

Reviewer 1 (Anonymous)

Basic reporting

The authors have worked hard to address the reviewers concerns from the first submission and this is commended. However, I still have made extensive comments where I feel that the text is unclear, especially in the newly added text. Regarding the figures, be sure to note that the two added close-ups are of teeth from the already figured jaw. Admittedly there are not too many published accounts of vertebrate fossils from the Chinle Formation of Utah, but the authors are mistaken when they claim that their submission is one of the first from the lower part of the Chinle. Some published accounts of fossils from the lower Chinle of Utah are Parrish and Good (1997); Parrish (1999); Parker et al., (2006), and Gauthier et al. (2011).

Experimental design

I have added notes on the manuscript to improve reproducibility and also noted a potential confusion with the locality numbers. If the tooth is determined to come from a bed in an established locality, then a second locality number is not needed for the float material from this bed. I would only suggest two locality numbers if the provenance of the float material could not be established.

Validity of the findings

I still have issues with the stratigraphic treatment in that the authors are attempting to create stratigraphic units based solely on the fact that they have not done the necessary work to determine the stratigraphic position. The revised manuscript contains an enlarged section attempted to justify this. Obviously a full stratigraphic treatment is outside of the scope of this paper so the authors should simply retain the section where they describe the fossiliferous bed and note that it is x meters below the Church Rock Member. This would be sufficient.

Overall I still think this specimen is simply a damaged tooth from a phytosaur. Teeth of this morphotype are extremely common in Chinle Formation beds that produce large numbers of phytosaurs and there is quite a bit of variation on tooth forms in heterodont phytosaurs (Hungerbeuler, 2000).. Also as stated previously I do not think that this specimen is not important enough to warrant its own treatment and should be recast as part of a more detailed paper on the fossil assemblage of this new locality. Therefore I still recommend rejection of the manuscript. However, if the editor and the other reviewer feel that this is work should be published with revisions, and if the comments I have provided are taken into consideration and the stratigraphic section is simplified as recommended above, I will not argue if this manuscript is published in PeerJ.