When these organisms were studied under infrared light, they were found to vary in color intensity, with *L. rubellus* showing the darkest color. ~~Unlike the natural visibility of benthic organisms, their contrasting infrared visibility~~ Since this species especially flourishes at the bottom of the sublittoral zone, the low color intensity suggests ~~the possibility of~~ another survival strategy against predators. Almost all deep-sea fishes have eyes that are sensitive to light in the blue-to-green visible spectrum because these wavelengths can penetrate deep ~~deeply~~ into the ocean [24]. Malacosteids, however, have retinal pigments that are particularly sensitive to red light, and these fishes have been compared to snipers armed with infrared "snooperscopes" at night [25, 26]. One such predator, the malacosteid *Photostomias guernei*, ~~is reportedly~~ has been reported to be present in the seas around Japan, as well as in Suruga Bay [27, 28]. However, ~~it is unlikely that~~ *L.* ~~*aqueus*~~ *rubellus* is likely to remain undetected ~~affected by~~ even by deep-sea fishes with ~~the~~ long-wavelength sensitivity ~~of deep-sea fishes, as it shows the similarly dark appearance of~~ because it resembles dark rocks and skeletal fragments. The appearance of *L.* ~~*aqueus*~~ *rubellus* shells under infrared light suggests that ~~Laqueus~~ it has evolved a survival strategy in which its shell behaves optically like a nonliving object ~~on~~ at the bottom of the sublittoral ~~bottom~~zone.

~~4.2. One Likely Possibility for the Evolutionary Arms Race between Sessile Benthic Organisms and Macropredators~~

~~The camouflage strategy of *Laqueus rubellus* to the detection abilities of macropredators~~ Our findings suggest~~s~~ the presence of an intimate and evolutionary interplay or arms race between *L. rubellus* and its predators~~.~~, which in turn suggests ~~This leads to~~ several evolutionary scenarios, as discussed below.

L. ~~*aqueus*~~ *rubellus* and ~~the vision systems of~~ its predators may have experienced selective pressure—the former for developing optical evasion ability and the latter for developing ~~detection ability of the~~ photoreceptor ability to detect long-wavelength light~~, respectively~~.

Comment [A32]: A simple restatement of results before the inference here may help readers comprehend the text better, since they may not remember which specific result you are talking about.

Further, your original sentence implied that all the organisms studied showed the same color intensity and hence may share the same strategy under infrared light. But your results specifically mention *L. rubellus* as being particularly dark.

I've therefore revised your sentence accordingly.

Comment [A33]: You have referred to such predators *in general* both before this sentence and in relation to *L. rubellus*.

So it is not clear why *Photostomias guernei* is significant. I would advise you to either explain its relevance or remove this specific mention altogether.

Comment [A34]: You have focused on the infrared visibility of only *L. rubellus*, whereas provided data for all the other organisms in the results.

I would recommend that you offer insights comparing the success of all organisms studied, which you've said have varying infrared visibilities.

Each enhancement ~~of~~ in one group of organisms ~~one~~ exerts selection pressure for developing a compensating enhancement ~~of~~ in the other. This is a form of coevolution [1, 29]. In addition to this predator-prey interaction, brachiopod survival ~~on~~ at the sea bottom is also affected by competition among benthic organisms, which belong to a similar guild [30–32]. ~~As a consequence~~Consequently, several species of the benthic community are involved, and their abundances are not independent. This corresponds to the concept of “diffuse (or guild) coevolution” [1].

~~In the modern sea, h~~Highly efficient vision systems are ~~evident~~ seen in teleost fishes and coleoid cephalopods, both of which originated in the early Mesozoic and drastically diversified during the Jurassic [33–35]. Spirifer~~in~~ids, which were one of the most ~~thrived~~ successful brachiopod groups and showed no indications of color [36], became extinct soon after the diversification of these macropredators, even though they had ~~possessed certain morphologies that are considered to be~~ developed ~~exquisite~~ morphological adaptations ~~for~~ of the feeding system that are considered exquisite [37–41]. On the other hand, terebratulids did not become extinct but began to diversify and persisted to the modern era [42]. Considering the improvement over time in the predation abilities of macropredators [43], our results suggest that the red coloration and infrared opacity of terebratulids is an effective adaptation strategy ~~to life~~ for survival at the ~~sublittoral~~ bottom of the sublittoral zone, even though these organisms are immobile and seemingly defenseless.

