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GENERAL: This article documents new records of PEFO Triassic vertebrates that are worth publishing. However, it is marred by some questionable reasoning and statements that should be modified prior to publication. Particularly problematic are: identifications based on stratigraphic position, not morphology; inadequate documentation by description and/or illustration of some specimens; an apparent misunderstanding of what makes a taxon a nomen dubium; and a failure to develop the conclusions of the article. Numbers on the manuscript correspond to the following suggestions:

1. I can cite a longer list of articles using Chinle Group. Also, what does the term Dockum have to do with PEFO stratigraphic nomenclature? I suggest this all be dropped, and the authors just say they are using the traditional usage, Chinle Formation.
2. The Muttoni et al. work is very controversial, and a 209 age has nothing to do with a “long Norian” (the “long Norian” would go back more than 220 Ma). This text should be dropped as immaterial to this manuscript.
3. Taxonomic judgments should be made by morphology not by stratigraphic position. Furthermore, given that Hunt et al. and you have no problem referring material to Vancleavea, how can it be a nomen dubium? Obviously the osteoderms are diagnostic of a taxon.
4. Again, identifications should be made based on morphology, not stratigraphic position.
5. This specimen needs to be illustrated, especially since its stratigraphic range is “being extended.”
6. I can’t tell from the figure that this is Desmatosuchus. Why is it Desmatosuchus?
7. Parker 20003 only “demonstrates” that he is a taxonomic splitter. I would say Parker “argues” this.
8. Why is this Typhothorax coccinarum? Why is it not T. antiquum?
9. As with Vancleavea, you seem to have no problem referring material to this taxon, yet claim it is a nomen dubium. A taxon is not a nomen dubium just because it can’t be identified on somebody’s cladogram. If material can be referred to the taxon, then there must be something diagnosable about the taxon. Your own referrals support recognition of Parrishia and Vancleavea, but you then contradict this by saying the taxa are nomina dubia. You should be more consistent. If you really think the taxa are nomina dubia but want to refer material to them as convenient “trash bins,” say so up front.
10. Cite Heckert and Lucas paper on Chinle dinosaur biostratigraphy here.