

## Reviewer 2 (Sterling Nesbitt)

### *Basic reporting*

This is the second round of review and the paper is greatly improved. The authors do a pretty good job at addressing previous comments. I do, however, do not think it is quite ready for publication yet. I have made comments onto the word doc and a number of issues remain. Particularly, there are many inconsistencies throughout (e.g., lower member, use of quotes) and the ontogenetic phyosaur argument is a bit flawed (see mark-up). In the end, you cannot rule out this tooth belongs to a small phytosaur (though you can say it does pertain to an archosauriform). The comparison with phytosaurs needs to be reorganized and considered more carefully. As written, your argument that the new tooth is not a phytosaur is rather weak. This needs moderate revision although I am marking it as minor.

### Figures:

3A and E are out of focus and cannot be used. These must be retaken before publication

5, caption: small phytosaurs (you do not know if they are juvenile)

6, crop image to just show tooth (the rest is terribly out of focus)

8, not needed because it does not add anything

### *Experimental design*

No comment

### *Validity of the findings*

see above

### *Comments for the author*

No comment, see above