Asunto: Fwd: Decision for AJB-D-13-00327

De: Peter Wilf (pwilf@psu.edu)

Para: iescapa@gmail.com; nrcuneo@gmail.com; robert@ecodingo.com.au; johnsonkr@si.edu; ari_iglesias@yahoo.com.ar;

Fecha: jueves, 31 de octubre de 2013 22:33

Todos, Well, excellent service on these reviews! We couldn't have done any better than this. Not a single correction on any of the botany, fossil-character interprations, descriptions, or plates (thank goodness), but one reviewer caught a lot of useful small details on the markup pdf. They are not requiring any changes to the conservation angle, and of course I am not going to change it since I consider it quite important to the overall message and spent lots of time on it. I will get a revision ready as fast as possible and send it around! -Peter

Peter Wilf Professor of Geosciences, Pennsylvania State University, 537 Deike Building, University Park, PA 16802 USA Tel: +1-814-865-6721 pwilf@psu.edu | http://www3.geosc.psu.edu/~pdw3/



----- Forwarded message -----

From: **AJB** <ajb@botany.org>

Date: Thu, Oct 31, 2013 at 6:33 PM Subject: Decision for AJB-D-13-00327

To: Peter Wilf <pwilf@psu.edu>

Dear Peter,

We have received the reviews of your manuscript No. AJB-D-13-00327 ("First South American Agathis (Araucariaceae), Eocene of Patagonia" by Peter Wilf, Ph.D.; Ignacio H. Escapa, Ph.D.; N. Ruben Cuneo, Ph.D.; Robert M. Kooyman, Ph.D.; Kirk R. Johnson, Ph.D.; Ari Iglesias, Ph.D.).

I am pleased to inform you that we will consider a revised version of your manuscript for publication in the American Journal of Botany. Final acceptance is contingent on your response to the reviewers' criticisms and requests, which are judged to be relatively minor.

Below are the comments of the reviewers; if a reviewer also provided an attachment, it will be available through a link at the end of this letter and on your manuscript page.

Please revise your manuscript based on the reviews. You must also submit a detailed letter indicating your response to the reviewer comments and the changes you have made in the manuscript (or why no change was made).

If you have not already done so, please write your abstract in structured format: Premise of the study (why the work was done, what major questions of plant biology are addressed, and why it's important to the broad AJB readership); Methods; Key Results; Conclusions (what major points should the reader take from this article). See the instructions for authors, http://www.amjbot.org/site/misc/ifora.xhtml, for further information.

1 de 3 01/11/2013 12:39 p.m.

Finally, as you know, the readers of AJB are diverse in their interests and expertise. Consequently, all authors of papers to appear in AJB are required to include some context for their work that non-specialists can understand and appreciate. If you can clearly explain why this research is important, your paper will be much more useful and significant. I don't mean to be disrespectful or to sound flippant, but what we are requesting is that you make some attempt to reach readers whose reactions to this paper might be "So what?" or "Who cares?" I'm sure that with some thought, you and your co-authors will be able do this. These need not be lengthy additions, but they should mention the theoretical or conceptual basis of the work. Please include this in the abstract, the first paragraph of the introduction, and in the discussion.

Your revised manuscript is due ONE MONTH from the date of this letter.

When you are ready, log in to the system (http://ajb.edmgr.com/) as an Author:

User name: PWILF

PW: wilf1505

If you have any questions, feel free to contact us at ajb@botany.org. We look forward to receiving the revised manuscript.

Sincerely, Judy

Dr. Judy Jernstedt, Editor-in-Chief American Journal of Botany Department of Plant Sciences University of California, Davis One Shields Avenue Davis, CA 95616-8780 USA Tel: 530-752-7166; FAX: 530-752-4361

E-mail: ajb@botany.org

Associate Editor and Reviewer Comments:

Associate Editor (Wm Stein):

Both reviewers are in agreement that this manuscript is very well written and reports work on fossils from an interesting time period and part of the world. I certainly concur and therefore recommend publication with little if any revision. Reviewer 2 suggests shortening the manuscript by removing what is perceived to be extraneous, but socially important, material. I'll leave it up to the authors whether to do this or not. Personally, I can see arguments both ways on this.

Reviewer #1: This is an excellent and very clean manuscript submission. It has been a joy to review. I normally have a number of comments, but in this case not. Just one suggestion: If you did not use a reference manager program such as Endnote, please double check the references against the text citations because I did not do that.

I did, though, check out a number of the review and non-review papers, and things check out. The authors did not cite Lutz Kunzmann's 2007 review paper on Mesozoic Araucariaceae, but it was not essential to their case.

One query: Why did you not cite the Escapa and Catalono paper on the phylogeny of Araucariaceae that just came out in International Journal of Plant Sciences?

2 de 3 01/11/2013 12:39 p.m. Reviewer #2: This is a novel and important contribution relevant to southern hemisphere biogeography and reports in impressive detail on the Eocene presence of the extant Australasian conifer genus Agathis in Patagonia. There seems little doubt that the placement of the fossils in the genus is appropriate and is very adequately justified.

The paper is generally well written, but in my opinion should be improved in two main ways. Firstly, I found the wordy references to the conservation imperatives of A. lenticula to be (almost strangely) out of place in the report. That is not to say that awareness should not be raised about this matter, and the new fossils from remote Patagonia might help add to this message. It is just that this should be addressed elsewhere (e.g. popular science media). In the authors' own admission this species anyway cannot be established as indeed phylogenetically close to the fossils. Moreover, removing most of this text (and its numerous references) would serve to make the paper much more concise. Secondly, a more definitive diagnosis should be provided for the new fossil species.

Further comments are annotated to the original text.

I have not closely checked the accuracy of the text references to the figures and reference list, but note one error in the references. The figures incidentally are of outstanding clarity.

Extra suggested references;

Mike Macphail & Raymond J. Carpenter, Alcheringa: An Australasian Journal of Palaeontology (2013): New potential nearest living relatives for Araucariaceae producing fossil Wollemi Pine-type pollen (Dilwynites granulatus W.K. Harris, 1965), Alcheringa: An Australasian Journal of Palaeontology, DOI: 10.1080/03115518.2014.843145

Raymond J. Carpenter, Gregory J. Jordan, Mike K. Macphail, and Robert S. Hill. Near-tropical Early Eocene terrestrial temperatures at the Australo-Antarctic margin, western Tasmania. Geology, 40 (3), 267-270.

Pross et al. (2012) Persistent near-tropical warmth on the Antarctic continent during the early Eocene epoch. Nature, 2 AUGUST 2012 | VOL 488, p. 73-77.

Editorial Office Comments:

For the abstract, the couple sentences that are in the methods section would probably be better placed in the premise, and more methodological aspects included in the methods. Some minor editing may be necessary to stay within the 250 word limit (although please note that the headers "premise", etc., do not count in the word limit).

There is additional documentation related to this decision letter. To access the file(s), please click the link below. You may also login to the system and click the 'View Attachments' link in the Action column.http://ajb.edmgr.com/l.asp?i=90214&l=2Q5PI6TZ

3 de 3 01/11/2013 12:39 p.m.