**Major questions:**

**Question 1:** (section general) Many of the units indicated in the manuscript don’t seem to match your values - at least if I use them your data for several traits would be extreme outliers. For instance, for stomatal conductance, you suggested your units were mmolH2O/m2/s. I used the more commonly reported molH2O/m2/s, which would still give your study the lowest values in AusTraits.

Apologies for the confusion with this dataset. You are correct, our stomatal conductance was reported in molH20/m2/s, rather than mmol. I have corrected for that in the meta document in the new spreadsheet that I have sent through. In regard to these still producing low values, this could be due to our work being carried out on very young *Brachychiton* seedlings, many of which didn’t have leaves large enough to cover the entire screening area of the LI-COR. While measurements were adjusted to account for each leaf’s specific surface area, I imagine this procedure would differ from many of the other plant traits reported in your dataset. I’m not sure if that would help explain that slightly unusual values?

**Question 2:** (section general) In figure 6 in the manuscript you give the units for phoyosynthetic rate (A) as “mmolCO2/m2/s”, but the values you show are more in line with units “umolCO2/m2/s”. Then your values are still the lowest in AusTraits (and three values are excluded as too low) but if I used "mmolCO2/m2/s all your values would be excluded. 

Apologies again, you are correct. We used umol – which has now been edited in the meta document. As above, the low values are probably due to them being seedlings with very small leaves.

**Question 3:** (section general) For Huber value (inverse of your reported leaf area over sapwood area) your values are very high – I would have expect the opposite for seedlings, expecting high leaf area relative to sapwood area. Maybe this is correct for a seedling of a species with very thin leaves, but I want to confirm this. 

These are unusual species. Particularly *Brachychiton rupestris* (the narrow leaf bottle tree), that even as a seeding has an extraordinarily large stem. Given that all these species are closely related, I wouldn’t be too surprised if they all exhibited somewhat unusual Huber values because of this.

**Question 4:** (section general) Your values for LAR (leaf area ratio) are leaf area/total plant fresh mass. The more standard formulation is leaf area/total plant dry mass. Since your calculations use fresh mass, your values plot far lower than other studies. Do you have leaf dry mass and total plant dry mass? 

Apologies – those measurements are the dry mass; I have edited that in the meta file now. The reason for them plotting far lower? Perhaps because they’re seedlings and have much lower values?

**Question 5:** (section general) Your variable RWC is calculated as: RWC = [(fresh stem weight-dry stem weight) / (turgid stem weight - dry stem weight)] x 100; Our variable stem\_saturated\_water\_content\_per\_mass is calculated as RWC = (water in a saturated stem / stem dry weight). The top of the ratio is identical, but you have stem water mass as the denominator and we have stem dry weight. Do you have dry stem weight that we could use to properly align you values with others in AusTraits? 

Yes – the reported values that we had were all dry weight (see new spreadsheet), but I have now also included a column with the stem wet weights (Stem.wet).

**Question 6:** (section general) You current shoot to root ratios (that we’ve aligned with the AusTraits trait “root\_shoot\_ratio”) are based on fresh mass, while our variable is the ratio for dry mass. Do you have the dry mass values? Overall, if you have dry mass values for roots, shoots, and leaves I can better align many of your trait values with ours.

Apologies – again, these were mislabelled, all weights (except Stem.wet) are dried weights. This has been edited in the new spreadsheet.

**Minor questions:**

**Question 7:** (section people) Are all appropriate people listed, with appropriate details?

Yes

**Question 8:** (section source) Are the citation details for this study correct?

Yes

Questions 9: (section dataset) Can you provide more detailed information for any of these variables

Yes – see below for year\_collected\_start and end.

**Question 10:** (section dataset) Can you provide missing details for the variable year\_collected\_start? 

The year data collection commenced - 2014

**Question 11:** (section dataset) Can you provide missing details for the variable year\_collected\_end? 

The year data collection was completed - 2014

**Question 12:** (section sites) Do site details look complete and accurate? As a minimum we would like latitude, longitude, description.

More details – this study was conducted at the University of Queensland glasshouses – these are the latitude and longitude values for this area of the University of Queensland, St Lucia campus glasshouse location:

Latitude: -27.495667

Longtidue: 153.010020

Question 13: (section contexts) Do the additional context details look complete?

Yes

**Question 14:** (section traits) Does this study include other trait data we may have missed? 

No

**Question 15:** (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)?

No

**Question 16:** (section traits) Can you provide any additional information so that above exclusions no longer apply?

No

**Question 17:** (section traits) More than 10% of your data points for the trait huber\_value are outliers, does this seem reasonable, given what you know about the biology of these species and overall distribution of values in Austraits?

Yes – as mentioned in the major questions section, these are somewhat unusual species even as adults, but we studied them as seedlings, so that may be causing some unusual values.

**Question 18:** (section traits) Do the data for the trait leaf\_area\_ratio appear correct?

Yes

**Question 19:** (section traits) More than 10% of your data points for the trait photosynthetic\_rate\_per\_area\_saturated are outliers, does this seem reasonable, given what you know about the biology of these species and overall distribution of values in Austraits?

Yes – as mentioned in the major questions section, these are somewhat unusual species even as adults, but we studied them as seedlings, so that may be causing some unusual values.

**Question 20:** (section traits) Do the data for the trait root\_shoot\_ratio appear correct?

Yes

**Question 21:** (section traits) More than 10% of your data points for the trait seed\_mass are outliers, does this seem reasonable, given what you know about the biology of these species and overall distribution of values in Austraits?

These measurements were obtained from a subsample of seeds that were supplied to us from local nurseries. Each seed for each recorded plant was not weighed prior to planting (so the seed mass measurements are just a mean seed mass calculated from a subset of seeds provided to us). We’ll leave it up to you whether this averaged seed mass is something you’d like to include in your database.

**Question 22:** (section traits) Do the data for the trait stem\_saturated\_water\_content\_per\_mass appear correct?

Yes

**Question 23:** (section traits) More than 10% of your data points for the trait stomatal\_conductance\_per\_area\_at\_Asat are outliers, does this seem reasonable, given what you know about the biology of these species and overall distribution of values in Austraits?

Yes – as mentioned in the major questions section, these are somewhat unusual species even as adults, but we studied them as seedlings, so that may be causing some unusual values.

**Question 24:** (section traits) More than 10% of your data points for the trait water\_use\_efficiency\_intrinsic are outliers, does this seem reasonable, given what you know about the biology of these species and overall distribution of values in Austraits?

Yes – as mentioned in the major questions section, these are somewhat unusual species even as adults, but we studied them as seedlings, so that may be causing some unusual values.

**Question 25:** (section taxonomic\_updates) Do these taxonomic alignments and corrections look reasonable?

Yes