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Abstract

Crocodylians today comprise only 24 recognised species, and are often regarded as morphologically conservative. However, the fossil record of crocodylomorphs, which includes the extinct relatives of crocodylians, is much richer and extends over the last ~220 million years. This great biodiversity is reflected in their morphological disparity, with crocodylomorph species occupying a much wider range of ecological niches. Research effort has concentrated mostly on the description of new taxa and on placing them within the crocodylomorph evolutionary tree, and has greatly contributed to our understanding of crocodylomorph phylogeny and diversity. Nevertheless, another fundamental aspect of crocodylomorph macroevolution, morphological disparity, has only recently been the subject of quantitative scrutiny, with the focus often limited to specific subgroups rather than the entire clade. In this thesis, crocodylomorph morphological disparity is quantitatively assessed using distinct types of data. Body size patterns, characterised via a model-fitting approach, provide new insights into the adaptive landscape of crocodylomorphs. Patterns of cranial shape variation suggest an important link between ecological diversification and morphological disparity. Finally, the action of heterochrony, underlying remarkable cranial modifications in the crocodylomorph clade Notosuchia, is tested using geometric morphometrics. Together, these results represent a significant contribution to better understanding crocodylomorph phenotypic evolution.
Aos meus pais.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The main goal of palaeontology is to understand the history of life on Earth, which is documented by fossils of organisms that have been inhabiting the planet for at least 3.7 billion years (Awramik 1992; Bell et al. 2015; Dodd et al. 2017). The attempt to comprehend the past is driven not only by curiosity in uncovering the mysteries of ancient life, but also by the possibility of predicting the future transformations of the planet. In studying past animals, plants and environments we provide ourselves with crucial tools that help us to identify patterns and trends of changes that happened repeatedly in the past and that may be mirrored today (Benton and Harper 2013; Cowen 2013).

As opposed to experimental sciences, hypotheses formulated within the scope of historical sciences, such as palaeontology, cannot usually be tested via laboratory experiments (which does not make historical science epistemologically inferior to experimental science Cleland 2001; 2002). Within experimental sciences, the “traditional” approach of the scientific method seeks to explore the causal relationship between present and future events, which is ultimately assessed by testing hypotheses in controlled laboratory settings. Alternatively, historical scientists use a parallel route of evidential reasoning, looking for correlations between present and past events, which creates a time asymmetry between historical and experimental research. In other words, historical hypotheses are formulated to explain effects of long-past events, and multiple hypotheses can be tested by evidence that unambiguously discriminates one hypothesis from a set of other available ones (Cleland 2002). Accordingly, better hypotheses emerge and evolve from the accumulation of more and more diverse evidence (including those arising from Kuhnian paradigm shifts; Cleland 2002; Benton and Harper 2013). Numerous examples illustrate this pattern of evidential reasoning,
from Wegener’s hypothesis of continental drift (Cleland 2002) to the extinction of the
dinosaurs as the result of an asteroid impact (Brusatte et al. 2015).

Recent advances in many methodological techniques have provided palaeontologists
with tools to more quantitatively assess the evidence yielded by the fossil record, allowing
palaeontological research to flourish (Benton and Harper 2013). Although the basis of
palaeontology remains the discovery and description of new specimens or species, additional
steps and approaches to better understand the history of life are now common in
palaeontological studies, such as investigating how closely related those species are (with
systematic phylogenetic analyses) or if there were periods in geological time with greater or
lower biodiversity (by estimating diversity in statistically appropriate ways). This “new era”
of palaeobiology (the subfield of palaeontology created in the first half of the 20th century to
better integrate the emerging concepts of evolutionary biology; Sepkoski 2012), driven by
abundant data derived from quantitative approaches, has permitted more frequent and
comprehensive investigations of macroevolutionary patterns (i.e., evolutionary changes that
occurred over long geological time scales, usually above the species level).

1.1. Taxonomic diversity versus morphological disparity in macroevolutionary studies
During the modern synthesis, the concepts introduced by G. G. Simpson’s Tempo and Mode
in Evolution (1944), such as that of adaptive radiation, were key for the consolidation of
macroevolutionary studies and the marriage between palaeontological evidence and that from
other subfields of evolutionary biology (e.g., molecular data) (Benton 2015). Since Simpson’s
days, palaeontologists have engaged in the characterisation of macroevolutionary temporal
patterns from different types of data. Perhaps the most classical way of recognising
macroevolutionary patterns is by estimating taxonomic diversity. Although species richness in
the past has long been the subject of studies by naturalists (Mayr 1982), the modern concept of diversity estimation was arguably founded by the prominent work of Raup and Sepkoski (e.g., Raup 1972; Sepkoski 1978; 1979; 1981; Sepkoski et al. 1981; Raup and Sepkoski 1982; Sepkoski 1984), which has been subsequently improved by statistical approaches that more adequately account for biases in the fossil record (e.g., Alroy 2010).

However, another important branch of macroevolutionary studies focuses on the long-term variation of organisms’ morphologies, rather than changes in taxic biodiversity (Gould 1991). The distinction between morphological disparity (i.e., the amount of morphological variation among species) and taxonomic diversity was greatly clarified by the work of Foote (e.g., Foote 1993; 1997), which showed that the signals from these two distinct types of data are not always consistent, as changes in the number of species do not necessarily translate into changes in the morphological differences among them (Foote 1993; Hopkins and Gerber 2017). For instance, many studies have indicated that even though morphological variation patterns seem to track those of biodiversity curves during the early evolution of clades (e.g., Foote 1993; Hughes et al. 2013), subsequent discordant signals are frequently observed.

There are different approaches for quantifying morphological variation, also known as phenotypic variation, which usually include data from continuous characters (using traditional or geometric morphometrics) or discrete (i.e., cladistic) characters (Benton 2015; Hopkins and Gerber 2017). Continuous characters require measurements of specimens and are often associated with more restricted morphologies (e.g. a specific part of the skeleton). The use of discrete characters potentially allows the examination of many aspects of morphology simultaneously, but with the drawback that realistic descriptions of the morphologies are usually lost (i.e., it is more difficult to objectively visualise which parts of morphology are varying) (Hopkins and Gerber 2017). Furthermore, some linear measurements, such as those
used as proxies for body size, can summarise successfully information from complex traits, and modern geometric morphometric techniques (e.g., using three-dimensional data) can detect extremely nuanced morphological variation.

1.2. The study group: Crocodylomorpha

Crocodylomorpha, the group that includes extant crocodylians and their extinct relatives, represents an excellent system for studying phenotypic macroevolutionary patterns. In particular, crocodylomorphs are one of two archosaur lineages that, together with birds, survived until the present day. Living representatives are important as they serve as analogues for inferring many biological features (such as physiology and behaviour). Additionally, the more than 200-million-year-old evolutionary history of the group has a rich fossil record, with more than 500 species described, which exhibit remarkable morphological variation (Fig. 1.1).

Another crucial characteristic of Crocodylomorpha, which helps make the group a useful model for studying macroevolution, is the ongoing effort to establish clearer phylogenetic relationships between its members. A plethora of phylogenetic studies on crocodylomorphs have been published over the last three decades, from the pioneering work of Benton and Clark (1988), which introduced the classification of crocodylians and their fossil relatives within a cladistic framework, to more recent studies that aimed at reconciling phylogenetic signals from both molecular and morphological data (e.g., Lee and Yates 2018). This allows the employment of phylogenetic comparative methods (i.e., the use of information from phylogenies to test evolutionary hypotheses; Harvey and Pagel 1991; Martins and Hansen 1997), essential for more accurately characterising macroevolutionary patterns.
Table 1.1. Phylogenetic definitions of major crocodylomorph subclades, which are frequently referred to in this thesis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clade</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archosauria</td>
<td>The least inclusive clade containing <em>Crocodylus niloticus</em> and <em>Passer domesticus</em>.</td>
<td>Sereno (2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylomorpha</td>
<td>The most inclusive clade containing <em>Crocodylus niloticus</em>, but not <em>Rauisuchus tiradentes</em>,</td>
<td>Nesbitt (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Poposaurus gracilis</em>, <em>Gracilisuchus stipanicicorum</em>, <em>Prestosuchus chiniquensis</em>, or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Aetosaurus ferratus</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodyliformes</td>
<td>Last common ancestor of <em>Protosuchus richardsoni</em>, <em>Crocodylus niloticus</em> and all of its</td>
<td>Sereno et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>descendants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesoeucrocodylia</td>
<td>All crocodyliforms more closely related to <em>Crocodylus niloticus</em> than to *Protosuchus</td>
<td>Sereno et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>richardsoni*.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia</td>
<td>All crocodyliforms more closely related to <em>Notosuchus terrestris</em> than to *Crocodylus</td>
<td>Sereno et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>niloticus*.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neosuchia</td>
<td>All crocodyliforms more closely related to <em>Crocodylus niloticus</em> than to *Notosuchus</td>
<td>Sereno et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>terrestris*.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalattosuchia</td>
<td>The most inclusive clade consisting of <em>Teleosaurus cadomensis</em> and *Metriorhynchus</td>
<td>Young and Andrade (2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>geoffroyii*, but not <em>Pholidosaurus schaumburgensis</em>, <em>Goniopholis crassidens</em>, or <em>Dyrosaurus</em></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tethysuchia</td>
<td>Last common ancestor of <em>Pholidosaurus purbeckensis</em> and <em>Dyrosaurus phosphaticus</em> and all</td>
<td>Andrade et al. (2011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of its descendants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eusuchia</td>
<td>Last common ancestor of <em>Hylaeochampsa vectiana</em>, <em>Crocodylus niloticus</em>, *Gavialis</td>
<td>Brochu (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gangeticus*, and <em>Alligator mississippiensis</em> and all of its descendants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia</td>
<td>Last common ancestor of <em>Gavialis gangeticus</em>, <em>Alligator mississippiensis</em>, and <em>Crocodylus</em></td>
<td>Brochu (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>niloticus* and all of its descendants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gavialoidea</td>
<td><em>Gavialis gangeticus</em> and all crocodylians closer to it than to *Alligator</td>
<td>Brochu (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mississippiensis* or <em>Crocodylus niloticus</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alligatoroidea</td>
<td><em>Alligator mississippiensis</em> and all crocodylians closer to it than to <em>Crocodylus niloticus</em></td>
<td>Brochu (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or <em>Gavialis gangeticus</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodyloidea</td>
<td><em>Crocodylus niloticus</em> and all crocodylians closer to it than to <em>Alligator mississippiensis</em></td>
<td>Brochu (2003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or <em>Gavialis gangeticus</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3. Objectives

The main goal of this thesis is to quantitatively assess morphological variation within Crocodylomorpha, characterising phenotypic macroevolutionary patterns using different sources of information.

Chapter 2 investigates body size evolution across the entire crocodylomorph tree. A model-fitting approach is applied to explore the modes of evolution that underlie observed body size patterns. Furthermore, possible evolutionary drivers are assessed by testing for correlations with biotic and abiotic factors.

Chapter 3 explores crocodylomorph cranial shape variation using a taxonomically comprehensive approach. Landmark-based geometric morphometrics is used to assess the morphospace occupation of different crocodylomorph subgroups, as well as to estimate morphological disparity (through-time and between groups).

Finally, Chapter 4 focuses on Notosuchia, an extremely disparate group of crocodylomorphs, and tests the hypothesis that heterochronic processes underpin cranial shape modifications seen in the hypercarnivorous baurusuchids. Geometric morphometric techniques are once more employed to quantify notosuchian cranial shape variation, and allometric and ontogenetic changes are assessed using specific protocols.
Chapter 2: Crocodylomorph body size evolution

This chapter is a modified version of a manuscript submitted for publication in *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, which is currently under review. Additionally, the same manuscript was submitted as a preprint to *bioRxiv*, and can be found online as:


My contribution to this manuscript involved conducting all parts of the research, including co-co-designing the project, collecting the data, analysing it and interpreting the results, as well as writing the manuscript. My colleagues collaborated by co-designing parts of the research project and providing crucial feedback on interpretation of results and drafts of the manuscript.

2.1. Background

Body size influences many aspects of ecology, physiology and evolutionary history (Hutchinson and MacArthur 1959; Peters 1983; Calder 1984; Schmidt-Nielsen 1984; McKinney 1990a; McClain and Boyer 2009), and patterns of animal body size evolution are a long-standing subject of macroevolutionary investigation (e.g., Cope 1887; 1896; Depéret 1909; Newell 1949; Stanley 1973). As a major focus of natural selection, it is expected that significant variation should occur in the body size of animals, although confined within biological constraints, such as skeletal structure, thermoregulation and resource availability (Schmidt-Nielsen 1984; McKinney 1990a; Price and Hopkins 2015). Furthermore, body size
can often be easily measured or estimated from both fossil and modern specimens, and has therefore been widely used in phenotypic macroevolutionary studies (Cope 1887; 1896; Depéret 1909; Stanley 1973; Raup 1988; McKinney 1990a; Alroy 1998; Smith et al. 2010; Venditti et al. 2011; Heim et al. 2015).

With few exceptions (e.g., Laurin 2004; Benson et al. 2014a), previous studies of tetrapod body size evolution have focused on mammals (e.g., Alberdi et al. 1995; Alroy 1998; Smith et al. 2010; Smith and Lyons 2011; Venditti et al. 2011; Saarinen et al. 2014; Churchill et al. 2015; Gearty et al. 2018) and dinosaurs or birds (e.g., Burness et al. 2001; Hone et al. 2005; Carrano 2006; Turner et al. 2007; Butler and Goswami 2008; Lee et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2014b; Carballido et al. 2017; Benson et al. 2018). Little is known, however, about other diverse and morphologically disparate clades. Among those, Crocodylomorpha represents an excellent group for studying large-scale evolutionary patterns, with a rich and well-studied fossil record covering more than 200 million years, as well as living representatives (Bronzati et al. 2012; 2015; Mannion et al. 2015). Previous work has investigated multiple aspects of crocodylomorph macroevolution, including spatial and temporal patterns of diversity (Markwick 1998a; Bronzati et al. 2015; Mannion et al. 2015), as well as morphological variation, disparity, and evolution, with a particular focus on the skull (Langston 1973; Brochu 2001; Sadleir and Makovicky 2008; Stubbs et al. 2013; Toljagić and Butler 2013; Wilberg 2017; Chapter 4).

Nevertheless, studies quantitatively investigating macroevolutionary patterns of body size in crocodylomorphs have been restricted to particular time periods (e.g., Triassic-Jurassic body size disparity; Turner and Nesbitt 2013) or clades (e.g., metriorhynchids; Young et al. 2011), limiting broader interpretations. For instance, the influence of environmental temperature on the growth and adult body size of animals has long been acknowledged as an
important phenomenon (Schmidt-Nielsen 1984), and has been considered of significant influence on the physiology and distribution of crocodylians (Allsteadt and Lang 1995; Markwick 1998b). There is also strong evidence for climate-driven biodiversity patterns in the group (e.g., Markwick 1998a; Mannion et al. 2015). Nevertheless, it remains unclear whether extrinsic factors, such as temperature and geographic distribution, have impacted long-term patterns of crocodylomorph body size evolution (Delfino and de Vos 2014).

Most of the earliest crocodylomorphs, such as *Litargosuchus* and *Hesperosuchus*, were small-bodied animals (with estimated total lengths of less than 1 metre; Clark et al. 2000; Clark and Sues 2002), contrasting with some giant forms that appeared later, such as *Sarcosuchus* and *Deinosuchus* (possibly more than 10 metres long; Erickson and Brochu 1999; Sereno et al. 2001), as well as with the intermediate to large sizes of extant crocodylians (1.5–7 m; Ross 1998; Grigg et al. 2001). The absence of small-bodied forms among extant species indicates a long-term pattern of body size increase in crocodylomorphs. Directional trends of increasing body size through time (see McShea 1994), differential extinction of small bodied taxa, or other factors, such as climate-driven evolutionary change could explain this observation. However, because patterns of body size evolution along phylogenetic lineages of crocodylomorphs have not been characterised, its causes are unaddressed.

Since the end of the last century, palaeontologists have more frequently used quantitative comparative methods to investigate the tempo and mode of evolution along phylogenetic lineages (Felsenstein 1985; Hansen 1997; Pennell and Harmon 2013), including studies of body size evolution (MacFadden 1986; McKinney 1990a; Alroy 1998; Carrano 2006; Butler and Goswami 2008; Smith et al. 2010). More recently, numerous studies have employed a phylogeny-based model-fitting approach, using maximum likelihood or Bayesian
framework to identify the best-fitting statistical macroevolutionary model for a given phylogenetic comparative (Butler and King 2004; Hunt and Carrano 2010; Hunt 2012; Slater 2013; Benson et al. 2014a, b; Slater 2015; Benson et al. 2018).

Many of these works have tested the fit of a uniform macroevolutionary model, with a single set of parameters applied across all branches of a phylogeny (e.g., Cooper and Purvis 2010; Young et al. 2011; Sookias et al. 2012a; Slater 2013). This approach can be problematic as the dynamics of evolutionary trends vary through time, space and among clades (Hunt 2008a, b; Mahler and Ingram 2014; Hunt et al. 2015; Khabbazian et al. 2016). Therefore, uniform models are incompatible with the complexity of the natural world. In the present Chapter, this is approached in the context of the Simpsonian Adaptive Landscape (Simpson 1944; 1953), which have proved to be a fruitful conceptual framework for characterizing macroevolutionary changes, encompassing ideas such as adaptive zone invasion and quantum evolution (Hansen 2012; Arnold 2014; Mahler and Ingram 2014).

Macroevolutionary landscapes provide a conceptual bridge for dialogues between studies of micro- and macroevolution, and have benefitted from the subsequent advancements of molecular biology and genetics (Arnold et al. 2001). Within this paradigm, uniform models primarily represent static macroevolutionary landscapes, with unchanged peaks (or maximum adaptive zones; Stanley 1973) persisting through long time intervals and across the phylogeny (Simpson 1953; Hansen 2012; Mahler and Ingram 2014).

