

Bochaton et al. manuscript is scientifically sound and deserves its acceptance as a journal paper with minor revisions. I have several comments and recommendations that will in my opinion, improve the manuscript. I leave to the authors the decision to follow them or not. As a non-native English speaker, I have nothing to contribute concerning grammar and language.

Bochaton and colleagues present a study of Yellow-Headed Tortoise (*Indotestudo elongata*) remains recovered in four Hoabinhian culture sites from Thailand and Cambodia. The offered approach to the chelonian assemblages from a zooarchaeological perspective allows a relatively deep understanding of its cultural significance within Hoabinhian subsistence strategies, given the available information and considering the archaeological record restrictions. In my opinion, the study provides the expected contextual, methodological, and taxonomical background for a reliable scientific study. It provides a valuable analytical protocol and consistent data regarding not only tortoise remains fragmentation, body part representation and body size variations, but also other turtle and reptiles. The organization of the manuscript is correct, and the discussion addresses interesting issues, as well as the strengths and weaknesses of the study. Conclusion and perspective section offers a summary of the study contributions and the following lines of research.

Regarding specific aspects of the manuscript, the Introduction briefly summarizes the state of art. About the convenience of the selected information and references I have nothing to contribute, but been unfamiliar with the area and culture, its reading has facilitated me the understanding of the manuscript.

Material and methods section is correct, these are my comments:

- In the subsection "Main characteristics of *Indotestudo elongata*, the Yellow-Headed tortoise", the provided species information is adequate, although it would facilitate understanding to a foreign reader unfamiliar with the area to indicate the months in which it takes place the dry and rainy season (Lines 164 and 166-167).
- Regarding the subsection "Presentation of the studied sites and assemblages", I found it more clarifying to present the sites under study in the Introduction section.
- In Line 159, replace first "has" by "as".
- In "Quantification of the zooarchaeological data" section, provide references for the quantification units followed methodology.
- In Line 352, cervical scute instead of nuchal scute?
- In "Specific identification of the *I. elongata* archaeological bone sample" section, I would appreciate a more general description of the applied taxonomic identification criteria, specifically a brief paragraph regarding distinction between Testudinidae (i.e., *Indotestudo elongata*), Geoemydidae and Trionychidae, as later clarified in lines 434 to 436.
- References regarding the methodology applied for the identification and description of taphonomic alterations (i.e., water dissolution, gnawing, burning and cutmarks) should be included in the section.

Results are presented in a clear and organized manner. Figures and tables are suitable for the manuscript comprehension. I have found some mistakes:

- On Figure 2 caption: Line 397, replace GB for GW; Lines 398-399, remove measures GddvW and GdlvW as they do not appear in figure; Line 402, remove measure GplvW; and include measurements names for GdlmW and GplmW.
- On Figure 3, Nuchal plate (C) is upside down.

- On Tables 2 to 11, replace NMI for MNI.
- On Figure 6, site name is incorrectly spelled in Chart titles.

On References section:

- There are two Bochaton et al. 2019 references. It should be clarified each time in text with one is referred.
- Gracià et al. 2022 is not cited in text.
- Schlegel & Müller, 1845 is not listed in references.
- Boulenger, 1907 is not listed in references.
- Blyth, 1854 is not listed in references.