

Preprint Number: PCI Paleo #217

Title: Postcranial anatomy of colobines (Mammalia, Primates) from the Plio-Pleistocene Omo Group deposits (Shungura Formation and Usno Formation, 1967-2018 field campaigns, Lower Omo Valley, Ethiopia)

Overview

I have organized my comments by manuscript section with more thorough review provided for the figures. As this preprint has already gone through previous revision/review, my comments are fairly minor and I generally have no issues with any of the anatomical descriptions, functional interpretations, or taxonomic affiliations.

On a personal note, it is exciting to see a paper detailing isolated postcranial specimens for large bodied colobines as it will only improve functional interpretations of other specimens and provide a more nuanced picture of the anatomy of mixed substrate preferences. Such analyses are difficult without larger sample sizes of relevant elements and the assemblages presented here refine previously published, functional interpretations based on much more limited sample sizes.

Introduction

On line 137 to 138 the authors state that “*P. mutiwa* is currently known from only one single individual...” To stay consistent with later mention of a specific specimen number in the following sentence, I recommend providing the specimen number to which they are referring here as well.

Materials/Methods

On lines 269, 271, 273, and 278 (and possibly more) the authors begin their sentences with the genus abbreviations. It is generally recommended to start a sentence with the genus name written in full even when it has been defined earlier in the manuscript. I of course defer to the editors if this is an acceptable format for this publication.

Comparative Anatomy

On line 745 the authors describe a feature as being “extremely similar” I recommend removing the superlative.

Discussion

In lines 1481-1482 the authors state “...KNM-WT 16827, a partial skeleton attributed to *P. mutiwa*.” The fact that this specimen is attributed to *P. mutiwa* has been previously established in the paper so is redundant here. This occurs in subsequent discussion subsections as well.

On lines 1483-1486 the authors use Roman numerals in their list of justifications. Unless this formatting is required by the journal, listing with numbers e.g. 1-4 would be simpler.

Figures

This isn't a revision, but I wanted to compliment Figure 1 and Table 2 as they effectively convey a lot of important information very succinctly!

The functional rationales in Table 7 are a very nice touch.

The captions for Figs 2 -4 seem redundant with information about the measurements already provided in Table 6. If the intention is to provide Table 6 in appendices, then they're fine, but if all are intended to be a part of the main paper, I recommend shortening the captions.

Figures 10 & 18 are very busy and although the scatterplots are straightforward, but the inclusion of the density estimates below makes the whole figure difficult to read.

In Figures 11, 14, 16, 19, 22 the individual taxa shapes within the violin plots are very small and difficult to tell apart. I also recommend making the font size smaller on the fossil taxa labels so they aren't so crowded.

This could be a byproduct of uploading or the preprint viewing interface, but Table 12 has inconsistent font sizes and spacing. It's also unclear why it's split in two parts.

In footnote 3 for Table 16, "KNM-WT 1682" should be "KNM-WT 16827."

Figures 20 & 21 are very dark making details of the specimens difficult to see. I recommend adjusting the saturation.

For Fig. 23 and its mentions in the main text, "estimated body masses" may be more accurate than "inferred body masses." I also assume that the color coding on the individual points within the boxplot is based on taxon so a legend should be added for clarity.