Incorporating biological realism into statistical models of evolution is challenging (Uyeda and Harmon 2014). Many existing models are based on a Brownian motion (BM) process resulting from random walks of trait values along phylogenetic lineages (Felsenstein 1985; Hansen and Martins 1996; Hansen 2012). Uniform Brownian motion has many interpretations. For example, it can be used as a model of drift, or of adaptive evolution.
towards lineage-specific selective optima that undergo random walks through time, and seems reasonable for describing undirected stochastic change (Felsenstein 1985). Elaborations of BM models were subsequently proposed. Among these, the BM model with a tendency for directional evolution was formulated by adding a parameter $\mu$ (Pagel 2002), similar to the slope of trait values through time. “Trend-shift” models have also been proposed, in which the trend parameter ($\mu$) undergoes clade-specific or time-specific shifts (Benson et al. 2018).

Several evolutionary models also describe trait evolution under an Ornstein–Uhlenbeck (OU) process (Felsenstein 1988; Hansen 1997; Butler and King 2004; Beaulieu et al. 2012; Slater 2013), which describes the evolution of a trait towards or around a stationary peak or optimum value, at a given evolutionary rate. Thus, multi-regime OU models can account for the existence of multiple macroevolutionary regimes (or adaptive zones, in the Simpsonian Adaptive Landscape paradigm). Even though many OU-based models typically require a priori adaptive hypotheses for inferring the trait optima of regimes (Butler King 2004), more recent methods attempt to solve this problem by estimating location, values and magnitudes of regime shifts without a priori designation of selective regimes (Ingram and Mahler 2013; Mahler and Ingram 2014; Uyeda and Harmon 2014). In particular, the SURFACE method (Ingram and Mahler 2013) aims to identify convergent adaptive zones by allowing regime shifts to occur and identifying convergent regimes using AICc (Akaike’s information criterion for finite sample sizes; Akaike 1974). Originally designated to identify convergent trait evolution across phylogenetic lineages, the SURFACE algorithm makes use of a multi-peak OU-model and can be a tool to determine heterogeneity of macroevolutionary landscapes (Mahler et al. 2013; Davis et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2018). In this Chapter, a model-fitting approach is employed to characterize the adaptive landscape of body size.
evolution in Crocodylomorpha. This represents the first comprehensive investigation of major body size evolutionary patterns across the entire evolutionary history of crocodylomorphs.

2.2. Material and Methods

2.2.1. Proxy for body size

Extinct Crocodylomorpha are morphologically diverse, and frequently known from incomplete remains. Therefore, precise estimation of their body sizes, and those of comparable fossil groups, can be challenging (see Brocklehurst [2016] and Young et al. [2016a] for related considerations). There are many methods and equations for estimating crocodylomorph body size (either body mass or length) available in the literature. The most frequently used equations are derived from linear regressions based on specimens of modern species, using both cranial (Webb and Messel 1978; Hall and Portier 1994; Sereno et al. 2001; Hurlburt et al. 2003; Platt et al. 2009; 2011) and postcranial (Bustard and Singh 1977; Farlow et al. 2005) measurements as proxies. Although some of these approaches have been claimed to work well when applied to extinct taxa (e.g., Farlow et al. 2005), they are expected to be less accurate for extinct species that have different body proportions to those of extant species (Young et al. 2011; Pol et al. 2012; Godoy et al. 2016; Young et al. 2016a). An alternative approach that has been suggested is to use clade-specific equations that are derived from regressions using fossil specimens with complete skeletons preserved, such as the recently proposed equations for estimating body length in the highly specialised marine clade Thalattosuchia (Young et al. 2011; 2016a). Nevertheless, using this approach for the entire Crocodylomorpha would require numerous different equations and, consequently, complete specimens for all desired subclades.
Campione and Evans (2012) demonstrated a universal scaling relationship between proximal (stylopodial) limb bone circumferences and the body masses of terrestrial tetrapods. For instance, their equations, using both femur and humerus circumference, have been applied to estimate body mass of fossil dinosaurs (e.g., Campione and Evans 2012; Campione et al. 2014; Benson et al. 2014b; Carballido et al. 2017; Benson et al. 2018). However, due to a historical neglect of crocodylomorph postcranial anatomy, especially for Mesozoic taxa (Godoy et al. 2016), relatively less information is available on this part of the skeleton. Based on data collected for the present study, total or partial skull lengths (i.e., complete skulls or lacking only the snouts) can be measured in fossil specimens of approximately 50% of crocodylomorph species, whereas femoral and humeral shaft circumferences or lengths can only be measured in 35% of species. This greatly reduces the number of taxa that can be sampled and limits the utility of using postcranial elements as a proxy for body size. Similar problems exist for other methods, such as the “Orthometric Linear Unit” proposed by Romer and Price (1940) that uses dorsal centrum cross section (Currie 1978), as well as volumetric reconstructions (e.g., Colbert 1962; Hurlburt 1999; Motani 2001; Bates et al. 2009; Sellers et al. 2012), since relatively complete postcranial specimens are required.

For studying body size across all crocodylomorph evolutionary history, it was necessary to find an appropriate body size proxy, allowing the sampling to be as comprehensive as possible. Thus, two cranial measurements were used as proxies for total body length: total dorsal cranial length (DCL) and dorsal orbito-cranial length (ODCL), which is measured from the anterior margin of the orbit to the posterior margin of the skull. Ultimately, using cranial measurements results in a study of the patterns of cranial size evolution in crocodylomorphs (instead of patterns of body size evolution). Nevertheless, by doing this, the addition of potential errors to the model-fitting analyses is avoided, since
previous works have reported problems when estimating total body length from cranial measurements, particularly skull length (Fig. 2.1), as the equations were formulated using modern species and different crocodylomorph clades are likely to have body proportions distinct from those of living taxa (e.g., Young et al. 2011; Godoy et al. 2016; Young et al. 2016a). Furthermore, the range of body sizes among living and extinct crocodylomorphs is considerably greater than variation among size estimates for single species. Therefore, it is expected that the analyses will recover the most important macroevolutionary body size changes even when using only cranial measurements. The use of ODCL, in addition to DCL, is justified as it allows to examine the sensitivity of the results to changes in proportional snout length, as a major aspect of length change in crocodylomorph skulls results from proportional elongation or shortening of the snout (Clark 1994; Pol and Gasparini 2009; Wilberg 2015). Also, more taxa could be included in the analyses when doing so, because ODCL can be measured from some incomplete skulls.

The DCL dataset includes 219 specimens (representing 178 taxa), whereas the ODCL dataset includes 240 specimens (195 taxa). In total, measurements from 118 specimens (83 taxa) were collected via first-hand examination from specimens, using callipers and measuring tape. The remaining information was collected from the literature (98 specimens) or photographs (21 specimens) supplied by other researchers, and measurements were estimated using the software ImageJ (for the complete list of sampled specimens see information in Appendix A). Mean values were used in those cases where cranial measurements were collected for multiple specimens of the same taxon. For both the model-fitting and correlation tests, skull measurements (in millimetres) were log-transformed prior to the analyses. However, to help with the further interpretation and discussion of the results,
total body length was subsequently estimated using the equations presented by Hurlburt et al. (2003).

Figure 2.1. Real total body length (measured from some complete fossil crocodylomorph specimens) plotted against total length estimated from the cranial measurements DCL (A) and ODCL (B) (equations from Hurlburt et al. [2003]), exemplifying the amount of error expected when using the two measurements to estimate total body length of crocodylomorphs. R² value illustrates the strength of the correlation between real and estimated total lengths. Colours represent different mono- or paraphyletic crocodylomorph groups. See Appendix A for information on the specimens used to construct these plots.

2.2.2. Phylogenetic framework

For the phylogenetic framework of Crocodylomorpha, the aim was to maximise taxon inclusion and to use a phylogenetic hypothesis that best represents the current consensus. Thus, an updated version of the supertree presented by Bronzati et al. (2015) was primarily used. This supertree, which originally contained 245 taxa, was manually modified (“informal approach”) using the software Mesquite version 3.51 (Maddison and Maddison 2018). Apart from modifications seeking to maximise congruence of the tree with the current understanding of the phylogeny of the group, some recently published species were also
added, and taxa that have not yet received a formal description and designation were removed. Species not previously included in phylogenetic studies but for which body size data was available were also added to the supertree.

The supertree presented by Bronzati et al. (2015) is restricted to Crocodyliformes, which is less inclusive than Crocodylomorpha. Thus, non-crocodyliform crocodylomorphs taxa were added, following the phylogenetic hypotheses presented by Pol et al. (2013) and Leardi et al. (2017). Within Crocodyliformes, as in Bronzati et al. (2015) and other recent studies (e.g., Andrade et al. 2011; Montefeltro et al. 2013; Pol et al. 2014; Turner and Pritchard 2015; Buscalioni 2017), taxa classically associated to “Protosuchia” are paraphyletically arranged in relation to Mesoeucrocodylia, with less inclusive subgroups displayed following Bronzati et al. (2015). Accordingly, Hsisosuchus is the sister-group of Mesoeucrocodylia (as in Clark 2011; Pol et al. 2014; Buscalioni 2017) and the following groups represent taxa successively more distant from Mesoeucrocodylia: Shartegosuchidae (Clark 2011); an unnamed clade composed by taxa such as Sichuanosuchus and Shantungosuchus; an unnamed clade composed by Zaraasuchus and Gobiosuchus (Pol et al. 2014); Protosuchidae (Clark 2011; Pol et al. 2014; Turner and Pritchard 2015).

Within Mesoeucrocodylia, Notosuchia corresponds to the sister group of all the other mesoeucrocodylians (= Neosuchia in our topology), similar to what is presented by Andrade et al. (2011), Pol et al. (2014), and Turner and Pritchard (2015). Yet, Notosuchia comprises forms such as baurusuchids, sebecosuchians, peirosaurids, sphagesaurids, uruguaysuchids, and Araripesuchus. The relationships among taxa within Notosuchia follow the general arrangement presented by Pol et al. (2014).

One of the branches at the basal split of Neosuchia leads to a clade composed by longirostrine forms, which includes Thalattosuchia and Tethysuchia (i.e., Dyrosauridae and

The sister-group of the longirostrine clade mentioned above contains Eusuchia and its closest relatives such as Atoposauridae and Goniopholididae. The latter is depicted as the sister group of Eusuchia, whereas the former corresponds to the sister group of Eusuchia + Goniopholididae. This arrangement follows that recovered in Pol et al. (2014) and Bronzati et al. (2015). Regarding the internal relationships of Goniopholididae, the hypotheses of Martin et al. (2016) and Ristevski et al. (2018) were followed. For Atoposauridae, the arrangements presented by Tennant et al. (2016a) and Schwarz et al. (2017) were followed. For Paralligatoridae and Susisuchidae, the phylogenetic hypotheses of Turner (2015) and Turner and Pritchard (2015) were followed.

In relation to non-crocodylian eusuchians, the topology of Bronzati et al. (2015) was primarily followed, with modifications to accommodate the arrangements proposed by Turner (2015) and Turner and Pritchard (2015) within Paralligatoridae and Susisuchidae. The topology of Narváez et al. (2015) was followed regarding the interrelationships of the crown-group, as well as the position of Hylaeochampsidae + Allodaposuchidae as the sister group of Crocodylia. For the relationships within the crown-group, Brochu (2012), Brochu et al. (2012), Scheyer et al. (2013), and Narváez et al. (2015) were followed.

The final updated version of this supertree contains 296 crocodylomorph species, as well as nine closely related taxa used as outgroups for time-scaling the trees (see below).
Additionally, to accommodate major uncertainties in the crocodylomorph phylogeny, two other supertrees were constructed, with alternative positions of Thalattosuchia.

Thalattosuchians are Jurassic–Early Cretaceous aquatic crocodylomorphs, some of which were probably fully marine (Herrera et al. 2017). They have classically been placed within Neosuchia, as the sister taxon of Tethysuchia (Pol and Gasparini 2009). Nevertheless, some authors have argued that this close relationship may result from the convergent acquisition of longirostrine snouts in both groups (Clark 1994; Jouve et al. 2006), and some recent works have suggested alternative positions for Thalattosuchia, within or as the sister group of Crocodyliformes (i.e., only distantly related to Neosuchia; Young and Andrade 2009; Montefeltro et al. 2013; Turner 2015; Wilberg 2015).

Accordingly, to test the influence of uncertainty over the phylogenetic position of Thalattosuchia, the macroevolutionary analyses were performed using three distinct topologies of Crocodylomorpha (Fig. 2.2). In the first topology, the more classic position of Thalattosuchia was maintained (Thalattosuchia as the sister taxon of Tethysuchia and within Neosuchia; as in the original supertrees of Bronzati et al. (2012; 2015). In the two alternative topologies, Thalattosuchia was placed as the sister group of either Crocodyliformes (as non-crocodyliform crocodylomorphs), following the position proposed by Wilberg (2015), or Mesoeucrocodylia, following Larsson and Sues (2007) and Montefeltro et al. (2013). It is worth stressing that discrepancies among competing phylogenetic hypotheses do not concern only the “longirostrine problem” described above. However, the decision to further investigate only the impact of the different positions of Thalattosuchia is based on its high taxic diversity and the impact that its phylogenetic position has on branch lengths across multiple parts of the tree, factors that can substantially alter macroevolutionary patterns detected by the analyses.
Figure 2.2. Simplified cladogram showing the phylogenetic relationships among crocodylomorphs and the alternative positions of Thalattosuchia (dashed red lines), following Larsson and Sues (2007), Bronzati et al. (2012; 2015), Montefeltro et al. (2013), and Wilberg (2015). Silhouettes of crocodylomorph representatives in figures are from illustrations by Dmitry Bogdanov, Smokeybjb, and Nobumichi Tamura, hosted at Phylopic (http://phylopic.org), where license information is available.

2.2.3. Time-calibration

To perform the macroevolutionary analyses, it was necessary to time-calibrate the phylogenies, assigning ages to both terminal taxa and nodes (Bapst 2014a). This is a crucial step in comparative analyses of trait evolution, as the use of different methods may impact upon the inference of evolutionary models and the interpretation of results (Bapst 2013; 2014b). As such, three different time-scaling methods were used, each one with benefits and drawbacks. For these methods, ages (first and last occurrence dates) were initially obtained.
from the Paleobiology Database (PBDB), but were then checked using primary sources in the literature. To accommodate uncertainties related to the ages of terminal taxa (i.e., most taxon ages are based on single occurrences, known only within rather imprecise bounds), first and last occurrence dates were treated as maximum and minimum possible ages and drew terminal dates for time-calibration from a uniform distribution between these.

The first time-scaling method used was the minimum branch length method (mbl; Laurin 2004), in which a minimum branch duration is set a priori, to avoid the presence of undesirable and unrealistic zero-length branches (Bapst 2014a, b). For the analyses within this Chapter, the minimum of 1 Myr was set. Additionally, two recently introduced probabilistic time-scaling methods were also used. The cal3 is a stochastic calibration method that requires estimates of sampling and diversification (branching and extinction) rates to draw likely divergence dates under a birth–death-sampling model (Bapst 2013; Lloyd et al. 2016). The fact that most crocodylomorph taxa are singletons (i.e., very few genera or species have multiple occurrences in different time intervals) prevented the direct calculation of speciation, extinction and sampling rates needed as inputs to the cal3 method. Thus, when using this time-scaling method for the analyses within this Chapter, the same rates estimated for dinosaurs in Lloyd et al. (2016) were adopted (i.e., extinction and speciation rates = 0.935; sampling rate = 0.018), which used the apparent range-frequency distribution of dinosaurs in the PBDB for these estimates. Although essentially different from that of dinosaurs, the crocodylomorph fossil record is arguably comparable enough to result in similar rates, and a posteriori comparison to other time-scaling methods demonstrated that results were reasonable. The last time-scaling method used was the extended Hedman method, proposed by Lloyd et al. (2016), which is an expansion of the Bayesian approach presented by Hedman (2010), that uses the ages of successive outgroup taxa relative to the age of the node of
interest to date this node by sampling from uniform distributions (Lloyd et al. 2016; Brocklehurst 2017).

Since the input phylogenies were not completely resolved (i.e., the three alternative topologies of the supertree), the polytomies were randomly resolved, generating 20 completely resolved trees for each alternative phylogenetic scenario (i.e., with different positions of Thalattosuchia). These trees were then time-scaled using the three time-calibration methods. Time-scaling with the mbl and cal3 methods were performed using the package paleotree (Bapst 2012) in R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2018), whilst the Hedman method was implemented also in R, using the protocol published by Lloyd et al. (2016).

2.2.4. Macroevolutionary analyses

A model-fitting approach was applied to characterize patterns of body size evolution in Crocodylomorpha, with an emphasis on evolutionary models based on the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process (Hansen 1997; Butler and King 2004; Ingram and Mahler 2013; Slater 2013; Benson et al. 2018). The first formulation of an OU-based model was proposed by Hansen (1997), to incorporate Felsenstein’s (1988) suggestion of using the Ornstein-Uhlenbeck (OU) process as a basis for comparative studies (Butler and King 2004; Beaulieu et al. 2012). OU-based models (also known as “Hansen” models) express the dynamics of a quantitative trait evolving along the branches of a phylogeny as the result of stochastic variation around a trait “optimum” (expressed as theta: θ), towards which trait values are deterministically attracted (the strength of attraction is given by alpha: α). The constant σ², describes the stochastic spread of the trait values over time (i.e., under a Brownian motion process). Accordingly, the OU model can be formulated as:
\[ dX(t) = \alpha [\theta - X(t)] \, dt + \sigma dB(t) \]

This equation expresses the amount of change in trait \( X \) during the infinitesimal time interval from \( t \) to \( t + dt \). As expressed above, the formulation includes a term describing trait attraction towards \( \theta \), which is the product of \( \alpha \) and the difference between \( X(t) \) and \( \theta \). The term \( \sigma dB(t) \) describes stochastic evolution in the form of Brownian motion (BM), with random variables of mean zero and variance of \( dt \) (thus, \( \sigma^2 \) is the rate of stochastic evolution). In this sense, if \( \alpha \) is zero, the attraction term becomes zero, and the result is evolution by BM as a special case of OU (Butler and King 2004; Slater 2013; Benson et al. 2018). The OU model can also simulate trait evolution patterns similar to that observed under other evolutionary models, such as BM with a trend incorporated, and “white noise” or stasis (Hansen 1997; Slater 2013; Benson et al. 2018). Thus, the parameters of the OU model are crucial for interpreting the mode of evolution (Hansen 1997; Butler and King 2004). For example, the estimated ancestral trait value (i.e., the value of \( \theta \) at the root of the tree) is given by the parameter \( Z_0 \). Also, the time taken for a new macroevolutionary regime to become more influential than the ancestral regime (i.e., how long it takes to \( \theta \) to be more influential than \( Z_0 \)) can be obtained by calculating \( \ln(2)/\alpha \). This parameter is often called the phylogenetic half-life (or \( t_{0.5} \)).

