

The overall novelty of this manuscript is limited. The writing is repetitive and wordy, and the structure is not well organized. The functions of the Results, Discussion, and Conclusion sections are not clearly separated. Their content overlaps, and material often appears in inappropriate sections, which weakens the logical flow and readability of the manuscript. Many paragraphs are too long and include several main points without clear topic sentences or structure. This makes it difficult for readers to identify the key information. Therefore, substantial revision is necessary before the manuscript can be considered for acceptance.

1. The overall logic of the Introduction is unclear. It is lengthy and lacks focus. For example, the first paragraph contains too much information. It should be divided into several shorter paragraphs, with each paragraph focusing on one main point, rather than combining multiple research backgrounds and motivations in one block of text.
2. The explanation given in Line 65 is not sufficient to justify the exclusion of precipitation as an explanatory variable. Since mangroves are typical coastal ecosystems, the authors should also consider whether marine-related climate variables, such as sea surface temperature, may influence mangrove NDVI.
3. The Methods section should clearly state the unified spatial resolution of the datasets and describe the processing steps. This information is currently not clear.
4. Lines 130 to 140 read more like results rather than methods and should be moved to the Results section.
5. The subtitle in Line 150 should be revised to “Results and Discussion.” In the current version, the results and discussion are strongly mixed, but the section is titled only “Results,” which is not appropriate. If the authors prefer to keep the title as “Results,” then a separate Discussion section should be added to ensure a clear structure.
6. In Line 155, the full name of NDVI should be given at its first appearance, and the abbreviation can be used afterward. More importantly, the content of this sentence seems to belong to the background or methods rather than the results. It should be moved to the Introduction or Methods section.
7. Section 3.1 contains very long paragraphs with weak organization. The writing mainly lists findings without clear structure or emphasis. It is recommended to divide the long paragraph into several shorter paragraphs, with each paragraph focusing on one key result. This will improve clarity and readability.
8. In Section 3.2, the authors need to explain clearly how the 250 m NDVI data were matched with the 0.25 degree climate data. Because of the large difference in spatial resolution, the potential errors introduced during the matching process should be explained. It is also necessary to clarify whether these errors were quantified. If higher resolution climate data are available, the authors should explain why they were not used.
9. In Section 3.4, the authors should justify the use of 0.25 degree spatial resolution data. Mangroves are distributed in narrow coastal zones and are highly fragmented. A 0.25 degree grid cell usually

contains large areas that are not mangroves. This may greatly dilute the climate response signal of mangroves. The possible influence of this issue on the reliability of the results should be carefully discussed.

10. The Conclusion needs to be rewritten. A conclusion should clearly summarize the main findings and contributions of the study. It should not repeat the Introduction or present new discussion. For example, in the current version, Lines 349 to 354 read like part of the Introduction, while Lines 355 to 370 and 374 to 395 read like Discussion. The authors should reorganize this section and clearly present the main conclusions of the study.
11. Many sentences and expressions throughout the manuscript sound formulaic and unnatural. The authors are encouraged to carefully revise the language, improve clarity, and ensure that the writing is precise and academically appropriate.