

Overview

We thank both reviewers for constructive comments and for catching a few errors. We have revised the manuscript accordingly, and have taken all their advice except in the following cases:

Reviewer 1 (Ken Carpenter)

(No exceptions except as discussed in the "Both reviewers" section.)

Reviewer 2

Reviewer 2 asks whether the brief paragraph distinguishing between molds and casts is necessary. It is: this paper discusses both molds and casts in detail, and it is easy to become confused if the distinction is not made explicit. Here I am speaking from experience!

Reviewer 2 suggests removing the "[sic]" used after the British spelling "moulds" when it is quoted from the Carnegie Institute's 1934 annual report. We are inclined to keep them, as the spelling is not usual in the USA, and could easily be misinterpreted as a transcription error on our part.

We write:

The Jurassic section, including *Diplodocus* and the *Apatosaurus louisae* holotype CM 3018, was opened for ticketed previews at 6 am [sic] on Saturday 17 November 2007 (Roddy 2007)

Rather than inserting "[sic]", as we have done, Reviewer 2 suggests "why not correct this?" The content of Roddy 2007 shows that the surprising 6am preview time *is* in fact correct.

Both reviewers

Ken Carpenter asks:

Is the detail on the hunt for suitable forelimbs necessary, rather than simply listing the institutions and stating they did not have suitable material?

And similarly, Reviewer 2 writes:

This section -- while interesting -- could be cut for length.

Both reviewers are of course correct that this section *could* be cut or summarised if length was a problem. We would prefer to retain it, though, because it contains exactly the kind of information whose unavailability provoked us to write this paper in the first place. Ken Carpenter suggested (in the review form) summarising this section as "No suitable size limbs to mold and cast were available [from the] Sauriermuseum Aathal in Switzerland, The Wyoming Dinosaur Center, Denver Museum of Nature

and Science". Were I to read that, my immediate thought would be "But the Sauriermuseum has so many specimens! How they not have had any forelimbs?" and "But I know the Denver Museum has a complete Diplodocus mount, why couldn't its forelimbs be used?". Our goal in this paper is to provide a one-stop shop for the answers to precisely this kind of question.