Among the methods that attempt to model adaptive evolution under the framework of an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (e.g., Harmon et al. 2008; Beaulieu et al. 2012; Uyeda and Harmon 2014), the SURFACE algorithm (Ingram and Mahler 2013) estimates the fit of a non-uniform OU-based model by allowing shifts in trait optima (\( \theta \)) among macroevolutionary regimes. SURFACE locates regime shifts using stepwise AICc (Akaike’s information criterion for finite sample sizes; Akaike 1974; Sugiura 1978; Burnham and Anderson 2003),
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with a forward phase (that searches for all regime shifts in the phylogeny) and a backward phase (in which improvements of AICc scores merge similar regimes, detecting convergent evolution). Although it allows $\theta$ to vary among regimes, SURFACE assumes fixed whole-tree values of $\sigma^2$ and $\alpha$ (Ingram and Mahler 2013).

The performance of two different OU-based models was compared, one with a single trait optimum or a single macroevolutionary regime (“OU model”) and another non-uniform model with multiple regimes (“SURFACE model”). To test if other macroevolutionary models could provide a better description of the observed patterns of crocodylomorph body size evolution, these OU-based models were also compared to other BM-based models. First, the diffusion by Brownian motion (BM model), which assumes evolution via random walks, with a constant normally distributed deviation from the observed morphology, resulting in no directional trend in trait mean, but with increasing trait variance through time (Felsenstein 1985; Hunt and Carrano 2010; Hunt 2012; Slater 2013). Second, the “early burst” (EB model; also known as “ACDC model”; Blomberg et al. 2003), in which the lineages experience an initial maximum in evolutionary rate of change, that decreases exponentially through time according to the parameter $r$ (Harmon et al. 2010). This results in a rapid increase of trait variance in the early evolution of the lineages, followed by a deceleration (Blomberg et al. 2003; Harmon et al. 2010).

Finally, a set of uniform and non-uniform trend-like models were also fitted to the data. In the uniform “trend” model (i.e., with a single regime), the parameter $\mu$ is incorporated into the BM model to describe directional multi-lineage increase or decrease in trait values through time, in the entire clade (Pagel 2002; Hunt and Carrano 2010; Hunt 2012). Non-uniform “trend” models allow for shifts in the parameter $\mu$, which can be explored in two different ways according to the formulations of non-uniform trend models formulated by G.
Hunt and presented in Benson et al. (2018): temporal shifts in \( \mu \) (“time-shift trend models”) or shifts in \( \mu \) at specific nodes of the tree (“node-shift trend models”). In time-shift trend models, evolutionary dynamics are uniform across all branches alive during each interval. Shifts to a new value of \( \mu \) occurs at time-horizons and are applied to all lineages alive at that time. In node-shift trend models, values of \( \mu \) can vary among lineages. In a similar approach to the forward phase of SURFACE, the shifts in these non-uniform trend-like models are detected via stepwise AICc. In both time-shift and node-shift models, the Brownian variance (\( \sigma^2 \)) is constant across all regimes (Benson et al. 2018). For the macroevolutionary analyses with the entire crocodylomorph phylogeny, trend-like models allowing up to three time-shifts and ten node-shifts to occur were fitted.

Then, a set of exploratory analyses were performed to test which of these evolutionary models (SURFACE, OU, BM, EB and trend-like models) offered the best fit to the data, using the different time-scaling methods (\textit{mbl}, \textit{cal3} and \textit{Hedman} methods) and both log-transformed cranial measurements (DCL and ODCL). To reduce the computational demands, only 20 randomly resolved trees of the original supertree topology were used (with Thalattosuchia positioned traditionally within Neosuchia). The aim was to compare the performance of the OU-based models, particularly the SURFACE model, against the other evolutionary models, but also to evaluate possible influences of the different time-scaling methods and body size proxies. Maximum-likelihood was employed to fit these models to body size data and the phylogeny of Crocodylomorpha, and AICc scores were used to compare the performance of each model.

Previous works suggested caution when fitting OU models in comparative analyses (e.g., Ho and Ané 2014; Cooper et al. 2016). The issue of “large \( p \) small \( n \)” when using multi-regime OU models, demonstrated by Ho and Ané (2014), can result in false positives and
spurious support to more complex models (Khabbazian et al. 2016; Benson et al. 2018). This
issue may be reduced when using non-ultrametric trees (as done here), as this improves
identifiability of the parameters of OU models (Slater 2013; Ho and Ané 2014). Another
approach would be using the phylogenetic Bayesian information criterion (“pBIC”), proposed
by Khabbazian et al. (2016), as an alternative to using AICc for selecting the best fit. Ho and
Ané (2014) demonstrated that AICc is biased towards model overfit and suggested using
pBIC, a modified Bayesian information criterion (mBIC; Zhang and Siegmund 2007), which
is more conservative and has low rates of false positive identification of OU model regime
shifts (Khabbazian et al. 2016; Benson et al. 2018). The pBIC criterion is still not
implemented for all evolutionary models used in this Chapter, which prevents its usage for the
comparative model-fitting analyses. However, pBIC was used during the backward phases of
SURFACE model searches, to ensure that artefactually complex models were not returned.

Following these exploratory analyses, the analyses focused on the SURFACE model,
as the AICc scores indicated that this evolutionary model outperforms the others (see the
“Results” section of this Chapter). This second phase of analyses made use of all three
alternative phylogenetic scenarios (varying the position of Thalattosuchia) to test the
influence of phylogeny in interpretations of evolutionary regimes for body size in
Crocodylomorpha. SURFACE models were fitted to 20 randomly resolved trees from each of
these alternative topologies, using three different time-scaling methods (mbl, cal3 and
Hedman methods) and two log-transformed cranial measurements (DCL and ODCL). As
before, a conservative backward-phase of SURFACE was implemented, with pBIC searches
instead of AICc.

Two well-recognized crocodylomorph subclades, Notosuchia and Crocodylia, returned
a high frequency of macroevolutionary regime shifts, representing an apparently complex
evolutionary history under the SURFACE paradigm. However, SURFACE fits a single value of $\alpha$ to all regimes, and therefore could overestimate the strength of evolutionary constraint within regimes, and consequently miscalculate the number of distinct regimes within clades showing more relaxed patterns of trait evolution. This possibility was investigated by fitting the initial set of evolutionary models (SURFACE, OU, BM, EB and trend-like models) to the phylogenies of these two subclades (using 100 randomly resolved trees of each group, time-scaled with the mbl method) and their body size data (using only the ODCL dataset, since it includes more species). Differently from what was done for the entire crocodylomorph phylogeny, trend-like models fitted to Notosuchia allowed up to 2 time-shifts and 5 node-shifts to occur, whereas for Crocodylia 3 time-shifts and 7 node-shifts were allowed to occur (given that these two clades include fewer species and fewer shifts are expected, and that models with an exceeding number of shifts usually receive weaker support). In addition, for these same clades, the OUwie model-fitting algorithm was also employed (Beaulieu et al. 2012), fitting different BM and OU-based models which allow all key parameters to vary freely (since SURFACE allows only $\theta$ to vary, whereas it assumes fixed values of $\sigma^2$ and $\alpha$ for the entire tree). However, differently from SURFACE, OUwie needs a priori information on the location of regime shifts in order to be implemented. Thus, the same regime shifts identified by SURFACE were incorporated into the data (phylogenetic and body size data) to fit four additional evolutionary models using the OUwie algorithm: BMS, which is a multi-regime BM model that allows the rate parameter $\sigma^2$ to vary; OUMV, a multi-regime OU-based model that allows $\sigma^2$ and the trait optimum $\theta$ to vary; OUMA, also a multi-regime OU model, in which $\theta$ and the constraint parameter $\alpha$ can vary; and OUMVA, in which all three parameters ($\theta$, $\alpha$ and $\sigma^2$) can vary. Since computing all these parameters estimates can be an intensively demanding task (Beaulieu et al. 2012), some of the model fits returned
nonsensical values and were, therefore, discarded. Nonsensical values were identified by searching for extremely disparate parameter estimates, among all 100 model fits (e.g., some model fits found $\sigma^2$ values higher than 100,000,000 and $\alpha$ lower than 0.00000001).

All macroevolutionary analyses were performed in R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2018). Macroevolutionary models BM, trend, EB, and OU with a single regime were fitted using the R package geiger (Harmon et al. 2008). The SURFACE model fits were performed with package surface (Ingram and Mahler 2013). Implementation of pBIC functions in the backward-phase of SURFACE model fits, as well as the functions for fitting non-uniform trend-like models, were possible with scripts presented by Benson et al. (2018). The additional model-fitting analyses, using the OUwie algorithm, were implemented with the package OUwie (Beaulieu and O’Meara 2016).

2.2.5. Correlation with abiotic factors

To test whether abiotic environmental factors could be driving the evolution and distribution of body sizes in crocodylomorphs, environmental information was extracted from the literature. As a proxy for palaeotemperature, $\delta^{18}$O data from two different sources was used. The dataset from Zachos et al. (2008) assembles benthic foraminifera isotopic values from the Late Cretaceous (Maastrichtian) to the Recent. The work of Prokoph et al. (2008) compiled sea surface isotopic values from a range of marine organisms. Their dataset is divided into subsets representing palaeolatitudinal bands. For the analyses in this Chapter, two subsets were used: the temperate palaeolatitudinal subset, which extends from the Jurassic to the Recent, as well as the tropical palaeolatitudinal subset, which extends back to the Cambrian. For the correlation analyses, 10 Myr time bins were used (see Appendix A for information about the time bins), by taking the time-weighted mean $\delta^{18}$O for data points that fall within
each time bin. For the body size data used in the correlation tests, maximum and mean size values were calculated for each time bin, using both DCL and ODCL datasets. Correlations between the body size data and the proxies for palaeotemperature were first assessed using ordinary least squares (OLS) regressions. Then, to avoid potential inflation of correlation coefficients created by temporal autocorrelation (the correlation of a variable with itself through successive data points), a first-order autoregressive model was incorporated to generalised least squares (GLS) regressions (see e.g., Hunt et al. 2005; Marx and Uhen 2010; Benson and Butler 2011; Mannion et al. 2015). Furthermore, to test the possible differential influence of temperature on marine versus continental (terrestrial and freshwater) animals, two additional body size data subsets were created, one with only marine and another with only non-marine crocodylomorphs.

Additionally, palaeolatitudinal data was collected, from the PBDB and the literature, for every specimen in the datasets (DCL and ODCL datasets). The correlation between this palaeolatitudinal data and the body size data was first tested by applying OLS regressions to untransformed data. Then, to deal with possible biases generated by phylogenetic dependency, phylogenetic generalized least squares regressions (PGLS; Martins and Hansen 1997) were used. For this, branch length transformations were optimised between bounds with maximum likelihood using Pagel’s $\lambda$ (Pagel 1999), by setting the argument $\lambda = “ML”$ within in the function $ppls()$ of the R package caper (Orme et al. 2018). As for the correlation analyses between body size data and palaeotemperature, the datasets were also divided into two subsets each (only marine and only non-marine taxa).

Finally, to explore the effects of these two abiotic factors on the distribution of body sizes at more restricted levels (temporal and phylogenetic), all these regression analyses were repeated using subsets including only species of Crocodylia, Notosuchia, Thalattosuchia, and
Tethysuchia. For crocodylians, correlations with paleotemperature were restricted to the Maastrichtian until the Recent (i.e., data from Zachos et al. 2008). All correlation analyses used log-transformed cranial measurements (DCL and ODCL) in millimetres and were performed in R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2018). GLS regressions with an autoregressive model were carried out using the package nlme (Pinheiro et al. 2017), whereas PGLS regressions used the package caper (Orme et al. 2018).

2.3. Results

2.3.1. Comparative model-fitting analyses

Comparisons between the AICc scores for all the evolutionary models fitted to the crocodylomorph body size data (Fig. 2.3) show extremely strong support for the SURFACE model (note that lower AICc values indicate higher support). This is observed for all timescaling methods (mbl, cal3 and Hedman methods) and both body size proxies (DCL and ODCL). All uniform models exhibit relatively similar AICc scores, including the OU model with a single macroevolutionary regime, and all of these have poor support compared to the SURFACE model. Node-shift trend models received higher support than both uniform and time-shift trend models for most phylogenies, but have AICc values that are more similar to the set of uniform models than to the SURFACE models. Single-regime OU models only have better AICc scores than multi-trend models when trees are time-scaled with the mbl method. Even the best trend-like model (usually the models with six or seven node-shifts) have significantly weaker support than SURFACE, regardless of the time-calibration method (see Appendix A for a complete list of AICc scores, including for all trend-like models).

Based on the extremely strong support found for the SURFACE model, as well as on the capability of the SURFACE algorithm to locate the regime shifts across the phylogeny
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(Ingram and Mahler 2013), the subsequent analyses focused on the SURFACE model fits, to characterize in more detail the patterns of crocodylomorph body size macroevolution.

Figure 2.3. AICc scores of the evolutionary models fitted to crocodylomorph phylogeny and body size data. Results shown for two cranial measurement datasets (ODCL in the left column and DCL in the right one), as well as using three different methods to time-calibrate 20 randomly resolved phylogenies of Crocodylomorpha: (A) mbl, (B) Hedman, and (C) cal3 methods. For the trend-like models, only the AICc of the best model (“best trend”) is shown.
2.3.2. Appraising the SURFACE model fits

Aiming to minimise the problem of biased AICc support for more complex models (see Ho and Ané 2014; Khabbazian et al. 2016), two rounds of SURFACE model fits were implemented: one using the original algorithm (Ingram and Mahler 2013), with stepwise AICc searches in the two phases of SURFACE; and another using a modified version of the SURFACE algorithm presented by Benson et al. (2018), which uses pBIC searches in the backward-phase. This latter approach is more conservative and potentially should be able to indicate when overly complex models are being inappropriately supported, since the input trees used for this alternative implementation of SURFACE were the same as those used for the model fits with the original algorithm (i.e., with AICc searches only). Comparisons between the SURFACE results using pBIC and only AICc show that, in almost all cases, identical model fits are found for the same trees, with the same parameter estimates (Table 2.1). For the very few trees in which this is not true, the models are still very similar, with only minimal differences in the parameter values, mainly in θ values. This pattern was maintained when using any time-scaling method, cranial measurement or tree topology, indicating that the SURFACE model fits are not erroneously complex.
Table 2.1. Parameter estimates from some of the SURFACE model fits, using both stepwise search algorithms: full-AICc searches and backward-phase of SURFACE with pBIC searches. Model fits of the first ten trees (using the ODCL dataset, the mbl time-scaling method and with Thalattosuchia within Neosuchia). Z_0 values in log_{10} millimetres. “Number of regimes” represents the number of main (“convergent”) regimes for each model fit. See Appendix A for plots of all SURFACE model fits, containing information about parameter estimates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree number</th>
<th>Parameter estimates full-AICc searches</th>
<th>pBIC in the backward-phase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>α</td>
<td>σ^2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.217</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>16.06</td>
<td>0.418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SURFACE model fits exhibit a strong correlation between AICc/pBIC scores and the number of macroevolutionary regime shifts (Fig. 2.4; see Appendix A for plots of all SURFACE model fits). In general, model fits with lower (i.e., better) AICc/pBIC values tend to have more regime shifts. In other words, more complex models seem to be favoured by better AICc/pBIC values. Additionally, apart from higher (i.e., worse) AICc/pBIC values, simpler SURFACE model fits also tend to exhibit lower α values. Thus, simpler model fits are
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classified by high-AICc/pBIC scores and low values of \( \alpha \). Because the same randomly
resolved tree topologies were used for each of the time-scaling methods (mbl, cal3 and
Hedman), it was possible to compare the SURFACE model fits of these same trees obtained
across different branch-length calibration methods, by calculating pBIC scores (e.g.,
calculating the pBIC score the regime configuration obtained from analysis of the cal3-
calibrated tree on the mbl-calibrated tree; see Appendix A for all cross plotting of SURFACE
model fits on trees using different time-scaling methods). This shows that many of the
simplest SURFACE model fits are suboptimal (i.e., received worse pBIC scores) compared to
more complex regime configurations obtained during searches on trees with different branch-
lengths (Table 2.2). The simple models returned by some searches therefore represent failure
of the stepwise-AICc search to find the best regime configuration and are consequently not
considered when the macroevolutionary patterns of body size in crocodylomorphs are
described. Suboptimal model fits were more frequent on topologies with Thalattosuchia
placed as the sister group of Crocodyliformes, particularly when time-scaled using mbl and
cal3 methods. Although a full explanation cannot be provided for why the frequency of
suboptimal model fits varied among topologies with alternative positions of Thalattosuchia, it
is expected that AIC procedures face difficulties when finding the best fits for complex
datasets (Burnham et al. 2011), even when using pBIC. However, the SURFACE model fits
represent a useful simplification of major patterns of body size evolution in a group, and
particularly the shifts of average body sizes among clades on the phylogeny. In this respect,
they provide an overview of crocodylomorph body size evolution that is otherwise lacking
from current literature.
Figure 2.4. AICc (left) and pBIC (right) plotted against the number of regime shifts of SURFACE model fits, using crocodylomorph topologies with alternative positions of Thalattosuchia: A and B, Thalattosuchia within Neosuchia; C and D, Thalattosuchia as the sister group of Crocodyliformes; E and F, Thalattosuchia as the sister group of Mesoeucrocodylia. Numbers represent the 20 randomly resolved trees (time-calibrated using the mbl method) used for each model fit. Body size data from the ODCL dataset only.
Table 2.2. Examples of comparisons between simpler and more complex SURFACE model fits for the same trees. pBIC scores were obtained for regime configuration mapped onto trees with the same topology but using different time-calibration methods. By doing this, it was possible to compare the pBIC scores between simpler and more complex SURFACE model fits. Model fits shown are for trees with Thalattosuchia as the sister group of Crocodyliformes and using body size data from the ODCL dataset only. See Appendix A for all cross plotting of regime configurations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tree number and original time-scaling method</th>
<th>pBIC scores</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Simple model</td>
<td>Complex model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>mbl fit on mbl tree</td>
<td>Hedman fit on mbl tree</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree 3 (mbl-calibrated)</td>
<td>-130.2</td>
<td>-158.9*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree 3 (cal3-calibrated)</td>
<td>-139.1</td>
<td>-157*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree 4 (cal3-calibrated)</td>
<td>-132.6</td>
<td>-133.8*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree 5 (mbl-calibrated)</td>
<td>-105.7</td>
<td>-133.5*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree 6 (mbl-calibrated)</td>
<td>-130.1</td>
<td>-160.4*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree 7 (Hedman-calibrated)</td>
<td>-164.9*</td>
<td>-152.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The SURFACE analyses using different body size proxies (DCL and ODCL) and time-scaling methods (mbl, cal3 and Hedman methods) enabled the assessment of the influence of these factors on the SURFACE results. First, in general, alternative time-scaling methods did not cause substantial modifications to the SURFACE model fits in terms of
numbers of regimes or parameter values. However, as these methods generate different
divergence times, branch lengths and ages estimated for the origin of subclades are expected
to be distinct. Comparatively, while the Hedman method tended to estimate arguably too old
ages for the origins of some clades (estimating, for example, the origin of the crown-group to
be as old as the Late Jurassic compared to the Late Cretaceous ages of the oldest known
unequivocal crocodylians), trees that used the cal3 method often included branches with
lengths very close to zero. Furthermore, trees that were time-scaled using cal3 recovered
comparatively more suboptimal SURFACE model fits than those that used the other two
methods. Thus, the SURFACE model fits with trees calibrated using the mbl method were
favoured when describing and discussing the SURFACE results (even though those model fits
generated using the other two methods were not completely discarded).

