

- 1. Basic Reporting—No major problems here; some questions listed below
- 2. Experimental design—Great; very glad to see unilateral dissection and unilateral digital dissection on the same specimen
- 3. Validity of the findings—Generally very good; section on muscle function is perhaps a little bit of a stretch, but creates testable hypotheses
- 4. General comments-Below, I have provided line-by-line feedback on minor linguistic edits and a few technical questions/comments
 - Minor line-by-line edits:
 - 49- present → presents
 - 91- up to?
 - 196-208-Consider making a table
 - 241-remove “laterally” (redundant)
 - 248-include a section on MP and note that it was absent
 - Change “direction” to “orientation” 327 and 348
 - 389-add a comma after “fleshy”
 - 405-reword “presents slight lateral and anterior orientation components” to “presents components with slight lateral and anterior orientations” (if this is what you mean)
 - 435-remove “they are “
 - “Length” misspelled (427, 436)
 - 438-remove the comma in “TS, anteriorly.”
 - 471-change “its” to “the”
 - Remove (-ly) in:
 - 296- medioventral/ly;
 - 315- dorsal/ly;
 - 339-posterior/ly);
 - 497- posterior/ly;
 - 501-anterior/ly;
 - 523-dorsal/ly;
 - 633-anterior/ly;
 - 641-medial/ly;
 - 654-anterior/ly;
 - 656-ventral/ly;
 - 688-ventral/ly;
 - 693-Posterior/ly;
 - 756-anterior/ly

(in these examples, the word is not an adverb and should not have the -ly ending)
 - Change “pterygoid” to “pterygoideus” for consistency (289, 290, 308, 450) (please double-check; I may not have listed all examples)

- There are some other nomenclature inconsistencies; it seems like you should go with either pterygoideus internus and externus or medialis and lateralis, but not externus and medialis; likewise, if you use latinized “internus”, should you also use “pars superiorus” instead of “pars superior” and so on? You may want to decide on a standard and follow it consistently.
- 498-Reword from “presents a thin.....wrapping around” to “has a thin projection of its dorsal part that wraps around”
- 500-remove “with”
- 501-remove comma in “pe-B, anterior”
- 502-change “until” to “to”
- 525-change “with” to “to”
- 530-change “transversely oriented,” to “transversely oriented fibers,” (missing word)
- 532-change “took” to “caused”
- 545-add “the” before “sublingual”
- 548-change “until” to “to”
- 566-change “to the posterior part of...” to “*and* the posterior part of...”
- 641-remove comma in “thin, and lies...”
- 645-transversal?-reword
- 648-conjunctive → connective
- 653-add a comma after “Anteriorly”
- 658-would “pterygopalatine” be the right term for this suture?
- 666-auriculomandibularis—I assume this is the muscle that’s being referred to as “mandibuloarticularis” throughout
- 689-remove “the” from “In the cross section” (or the cross-sectional view)
- 691-remove “with”
- 695-change “until” to “to”
- 711-Reword “the transversely oriented stretch to...” to “stretch transversely to...”
- 721-conjunctive→connective
- 733-“Additionally to”→“In addition to”
- 735-“by” → “of”
- 735/6-Reword “The major relative contribution of the masseter superficialis to the total volume...”
- 744-Beginning here, TS is referred to as “unipennate” and “bipennate”, but when it was described in results, it was described as “fan-shaped” in all three genera, suggesting that it is multipennate (and it appears to be).
- 768-“as being” → “to be”
- 791-reword “allowing extant anteaters to be split into two distinct groups”
- 801-remove “as” from “considered as”
- 849-“sloths” → “sloth”
- 876-reword “tearing” to “which would tear”

- 919-923-“contraction abducts the dorsal part of the mandibular ramus (inwards movement)...” this wording is extremely confusing
 - 933-“thecombined” → “the combined”
 - 961-add apostrophe (“muscles”)
 - 969-occurring→that occur
- Figure captions:
 - Table 2-change “Ma” to “MA” to be consistent with text
 - Figure 1 caption-“dlimitates” → “delimits”
 - Figure 4 caption- “profunfus” → “profundus”
- Additional questions/concerns/comments:
 - The muscle that is being referred to as MA—are you very sure it isn’t the digastric? It looks like a derived form of a carnivoran-like digastric (e.g., see Scapino ’76), which would both explain why digastric is “missing” in these species and why this muscle is present.
 - Occasionally, the word “muscle” is used in a way that is ambiguous (e.g., line 410 “3 muscles”). Is a segment referred to as a “part” an individual muscle making up part of a complex in some instances (e.g., pars zygomaticus of temporalis) but just a muscle segment in others “pars reflexa of masseter)?
 - Sometimes there is pressure to condense the descriptive component of this type of study (i.e., lines 229-726). On one hand, I wonder if it might be possible to streamline this, but on the other, I support including as extensive a description as possible because this facilitates future comparative studies.