This manuscript seeks to apply new analytical approaches to an impressive collection of data synthesized for four species of seagrasses. Potentially this is a very interesting piece of work.

However, the importance and novelty of the work are completely buried by the textual presentation where the introduction in particular needs to be completely re-written. The central problem is that the theoretical expectations need to be crystal clear without reading other (referenced) papers – what is the relationship between F_{IS} and R and c? What will the R vs F_{IS} slope show? What will be the expected effect of including all ramets vs. just genets? Perhaps the authors are modest in citing and profiling their own previous work, but failure to summarise this body of literature makes the current manuscript unapproachable to a fairly naïve reader. Simply put, in today's age of data overload, one cannot expect their reader to look at five other papers simply to understand the paper that they are presently reading!

Also missing from the introduction is a sense of biology. Reworking some of the context currently siting in the discussion and adding some conceptual diagrams will be helpful here.

Finally, the writing is very uneven both in terms of content and readability. Some very hard edits to pull it all together are required.

Minor points:
Please use line numbers to make commenting easier!

1. Abstract – Needs to provide some information on the theory being applied and the end goal of the analyses – as written I cannot tell what was really inferred and why it matters.
2. Introduction, 2nd paragraph – What is the main question or goal motivating this paragraph? To determine c? State the problem in the beginning of the paragraph and the reason for wanting to know this so the reader can follow. R is not formally defined. "dynamics and evolution"/"evolution and dynamics" used in adjacent sentences.
3. Introduction, 3rd paragraph – Is the main point that F_{IS} is an unreliable indicator of c?
4. Introduction, 5th paragraph – What are the "recent modelling developments"? What are their innovations? A little on how they work.
5. Introduction – it would be lovely to add a figure showing a picture of the four species and put the relevant life history traits onto the figure. This would help the reader evaluate the species metrics against life histories. Similarly a map of sampling sites and species ranges would be welcome …. biologists like to see biology!
6. Introduction overall – The novelty of what is being done in this paper is not clear: much of this would be helped by discussing the new methodology and why/how it represents a distinct advance to the field. Perhaps a concept diagram modified from a previous publication can be included to set up the expectations for the reader.

7. Methods – no need to define R2 and F tests: readers should be aware of basic statistics
8. Discussion lists expectations from theory - make sure introduction adequately discusses each of these.
9. Discussion – with N=4 for species number, caution is advisable in terms of drawing conclusions regarding the influence of life history attributes.
10. Discussion – midway through (starting with "*Implications for understanding clonal versus sexual prevalence"* the style and tone of writing shifts noticeably (=different authors writing different sections?"). This discussion is extremely interesting but these ideas should first appear in the introduction and indeed would set up the motivation for this study. The discussion can easily revisit these themes in light of the new findings but much of this text needs to be moved.
11. Literature cited is inconsistently formatted as are in text citations.
12. Throughout there are spelling and grammatical errors.