Second, comparable results are found across model fits with different cranial
measurements (DCL and ODCL) when using the same time-scaling methods and tree
topologies. Although there are slightly more suboptimal model fits when using the DCL
dataset, there is not enough evidence to support the idea that the use of a different cranial
measurement is causing this pattern, as due to taxon sampling the phylogenetic trees used for
fitting models using DCL and ODCL are different. However, in order to minimise the number
of model fits used to characterise crocodylomorph body size evolution, the results obtained
from the ODCL dataset were favoured for the description of the macroevolutionary patterns,
as this dataset includes more species than the DCL, and it usually provides more realistic
estimated body size values (for θ and Z₀) when using the equations presented by Hurlburt et
al. (2003).

The position of Thalattosuchia had an influence on the range of the attraction
parameter (α), which is a whole-tree, fixed parameter in the SURFACE model fits. When
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Thalattosuchia is placed as the sister taxon of Crocodyliformes, the lowest values of $\alpha$ were obtained (ranging from 0.0072 to 0.1399), perhaps reflecting the more frequent suboptimal model fits for this scenario, and consequently the highest phylogenetic half-lives ($t_{0.5} = 4.95$ to 95.99 Myr). In the other two alternative scenarios (i.e., Thalattosuchia either within Neosuchia or as the sister group of Mesoeucrocodylia), comparable values of $\alpha$ were found, ranging from 0.0136 to 0.6595, with considerably shorter phylogenetic half-lives ($t_{0.5} = 1.05$ to 50.89 Myr).

2.3.3. Describing the body size macroevolutionary patterns in Crocodylomorpha

The SURFACE model fits were used to describe patterns of crocodylomorph body size evolution, focusing on the best model fits from the analyses implemented with pBIC searches (i.e., the low-pBIC/high-$\alpha$ model class), using body size data from the ODCL dataset and trees time-calibrated mainly (but not only) with the mbl method (see Appendix A for plots of all SURFACE model fits). Most SURFACE model fits identified more than four main macroevolutionary regimes (with different $\theta$ values). These are distributed along crocodylomorph phylogeny by means of numerous regime shifts, usually more than 15, independently of the position of Thalattosuchia. Trait optima values for these regimes varied significantly among different crocodylomorph subclades and are described in detail below. Overall, regime shifts are frequently detected at the bases of well-recognised clades, such as Thalattosuchia, Notosuchia and Crocodylia. Nevertheless, shifts to new regimes are not restricted to the origins of these diverse clades, since many other regime shifts are observed across crocodylomorph phylogeny, including regimes containing only a single species.

The SURFACE results indicate an ancestral regime of small body sizes for Crocodylomorpha, regardless of the topology or time-scaling method used (Figs. 2.5, 2.6, and
This is consistent with the small body sizes of most non-crocodilyiform crocodylomorphs such as *Litargosuchus leptorhynchus* and *Hesperosuchus agilis* (Clark et al. 2000; Clark and Sues 2002). Trait optima for this initial regime ($Z_0$) ranged from 66 to 100 cm (total body length was estimated only after the SURFACE model fits, based on the equation from Hurlburt et al. [2003]; see the “Material and Methods” section of this Chapter). Very few or no regime shifts are observed among non-crocodilyiform crocodylomorphs (Figs. 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7B), except for when Thalattosuchia is placed outside Crocodyliformes (Fig. 2.7A). But even in this latter case, shifts are seen only within or at the base of Thalattosuchia. For example, some trees time-scaled with *mbl* (tree number 11; Fig. 2.7B) and *cal3* (trees number 13 and 15) methods show a Late Triassic regime shift towards much larger body lengths ($θ = 560–880$ cm) at the base of Thalattosuchia, but many model fits that used these methods also exhibit much simpler models, with very few regime shifts. When using the *Hedman* method, however, a shift at the base of Thalattosuchia is more frequently observed, in many cases representing the oldest regime shift in the evolutionary history of Crocodylomorpha, and the only one to occur before the Triassic-Jurassic boundary (although the oldest thalattosuchian fossils only occur in the Early Jurassic). Regardless of the position of Thalattosuchia, the ancestral regime of all crocodylomorphs ($Z_0$) was inherited by protosuchids (such as *Protosuchus, Orthosuchus,* and *Edentosuchus*) and some other non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodyliforms (e.g., *Shantungosuchus, Fruitachampsa, Sichuanosuchus* and *Gobiosuchus*).
Figure 2.5. SURFACE model fit (using pBIC searches in the backward-phase) of tree number 10 among crocodylomorph topologies with Thalattosuchia placed within Neosuchia, using the ODCL dataset and time-calibrated with the mbl method. Attraction to unrealized low or high trait optima are highlighted in blue and red, respectively. Model fits of trees sharing the same position of Thalattosuchia show very similar regime configurations, regardless of the dataset used (ODCL or DCL) and the time-calibration method (see Appendix A for all SURFACE plots).
Patterns of body size evolution at the base of Mesoeucrocodylia are influenced by the position of Thalattosuchia. In nearly all model fits with Thalattosuchia within Neosuchia (Figs. 2.5 and 2.6), a regime of smaller body sizes ($\theta = 130–230$ cm) is observed at the base of the branch leading to Mesoeucrocodylia, with the same regime frequently inherited by the branches leading to both Notosuchia and Neosuchia. When thalattosuchians are placed as the sister group of Crocodyliformes, a similar pattern is observed in most trees time-scaled with the Hedman method, but also in trees number 13 and 15 with the cal3 method, and number 11 (Fig. 2.7A) with the mbl method. With Thalattosuchia as the sister group of all the other mesoeucrocodylians (i.e., Notosuchia + Neosuchia), most trees exhibit a change to a regime of larger sizes ($\theta = 210–490$ cm) occurring at the branch leading to Mesoeucrocodylia (Fig. 2.7B), although some model fits (e.g., trees number 5, 8, 10, and 16 using all time-scaling methods) show no shift at the base Mesoeucrocodylia (i.e., inheriting the same regime as non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodyliforms). When a change at the base of Mesoeucrocodylia is observed, this same regime is usually inherited by Neosuchia, and shifts to regimes of smaller sizes ($\theta = 66–140$ cm) are subsequently seen either at the base of or within Notosuchia.
Figure 2.6. A, SURFACE model fit (using pBIC searches in the backward-phase) of tree number 16 among crocodylomorph topologies with Thalattosuchia placed within Neosuchia, using the ODCL dataset and time-calibrated with the mbl method. Attraction to unrealized low or high trait optima are highlighted in blue and red, respectively. B, Simplified version of (A) with independent multi-taxon regimes collapsed to single branches.
The position of Thalattosuchia also has an impact on the configuration of regime shifts among non-eusuchian neosuchians. The regime of relatively smaller sizes at the base of Mesoeucrocodylia is maintained at the base of Neosuchia in most model fits of trees with Thalattosuchia within Neosuchia (Fig. 2.5 and 2.6). Subsequently, regime shifts towards larger sizes ($\theta = 210–500$ cm) are seen among some taxa such as goniopholidids, *Agaresuchus* and *Alloposuchus*, whereas shifts to regimes of smaller $\theta$ values (41–140 cm) are also detected in branches associated with small taxa (e.g., atoposaurids, susisuchids and *Pietraroiasuchus*). More complex models of trees with Thalattosuchia placed as the sister group of Crocodyliformes (e.g., tree 11, using the mbl method; Fig. 2.7A) show the same pattern. Comparatively, when Thalattosuchia is placed as the sister taxon of Mesoeucrocodylia (Fig. 2.7B), the regime of larger sizes seen at the base of Neosuchia is frequently inherited by most non-eusuchian neosuchians (except for some of the smallest taxa, such as atoposaurids and susisuchids), resulting in fewer regime shifts amongst non-eusuchian neosuchians than in the other two alternative scenarios.
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Figure 2.7. SURFACE model fits of trees time-calibrated with the mbl method, using the ODCL dataset. **A**, Model fit of tree number 14 with Thalattosuchia as the sister group of Crocodyliformes. However, many model fits of trees sharing this same position of Thalattosuchia show simpler model configurations, with significantly fewer regimes (see text for details). **B**, Model fit of tree number 11 with Thalattosuchia as the sister group of Mesoeucrocodylia. A few model fits of other trees with Thalattosuchia in the same position are simpler, particularly when using the cal3 time-scaling method (see Appendix A for all SURFACE plots). **C** and **D** are simplified versions of (**A**) and (**B**), respectively, with independent multi-taxon regimes collapsed to single branches.
Within Notosuchia, most model fits show many taxa inheriting the same regime of smaller sizes present at the base of the clade ($\theta = 66–140$ cm), regardless of the position of Thalattosuchia and the time-scaling method used. Nevertheless, the group is also characterised by many additional regimes, with considerably variable trait optima, usually ranging from 66 to 460 cm. Shifts to regimes of smaller sizes are often seen in uruguayasuchids, Anatosuchus, Pakasuchus and Malawisuchus, with $\theta$ values very similar to or the same as the ancestral crocodylomorph regime ($Z_0$). Furthermore, shifts towards larger sizes are seen among peirosaurids ($\theta = 210–250$ cm), and, more dramatically, in sebecosuchids and in the armoured sphagesaurid Armadillosuchus arrudai ($\theta = 320–850$ cm).

Tethysuchia and Thalattosuchia are characterised by a dominance of macroevolutionary regimes of large body sizes ($\theta = 320–980$ cm), usually with lower body size disparity than Notosuchia. When Thalattosuchia is placed as sister taxa of either Tethysuchia, within Neosuchia (Figs. 2.5 and 2.6), or Mesoeucrocodylia (Fig. 2.7B), both Tethysuchia and Thalattosuchia share the same regime of large sizes ($\theta = 460–610$ cm), which is subsequently inherited by many of their members. In the first scenario, the shift to this regime takes place during the Early Jurassic, in the neosuchian branch that leads to the dichotomy Thalattosuchia + Tethysuchia. In the second case, most model fits show the shift regime occurring earlier in time, during the Late Triassic, at the base of Mesoeucrocodylia or among non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodyliforms. In the last alternative phylogenetic scenario, when Thalattosuchia is placed as the sister taxon of Crocodyliformes (Fig. 2.7A), even though Tethysuchia and Thalattosuchia do not share the same inherited regime, the model fits indicate that independent regime shifts to larger sizes occur at the bases of both clades, usually with very similar (or the same) trait optima values (also around 500 cm).
Within Tethysuchia, many trees exhibit a regime shift towards even larger sizes in a clade formed by the giant forms *Sarcosuchus imperator* and *Chalawan thailandicus* (θ = 840–980 cm). Among thalattosuchians, a shift to a regime with the same trait optimum (i.e., convergent) as that of the largest tethysuchians is usually observed in the teleosaurid clade formed by *Machimosaurus* and *Steneosaurus*. Despite the dominance of regimes of larger sizes, there are regimes of smaller sizes within Tethysuchia and Thalattosuchia, exemplified by some trees with isolated shifts in *Pelagosaurus typus*, *Teleosaurus cadomensis* and *Platysuchus multiscrobiculatus*, in Thalattosuchia, and *Vectisuchus leptognathus* and *Hyposaurus rogersii*, in Tethysuchia.

Crocodylia is also characterized by a dominance of macroevolutionary regimes of relatively large sizes, as in Thalattosuchia and Tethysuchia. Indeed, regimes towards large sizes are frequently associated with clades of predominantly aquatic or semi-aquatic forms, although not strictly restricted to them. Regarding Crocodylia, a Cretaceous regime shift is usually detected at the base of the clade (Figs. 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7), changing from the macroevolutionary regime of smaller sizes (θ = 110–210 cm) found for non-crocodylian eusuchians (such as hylaeochampsids and some allodaposuchids) to a regime of larger trait optima (θ = 320–340 cm). This same ancestral regime for all crocodylians is inherited by many members of the clade, particularly within Crocodyloidea and Gavialoidea. Although some model fits show Crocodylia inheriting the same regime as closely related non-crocodylian eusuchians, these trees are less common in general. In these trees, shifts towards larger body sizes are seen in members of Crocodyloidea and Gavialoidea, but they only occur later in time and arise independently. In comparison to the other two main lineages of Crocodylia, Alligatoroidea is characterized by a regime of lower trait optima values (θ = 210–230 cm), which frequently occurs as a Late Cretaceous shift at the base of the clade. But
Alligatoroidea is also distinct from the other two clades by exhibiting more regime shifts, reflecting its great ecological diversity and body size disparity (ranging from very small taxa, such as the caimanine *Tsoabichi greenriverensis*, to the huge *Purussaurus* and *Mourasuchus*).

### 2.3.4. Investigating the modes of body size evolution within Notosuchia and Crocodylia

The significant number of regime shifts that occur within both Notosuchia and Crocodylia led to deeper scrutiny of the modes of body size evolution in these two clades. For that, another round of model-fitting analyses was conducted, initially fitting the same evolutionary models (SURFACE, OU, BM, EB and trend-like models) to subtrees representing both groups. In addition, the same regime shifts identified by the SURFACE algorithm were used to fit four additional models using the OUwie algorithm (BMS, OUMV, OUMA and OUMVA), which allow more parameters to vary, but need regime shifts to be set *a priori*.

The results of these analyses indicate different modes of body size evolution during the evolutionary histories of these two groups. In Crocodylia (Fig. 2.8A; see Appendix A for a complete list of AICc scores), AICc scores indicate a clear preference for OU-based models, with highest support found for the SURFACE model, but also strong support for the uniform OU model, as well as OUMA and OUMVA models. The SURFACE algorithm frequently identified three main macroevolutionary regimes for crocodylians (with θ values around 200, 350 and 750 cm, respectively), with α ranging from 0.053 to 0.247 and σ² between 0.0014 and 0.0054. When allowed to vary among regimes (i.e., in models OUMA and OUMVA), ranges of both parameters increase significantly, with some model fits displaying extremely unrealistic parameter values, which might explain the stronger support found for SURFACE compared to these latter models. Among the BM-based models, even the best trend-like
model (usually the one with the best AICc scores among BM-based models) received consistently worse support than any of these four OU-based models.

![AICc scores of all evolutionary models fitted to the phylogenies and body size data of Crocodylia and Notosuchia. For the trend-like models, only the AICc of the best model (“best trend”) is shown.](image)

**Figure 2.8.** AICc scores of all evolutionary models fitted to the phylogenies and body size data of Crocodylia and Notosuchia. For the trend-like models, only the AICc of the best model (“best trend”) is shown.
The results show a different scenario for Notoarchia, for which comparable support was found for all evolutionary models analysed (Fig. 2.8B). Among OU-based models, slightly better AICc scores were found for the SURFACE model. However, this model received virtually the same support as the BMS model, the best of the BM-based models.

BMS is a multi-regime BM model that allows the rate parameter \((\sigma^2)\) to vary, and, as \(\alpha\) is effectively set to zero, represents diffusive model of evolution. The support found for this model might suggest a more relaxed mode of body size evolution in notosuchians, which is consistent with the wide range of body sizes observed in the group, even among closely-related taxa. Indeed, even though the sample includes twice as many crocodylians (\(n = 70\)) as notosuchians (\(n = 34\)), many SURFACE model fits found three main macroevolutionary regimes for notosuchians, similar to what was found for Crocodylia (although model fits with less regimes were more frequent for Notosuchia than in Crocodylia). For these, \(\theta\) values were usually around 80, 150 and 280 cm, with \(\alpha\) usually ranging from 0.0124 to 0.6213 and \(\sigma^2\) between 0.0011 and 0.0201. When the same regimes detected by the SURFACE algorithm were used by the OUwie algorithm to fit the BMS model, values of \(\sigma^2\) rarely varied significantly from the range of whole-tree \(\sigma^2\) estimated for the SURFACE model fits. The few exceptions were usually related to regimes with unrealised \(\theta\) values, as in the case of *Armadillosuchus arrudai* (probably with more than 2 metres in total length, whereas other sampled sphagesaurids reach no more than 1.2 m; Marinho and Carvalho 2009), and sebecosuchians (top predators of usually more than 2.5 metres; Godoy *et al.* 2016), even though these values might still be realistic when simulating trend-like dynamics (i.e., in a single lineage with extremely disparate trait values; Hansen 1997; Benson *et al.* 2014a).
2.3.5. The influence of palaeolatitude and palaeotemperature

Most of the correlation analyses between the body size data and the different datasets of the abiotic factors palaeotemperature and palaeolatitude yielded very weak or non-significant correlations (see Appendix A for all regression results). The phylogenetic regressions of body size and palaeolatitudinal data found some significant correlations. However, in all cases the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was very low (always smaller than 0.1), indicating that the correlation is very weak and only a small proportion (less than 10%) of the body size variation observed can be explained by the palaeolatitudinal data (Fig. 2.9).

