

To: Justin Spielmann
New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science
1801 Mountain Rd. NW
Albuquerque NM 87104

Dear Mr. Spielmann,

I am writing to you regarding your recent article in the NMMNH Bulletin (no. 37) on *Redondasuchus* which you co-authored with Adrian Hunt, Spencer Lucas, and Andrew Heckert. This paper claims to present a “new” reinterpretation of the holotype osteoderm of *Redondasuchus reseri*, in addition to discussing of the validity of *Redondasuchus* and the terminology applied to osteoderm morphology.

Your disagreements with my 2002 M.S. thesis regarding the referral of *Redondasuchus* to *Typothorax*, and whether the change in osteoderm form around the center of ossification should be referred to as “arching” or “flexing” are interesting, although I did not find them entirely convincing. However, these are professional disagreements, and I am content to discuss my views in future publications rather than in this letter.

Of much greater concern to me is your oversight regarding my reinterpretation of the *Redondasuchus* type osteoderm. In my 2002 M.S. thesis (pp. 34-36), I clearly recognized and corrected the mistaken orientation of the holotype osteoderm made by Hunt and Lucas (1991) and Heckert et al. (1996). I correctly identified the edge closer to the region of arching/flexing as being the medial edge, and the anterior bar as occurring along the anterior edge. Moreover, I provided a revised anterior cross section for the holotype osteoderm, presented in the same figure (fig. 3.1) as the reconstruction of TTUP 9214 you discussed in the paper.

My 2002 thesis was the first time this correction of the original *Redondasuchus* papers was, to my knowledge, ever made. It was therefore somewhat disconcerting to read the following passage on the first page (p.583) of your recent publication in NMMNH Bulletin no. 37:

The interpretation of the orientation of flexure in the diagnosis of the genus *Redondasuchus* presented here (Fig. 1) differs from that of previous studies (Hunt and Lucas, 1991; Heckert et al., 1996). These studies suggested that, for the mid-dorsal paramedian scutes, the point of flexure was “two-thirds of the lateral distance from the medial to lateral edge of the scute” (Heckert et al., 1996, p. 620). However, we believe that this is incorrect and that the point of flexure instead lies one-third of the lateral distance from the medial to lateral edge of the scute (Fig. 1).

My thesis is not cited in this passage, nor given credit for this reorientation of the holotype osteoderm at any other point in the text. Moreover, you present a revised cross section through the carapace (Fig. 1) that is almost identical to the one I presented. The impression one gets from reading your paper is that you were quite happy to cite my thesis when you disagreed with my interpretations, but improperly took credit for the

interpretations you agreed with *without* citing me. Moreover, given that my reinterpretation of the *Redondasuchus* type scute was integral to the chapter in my thesis which you cited so heavily elsewhere in your paper, and the fact that you cite my figure 3.1 containing a reconstruction of the *Redondasuchus* type osteoderm identical to the one you present, it seems impossible that you could be unaware that the reinterpretation you offered was not original to your paper.

I am hoping that you can provide some explanation for your oversight.

Much thanks,

Jeffrey W. Martz
Department of Geosciences, Texas Tech University
Lubbock, TX
lnjeff@yahoo.com