Caldera, March the 24th, 2016

Dear Colleagues:

Thank you very much for the time and effort spent in reviewing again our manuscript. I have addressed the corrections in the text and I have modified the identity of *Peltodoris* *marmorata*, synonymizing it to *Diaulula* *variolata* considering your information and insight. Our responses to the referees’ comments are given in detail below (responses in **bold**).

I have uploaded a new revised version of the manuscript through the website (as well as pertinently modified images). Please let me know if there are any other queries regarding this submission.

Best regards,



Juan Francisco.

**REVIEWER: Michael Schroedl**

**Basic reporting**

The authors greatly improved their manuscript and followed most of my species ID suggestions. There is still a problem regarding "Peltodoris marmorata", see below  
  
Minor details:  
page 2, line 17: omit "of the Región de Atacama, in" since its repeated in the next sentence  
**Response: done.**

Page 3, line 13: Bergh (1898) is missing here  
**Response: done.**

Page 4, line 16: omit "either" (?)  
**Response: done.**

Page 5, line 21: omit "Infraclass" and put "Opisthobranchia" into quotation marks  
**Response: done.**

Page 6, line 24: for details on egg masses you may add "(see Schrödl, 2003)"  
**Response: done.**

Page 14, line 27: single specimen, so it should read ".. it was ..."  
**Response: done.**

page 17, 2: should read "Munich" (or omit since "München" is already mentioned)

**Response: done.**

**Experimental design**

no comments

**Validity of the findings**

It's good to provide a COI barcode of the new Berthella. But why not mentioning the Genbank number in the species description? Please provide at least some analysis or comparison with B. platei.  
**Response: I have added a text comparing the new species with a pair of species with Genbank numbers available (in particular comparing with the southern Chilean *B. platei*)**

I've seen many Diaulula variolata-like dorids in (central and northern, never southern!) Chile. Whitish to mottled or dark specimens: All recently and ethanol preserved (!) specimens I examined more closely finally showed at least some caryophyllidia. So they are NOT Peltodoris marmorata. Please, check your synonymy! Page 9, line 27: the Schrödl 2003 specimens and figs belong to Diaulula variolata, since they have caryophyllidia. 

Considering "Peltodoris marmorata" a distinct species from Diaulula variolata you could reason that Bergh (1898) did not mention caryophyllidia, that neither Marcus (1959) nor Valdés & Muniaín (2002) found caryophyllidia, and that I just by chance only found many many Diaulula but never any Peltodoris in Chile. However, I would think it is more parsimonious to suspect that Bergh (1898) and Marcus and later authors overlooked the small (!) caryophyllidia between the big (!) normal tubercles; old or formalin preserved specimens could have easily lost their spicules... And I noticed that your own, single specimen of "Peltodoris" is really small! Perhaps you'll have a closer look via SEM? No apical sensory knob on the slender and small "tubercles"? Even if not, maybe caryophyllidia develop later, between the big tubercles?   
  
Well, I just had the chance to recheck the Bergh material of variolata and the marmorata types: There are some more or less visible caryophyllidia (old material from 1898!) in variolata and the paralectotype of marmorata. The lectotype, unfortunately, is quite squeezed and the back in bad condition. But even there: some slender tubercles seem to show the typical apical knob of caryophyllidia and there are remainders of strong peripheral spicules. In my opinion, there is very little reason to doubt the synonymy of marmorata with the senior variolata. You can cite this new information as personal communication, if you want.

**Response: Thanks for your insight. Considering that you have examined the material of Bergh, I concur with you in the synonymization of *Peltodoris* *marmorata* with *Diaulula* *variolata* and I have changed the text and the images accordingly: I have merged the species description to *D*. *variolata* and I have listed the previous synonymy of *P*. *marmorata* with *D*. *variolata*.**  
The Aldea et al 2011 specimens are neither D. variolata nor P. marmorata but almost certainly Diaulula punctuolata (as already stated in Uribe et al 2013). Please adjust and check the synonymy carefully

**Response: Yes; it was a mistake. I have corrected the text already.**

**Comments for the author**

Sorry for emphasizing these variolata / marmorata points again. They are important to avoid later taxonomic confusion. The history of Chilean dorids was / is already complicated enough...  
  
I'm ticking "minor revisions" because I trust you'll seriously consider the taxonomic problems emphasized above.   
If in doubt, please feel free to send me for rerereview.

**Response: Thank you very much for your corrections and information on the *D*. *variolata*/*P*. *marmorata* confusion. It is very important to have this point settled and your new information on the material of Bergh is essential to this.**

**REVIEWER: Reviewer 2**

**Basic reporting**

No comments. All previous concerns have been addressed.

**Experimental design**

No comments. All previous concerns have been addressed.

**Validity of the findings**

No comments. All previous concerns have been addressed.

**Response: Thanks for your time.**