resprout vs. are fire\_killed - would that be appropriate? (So far we’ve used the second trait for censuses of proportion of trees killed, but we have input relatively few fire-response studies and these are evolving trait definitions.)

ANSWER: Our primary interest was modelling the probability an individual will survive as a function of individual and species level characteristics. However, you could also estimate the population level proportion of individuals that survived each treatment. I'm happy for you to add that trait. My main concern is the interpretation of the resprouting\_proportion\_stems. Technically, we are not measuring the proportion of tiller resprouting. To do so would require tagging each individual stem and only assessing whether they resprout or not. In reality, I suspect all the tillers coming up postfire are most likely new tillers - not really a measure of tiller resprouting. I think it is OK to keep this trait but it might need to be renamed (possibly resprout\_strength) whereby strength is measured in terms of the postfire tiller abundance / prefire tiller abundance. Effectively this gives you a continuous measure of resprouting strength conditioned on initial size (or in this case number of tillers).

Question: (section general) We will be adding water\_treatment as a contextual variable. ANSWER: That is fine.

Question: (section people) Are all appropriate people listed, with appropriate details?

Question: (section source) Are the citation details for this study correct? ANSWER: Yes

Question: (section dataset) Can you provide more detailed information for any of these variables? ANSWER: Yes this all looks correct. Though I would Remove the first sentence from the sampling\_strategy I would also put year\_collected\_start as June 2014 and year\_collected\_end as March 2016. This would more fully encapsulate the entire duration of the experiment: the growth period (which started in June) and the treatment phase (10 weeks).

Question: (section sites) Do site details look complete and accurate? As a minimum we would like latitude, longitude, description. ANSWER: More accurate lat/long details: Lat: -37.718 Long: 145.047 Description: La Trobe University (Bundoora) Glasshouse

Question: (section traits) Does this study include other trait data we may have missed? ANSWER: As suggested above. You can also include proportion of individuals surviving burn treatment.

Question: (section traits) Were any of your data sourced from other studies? If so, can you tell us which records and the source (so that we can avoid duplicates, where possible)? ANSWER: No

Question: (section traits) Can you provide any additional information so that above exclusions no longer apply? ANSWER: Missing data are due to replicated trait values for individuals within a species. So this appears correct.

Question: (section traits) Do the data for the trait leaf\_dry\_mass appear correct? ANSWER: These data look correct

Question: (section traits) Do the data for the trait leaf\_fresh\_mass appear correct? ANSWER: These data look correct

Question: (section traits) Do the data for the trait resprouting\_proportion\_stems appear correct? ANSWER: Technically this trait is not measuring proportion of tillers that have resprouted. To do so would require marking each tiller individually and only examining those tagged responses. Please consider renaming to resprouting\_strength

Question: (section traits) Do the data for the trait specific\_leaf\_area appear correct? ANSWER: This looks correct

Question: (section traits) Do the data for the trait growth\_habit appear correct? ANSWER: Yes

Question: (section traits) Do the data for the trait life\_history appear correct? ANSWER: Yes

Question: (section traits) Do the data for the trait photosynthetic\_pathway appear correct? ANSWER: Yes

Question: (section traits) Do the data for the trait regen\_strategy appear correct? ANSWER: Yes

Question: (section taxonomic\_updates) Do these taxonomic alignments and corrections look reasonable? ANSWER: Some of the suggested names appear to be out of date or invalid synonyms. John is confident that most of the names (minus the typos) are correct and up to date -- at least relative to the Victorian Flora.