

WANG, SCHÄDEL, SAMES and HORNE

The manuscript reports three ostracods preserved in Cretaceous age amber from Burma. Relatively few ostracods have been described from amber and similar deposits and, as the authors observe, more from Cenozoic age deposits than from Mesozoic. The material is of international interest, although I predict that in a few years time interest will focus only on ostracod specimens from amber with soft parts preserved.

The manuscript is concise, suitably structured, generally well written, the experimental design and methodology are appropriate, reference citations are relevant and up-to-date, and the figures are both necessary and of good quality.

Major comment:

Taxon A. This carapace is described (lines 107-8) as ‘right valve slightly larger than left valve’, however, from Fig. 2C, a right lateral view, the overlap appears to be LV>RV and this is supported by the description, for example, that maximum valve height is anterior of mid-length. The point is important both from a basic taxonomic perspective and also because it means that the fundamental carapace shape and valve overlap are the same as Taxon C (Fig. 1 C). In lines 157-8 it is suggested that Taxon C might belong to the genus *Harbinia*, a conclusion I support because of shape, overlap, valve inflation and surface punctuation, although the specimen is observed and imaged from a ventrally oblique view and the shape of the dorsal margin is not visible. The views of Taxon A (e.g. Fig. 2D and G) suggest that it is crushed which could explain why the valves are not as inflated as in Taxon C. In fact there are a number of Cretaceous ostracod genera with a rounded subtriangular shape and greatest height towards the anterior and, as the authors correctly comment (lines 177-9), without additional evidence from adductor muscle scars it is difficult to more precise.

Minor comments:

Line 48: ‘...although **the** number of kinds...’.

Lines 66 and 70: please given the correct German names of the laboratories.

Line 82: Smith *et al.* (2015) not in References (only Smith *et al.*, 2011).

Line 84: Latreille, 1806 (not 1804).

Lines 84-87: higher systematic authors should be listed in References.

Line 92: ‘have we’ (not ‘we have’).

Line 158: 'Tsao, 1959' should be listed in References, even if authors used pictures from other literature.

Lines 165-6: '...**their** positions within the amber **do** not allow us...'.

Line 176: delete) after 2003.

Line 195: '...that it is **easily** possible **for** aquatic organisms **to be** trapped...'.

Lines 198-199: I suggest '...indicate that in-situ embedment of aquatic organisms is present in many amber sites.'.

Line 200: 'and' (not 'an').

Lines 228-232: are these two sentences really necessary?

Line 246: Horne (2003) is run into Cruickshank & Ko.

Line 298: Smith *et al.* (2011) not seen in text.

Line 307: Dilcher.

Line 314: I see no asterisk on Fig. 1.

I recommend **publication with minor revisions**.

Alan Lord

Frankfurt-am-Main

05-08-2020