![Figure 2.9](image)

**Figure 2.9.** Palaeolatitudinal distribution of extinct crocodylomorphs through time, incorporating body size information (circle sizes), with colours representing different mono- or paraphyletic (i.e., Crocodylomorph = non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs, excluding Thalattosuchia; Neosuchia = non-crocodylian neosuchians) crocodylomorph groups. Body sizes are $\log_{10}$ values of orbito-cranial dorsal length (ODCL), in millimetres.

The situation was similar regarding temporal patterns of body size compared to global palaeotemperature, with most analyses revealing very weak or non-significant correlations.
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Significant correlations were found in some cases, but they were frequently inconsistent (i.e., correlations did not persist in both ODCL and DCL datasets or were absent when accounting for serial autocorrelation using GLS). The lack of strong correlations between environmental variables and body size is consistent with the results from the macroevolutionary (model-fitting) analyses, which found strong support for a multi-regime OU model (SURFACE). This suggests that shifts between adaptive zones are more important in determining large-scale macroevolutionary patterns of crocodylomorph body size evolution than abiotic factors, at least when analysed separately.

However, one important exception was found between mean body size values and palaeotemperatures from the Late Cretaceous (Maastrichtian) to the Recent (data from Zachos et al. [2008]). Moderate to strong correlations were found when using either all taxa in the datasets or only non-marine species ($R^2$ ranging from 0.376 to 0.635), with higher mean body size values found in time intervals with lower temperatures (i.e., positive slopes, given that the $\delta^{18}O$ proxy is inversely proportional to temperature). The correlation was present even when applying GLS regressions with an autoregressive model (Table 2.3), which returned very low to low autocorrelation coefficients (Phi = 0.01–0.15). This suggests that temperature might have had an influence in determining the body size distribution of crocodylomorphs at smaller temporal and phylogenetic scales (Fig. 2.10A). For this reason, further analyses scrutinised the relationships between the distribution of body sizes and these abiotic factors at these smaller scales, by repeating the regression analyses using only data for Crocodylia, Notosuchia, Thalattosuchia, and Tethysuchia (see the “Material and Methods” section of this Chapter).
Figure 2.10. Caption on next page.
Figure 2.10. A, Phenogram with body size ($\log_{10}$ ODCL) incorporated into crocodylomorph phylogeny, with colours representing different crocodylomorph groups. B, Crocodylomorph body size and palaeotemperature through time. Mean $\log_{10}$ ODCL represented by dashed black line, shaded polygon shows maximum and minimum values for each time bin. Continuous light green displays mean $\log_{10}$ ODCL values only for Crocodylia. Palaeotemperature ($\delta^{18}$O) data from Zachos et al. (2008). C, Body size disparity through time. Disparity is represented by the standard deviation of $\log_{10}$ ODCL values for each time bin (only time bins with more than 3 taxa were used for calculating disparity). Error bars are accelerated bias-corrected percentile limits (BCa) of disparity from 1,000 bootstrapping replicates. Asterisks mark the events of largest interval-to-interval changes in disparity.

Table 2.3. Regression results of mean body size values (from both DCL and ODCL datasets) on palaeotemperature. Results of GLS (with an autoregressive model) and OLS (untransformed data) regressions. Mean body size values represented by log-transformed cranial, in millimetres. Data from both datasets was divided into subsets with all crocodylomorphs or only non-marine species. 10 time bins were analysed in all four subsets ($n=10$). Palaeotemperature data from Zachos et al. (2008), represented by $\delta^{18}$O data from the Late Cretaceous to Recent. Only significant correlations ($p < 0.05$) are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th></th>
<th>GLS</th>
<th>OLS (untransformed)</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope</td>
<td>AIC</td>
<td>R²</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>Slope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODCL (all taxa)</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>2.022</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>-31.576</td>
<td>0.635</td>
<td>2.023</td>
<td>0.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.003)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCL (all taxa)</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>2.433</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-19.577</td>
<td>0.527</td>
<td>2.433</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODCL (non-marine)</td>
<td>-0.157</td>
<td>1.964</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-24.96</td>
<td>0.502</td>
<td>1.965</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.013)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCL (non-marine)</td>
<td>-0.089</td>
<td>2.345</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-16.045</td>
<td>0.376</td>
<td>2.346</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.034)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These additional regressions corroborate the hypothesis that at least some crocodylomorph subclades show a correspondence between body size and global
palaeotemperature. Although most of the regressions provided non-significant or weak/very weak correlations (see Appendix A for all regression results), including all regressions of body size on palaeolatitudinal data, both maximum and mean body size values of Crocodylia are strongly correlated to palaeotemperature through time (Table 2.4). The positive slopes and coefficients of determination ($R^2 = 0.632$ and $0.647$) indicate that the lowest temperatures are associated with the highest body size values in the crown-group. However, correlations with data from other subclades (Notostracotheria, Thalattosuchia and Tethysuchia) were mostly non-significant, suggesting that this relationship between body size and temperature was not a widespread pattern among all groups.

**Table 2.4.** Regression results of maximum and mean body size values (from both DCL and ODCL datasets) on palaeotemperature. Results of GLS (with an autoregressive model) and OLS (untransformed data) regressions. Mean body size values represented by log-transformed cranial, in millimetres. Data from both datasets was divided into subsets with all crocodylomorphs or only non-marine species. 10 time bins were analysed in all four subsets ($n=10$). Palaeotemperature data from Zachos *et al.* (2008), represented by δ18O data from the Late Cretaceous to Recent. Only significant correlations ($p < 0.05$) are shown.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>GLS</th>
<th>OLS (untransformed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Phi</td>
<td>Interc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODCL maximum size</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>2.133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODCL mean size</td>
<td>-0.297</td>
<td>1.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCL maximum size</td>
<td>-0.215</td>
<td>2.618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCL mean size</td>
<td>-0.235</td>
<td>2.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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2.4. Discussion

2.4.1. The adaptive landscape of crocodylomorph body size evolution

Crocodylomorph body size disparity increased rapidly during the early evolution of the group, from the Late Triassic to the Early Jurassic (Hettangian–Sinemurian), which is mostly a result of the appearance of the large-bodied thalattosuchians (Fig. 2.10C). After a decline in the Middle Jurassic, body size disparity reaches its maximum peak in the Late Jurassic, with the appearance of atoposaurids, some of the smallest crocodylomorphs, as well as large teleosaurids (such as Machimosaurus). This increase in disparity may have occurred earlier than the results suggest, given that Middle Jurassic records of atoposaurids (Young et al. 2016b) could not be included in the analyses due to their highly incomplete preservation.

Since this peak in the Middle/Late Jurassic, crocodylomorphs underwent an essentially continuous decline in body size disparity, with some short-term fluctuations related to the extinction or diversification of particular lineages. The Early Cretaceous witnessed the extinction of thalattosuchians, and a sharp decrease in disparity is seen from the Berriasian to the Barremian (although this time interval is also relatively poorly sampled in the dataset). A subsequent increase in disparity is seen in the Aptian, probably reflecting the appearance of small-bodied crocodylomorphs (such as susisuchid eusuchians). Nevertheless, this is followed by a continuing decline for the remainder of the Cretaceous (in spite of the occurrence of highly disparate notosuchians). The Cenozoic is also characterised by an overall decrease in disparity, even though some short-term increases in disparity do occur, mostly related to the presence of smaller-bodied crocodylians in the Palaeogene (such as Tsoabichi).

The macroevolutionary patterns that gave rise to these patterns of body size disparity through time were characterised by performing comparative model-fitting analyses. The results indicate a strong support found for a multi-peak OU model (i.e., the SURFACE model;
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Fig. 2.3). Within the concept of adaptive landscape (Simpson 1944; 1953; Hansen 2012), the SURFACE regimes, with different trait optima, can be interpreted as shifts to new macroevolutionary adaptive zones (Van Valen 1971; Stanley 1973). Thus, the support found for the SURFACE model indicates that lineage-specific innovations and/or adaptations in body size play an important role in determining the patterns of crocodylomorph body size evolution. The comparative model-fitting analyses also indicate that uniform or BM-based models provide poor explanations for the overall patterns of crocodylomorph body size evolution. Thus, the hypothesis of long-term, multi-lineage trends during the evolution of crocodylomorph body size is rejected. This is true even for Crocodylia, which shows increases in maximum, minimum and mean body sizes during the past 70 million years (Fig. 2.10C), a pattern that is classically taken as evidence for trend-like dynamics (McShea 1994). In fact, explicitly phylogenetic models of the dynamics along evolving lineages reject this.

Likewise, diffusive Brownian-motion like dynamics can also be rejected for most of Crocodylomorpha, although Notosuchia might be characterised by relatively unconstrained dynamics (Fig. 2.8). Single-regime (i.e., uniform) models received poor support in general, which might be expected for long-lived and disparate clades such as Crocodylomorpha, that show complex and non-uniform patterns of body size evolution (see Stanley 1973, McKinney 1990; Hansen 1997; Butler and King 2004). Although multi-regime trend-like models received stronger support than uniform models for most phylogenies (Fig. 2.3), multi-peak OU models (SURFACE) received overwhelmingly still greater support. This suggests that the macroevolutionary landscape of crocodylomorph body size evolution is best described by shifts between phylogenetically defined regimes that experience constrained evolution around distinct trait optima (Butler and King 2004; Hansen 2012; Ingram and Mahler 2013; Mahler and Ingram 2014).
The success of a multi-peak OU model indicates that, in general, a significant amount of crocodylomorph body size variance emerged through pulses of body size variation, and not from a gradual, BM-based dispersal of lineages through trait (body size) space. These pulses, represented by regime shifts, indicate that lineage-specific innovations (such as ecological diversification; see below) and adaptations are important for the large-scale patterns of crocodylomorph body size evolution.

This can also explain the weak support for the early burst (“EB”) model found in the analyses. This model was proposed as an attempt to simulate Simpson’s (1944) idea of diversification through “invasion” of new adaptive zones (niche-filling). However, it only focuses on a particular pattern of the idea, more specifically on the more widespread concept of adaptive radiation, in which evolutionary rates of changes are higher in the early evolution of a clade and decelerate through time (Harmon et al. 2010). In this sense, the EB model does represent the complete idea of “quantum evolution” proposed by Simpson (1953) (i.e., abrupt phenotypic shifts along evolving lineages resulting from the distribution of opportunities or “unfilled niches”). This might explain why Harmon et al. (2010), in the study that formally proposed the EB model, found that early bursts receive little support from phylogenetic comparative data, even though some studies have found otherwise for some specific clades (e.g., in the body size evolution of some dinosaur subgroups; Benson et al. 2014).

Accordingly, the weak support for the EB model in this Chapter does not reject Simpson’s hypothesis “quantum evolution” or adaptive zone invasion. Furthermore, the pattern of crocodylomorph body size evolution could still be explained by niche-filling if niche availability was distributed through time rather than being concentrated early in the evolution of the clade. This is one possible explanation of the pattern of regime shifts returned by the SURFACE analyses, and might be particularly relevant for clades with long
evolutionary histories spanning many geological intervals and many episodes of possible radiation.

Bronzati et al. (2015) examined variation in rates of species diversification among clades using methods based on tree asymmetry. They found that most of crocodyliform diversity was achieved by a small number of significant diversification events that were mostly linked to the origin of some subclades, rather than via a continuous process through time. Some of the diversification shifts from Bronzati et al. (2015) coincide with body size regime shifts found in many of the SURFACE model fits (as at the base of Notosuchia, Eusuchia and Alligatoroidea; Fig. 2.11). However, many of the shifts in body size regimes detected by the analyses are found in less-inclusive groups (as in the case of “singleton” regimes, that contain only a single taxon).
Figure 2.11. Summary of the SURFACE results combined with the crocodylomorph diversification shifts found by Bronzati et al. (2015). Nodes with diversification shifts are indicated by arrows, the colours of which represent distinct trait optima values (total body length in centimetres, after applying formula from Hurlburt et al. [2003]), of different body size regimes. Black arrows indicate nodes for which diversification shifts were identified, but no body size regime shift was found by SURFACE.
2.4.2. Ecological diversification and its implications for crocodylomorph body size distribution

Ecological factors seem to be important for the large-scale patterns of body size in crocodylomorphs. Many of the regime shifts to larger sizes detected by the SURFACE analyses occur at the base of predominantly aquatic or semi-aquatic clades, such as Thalattosuchia, Tethysuchia and Crocodylia (Figs. 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7), although there are also small-bodied aquatic and semi-aquatic clades, such as Atoposauridae. Some terrestrial clades also display relatively large sizes (such as sebecosuchians and peirosaurids, within Nitosuchia). However, most terrestrial species are small-bodied (Fig. 2.12), including many of the earliest crocodylomorphs (such as Litargosuchus leptorhynchus and Hesperosuchus agilis; Clark et al. 2000; Clark and Sues 2002; Fig. 2.12A), and are within body size regimes of lower values of θ (< 150 cm; Figs. 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7). In contrast, the regimes with the highest values of θ (> 800 cm) are almost always associated with aquatic or semi-aquatic crocodylomorphs (e.g., the tethysuchians Sarcosuchus imperator and Chalawan thailandicus, the thalattosuchians Machimosauros and Steneosaurus, and the crocodylians Purussaurus and Mourasuchus).

To further investigate this, the body size data was subdivided into three discrete categories to represent different generalised lifestyles: terrestrial, semi-aquatic/freshwater, and aquatic/marine. Initially, a relationship was found between the lifestyle and body size using analysis of variance (ANOVA), showing that terrestrial, freshwater and marine species had significantly different body sizes (Fig. 2.12B; Table 2.5). Next, to account for phylogenetic dependency, a phylogenetic ANOVA (Garland et al. 1993; Revell 2012) was performed. This asks specifically whether evolutionary habitat transitions are consistently associated with particular body size shifts as optimised on the phylogeny and returned non-significant results. This indicates that, although crocodylomorphs with more aquatic lifestyles (particularly
marine species) tend to be large-bodied, the evolutionary transitions between these lifestyle
categories were probably not accompanied by immediate non-random size changes.
Furthermore, the smaller bodies of some lineages (e.g., atoposaurids, *Tsoabichi* and
*Pelagosaurus*) show that adaptive peaks of smaller sizes are also viable among aquatic/semi-
aquatic species. This suggests that, even though there seem to be an ecological advantage for
larger-sized freshwater/marine crocodylomorphs, the body size lower limit (i.e., minimum
body sizes achieved) of these aquatic species might have been comparable to that of terrestrial
ones.

**Table 2.5.** Pairwise comparison between body size of crocodylomorphs subdivided into three lifestyle
categories. Body size data from the ODCL dataset (log-transformed cranial measurement, in
millimetres). Number of species in each category: 45 (terrestrial), 100 (semi-aquatic/freshwater), and
50 (aquatic/marine). Results of one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA), without accounting for
phylogenetic dependency, and phylogenetic ANOVA (Garland et al. 1993; Revell 2012). *Bonferroni-
corrected p-values (q-values) significant at alpha = 0.05

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Pairwise comparisons</th>
<th>t-value</th>
<th>ANOVA q-value</th>
<th>Phylo ANOVA q-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>1.854</td>
<td>0.223</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>Terrestrial – Freshwater</td>
<td>4.196</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001*</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-aquatic/ freshwater</td>
<td>2.026</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.0249</td>
<td>Terrestrial – Marine</td>
<td>8.721</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001*</td>
<td>0.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic/marine</td>
<td>2.263</td>
<td>0.185</td>
<td>0.0261</td>
<td>Freshwater – Marine</td>
<td>5.997</td>
<td>&lt; 0.001*</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 2.12. A, Body size frequency distributions of different crocodylomorph groups, constructed using the full set of 240 specimens in the ODCL dataset. Underlying unfilled bars represent values for all crocodylomorphs. Filled bars represent values for Crocodylia, Notochordia, Thalattosuchia, non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs (excluding thalattosuchians), Tethysuchia and non-crocodylian neosuchians (excluding tethysuchians and thalattosuchians). B, Body size distributions of different crocodylomorph lifestyles, shown with box-and-whisker plots (on the left) and a mosaic plot (on the right). The 195 species from the ODCL dataset were subdivided into terrestrial, semi-aquatic/freshwater and aquatic/marine categories (n = 45, 100 and 50, respectively) based on the literature.
Previous studies have investigated a possible link between an aquatic/marine lifestyle and larger body sizes in other animals, particularly in mammals (e.g., Smith and Lyons 2011; Heim et al. 2015; Gearty et al. 2018). For instance, it has been previously shown that aquatic life in mammals imposes a limit on minimum body size (Downhower and Bulmer 1988; Gearty et al. 2018) and relaxes constraints on maximum size (Williams 1999). Therefore, aquatic mammals (especially marine ones) have larger body sizes than their terrestrial relatives (Smith and Lyons, 2011; Vermeij 2016). Here, a similar pattern is documented in crocodylomorphs, although the phylogenetic ANOVA results (Table 2.5) revealed that changes in size are not abrupt after environmental invasions (as also suggested by the diminutive size of some semiaquatic lineages, such as atoposaurids and some crocodylians).