~~The relationship between the coloration and the apparent evolutionary trend motivated us to consider the etiology of visibility and its evolution.~~ Through biochemical analysis of intracrystalline proteins in the terebratulid shell, Cusack et al. [14] identified the N-terminal amino acid sequence of a 6.5~~-~~kDa protein ~~that may~~ whose function may be to embed a red carotenoprotein in the shell. In this study, the shells of larger ~~Because~~ *L.* ~~*aqueus*~~ *rubellus* individuals ~~shells examined here~~ tended to ~~exhibit~~ have more vivid red coloration ~~in larger~~

Comment [A35]: It’s not clear what the species of the benthic community are involved in. Did you perhaps mean that this predator-prey coevolution is not restricted to *L. rubellus* but also occurs in other species of the benthic community from the same guild since they are competitors exposed to the same pressures?

Comment [A36]: Since your paper focuses chiefly on predator-prey coevolution, it is not immediately clear how diffuse coevolution is relevant in this context. Please elaborate on this.

Comment [A37]: This section of the sentence is not very clear. Did you mean that their coloration did not evolve over time?

Comment [A38]: Statements about motivation behind your study should not appear so late in a paper. I have already added this motivation in the introduction, where it’s more relevant.

Also, “etiology” is the study of causes of diseases and does not appear relevant in this context.

~~individuals,~~; this indicates that the red pigment is ~~probably~~ deposited gradually during the growth of the secondary shell layer. Because the 6.5~~-~~kDa protein has been extracted from different shell layers in each species, it seems to represent a phylogenetic constraint [44].

Comment [A39]: It may not be clear to readers how the description of the protein responsible for the coloration is relevant here, or what is significant about the pigment being deposited gradually during the growth phase.

Please add some comments on why these topics are noteworthy in the context of evolution.

~~Enigmatic problems remain in this~~Our hypothesis is yet to explain some problems, namely, the origin of infrared opacity and its evolution. Further studies will be needed to understand how terebratulids in the marine benthic community have evolved in response to increasing predation pressures.

Comment [A40]: As written, the discussion seems to end rather abruptly. Please review if you need to mention any study limitations first.

Also, while the future research direction you have mentioned is valid, what peer reviewers may like to know is what broad implications your findings have in this field of study.

I would advise you to review the aims and scope of your target journal and see if you can add specific insights on any study implications that will be of interest and value to the journal's readers.

References

1. G. J. Vermeij, Evolution and Escalation: an Ecological History of Life, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, ~~USA1987~~USA, 1987.
2. J. M. Chase, E. G. Biro, W. A. ~~Ryber~~Ryberg, and K. G. Smith, "Predators temper the relative importance of stochastic processes in the assembly of prey metacommunities," Ecology Letters, vol. 12, no. 11, pp. 1210–1218, 2009.
3. I. Hayami ~~I~~ and I. Hosoda ~~I, "Fortpecten takahashi~~, "Fortipecten takahashii, a reclining pectinid from the ~~Pliocoene~~Pliocene of north Japan," Palaeontology, vol. 31, pp. 419–444, 1988.
4. ~~ALA~~A. L. A. Johnson ~~(1994).~~, "Evolution of European Lower Jurassic Gryphaea (Gryphaea) and contemporaneous bivalves," Historical Biology, vol. 7~~(~~, no. 2~~),~~, pp. 167–186, 1994.
5. R. Nakashima, A. Suzuki, and T. Watanabe, "Life history of the Pliocene scallop Fortipecten, based on oxygen and carbon isotope profiles," Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, vol. 211, no. 3–4, pp. 299–307, 2004.
6. E. Savazzi, "Adaptations to tube dwelling in the Bivalvia," Lethaia, vol. 15, no. 3, pp. 275–297, 1982.

7. A. Seilacher, “Constructional morphology of bivalves: evolutionary pathways in primary versus secondary soft-bottom dwellers,” Palaeontology, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 207–237, 1984.

8. I. Hayami, “Living and fossil scallop shells as airfoils: an experimental study,” Paleobiology, vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1–18, ~~1996~~1991.

9. ~~MJ~~M. J. Simms and ~~GD Sevastoplo,~~ G. D. Sevastopulo, “The origin of articulate crinoids~~,~~,” Palaeontology, vol. 36, no. 1, pp. 91–109, 1993.

10. T. K. Baumiller ~~TK~~ and F. J. Gahn ~~FJ~~, “Testing predator-driven evolution with Paleozoic crinoid arm regeneration,” Science, vol. 305, no. 5689, pp. 1453–1455, 2004.

