

## Editor's comments

Both reviewers found valuable elements in the manuscript, particularly the organization and the breadth of comparisons. However, both found substantial areas for improvement, especially in the stratigraphic and phylogenetic context, and in the presentation of the figures.

Reviewer 1 is concerned that the tooth may not warrant a whole paper. The editorial criteria at PeerJ are based on scientific validity, not perceived importance, so after some deliberation I am cautiously following Reviewer 2's recommendation of "Major Revisions". However, you should carefully consider Reviewer 1's argument about how much stronger the contribution would be if it was presented as a faunal assemblage from a poorly studied area, with a stronger stratigraphic context.

Whether or not you decide to reshape the manuscript in that direction, substantial improvement will be required. Please be diligent in addressing all of the concerns raised by both reviewers, and take their comments in the constructive spirit in which they are offered.

Please be aware that we consider these revisions to be major, and your revised manuscript will probably have to be re-reviewed.

If you are willing to undertake these changes, please submit your revised manuscript (with any rebuttal information\*) to the journal within 60 days.

Mathew Wedel  
Academic Editor for PeerJ