As animals lose heat faster in water than in air (given the different rates of convective heat loss in these two environments), it has demonstrated that thermoregulation plays an important role in determining the larger sizes of aquatic mammals (Downhower and Bulmer 1988; Ahlborn and Blake 1999; Gearty et al. 2018). Although mammals have distinct thermal physiology to crocodylomorphs (which are ectothermic poikilotherms), it has been reported that American alligators (Alligator mississippiensis) heat up more rapidly than cool down, and that larger individuals are able to maintain their inner temperature for longer than smaller ones (Smith 1976). Thus, given that both heating and cooling rates are higher in water than in air (Smith 1976), larger aquatic/semi-aquatic animals could have advantages in terms of physiological thermoregulation. If extinct crocodylomorphs had similar physiologies, this could provide a plausible explanation for the larger sizes of non-terrestrial species.
2.4.3. Cope’s rule cannot explain the evolution of larger sizes in Crocodylomorpha

Previous interpretations of the fossil record suggest a dominance of small sizes during the early evolution of crocodylomorphs (Irmis et al. 2013; Turner and Nesbitt 2013), inferred from the small body sizes of most early crocodylomorphs. Consistent with this, the SURFACE results revealed a small-bodied ancestral regime for Crocodylomorpha ($Z_0$ between 66 and 100 cm), which was inherited virtually by all non-crocodyliform crocodylomorphs. Larger non-crocodyliform crocodylomorphs have also been reported for the Late Triassic (e.g., Carnufex carolinensis and Redondavenator quayensis, with estimated body lengths of approximately 3 metres; Zanno et al. 2015), but the fragmentary nature of the specimens prevented their inclusion in the macroevolutionary analysis. Nevertheless, given the larger numbers of small-bodied early crocodylomorphs, taxa like Carnufex and Redondavenator probably represent derived origins of large body size and their inclusion would likely result in similar values of ancestral trait optima ($=Z_0$).

The small ancestral body size inferred for crocodylomorphs, combined with the much larger sizes seen in most extant crocodylians and in some other crocodylomorph subclades (such as thalattosuchians and tethysuchians), suggests a pattern of increasing average body size during crocodylomorph evolutionary history. The idea is reinforced by the overall increase in crocodylomorph mean body size through time, particularly after the Early Cretaceous (Fig. 2.10B). The same pattern also occurs within Crocodylia during the past 70 million years (Fig. 2.10B), as some of the earliest taxa (such as Tsoabichi, Wannaganosuchus and Diplocynodon deponiae) were smaller-bodied ($< 2$ m) than more recent species, such as most extant crocodylians (usually $> 3$ m). Cope’s rule is most frequently conceived as the occurrence of multi-lineage trends of directional evolution towards larger body sizes (Cope
1887; 1896; Stanley 1973), and this can be evaluated using BM-based models that incorporate a directional trend (parameter μ; see e.g., Hunt and Carrano, 2010; Benson et al. 2018).

Little support was found for trend-like models as a description of crocodylomorph or crocodylian body size evolution. Therefore, the applicability of Cope’s rule to crocodylomorph evolution is rejected. This reinforces previous works suggesting that multi-lineage trends of directional body-size evolution are rare over macroevolutionary time scales (Sookias et al. 2012a, b; Huttenlocker 2014; Benson et al. 2018; but see Benson et al., 2014a). Furthermore, the SURFACE model fits indicate that regime shifts towards smaller-bodied descendent regimes occurred approximately as frequently (9–13 times) as shifts to regimes of larger body sizes (13–16 times; Fig. 2.13). Together, these results indicate that long-term increases in the average body size of crocodylomorphs also cannot be explained either by multi-lineage trends of directional evolution towards larger size, or by a biased frequency of transitions to large-bodied descendent regimes.

Instead, the apparent trend towards larger body sizes can be explained by extinctions among small-bodied regimes. Crocodylomorph body size disparity decreased gradually through the Cretaceous (Fig. 2.10B). This occurred due to the decreasing abundance of small-bodied species. Despite this, the SURFACE model fits mostly indicate the survival of clades exhibiting small-bodied regimes (θ < 200 cm) until approximately the end of the Mesozoic, (e.g., gobiosuchids, uruguaysuchids, sphagesaurids, hylaeochampsids and some allodaposuchids; Figs. 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7). Many of these small-bodied clades became extinct at least by the Cretaceous/Palaeogene (K/Pg) boundary, resulting in a substantial reduction of small-bodied species. Further reductions among the crown-group (Crocodylia) occurred by the Neogene, from which small-bodied species are absent altogether (Figs. 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7).
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Figure 2.13. Distribution of regime shifts represented by the difference between descendant and ancestral regimes trait optima values ($\theta$) plotted against the $\theta$ of the ancestral regime. Large red circles represent shifts that led to clades containing multiple taxa, while smaller pink circles represent “singleton” regimes, containing only single taxa. Vertical dashed line indicates the ancestral regime for all crocodylomorphs ($Z_0$), while horizontal dashed line can be used as a reference to identify regime shifts giving rise to larger (circles above the line) or smaller-bodied (circles below the line) descendants. Circles at the exact same position (i.e., shifts with the same $\theta$ values for both ancestral and descendant regimes) were slightly displaced in relation to one another to enable visualization. This plot was constructed using the $\theta$ values from trees with different positions of Thalattosuchia: A, Tree number 10, with Thalattosuchia within Neosuchia; B, Tree number 14, with Thalattosuchia as the sister group of Crocodyliformes; C, Tree number 11, with Thalattosuchia as the sister group of Mesoeucrocodylia. $\theta$ values in log_{10} mm, relative to the cranial measurement ODCL (orbito-cranial dorsal length).

This predominance of regimes of large sizes today is also linked to the occurrence of large body sizes in Crocodylia. The SURFACE analyses focusing on Crocodylia, indicate ancestral body size regimes with relatively high values of $\theta$ ($Z_0$ between 220 and 350 cm). The shift to a larger-sized regime (when compared to smaller-bodied eusuchian regimes) probably occurred at the Late Cretaceous (Figs. 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7), and this same regime was inherited by many members of the clade (predominantly semi-aquatic species). During the Palaeogene, however, shifts to regimes of smaller sizes also happen (such as in Tsoabichi
greenriverensis, Diplocynodon deponiae and planocraniids), increasing body size disparity (Fig. 2.10C). The crocodylian body size distribution shifts upwards mainly during the latter part of the Cenozoic (from the Miocene; Fig. 2.10B), when even larger-bodied animals occur (e.g., Purussaurus and Mournasuchus), combined with the disappearance of lineages of smallest species.

2.4.4. Correlation of crocodylian body size with global cooling

The time-series regressions demonstrate a moderate to strong correlation between crocodylian size and palaeotemperature (Table 2.4). This results from the upward-shift of the crocodylian body size distribution, coinciding with cooling global climates in the second half of the Cenozoic (Zachos et al. 2008; Linnert et al. 2014). Even though this is an apparently counter-intuitive relationship, it is not interpreted here as a result of direct causation. Previous studies have shown that crocodylian species richness decreased with declining global temperatures of the Cenozoic (Markwick 1998a; Mannion et al. 2015). Furthermore, the palaeolatitudinal ranges of both marine and continental crocodylomorphs have contracted as temperatures decreased (Fig. 2.9; see also Markwick 1998a; Mannion et al. 2015). Therefore, the temperatures experienced by evolving lineages of crocodylians are not equivalent to global average temperatures. It is proposed here that the association between global cooling and increasing crocodylian body size results from a systematic reduction of available habits/niches (due to a more restricted geographical distribution), with differential extinction of smaller-bodied species. The hypothesis of selective extinction is also consistent with the decreasing disparity of body size disparity of crocodylians during the Cenozoic (Fig. 2.10B).
2.4.5. Body size selectivity and diversification across Mesozoic boundaries

Numerous comparative studies have investigated a possible link between extinction risk and animal body size (e.g., Alroy 2001; Johnson 2002; Fisher and Owens 2004; Cardillo et al. 2005; Clauset and Erwin 2008). For example, larger body sizes, in association with dietary specializations, might increase susceptibility to extinction in some animal groups, such as hypercarnivorous canids (Purvis et al. 2000; Van Valkenburgh et al. 2004). On the other hand, the recovery of some animal clades after extinction events can also be associated with a subsequent increase in diversity and morphological disparity (e.g., Palaeogene mammals; Alroy 1998), potentially leading to the exploration of new regions of body size space (i.e., invasions of new body size adaptive zones). Thus, although for some groups (and for some extinctions) body size might play an important role, this is evidently not a generalised pattern across all animals.

For crocodylomorphs, little is known about possible influence of body size on differential extinction. In one of the few studies to quantitatively investigate this, Turner and Nesbitt (2013), using femoral length as a proxy for total body size, recognized a drop in mean body size of crocodylomorphs across the Triassic-Jurassic (T–J) boundary. The SURFACE results, however, indicate otherwise, as all Triassic crocodylomorphs are within a macroevolutionary regime of smaller sizes (θ < 100 cm) when Thalattosuchia is placed within Neosuchia (Figs. 2.5 and 2.6). In the other two phylogenetic scenarios, the origin of thalattosuchians (which are predominantly large-bodied animals) is placed either at the middle of the Late Triassic or closer to the T–J boundary (Fig. 2.7). However, as the first records of thalattosuchians only occur in the Early Jurassic, mean body size increases immediately after the boundary (Fig. 2.10A). The differences between the results obtained in this Chapter and those found by Turner and Nesbitt (2013) might be related to the distinct body size proxies
used, or to sampling, as those authors also included non-crocodylomorph taxa in the pseudosuchian lineage. In this context, it is acknowledged that the inclusion of larger non-crocodyliform crocodylomorphs, such as *Carnufex carolinensis* (~3 metres; Zanno *et al.* 2015), in the analyses of this Chapter might change the results. Thus, at the moment there is no empirical or statistical evidence to demonstrate selectivity of body sizes in crocodylomorphs during the end-Triassic extinction.

The Early Jurassic was characterized by key events of crocodylomorph diversification (Bronzati *et al.* 2015) and an increase in morphological disparity (Toljagić and Butler 2013), following the end-Triassic extinction. Similarly, the body size data collected for this Chapter suggests an increase in body size disparity after the T–J boundary (Fig. 2.10B). Although a decrease in disparity is observed subsequently, this is probably due to the relatively few crocodylomorphs known for the latest Early Jurassic and the Middle Jurassic (Sinemurian–Aalenian; Mannion *et al.* 2015). Subsequently, the diversification of thalattosuchians during the Late Jurassic, together with the occurrence of smaller- to intermediate-bodied neosuchians (such as atoposaurids and goniopholidids), created the greatest observed disparity of crocodylomorph body sizes during their evolutionary history (Fig. 2.10C).

Recent studies (Tennant *et al.* 2016b, c; 2017) suggested that a combination of environmental perturbations occurred during the Jurassic-Cretaceous (J/K) transition, which might have led to the extinction of some tetrapod lineages. For crocodylomorphs the boundary is characterised by a decrease in marine diversity (Mannion *et al.* 2015; Tennant *et al.* 2016b, c), highlighted by declines in thalattosuchian diversity, especially among teleosaurids, which suffered widespread extinction (except, apparently, at lower palaeolatitudes; Fanti *et al.* 2016). Nevertheless, Wilberg (2017) did not find evidence for a substantial decrease in crocodylomorph cranial disparity across the J/K boundary (neither did
the analyses performed in Chapter 3 of this thesis). Similarly, the SURFACE results do not suggest dramatic changes in body size space exploration immediately before or after the J/K boundary (Figs. 2.5, 2.6 and 2.7), and there seems to be no defined body size selectivity across this boundary, as the multiple survivor crocodylomorph lineages were within regimes of very disparate optima values. Furthermore, the decrease in disparity observed in the middle of the Early Cretaceous (i.e., Valanginian–Barremian) is likely due to poor sampling (Butler et al. 2012; Benson et al. 2013), resulting in the scarcity of more completely preserved crocodylomorphs during these stages.

The Late Cretaceous is marked by a remarkable fossil richness of notosuchians, in Gondwana (Carvalho et al. 2010; Pol and Leardi 2015), and the diversification of eusuchian crocodylians (Brochu 2003). Notosuchia exhibits a wide range of body sizes (Fig. 2.12A), to some extent reflecting its remarkable diversity (Mannion et al. 2015; Pol and Leardi 2015) and morphological disparity (Wilberg 2017; see Chapters 3 and 4 of this thesis for further examples). The model-fitting analyses performed using only notosuchian data suggest more relaxed modes of body size evolution (Fig. 2.9), which is consistent with their species richness and morphological disparity. This could be explained by a combination of intrinsic (i.e., innovations and/or adaptations, such as a highly modified feeding apparatus; Ősi 2014; Pol et al. 2014) and extrinsic factors (i.e., specific environmental conditions, such as the predominantly hot and arid climate of the Gondwanan landmasses occupied by notosuchians; Carvalho et al., 2010; Marsola et al., 2016).

Even though the body size data of this Chapter show no specific pattern at the K/Pg boundary, a decline in body size disparity is present through the Late Cretaceous, combined with an increase in mean body size (Fig. 2.10), a pattern that generally continued through the Cenozoic (although with some short-term fluctuations). This supports the hypothesis that the
Chapter 2: Crocodylomorph body size evolution

K/Pg extinction had only minor impacts on crocodylomorphs (Russell and Wu 1997; Markwick 1998a; Bronzati et al. 2015; Mannion et al. 2015). Although subsampled data suggests a decline in terrestrial diversity during the Late Cretaceous, it occurred prior to the boundary, from the Campanian into the Maastrichtian, in both Europe and North America (Mannion et al. 2015). Indeed, different crocodylomorph subclades lost several species prior to the end of the Cretaceous (in particular notosuchians and non-crocodylian eusuchians; Bronzati et al. 2015; Mannion et al. 2015; Figs. 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7), and multiple lineages within other groups, such as dyrosaurid tethysuchians and crocodylians, crossed the boundary with little change (Russell and Wu 1997; Markwick 1998a; Jouve et al. 2008; Figs. 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7). The results of this Chapter suggest a long-term pattern of extinctions among small-bodied taxa, starting from the Late Cretaceous and continuing to the Recent. This may have resulted from a longstanding trend of global cooling (Zachos et al. 2008; Linnert et al. 2014), resulting in more restricted geographical distributions, and reducing niche availability for crocodylomorphs. This is consistent with the SURFACE results (Figs. 2.5, 2.6, and 2.7), that show very few smaller-bodied regimes ($\theta < 150$ cm) during the Palaeogene and a complete absence after the Neogene. This pattern strikingly contrasts with that proposed for mammals, which may have experienced selectivity against larger bodied taxa across the boundary (Wilson 2013), although an increase in body size is observed subsequently during the Palaeogene (Alroy 1998; Smith et al. 2010). It also differs from that suggested for squamates (lizards and snakes), for which survival was possibly associated with small body sizes (Longrich et al. 2012).
2.5. Conclusions

After an early increase (with the highest peak in the Late Jurassic), crocodylomorph body size disparity experienced sustained decline during virtually its entire evolutionary history. This disparity decrease is combined with an increase of average body size through time, with highest peaks in the Middle Jurassic and today. In particular, the increase in mean body size seen during the Cenozoic (mostly related to crocodylians) is linked to an overall decrease in global temperatures.

Comparative model-fitting analyses were used to further characterise these body size macroevolutionary patterns in crocodylomorphs. The results show extremely strong support for a multi-peak Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model (SURFACE), rejecting the hypothesis of evolution based on Brownian motion dynamics (including those representing the concept of Cope’s rule). This suggests that crocodylomorph body size evolution can be described within the concept of a macroevolutionary adaptive landscape, with a significant amount of crocodylomorph body size variance evolving from pulses of body size changes, represented by shifts between macroevolutionary regimes (or adaptive zones). This is reflected in the regime shifts frequently detected at the base of well-recognised and diverse crocodylomorph subclades, such as Notosuchia, Thalattosuchia, and Crocodylia.

At large temporal and phylogenetic scales, no strong correlation was found between the body size data and abiotic factors, indicating that shifts between macroevolutionary regimes are more important for determining long-term patterns of crocodylomorph body size than isolated climatic factors. However, at more refined scales, body size variation may track changes in climate. In the case of Crocodylia, a global cooling event might explain the long-term increases in body size, as a result of systematic reduction of available habitats/niches.
(due to a more latitudinally-restricted geographical distribution during cooler global climates), with differential extinction of smaller-bodied species.

Shifts towards larger sizes are often associated with aquatic/marine or semi-aquatic subclades, indicating that ecological diversification may also be relevant, and suggesting a possible link between aquatic adaptations and larger body sizes in crocodylomorphs. These shifts to larger sizes, occurred throughout crocodylomorph evolutionary history, combined with the extinction of smaller-sized regimes, particularly during the Late Cretaceous and Cenozoic, explain the overall increase in mean body size, as well as the large-bodied distribution of extant crocodylians compared to earlier taxa.
3.1. Background

Transformations in the shape of living organisms have historically been the subject of scientific investigations (e.g., Russell 1916; Thompson 1917; Huxley 1932), as the study of shape provides crucial morphological information, which is fundamental for understanding the evolution of life on Earth (Darwin 1859). Morphometrics (namely the “measurement of shape”) is the systematic study of shape of organisms using multivariate statistical methods, and is usually subdivided into “traditional morphometrics” (which involves linear measurements, angles and ratios; Marcus 1990) and the more recent “geometric morphometrics”, in which two- or three-dimensional landmark-based data is used to capture the geometry of the structure being studied (Bookstein 1991; Rohlf and Marcus 1993; Adams et al. 2004; Mitteroecker and Gunz 2009; Cooke and Terhune 2015).

Although there are other methods available for quantifying shape changes (e.g. Euclidian distance matrix analysis; Lele and Richsmeier [1991; 2001]; and elliptic Fourier analysis; Lestrel [1982]; Haines and Crampton [2000]), the use of landmark-based geometric morphometrics has become increasingly more frequent in ecological and evolutionary studies (Adams et al. 2004; Zelditch et al. 2012). However, the long recognised and often tight relationship between form and function (Cuvier 1817; Russell 1916; Gould 1977; Lauder 1981) potentially increases the frequency of convergent evolution, which challenges the accurate characterisation of macroevolutionary patterns (Harvey and Pagel 1991; Martins and Hansen 1997; Banavar et al. 2014; Cooke and Terhune 2015). This makes imperative the incorporation of phylogenetic information for assessing shape variation in an evolutionary
framework, paving the way for the use of phylogenetic comparative methods in geometric morphometric studies (Rohlf 2001; Monteiro 2013; Zelditch et al. 2012).