11. T. Oji and K. Kitazawa, “Discovery of two rare species of stalked crinoids from Okinawa Trough, southwestern Japan, and their systematic and biogeographic implications,” ~~Zool Sci~~Zoological Science, vol. 25, no. 1, pp. 115–121, 2008.

12. M. A. James ~~M.,~~, A~~.,~~. D. Ansell ~~A. D.,~~, M. J. Collins ~~M. J.,~~, G. B. Curry ~~G. B.,~~, L. S. Peck ~~L. S.,~~, and M. C. Rhodes ~~M. C.,~~, “Biology of Living Brachiopods,” Advances in Marine Biology, vol. 28, no. C, pp. 175–387, 1992.

13. L. S. Peck ~~LS, 2001.~~, “Physiology,” in Brachiopods Ancient and Modern: a Tribute to G. Arthur Cooper, S. J. Carlson and M. R. Sandy, Eds., pp. 89–104, The Paleontological Society, Boston, Mass, USA, 2001.

14. ~~MCusack, GCurry,~~M. Cusack, G. Curry, H. Clegg, and G. Abbott, “An intracrystalline chromoprotein from red brachiopod shells: implications for the process of biomineralization,” Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology, B: Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, vol. 102, no. ~~102,~~1, pp. 93–95, 1992.

15. D. E. Lee, D. I. Mackinnon, T. N. Smirnova, P. G. Baker, Y. Jin, and D. Sun, “Terebratulida,” in Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part H: Brachiopoda Revised, R.L. Kaesler, Ed., pp. 1965–2253, Geological Society of America and Kansas University Press, Boulder, Co and Lawrence, Kan, USA, 2006.

16. Y. Shiino and K. Kitazawa, “Behavior of terebratulide brachiopod Laqueus rubellus, with special reference to the pedicle function,” The Japanese Journal of Benthology, vol. 65~~;~~, pp. 18–26, 2010 (~~Japnese~~Japanese).

17. T. Kaneko and M. Tsuji, “Distribution of benthic organisms in relation to environmental parameters in Uchiura Bay (inner part of Suruga Bay),” Journal of NIRE, vol. 7~~;~~, pp. 153–168, 1998 (Japanese).

18. ~~AW~~A. W. Collier, ~~1970~~ “Oceans and coastal waters as life-supporting environments,” in Marine Ecology, O. Kinne, Ed., vol. 1, pp. 1–93, ~~Wily~~Wiley-Interscience, London, UK, 1970.

19. N. G. Jerlov~~ N. G. 1970~~, “Light, General Introduction,” in Marine Ecology, O. Kinne, Ed., vol. 1, pp. 95–102, Wiley-Interscience, London, UK, 1970.

20. E. J. Denton, “The "design" of fish and cephalopod eyes in relation to their environment,” in Proceedings of the Symposia of the Zoological Society of London, vol. 3, pp. 53–55, 1960.

21. ~~Wells~~ M. J. ~~1966~~Wells, “Cephalopod sense organs,” in Physiology of Mollusca, K. M. Wilbur and C. M. Yonge, Eds., pp. 523–545, Academic Press, London~~.~~, UK, 1966.

22. A. Packard, “Cephalopods and fish: the limits of convergence,” ~~Biol. Rev~~Biological Reviews, vol. 47, pp. 241–307, 1972.

23. R. H. Douglas~~ R. H.~~, C. W. Mullineaux, and J. C.~~ W.~~ Partridge,~~ J. C., 2000~~ “Long-wave sensitivity in deep-sea stomiid dragonfish with far-red bioluminescence: evidence for a dietary origin of the chlorophyll-derived retinal photosensitizer of Malacosteus niger,” Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B, vol. 355, no. 1401, pp. 1269–~~72,.~~1272, 2000.

24. R. H. Douglas~~ R. H.~~, J. C. Partridge~~ J. C.~~, and ~~marshall~~ N. J~~.,~~. Marshall, “The eyes of deep-sea fish I: Lens pigmentation, tapeta and visual pigments,” Progress in Retinal and Eye Research, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 597–636, 1998.

25. P. J. Herring, The Biology of the Deep Ocean, Oxford University Press, New York, NY, USA, 2002.

26. E. A. Widder, M. I. Latz, P. J. Herring, ~~1984~~and J. F. Case, “Far red bioluminescence from two deep-sea fishes,” Science, vol. 225, no. 4661, ~~510-~~pp. 512–514~~,.~~, 1984.

