

Answers to Reviewer 1 and modifications addressed in the revised version of the manuscript

Specific comments:

Q1: The methods and materials are overall described in detail in the paper. I only suggest including a clearer definition of what natural/artificial reefs and wrecks are, just at the beginning of the 2.2.1 section (before line 112). The definition of wrecks is actually included at lines 83 and 140, but a very brief introduction of the distinction of the three elements could be integrated.

A1: We inserted the definition of natural reef, artificial reef, and wreck in the introduction.

Q2: Do you investigate also the www.relitti.it database? This database was suggested by stakeholders within the marine tourism sector (in the frame of an H2020 project) and might be compared to these wrecks data.

A2: We consulted the www.relitti.it website and we found that much information (included coordinates) was not directly available on the website but complex inquiries were required to acquire the data. Moreover, the website was offline during a consistent part of the data collection phase.

Q3: How many questionnaires were collected? only by Partners or also a wider network? This information could be included in line 152.

A3: We shared the questionnaires only with project partners. The number of questionnaires collected will be included in the final version.

Q4: Line 183: the “groups” are mentioned here for the first time after line 31 in the abstract, so a short introduction can be included.

A4: Groups’ specifications have been added in paragraph 2.2.1.

Technical corrections:

Line 43 and 53: inserted missing citations.

Line 60: the Reefbase website URL has been included, as requested.

Line 63: the citation has been corrected, as suggested.

Line 91: the hyperlink of the PDF was copy-pasting a bad address mixing it with the line numbers, please make sure to copy-paste the correct spelled address.

Line 97: the URL was misspelled, we corrected it.

Line 150: has been rephrased in order to accomplish the reviewer request.

Answers to Reviewer 2 and modifications addressed in the revised version of the manuscript

General comments:

We specified that the study regards the portion of the Adriatic Sea that is composed of Italian, Croatian and International waters in the introduction.

Specific comments:

Q1: Section 2.1 describes a literature and data review: it would be valuable to have these elements as a supplemental information to this paper

A1: The bibliography functional to the dataset enrichment has been released contextually with the revised version of the data paper as supplemental material. All the consulted literature is also available for download with the data from SEANOE repository. More specifically the .xlsx version of the database has a tab called "Literature" reporting for each reef the consulted material (in a relation of "one to many").

Q2: In section 2.2.1, it would be useful to explain more clearly that the 4 questions have been used to categorize reefs in 4 groups and refer to table 2

A2: The four main groups of questions have been evidenced in section 2.2.1, as required.

Q3: In table 2, it would seem more clear to have "Applicability" instead of "Applicability restriction" and simply list the type of elements where the information applies, e.g.: AR; NRs, ARs; ARs, wrecks; ...; all (or explicitly NRs, ARs, wrecks)

A3: The field "Applicability" in Table 2 has been changed accordingly to the suggestions of the reviewer.

Q4: In fig. 4, the fact that missing years are not represented is somehow misleading. I think a different representation would help to better communicate the deployment frequency to readers.

A4: Figure 4 has been corrected including periods where no ARs were deployed and no wrecks sunk, as demanded.

Q5: In the section 6 Data availability (and in a few other places in the manuscript) it is mentioned that the database is available from EMODnet, and then referring to the SEANOE repository. From the documentation (<https://www.seanoe.org/html/about.htm>) I have understood that SEANOE duplicates records from its repository into the EMODnet Data Ingestion portal but it's not clear whether the specific dataset, described here, has been already included in any of the EMODnet portals/catalogues. Could you please clarify this and update the manuscript accordingly?

A5: The database is currently undergoing the appropriate procedure to be published in the EMODnet catalogs, but it is still in Data Ingestion Portal. We corrected as requested in the appropriate sections.

Q6: In the webGIS interface (<https://adriareef.github.io/sandbox3/>) there seems to be no explicit way to download the filtered elements after a specific search. This could be a useful added functionality for users. In addition to that, it would be good to have an explicit reference in the webGIS interface both to the original dataset (<http://doi.org/10.17882/74880>) and the data paper (<https://essd.copernicus.org/preprints/essd-2020-384/>) to allow interested users to check sources, methods and references.

A6: The WebGIS has been conceived only as a viewer from the original purpose. For sure all the suggested modifications would be valuable for the users and we will consider implementing them. The references to data and the data paper have been added to the WebGIS interface.

Technical correction:

Corrections and suggestions indicated in the supplemental PDF have been incorporated in the revised version of the manuscript.