In this context, data collected from fossil organisms can yield essential information for a better comprehension of evolutionary shape changes. Among tetrapods, crocodylomorphs represent a good system for studying large-scale phenotypic evolution, given their long and rich fossil record (Bronzati et al. 2015; Mannion et al. 2015), as well as extensive recent effort to resolve major phylogenetic uncertainties (e.g., Jouve et al. 2006; Larsson and Sues 2007; Andrade et al. 2011; Clark 2011; Brochu 2011; 2012; Bronzati et al. 2012; Pol et al. 2013; Montefeltro et al. 2013; Pol et al. 2014; Young 2014; Herrera et al. 2015; Turner 2015; Wilberg 2015). Historically, the crocodylomorph skull has received substantial attention in anatomical studies, (Iordansky 1973), which might explain the preference for this part of the skeleton as the source of morphological information in most works quantitatively investigating phenotypic evolution in the group. Important exceptions include: Stubbs et al. (2013) and Walmsley et al. (2013), which assessed mandibular morphology; Bonnan et al. (2008) and Chamero et al. (2013), which used postcranial shape data; Gold et al. (2014), which assessed braincase shape variation; and Toljagić and Butler (2013), which used discrete characters to investigate morphological variation in the entire skeleton.

Previous work on crocodylomorph cranial shape variation have mostly focused on specific subgroups, especially crocodylians (Monteiro et al. 1997; Pierce et al. 2008; Sadleir and Makovicky 2008; Piras et al. 2009; 2010; 2014; Watanabe and Slice 2014; Clarac et al. 2016; Iijima 2017; McCurry et al. 2017a; Foth et al. 2017a; Bona et al. 2018), but also thalattosuchians (Pierce et al. 2009a; Young et al. 2010) and notosuchians (Chapter 4). One exception, however, is the recent work of Wilberg (2017), which assessed cranial shape variation for Crocodyliformes as a whole, sampling a large number of species (n = 131).
Nevertheless, although larger than anything previously compiled, the landmark dataset presented by Wilberg (2017) did not include numerous crocodylomorphs (e.g., non-crocodyliform crocodylomorphs), and morphospace occupation was only compared between members of the crown-group (i.e., crocodylians) and non-crown crocodylomorphs. Therefore, the sample size of Wilberg (2017) could be significantly increased, potentially permitting the assessment of morphospace occupation among a larger number of crocodylomorph subgroups (e.g., notosuchians and thalattosuchians).

Furthermore, Wilberg (2017) used cranial shape data to estimate morphological disparity in crocodylomorphs through time, a practice also implemented previously by several other crocodylomorph studies (e.g., Pierce et al. 2008; Young et al. 2010; Stubbs et al. 2013) and very frequently in studies of other tetrapod groups (e.g., in dinosaurs [Benton et al. 2014; Brusatte et al. 2008a, b]), turtles [Foth and Joyce 2016; Foth et al. 2017b], pterosaurs [Butler et al. 2012; Foth et al. 2012], and early archosaurs [Foth et al. 2016a]). Wilberg (2017) compared disparity estimation using distinct disparity metrics (i.e., range- and variance-based metrics; Foote 1993; Wills et al. 1994; Foote 1997), as well as using different numbers of time bins (i.e., time bins based on chronostratigraphic divisions and equal-length time bins). However, a recent study (Guillerme and Cooper, 2018) suggests that alternative time subsampling methods can impact significantly on disparity-through-time analyses, given the uneven nature of the fossil record and that distinct methodologies have different assumptions for sampling taxa in each time interval. Additionally, Wilberg (2017) did not investigate cranial shape disparity among different crocodylomorph subgroups or ecologies (e.g., aquatic, semi-aquatic or terrestrial lifestyles).

In this Chapter, I use geometric morphometric techniques to comprehensively quantify crocodylomorph cranial shape variation, by combining a previously available landmark
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dataset (from Wilberg [2017]) with newly digitised specimens. I also quantify cranial shape disparity between distinct crocodylomorph subgroups, and estimate disparity through time across the entire evolutionary history of the group using a variety of alternative methods. Accordingly, this Chapter aims to assess the impact on both shape variation and disparity estimates of significantly increasing taxon sample size, as well as the possible drivers of the observed variation. Additionally, I aim to investigate the impacts of different methods used to estimate disparity over time.

3.2. Material and Methods

3.2.1. Sampling and data collection

I used two-dimensional landmark-based geometric morphometric analyses to quantify cranial shape variation among crocodylomorphs. Ideally, skull shape would be fully assessed in a three-dimensional approach, using landmarks on 3D surfaces. However, most crocodylomorph crania are taphonomically deformed, usually by dorsoventral compression, which prevents a comprehensive study using 3D data. Thus, I initially used the data published by Wilberg (2017), as this was the most phylogenetically comprehensive 2D landmark dataset available for the group. This dataset comprised 131 crocodylomorph specimens, most of which were identified to species level, and used only dorsal views of skulls, as this view is less susceptible to compression and taphonomic distortion across different crocodylomorph groups. Wilberg (2017) digitised four landmarks on the right side of the skulls of individual specimens (reflecting the left side of the skull when only this was available or it was better preserved or more complete than the right side): “Landmark 1” at the caudalmost point of the skull at the midline (excluding the occipital condyle), “Landmark 2” at the rostralmost point of the snout, “Landmark 3” at the rostralmost point of the orbit margin, and “Landmark 4” at
the caudalmost point of the quadrate or quadratojugal (when visible) or the caudolateralmost point of the skull. Apart from these four landmarks, the outlines of skulls were digitised by Wilberg (2017) using sliding semilandmarks (Bookstein 1996; 1997; Adams et al. 2004). As described by Wilberg (2017), the outline is traced as a curve extending from “Landmark 1” to “Landmark 2”, on the right side of the skull, and subsequently resampled to contain 60 equidistant semilandmarks (Fig. 3.1).

**Figure 3.1.** Example, using one specimen (*Araripesuchus wegeneri*, MNN GAD19), of the position of the four landmarks (in red) and the 60 equidistant semilandmarks curve (in yellow) used in this Chapter.

To expand this dataset, I digitised landmarks for 86 new specimens, representing an increase of nearly 65% over the dataset of Wilberg (2017). Non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs were particularly underrepresented in Wilberg (2017), with only three taxa present in the original dataset, but 18 in my expanded dataset. However, in general it was possible to expand the taxonomic sample of all crocodylomorph subgroups. From the 131 specimens included in the original dataset, five were removed, including three unnamed specimens ("*Borealosuchus* Tullock specimen", "*Mecistops* Lothagam specimen", and
“Prodiplocynodon Utah specimen”), as well as Stomatosuchus (because the fossil material was lost during World War II [Sereno and Larsson 2009], preventing the inclusion of the taxon in more recent phylogenetic analyses), and Hamadasuchus sp. (because first-hand observation allowed me to instead use the holotype specimen of this genus). Following Wilberg (2017), I did not include specimens identified by previous workers as juvenile or sub-adult in the expanded dataset, in order to reduce the effect of ontogeny on cranial shape variation. Furthermore, I also updated the taxonomy, permitting me to identify all specimens at least to species level and to incorporate more recent taxonomic opinions. Thus, some of the specimens treated by Wilberg (2017) as different species were merged (this was mostly the case among thalattosuchians following recent taxonomic work: e.g., Parrilla-Bel et al. [2013], Herrera et al. [2015], and Foffa et al. [2018]). In the cases where multiple specimens are present for a species, averaged values were obtained before the Procrustes alignment. The final expanded dataset includes 212 specimens, representing 209 species (see Appendix B for the complete list of specimens). For landmark data collection, I followed the procedure described in Wilberg (2017), using tpsUTIL version 1.76 (Rohlf 2015) for compiling the images into a single .tps file, then digitising the landmarks and semilandmarks in tpsDIG2 version 2.30 (Rohlf 2015).

3.2.2. Phylogenetic framework

For the phylogenetic framework, I used a modified version of the crocodylomorph supertree constructed for Chapter 2, which is itself a newer version of the supertrees previously constructed by Bronzati et al. (2012; 2015). As in Chapter 2, I used three alternative positions for the clade Thalattosuchia, as this represents one of the major uncertainties in crocodylomorph phylogeny (see “Material and Methods” section of Chapter 2 for details).
then used an informal approach (by manually modifying the tree using the software Mesquite version 3.51; Maddison and Maddison 2018) to add species for which I had landmark data, but which were not previously included in the supertree. The final version of the supertree includes 325 species (316 crocodylomorphs and nine non-crocodylomorph species, as outgroups), representing an increase of 20 taxa in comparison to the supertree used in Chapter 2. For the phylogenetic positions of the additional taxa included, I followed recently proposed phylogenetic hypotheses. These included Brochu (2006) for gavialoids, Jouve et al. (2015) for tomistomines, Meunier and Larsson (2017) for tethysuchians, and Parrilla-Bel et al. (2013), Herrera et al. (2015), Fanti et al. (2016), Foffa et al. (2018), and Ősi et al. (2018) for thalattosuchians. Additionally, I followed the phylogenetic hypothesis presented in Wilberg (2017) for some extant crocodylians included in his original landmark dataset.

For performing disparity analyses, it was necessary to time-calibrate the trees (Bapst 2014a). I used the mbl method (Laurin 2004), which uses a minimum branch duration (in this case set as 1 Myr) that is defined before time-scaling the phylogenies, in order to avoid zero-length branches. Only one time-calibration method was used, although several alternative approaches are available (see “Material and Methods” section of Chapter 2 for details), since the aim here was to assess the impact of other factors on the analyses (such as different topologies and distinct disparity metrics). For time-calibration, crocodylomorph age data (first and last occurrence dates) were initially obtained from the Paleobiology Database (PBDB), but were subsequently checked using the literature. To accommodate uncertainties related to both debatable phylogenetic positions (reflected as polytomies in the supertree) and ages of terminal taxa (i.e., ages based on single imprecise bounds, such as entire periods or ages/stages), I generated 10 randomly resolved trees, each one of which was time-calibrated with first and last occurrences dates treated as maximum and minimum possible ages,
drawing terminal dates (for the mbl method) from a uniform distribution between these. Time-scaling was performed using the package paleotree (Bapst 2012) in R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2018).

### 3.2.3. Geometric morphometric analyses

Prior to all geometric morphometric analyses, the crocodylomorph landmark data was subjected to a generalised Procrustes analysis (GPA), using the package geomorph (Adams and Otárola-Castillo 2013) in R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2018). GPA (also known as Procrustes superimposition, Procrustes fit or GPA-alignment) is performed for obtaining shape variables from landmark data after translating, rescaling and rotating the specimens, resulting in aligned Procrustes coordinates for each specimen (Gower 1975; Rohlf and Slice 1990). Semilandmarks were defined using function define.sliders() in the same package, and the location of sliding semilandmarks during GPA-alignment was optimised by minimizing the bending energy between the reference and target specimen (i.e., argument ProcD=FALSE within in the function gpagen(), also in geomorph; see Bookstein 1997). Subsequently, the Procrustes coordinates of specimens were used as the input data for an ordination method, to investigate which aspects of cranial shape varied the most among the sampled crocodylomorph taxa. For that, I used principal component analysis (PCA; Hotelling 1933), which was also performed in geomorph.

It is worth mentioning that these initial procedures (i.e., GPA followed by PCA) are, to some extent, different from those applied by Wilberg (2017). The first difference was that during Procrustes alignment, Wilberg (2017) allowed up to three iterations to occur (with semilandmarks allowed to slide differently in each iteration). As I did not set a maximum number of iterations, this resulted in up to six iterations in my analyses. Furthermore, Wilberg
(2017) also used a different software for performing GPA and ordination (tpsRELW; Rohlf 2015). Instead of PCA, Wilberg used Relative Warp Analysis (RWA) as the ordination method, which should produce equivalent results to PCA, as he did not weight the variation by bending energy (i.e., $a = 0$; Zelditch et al. 2012; Rohlf 2015). However, as a sensitivity analysis, I submitted the original landmark data from Wilberg (2017) to the same procedure used for the expanded dataset, in order to estimate the impact of these alternative procedures on the results (i.e., morphospace occupation and PC scores [eigenvalues of each principal component or eigenvector from the PCA]).

As the landmark data used in this Chapter derives from two distinct sources (i.e., the dataset provided by Wilberg [2017] and the data collected for the present study), particular attention was paid to the potential impact of interobserver error on the cranial shape data (i.e., measurement error caused by different observers/operators during the digitisation of landmarks). This issue has received increased attention recently, given that sharing of geometric morphometric datasets among scientists has become more frequent, and that a significant amount of data (particularly three-dimensional data) have been collected from multiple instruments (e.g., Fruciano 2016; Fruciano et al. 2017; Robinson and Tefhune 2017; Shearer et al. 2017; Daboul et al. 2018). To assess whether interobserver error could be influencing the morphospace occupation within my sample of crocodylomorphs, I initially examined the scatterplot of scores along the first two principal components, dividing the specimens into two groups: those originally included in the dataset of Wilberg (2017) and those newly included in this Chapter. Additionally, to more quantitatively approach this issue, I used Procrustes ANOVA (i.e., linear models) in geomorph (Goodall 1991; Klingenberg and McIntyre 1998; Anderson 2001) to compute the amount of variation caused by interobserver error. The Procrustes coordinates of all taxa were used as the response variable in the
Procrustes ANOVA formula, and the independent (grouping) variable was a discrete vector indicating whether the landmark data was originally collected by Wilberg (2017) or by me. As recommended by Collyer et al. (2015), I used a residual randomization permutation procedure with 10,000 permutations to test the model significance. The percentage of variation driven by interobserver error was then calculated by dividing the sum of squares (SS; see Goodall 1991) for the term (grouping variable) by the total sum of squares of the model. The same procedure was employed for examining the amount of variation originating from measurement error in the first principal components (i.e., computing the percentage of variation caused by interobserver error for each of these PCs).

Two procedures were then followed to attempt to minimise the effects of interobserver error on the shape data. First, I applied Burnaby’s (1966) procedure of statistical correction (also known as Burnaby back-projection or Burnaby’s projection), used for removing the effect of extraneous variables from morphometric data (Rohlf and Bookstein 1987; Adams 1999). Burnaby’s method was originally designed as a size correction procedure, but it can be used for removing the effects of other undesirable variables (vectors), by projecting the original shape data into a subspace orthogonal to these vectors (Adams 1999; Fruciano 2016). Apart from being frequently applied as a size correction in both traditional and geometric morphometrics (Jungers et al. 1995; Klingenberg 1996; 2016; McCoy et al. 2006), this method has proved itself useful for eliminating or reducing the artefactual variation caused by other factors, particularly the body arching in fish (e.g., Valentin et al. 2008; Fruciano et al. 2011; Ingram 2015). The subspace (L) orthogonal to an extraneous variable (f1) is obtained with matrix algebra, using the formula:

\[ L = I_q - f_1(f_1' f_1)^{-1} f_1' \]
For $N$ specimens, $f_1$ is a $q \times 1$ column vector, where $q$ is the number of variables. $I$ is the identity matrix of $q \times q$ dimensions, whereas $L$ is an idempotent symmetric matrix of rank $q - 1$ (Rohlf and Bookstein 1987; Adams 1999). By multiplying the original data matrix by $L$, the dataset of “adjusted specimens” (i.e., specimens with variation projected only to the hyperplane orthogonal to the vector $f_1$) is obtained (in this case, landmark coordinates without the effect of an undesirable factor). For the purpose of this Chapter, $f_1$ should be a vector that best represents the shape variation caused by interobserver error. Accordingly, I used the sum of squares from Procrustes ANOVA models to identify the principal component with the highest percentage of variation explained by interobserver error, and subsequently used the specimens’ PC scores for that principal component to represent $f_1$. The matrix algebra for the procedure described above was performed in R, adapting the script from Claude (2008). The resulting adjusted landmarks were subjected to GPA and PCA, and the scatterplot of the first two principal components was used to inspect the results (once again dividing the specimens into two groups).

The second procedure used for reducing the effect of interobserver error focused on the landmark digitisation protocol. As specified above, I followed the digitising protocol defined by Wilberg (2017). For assessing the accuracy of this protocol, I opened the .tps file (i.e., the “raw” landmark coordinates of each specimen) made available by Wilberg (2017) in the software tpsDIG2 version 2.30. As I did not have access to the source images of specimens originally used for digitising the landmarks, I modified the .tps file to use a blank image, which allowed me to visualise the landmarks of all specimens. I then compared the landmarks digitised by Wilberg (2017) and by me, searching for possible differences that
could generate biases during the digitisation process. I then attempted to minimise possible
differences by re-digitising the landmarks, following a standardised protocol.

