Tables:

Changed Table 1 to the list of samples used in this study and the accompanying GenBank numbers. Added a new Table 2, which is a summary of measurements of the comparative material, and a new Table 3, which presents the pairwise sequence divergence from the molecular analyses and Table 4, a summary of diagnostic characters across all members of the *H. signata* Complex.

Editor:

Comment 1) From the summary of measurements in Table 2, it is clear that the type specimens are adults and not juveniles. Furthermore, our examination of adult-sized males of hundreds of specimens from the complex that were collected year round from different countries all had nuptial pads. The description of the gonads is thus unnecessary.

Comment 2) Rewrote the comparisons section to include SVL, humeral glands, and webbing

Comment 3) Table 2 now presents data on the materials examined. Measurements of the holotype are inserted at the end of the ‘Description of holotype’ section and measurements of the paratype is listed at the end of the ‘Variation’ section.

Comment 4) Added Table 4

Comment 5) The list of voucher specimens are referenced to Brown and Guttman (2002)(Lines 93-94). This list is rather long and waste of space to replicate in this paper.

Comment 6) Removed ‘relictual’ from title and adjusted the Discussion section to be more conservative of the use of this term (Line 272)

Assoc. Editor

Comment 1) Rewrote the comparisons section to include SVL, humeral glands, and webbing

Comment 2) Defined the H. signata Complex (Lines 40-45)

Comment 3) Added Table 4

Comment 4) Table 2 now presents data on the materials examined. Measurements of the holotype are inserted at the end of the ‘Description of holotype’ section and measurements of the paratype is listed at the end of the ‘Variation’ section. The list of voucher specimens are referenced to Brown and Guttman (2002)(Lines 93-94). This list is rather long and waste of space to replicate in this paper.

Comment 5) From the summary of measurements in Table 2, it is clear that the type specimens are adults and not juveniles. The description of the gonads is thus unnecessary.

Comment 6) Added Table 3 and rewrote the Results to justify the use of % sequence divergence in the recognition of the new species (Lines 154-158).

Comment 7) Removed ‘relictual’ from title and adjusted the Discussion section to be more conservative of the use of this term (Line 272)

Comment 8) Referenced Brown and Siler (2013), which has a broader phylogenetic tree of the *H. signata* Complex. This provides a broader perspective of the placement of the complex within *Hylarana* (Lines 157-158).

Additional comments:

Comment 1) Added the distance between the new and original site (Line 69)

Comment 2) Added a ‘sampling’ section to M&M to justify choice of samples used (Lines 81-95).

Comment 3) Added elevation to the holotype and paratype sections

Comment 4) Discussed in Results (Lines 154-158).

Comment 5) Rewrote the caption of Fig.1 to mention the *Hylarana signata* Complex

Reviewer 1

Comment 1) Added Table 2 and Table 4

Comment 2) Based on comparative SVL (Table 2), it is clear that the type specimens are not juveniles. They are males (despite lacking nuptial pads) because they possess humeral glands (females do not have these). Based on % sequence divergence, morphological differences, phylogenetic placement, and allopatry (*H. siberu* is endemic to Siberut Island), it is clear that *H. siberu* and the new species are separately evolving lineages with no gene flow between populations and warrants specific recognition.

Comment 3) Table 3 now provides the sequence divergences of all species in the *H. signata* Complex.

Comment 4) Dealt with.

Comment 5) Added ‘conservation’ to line 287.

Comment 6) Referenced Brown and Siler (2013), which has a broader phylogenetic tree of the *H. signata* Complex. This provides a broader perspective of the placement of the complex within *Hylarana* (Lines 157-158).

Reviewer 2

Comment 1) *H. signata* Complex defined

Comment 2) See Editor Comment 1

Comment 3) The phylogenetic analyses was based on a non protein coding locus hence the partitioning of data is problematic and unnecessary.

Comment 4) The phylogenetic analyses clearly places the new species in the *Hylarana signata* Complex (Lines 147-148)

Comment 5) We see no problems with the structure of the introduction. It begins with an overview of the entire complex and prior studies. The second paragraph focuses in on the new species and *H. siberu*.

Other general edits and formatting issues have been addressed