27. S. Imai, “On the Stomiatoidea of Suruga Bay and Sagami Bay,” in Suisangaku-Shusei, Y. Suehiro, Y. Oshima, and Y. Hiyama, Eds., pp. 553~~-~~–563, University of Tokyo Press, Tokyo, Japan, 1957.

28. G. Shinohara and K. Matsuura, “Annotated checklist of deep-sea fishes from Suruga Bay, Japan,” National Science Museum Monographs, vol. 12, pp. 269~~-~~–318, 1997.

29. R. Dawkins and J. R. Krebs, “Arms races between and within species,” Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, Biological Sciences, vol. 205, no. 1161, pp. 489~~-~~–511, 1979.

30. S. J. Gould and C. B. ~~Callowy~~Calloway, “Clams and brachiopods; ships that pass in the night,” Paleobiology, vol. 6, pp. 383–396, 1980.

31. C. W. Thayer, “Brachiopods versus mussels: Competition, predation, and palatability,” Science, vol. 228, no. 4707, pp. 1527–1528, ~~1995~~1985.

32. V. Tunnicliffe and K. Wilson, “Brachiopod populations: distribution in fjords of British Columbia (Canada) and tolerance of low oxygen concentrations,” Marine Ecology Progress Series, vol. 47, pp. 117–128, 1988.

33. ~~JG Maise.~~J. G. Maisey, Discovering Fossil Fishes, Henry Holt and Company, New York, NY, USA, 1996.

34. J. Strugnell and M. K. Nishiguchi, “Molecular phylogeny of coleoid cephalopods (Mollusca: Cephalopoda) inferred from three mitochondrial and six nuclear loci: A comparison of alignment, implied alignment and analysis methods,” Journal of Molluscan Studies, vol. 73, no. 4, pp. 399–410, 2007.

35. B. Venkatesh, “EvolutionandEvolution and diversity of fish genomes,” Current Opinion in Genetics and Development, vol. 13, no. 6, pp. 588–592, 2003.

36. C. H. Stevens, “Color Retention in the Brachiopod Chonetinella jeffordsi Stevens,” Journal of Paleontology, vol. 39, pp. 728–729, 1965.

37. Y. ShinoShiino, “Passive feeding in spiriferidebrachiopodsspiriferide brachiopods: an experimental approach using models of

Devonian Paraspirifer and Cyrtospirifer,”Letaia Lethaia, vol. 43, no. 2, pp. 223–231, 2010.

38. Y. Shiino, O. Kuwazuru, and N. Yoshikawa, “Computational fluid dynamics simulations on a Devonian spiriferid Paraspirifer bownockeri (Brachiopoda): Generating mechanism of passive feeding flows,” Journal of Theoretical Biology, vol. 259, no. 1, pp. 132–141, 2009.

39. Y. Shiino and O. Kuwazuru, “Functional adaptation of spiriferide brachiopod morphology,” Journal of Evolutionary Biology, vol. 23, no. 7, pp. 1547–1557, 2010.

40. Y. Shiino Y and O. Kuwazuru O, 2011, “Theoretical approach to the functional optimisation of spiriferide brachiopod shell: Optimum morphology of sulcus,” J.Journal of Theoretical Biology, vol. 276(, no. 1),, pp. 192–198, 2011.

41. Y. Shiino and O. Kuwazuru, “Comparative experimental and simulation study on passive feeding flow generation in CyrtspiriferCyrtospirifer,” Memoirs of the Association of Australasian Palaeontologists, vol. 41, pp. 1–8, 2011.

42. G. B. Curry and C. H. C. Brunton, “Stratigraphic distribution of brachiopods,” in Treatise on Invertebrate Paleontology, Part H: Brachiopoda Revised, P. A. Selden, Ed., pp. 2901–3081, Geological Society of America and Kansas University Press, Boulder, Co and Lawrence, Kan, USA, 2007.

43. G. J. VermejVermeij, “The Mesozoic marine revolution; evidence from snails, predators and grazers,” Paleobiology, vol. 3, pp. 245–258, 1977.

M. ~~Cuseck~~Cusack and A. Freer~~.~~, “Biomineralization: elemental and organic influence in carbonate systems,” ~~Chem Rev~~Chemical Reviews, vol. 108, no. 11, pp. 4433–4454, 2008.