Comment (Case 3700) – On the proposed designation of Diplodocus carnegii Hatcher, 1901 as the type species of Diplodocus Marsh, 1878 (Dinosauria, Sauropoda): application should be rejected based on new data (see BZN 73(1): 17–24 [Case]; BZN 73(2–4): 127, 128, 129–131, 134–135)
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1. In a newly published abstract concerning the temporal distribution of Morrison Formation diplodocid sauropods, Tschopp et al. (2016) retreat from their previous treatment of Diplodocus longus as a nomen dubium (Tschopp et al., 2015) by suggesting that D. longus could be ancestral to D. carnegii and D. hallorum, judging from an overview of the temporal distribution of Morrison diplodocid specimens. When putting specimens of Morrison diplodocines into a stratigraphic context, the type locality of D. longus at Felch Quarry 1 in Garden Park, Colorado is situated low in the Brushy Basin Member of the Morrison Formation in contrast to the localities of known specimens of D. carnegii and D. hallorum, which are situated in the middle section of the Brushy Basin Member (see Turner & Peterson 1999, p. 86, fig. 7). Moreover, the fact that Galeamopus specimens partially overlap with the earliest known occurrences of Diplodocus (the Galeamopus skull USNM 2673 was found at the type locality of Diplodocus, and the Galeamopus skulls AMNH 969 and SMA 0011 were found lower in the Morrison Formation in the Salt Wash Member) lends support to the conclusion by Tschopp et al. (2016) that D. longus might be ancestral to D. carnegii and D. hallorum, because the occurrence of the diplodocine skulls CM 11255 (considered possibly belong to Barosaurus; Melstrom et al., 2016), CM 3452, CM 11161, and USNM 2672 within the range of unequivocal Diplodocus specimens suggests that Barosaurus/Kaatedocus-like diplodocines stratigraphically co-existed with Diplodocus/Galeamopus-like forms.

2. Based on the as-yet-unpublished results of the abstract by Tschopp et al. (2016), I urge the Commission to reject the proposals in Case 3700 (Tschopp & Mateus, 2016) if the “Morosaurus” agilis holotype (USNM 5384) is confirmed to be from the same individual as YPM 1920 as stated by Tidwell et al. (2005).
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