

Patrick,

I just a few weeks ago started listening to your podcast, Science . . . sort of, and must compliment you on an excellent and very enjoyable podcast. I enjoy listening to your critical discussion of scientific literature as well as the talk of movies, etc in between.

I am a fourth year Biology/Geology undergraduate at the University of Chicago and do research in Paul Sereno's lab. I just finished listening to your discussion of Jack Horner's recently published article "*Torosaurus* Marsh, 1891, is *Triceratops* Marsh, 1889 (Ceratopsidae: Chasmosaurine): synonymy through ontogeny." I was rather disturbed to hear your discussion misinterpret a major point of the article, the question of which taxon is valid, *Triceratops* or *Torosaurus*. Many media sources, including your podcast, have incorrectly reported that, according to Horner's article, *Triceratops* is no longer a valid taxon. However, as even the title of the article states, *Torosaurus* is the invalid taxon. You stated that *Torosaurus* has priority because *Triceratops* was given to a juvenile of the genus, however, having just reviewed the principles of priority in the international code of zoological nomenclature, I find no such principle. Horner, very clearly throughout the article, denotes *Torosaurus* as the invalid taxon by writing it as '*Torosaurus*'. Finally, at the end of the article in the section entitled Systematic Paleontology, Horner explicitly lists *Triceratops horridus* and *Triceratops prorsus* as valid species, and *Torosaurus latus* as a junior synonym.

I much appreciated the rest of your discussion of the article, and share your doubt about Horner's conclusion that the two genera are synonymous.

Nicole