

Editor's comments

Both reviewers note substantial improvements to the manuscript, which is commendable. However, neither reviewer is convinced that the tooth in question is not a phytosaur tooth. This is coming from two researchers who have extensive experience working with Late Triassic vertebrate fossils. It is true that projected impact or perceived importance is not a criterion for acceptance at PeerJ, but there has to be a lower bound on what counts as a novel contribution, and a single probable (in the reviewers' estimation) phytosaur tooth is below that bound.

If it is any consolation, this has been a very difficult decision for me. It's wonderful that so many students are involved on the project, and I am certainly sensitive to the difficulty of staying in touch with everyone in such a large group over time (as mentioned in your rebuttal letter). Furthermore, I have a soft spot in my heart for odd little specimens, so I am philosophically inclined in favor of the manuscript on that score as well. But at bottom the question is whether this little specimen is actually odd. Neither reviewer is convinced, and I must bow to their considerable expertise.

In your rebuttal letter you mentioned your intent to pursue a larger project on the fossils from the Comb Ridge locality. That is a very worthy goal and a broader manuscript of that sort is a more natural place to consider the probable affinities of this tooth. When the time comes, I hope that you will consider publishing your expanded results in PeerJ.

With sincere best wishes,

Mathew Wedel
Academic Editor for PeerJ