Viewer1 Response

We sincerely thank you for your positive feedback and valuable comments on our manuscript. We have corrected the typo in Line 66 by changing the Capital “S” to a lowercase “s”.

Viewer2 Response

1. Response: Thank you for this thoughtful comment. We agree that the distinction between shallow-water and deep-water environments does not capture the full ecological variability among specific depositional settings. We have clarified in the revised manuscript that this broad classification was adopted to improve comparability across sources with highly heterogeneous environmental terminology and levels of detail. We have also added a statement directing users to the original sources, through the reference links provided in the database, for more detailed depositional environment descriptions where available (see Lines 272-284).

2. Response: Thank you for highlighting the need for a clearer description of age assignment and palaeogeographic reconstruction. For records assigned to a standard geological stage, we now specify that numerical ages were assigned using the midpoint between the start and end ages of that stage, based on the age boundaries provide in the latest International Chronostratigraphic Chart (Cohen et al., 2025). Broader stratigraphic assignments were retained where finer resolution was not supported by sufficient evidence (see Lines 235-242); We have also clarified that palaeogeographic coordinates were reconstructed using the PALEOMAP plate reconstruction model in Time Machine. Modern latitude and longitude and the corresponding start and end ages were uploaded and mapped to the appropriate coordinate and age fields, and the resulting palaeocoordinates were incorporated into the database (see Lines 263-269).

3. Response: Thank you for highlighting this important distinction. We agree that insufficient information should not be interpreted as evidence of absence. We have clarified in the revised manuscript that NO in the Symbiont Bearing field is assigned only where published information supports the absence of algal endosymbionts. Where neither the original source nor the consulted references provide sufficient information for a reliable assignment, the entry is left blank. The same convention applies to Ecological Preference and Test Composition. We now explicitly state that blank entries indicate unknown or insufficiently documented traits, rather than the absence of a trait (see Lines 293-294 and 302-306).

4. Response: Thank you for this helpful suggestion. We have reviewed the metadata and added an “estimate” annotation to derived or estimated values, including reconstructed palaeogeographic coordinates, numerical ages assigned as the midpoints of the corresponding geological stages, and calculated test volumes. These annotations help users distinguish derived or estimated values from directly reported or measured values. We have also clarified the convention for missing trait data in the revised manuscript: entries are left blank where neither the original source nor the consulted references provide sufficient information for a

reliable assignment. Blank entries therefore indicate unknown or insufficiently documented traits, rather than the absence of a trait (see Lines 302-306).

5. Response: Thank you. We have added Heim et al. (2015) to the relevant paragraph in the Introduction (see Line 77).