Following these two procedures, landmark data were subjected to GPA and PCA, and
the results were then inspected using a plot of PC scores from the first two principal
components (with specimens divided into the same two groups), as well as by using
Procrustes ANOVA to calculate the percentage of variation caused by interobserver error. To
better visualise the morphospace occupation of different crocodylomorph subgroups (in PC1
versus PC2 scatterplots), I used distinct colours and convex hulls (i.e., the area inside the
minimum convex polygon; Cornwell et al. 2006) for six groups: Crocodylia, Tethysuchia,
Thalattosuchia, Notosuchia and two paraphyletic groupings of non-crocodylian neosuchians
(excluding tethysuchians and thalattosuchians) and non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs
(excluding thalattosuchians). To statistically assesses the differences in the morphospace
occupied by these groups, I used non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance
(npMANOVA). In contrast to a parametric MANOVA, npMANOVA does not require the
data to be normally distributed, and tests for significant differences on the basis of
permutations (Anderson 2001). Pairwise comparisons between groups were performed, with
PC scores of taxa within each group transformed into a Euclidean distance matrix and
permuted 10,000 times. I then obtained adjusted p-values, to reduce the likelihood of type 1
statistical errors, using the Bonferroni correction (Rice 1989). It is worth mentioning that, as
the Bonferroni correction is considered very conservative, other methods for dealing with
multiple comparisons were also applied (such as the “Holm” and the “BH” methods; Holm
[1979]; Benjamini and Hochberg [1995]), as a sensitive test. Nevertheless, when different
methods provided similar results, only the Bonferroni-corrected p-values were reported.
I used phylomorphospaces to visually examine the influence of phylogeny on the shape variation described by the first two principal components, by projecting phylogenetic hypotheses onto the morphospace of PC1 against PC2. For that, the ancestral states were estimated (i.e., landmark coordinates of hypothetical ancestors) using the R package `geomorph`, which in turn uses function `fastAnc()` from package `phytools` (Revell 2012). This function uses the “re-rooting method” (i.e., re-rooting the tree at every internal node; Yang et al. 1996; Garland and Ives 2000) for estimating ancestral states with maximum likelihood and assumes Brownian motion as the model of evolutionary change. Additionally, I more quantitatively assessed the phylogenetic signal present in the shape data using a multivariate generalisation of the K statistic of Bloomberg et al. (2003), which is a distance-based approach described by Adams (2014). Using the function `physignal()` present in R package `geomorph`, I obtained Adams’ K\textsubscript{mult}, which provides a statistical measure of phylogenetic signal based on Brownian motion dynamics (i.e., the expected value of K\textsubscript{mult} under Brownian motion is 1). The input data for this function is the entire dataset of aligned landmarks (Procrustes coordinates of all specimens), which means that all aspects of shape variation are being analysed (not only PC1 and PC2). For that, I used all 10 trees of each alternative phylogenetic scenario (i.e., with different positions of Thalattosuchia), and calculated K\textsubscript{mult} for each tree performing 1000 iterations.

Furthermore, I also divided crocodylomorph species into three categories representing distinct ecological habits (or lifestyles): marine/aquatic, freshwater/semi-aquatic and terrestrial species. For dividing taxa into these subsets, I used information available in the literature (mostly the information available in Mannion et al. 2015), as well as in the PBDB (see Appendix B for a list of the lifestyles of all taxa). I then visually assessed the differences in morphospace occupation using colours and convex hulls, and statistically scrutinised these
differences using npMANOVA (using the same parameters as for the taxonomic groups). For analyses with taxonomic groups and ecological categories, pairwise npMANOVA tests were performed using package RVAideMemoire (Hervé 2018), in R version 3.5.1 (R Core Team 2018).

3.2.4. Estimating disparity

Following the above procedures that accounted for measurement error, I performed analyses to calculate the cranial shape disparity of the sampled crocodylomorphs. There are numerous different methods for quantifying morphological disparity, which for geometric morphometric data correspond to alternative proxies for space occupation (commonly known as disparity metrics or indices; Foote 1993; Wills et al. 1994; Foote 1997; Wills 2001; Zelditch et al. 2012; Hopkins and Gerber 2017). Among these, the most frequently used in palaeontological studies are the sums and products of ranges and variances (Wills et al. 1994; Guillerme and Cooper 2018), which usually provide somewhat different results, and have their own limitations (e.g., range metrics are more susceptible to problems arising from uneven sampling, and variance metrics can introduce co-variance between not measured dimensions; Butler et al. 2012; Guillerme and Cooper 2018). For the analyses within this Chapter, I selected the sum of variances as the disparity metric, as it seems to be more robust for measuring disparity through time (see Wills et al. 1994; Guillerme and Cooper 2018), and also because it allows comparisons with the results from Wilberg (2017) as well as other studies (e.g., Stubbs et al. 2003; Toljagić and Butler 2013). Thus, herein, disparity is defined as the sum of variances expressed for all dimensions (eigenvectors), using PC scores of specimens from all non-null principal components.
For disparity-through-time analyses, I included the estimated ancestral states, using all 10 time-calibrated trees for each of the three alternative phylogenetic scenarios. Subsequently, two sub-sampling procedures were used for assessing crocodylomorph disparity through time: time binning and time-slicing. As detailed by Guillerme and Cooper (2018), different methods for sub-sampling taxa through time can have important impacts on the results of disparity-through-time studies. For example, using stratigraphic intervals such as stages (a widely employed approach; e.g., Prentice et al. 2011; Foth et al. 2012; Hughes et al. 2013; Stubbs et al. 2013; Benton et al. 2014; Wilberg 2017) usually introduces sampling biases, since some short time bins can include very few taxa, leading to large confidence intervals (Guillerme and Cooper 2018). Alternatively, time bins can be arbitrarily set to represent equal length intervals (e.g., Butler et al. 2012; Foth and Joyce 2016; Foth et al. 2016a; 2017b; Wilberg 2017), which might diminish the issues of uneven sampling. However, as this approach only allows comparisons of changes in disparity that occur between intervals, it potentially assumes a punctuated model of evolution (i.e., “punctuated equilibrium”, sensu Gould and Eldredge 1977), and prevents the assessment of variation within intervals as a result of gradual evolution (Guillerme and Cooper 2018). As an alternative to this time binning method, Guillerme and Cooper (2018) recently proposed the “time-slicing” method, which is a phylogeny-based method (i.e., using data from terminal taxa, nodes and branches) and takes into consideration those taxa contemporaneous at specific equidistant points in time (instead of taxa that were present between two points in time), resulting in even sampling. Furthermore, this method allows a priori definition of the evolutionary model underlying the changes in disparity.

Therefore, to more rigorously assess the patterns of crocodylomorph cranial shape disparity through time, I used both time sub-sampling methods, with time sub-samples (either
time bins or time slices) defined by the number of intervals (i.e., using the same number of
time intervals for both methods). In this case, I used 10 and 20 time intervals (i.e., equal-
length time bins, in the time binning method, and equally distant specific points in time, in the
time-slicing method), to assess the impact of the number of time intervals. In both methods, I
used landmark data for both terminal taxa and hypothetical ancestors, and I also allowed taxa
to occur in multiple time intervals, by using taxon first and last occurrence dates. PC scores of
taxa in each time bin were subjected to bootstrapping (1,000 iterations) to calculate
confidence intervals. Finally, for the time-slicing method, I calculated disparity assuming
gradual and punctuated models of evolution. For punctuated evolution, selection of values of
ancestors or descendants was based on the position of the time slice along the branch, using
the score of the ancestor if it is located in the first half of the branch, and the score of the
descendant if it is in the second half (i.e., “proximity”; Guillerme and Cooper 2018). For
gradual evolution, a probability function of the distance between the nodes/tip at the ends of
the branch and the slice was used for selecting the values (i.e., “gradual splits”; Guillerme and
Cooper 2018).

I further inspected disparity among different crocodylomorph subgroups by dividing
the PC scores for each species into distinct subsets. First, I assessed disparity using six
subsets: Crocodylia, Tethysuchia, Thalattosuchia, Notosuchia, non-crocodylian neosuchians
and non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs. Second, to investigate if the inclusion of
crocodylians and tethysuchians within Neosuchia could significantly change the results, I
divided the species into four subsets (Notosuchia, Thalattosuchia, Neosuchia and non-
mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs). PC scores were subsequently bootstrapped 100 times
and, during each bootstrap replication, the number of elements (taxa) drawn was standardised
in all groups, by rarefying the data to 18 elements (the minimum number of species in a group
[in this case, non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs]). As for disparity-through-time analyses, the metric used was the sum of variances (i.e., “disparity” is the median of the sum of variances in each group). Significant differences in bootstrapped median values were statistically assessed using npMANOVA with 10,000 permutations, followed by a Bonferroni correction for adjusted p-values (Rice 1989, Anderson 2001). Finally, in addition to these analyses investigating disparity among different taxonomic groups, I also calculated disparity for crocodylomorphs divided into three ecological categories. As for the taxonomic groups, PC scores were bootstrapped (100 times) and rarefied (to 45 elements, as this is the minimum number of taxa within any of the ecological categories), and I subsequently used npMANOVA to test for statistically significant differences. All disparity analyses (through-time and between groups) were performed using the R package dispRity (Guillerme 2018). An example R script of the morphometric geometric and disparity analyses can be found in Appendix C.

3.3. Results

3.3.1. Geometric morphometric analyses

The results obtained after subjecting the landmark dataset made available by Wilberg (2017) to Procrustes alignment (GPA) and ordination (PCA) were very similar to those originally presented by Wilberg (2017). The minor differences are possibly due to slightly different methodological settings between the two software packages (tpsRELW and the R package geomorph; as detailed in the “Material and Methods” section of this Chapter). However, the first two principal components represent very similar percentages of total shape variation (i.e., PC1 = 70.76% in this work and 73.55% in Wilberg [2017], PC2 = 9.58% in this work and 10.81% in Wilberg [2017]) and describe almost identical aspects of morphological changes
(PC1 mainly represents snout length, whereas PC2 shows variation in snout width, position of the orbit and quadrate condyle width). A morphospace scatterplot of PC1 against PC2 (Fig. 3.2) also shows taxa in similar positions in the morphospace to that presented in Wilberg (2017; figure 4), and convex hulls of crocodylians and non-crocodylian crocodylomorphs illustrate comparable morphospace occupations. These results indicate that any dissimilarities found after expanding the landmark dataset would not be the result of differences in the alignment and ordination procedures.

Figure 3.2. Morphospace scatterplot of the first two principal components using only specimens included in the original dataset of Wilberg (2017), with 131 taxa. Comparative morphospace occupation of crocodylians (crown group) and non-crocodylian crocodylomorphs (non-crown) is shown using convex hulls. Deformation grids illustrate the cranial shape at the extremes of each PC.
Following this initial sensitivity analysis, I investigated the cranial shape variation of crocodylomorphs using the expanded dataset of 209 species. Following GPA and PCA, the PC1 versus PC2 morphospace (Fig. 3.3) exhibits a pattern unequivocally caused by interobserver error (i.e., measurement error introduced to data due to different observers/operators during data collection). Taxa originally included in Wilberg’s (2017) dataset are clearly separated from those included in the present study, mainly along the PC2 axis. Whereas PC1 (50.89% of the variation) still seems to represent changes in snout length, PC2 accounts for a significant larger amount of the total variation (22.89% of the variation) compared to the sensitivity analysis. Furthermore, apart from changes in the quadrate condyle width, PC2 does not seem to represent variations in other meaningful aspects of cranial morphology, suggesting PC2 might mainly represent interobserver error.
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Figure 3.3. Morphospace plot (PC1 versus PC2) using the expanded dataset, with 209 taxa. Different colours were used for taxa originally in the dataset of Wilberg (2017), in red, and those newly included in the present Chapter, in blue. Deformation grids illustrate the cranial shape at the extremes of each PC.

Table 3.1. Procrustes ANOVA results investigating the amount of variation in shape data caused by interobserver error. SS, sum of squares after 10,000 permutations; MS, mean squares; % of variation, obtained by dividing the sum of squares of the independent variable (groups) by the total sum of squares; F, F-statistic; p, p-value. * Significant at alpha = 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>% of variation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total shape variation (all PCs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interobserver error</td>
<td>0.3507</td>
<td>0.35069</td>
<td>7.342348</td>
<td>16.403</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>4.4255</td>
<td>0.02138</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.7762</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Shape variation represented by PC2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>% of variation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interobserver error</td>
<td>0.32754</td>
<td>0.32754</td>
<td>29.96293</td>
<td>88.558</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>0.76562</td>
<td>0.00370</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.09316</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To quantitatively estimate the amount of measurement error in the shape data, I used Procrustes ANOVA with two distinct groups (taxa originally sampled by Wilberg [2017] and those included in this Chapter) as the independent variable. The results show that interobserver error corresponds to more than 7% of total shape variation, and virtually 30% when assessing only the variation expressed by PC2 (Table 3.1). Among other PCs, interobserver error represents a much smaller, sometimes marginal, percentage of the
variation (e.g., PC1 = 0.01%; PC3 = 2.84%; PC4 = 1.8%). This confirms that, among all principal components, PC2 contains the largest amount of interobserver error, suggesting that it could be used as a proxy vector (i.e., vector f1) for performing Burnaby’s (1966) projection, aiming at removing the effects of an extraneous variable (in this case, interobserver error) from the shape data. Thus, I subsequently employed Burnaby’s (1966) method, projecting the landmark data into a subspace orthogonal to scores from PC2.

After GPA and PCA, the amount of variation accounted for interobserver error was evidently reduced (from more than 7% to 1.68% of total shape variation). However, the morphospace of PC1 against PC2 reveals that essential shape information was also eliminated, as the morphological aspects represented by the first principal components are rather unrealistic (Fig. 3.4A). Since this procedure did not produce satisfactory results, I then more rigorously assessed the landmark digitising protocol, by visualising the landmarks from the original dataset on a blank image (see “Material and Methods” section of this Chapter for details). This allowed me to identify an important difference in the protocol. Different to what was described by Wilberg (2017), the curve representing the skull outline did not contain 60 equidistant semilandmarks. Instead, there were two separate but adjoining curves. The first curve, containing 35 semilandmarks, extended from “Landmark 1” to the level of the rostralmost point of the orbit. The other, with 25 semilandmarks, started just after the end of the first curve and extended until “Landmark 2”. Even though these curves were merged in the final .tps file made available by Wilberg (2017), they were very likely drawn separately, creating two modules on the outline of the skull (one rostral to and another caudal to the level rostralmost point of the orbit), potentially exacerbating differences between longirostrine and brevirostrine forms. Thus, to reduce the bias caused by differences in the digitising protocol, I used the software tpsDIG2 (Rohlf 2015) to manually modify all specimens in the original
Wilberg’s dataset, resampling the outline curves to contain 60 equidistant semilandmarks. I then added the remaining specimens (those included for the first time in the present work) and subjected the landmark data to GPA and PCA.
Figure 3.4. Morphospace plot (PC1 versus PC2) using the expanded dataset, after applying two procedures for removing the effect of interobserver error: A, Burnaby’s (1966) projection method and B, standardisation of the landmark digitising protocol. Different colours were used for taxa originally in the dataset of Wilberg (2017), in red, and those included for the first time in the present Chapter, in blue. Deformation grids illustrate the cranial shape at the extremes of each PC.

Procrustes ANOVA results (Table 3.2) show that potential error caused by multiple observers was drastically reduced (i.e., interobserver error accounts for 1.6% of total shape variation), which indicates that biases originating from imprecisions in the digitising protocol generated most of the error. For this reason, I used this modified version of the expanded dataset for all subsequent analyses. The morphospace scatterplot of PC1 versus PC2 provides further evidence that interobserver error has been considerably reduced following the standardisation of the digitising protocol, as specimens are not clearly separated (Fig. 3.4B). The aspects of morphology represented by PC1 and PC2 are equivalent to those found by the original analysis (Wilberg, 2017). PC1 (71.89% of the variation) still describes variation in snout length, but it also expresses changes in the caudolateral region of the skull, maybe reflecting the addition of many metriorhynchoid thalattosuchians (twice as many as in the original dataset) and some gavialoids (such as Piscogavialis jugaliperforatus and Ikanogavialis gameroi). PC2 (8.6% of the variation) mostly describes changes in the quadrate condyle and the position of the orbit in relation to the lateral outline of the skull. All other principal components summed up represent less than 16% of total shape variation, none of which represents more than 4% (Fig. 3.5).
Figure 3.5. Percentage of the cranial shape variation expressed by each of the first 20 principal components, using the modified version of the expanded dataset (after the standardisation of the landmark digitising protocol). Shown in green are the principal components (PC1 and PC2) used for morphospace scatterplots in this Chapter.

Table 3.2. Procrustes ANOVA results investigating the amount of variation in shape data caused by interobserver error after the standardisation of the landmark digitising protocol. SS, sum of squares after 10,000 permutations; MS, mean squares; % of variation, obtained by dividing the sum of squares of the independent variable (groups) by the total sum of squares; F, F-statistic; p, p-value. * Significant at alpha = 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>% of variation</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interobserver error</td>
<td>0.0870</td>
<td>0.0869</td>
<td>1.6066</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>0.038*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residuals</td>
<td>5.3272</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.4142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The region around the negative end of the PC1 axis (left side of the plot; Fig. 3.6) shows a concentration of longirostrine species, most of which are gavialoids (such as *Piscogavialis jugaliperforatus* and *Ikanogavialis gameroi*), thalattosuchians (such as *Pelagosaurus typus*, *Steneosaurus bollensis*, and *Teleosaurus cadomensis*), and tethysuchians (such as the “pholidosaurid” *Terminonaris browni* and the dyrosaurid *Rhabdognathus keiniensis*). However, some representatives of other groups are also present in this region, such as the notosuchian *Stolokrosuchus lapparenti* and the crocodyloid *Euthecodon brumpti*.

The positive extremity of PC1 (Fig. 3.6) is dominated by forms with very short rostra, such as the notosuchians *Notosuchus terrestris* and *Comahuesuchus brachybuccalis*, the non-crocodylian neosuchians *Iharkutosuchus makadii* and *Acynodon adriaticus*, as well as the non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodyliform *Gobiosuchus kielanae*. The distribution along the PC2 axis is not as extreme as for PC1, but, in general, taxa at the positive end of the axis (at the top of the plot; Fig. 3.6) have broader snouts and wider quadrate condyles. This region is occupied by the caimanine alligatoroid *Purussaurus brasiliensis*, as well as some notosuchians (such as *Lorosuchus nodosus* and *Armadillosuchus arrudai*). Notosuchians (such as *Candidodon itapecuruense*) are also observed in the region of negative PC2 scores (at the bottom of the plot; Fig. 3.6), in addition to many thalattosuchians (such as *Cricosaurus lithographicus*, *Maledictosuchus ricaensis* and *Rhacheosaurus gracilis*).

Comparisons of the morphospace occupied by different crocodylomorph subgroups (Fig. 3.7) reveals a wide distribution of crocodylians and notosuchians. Crocodylian species (Fig. 3.7A) exhibit almost the entire range of morphological variation described by PC1 (i.e., long versus short snouts), whereas most notosuchians (Fig. 3.7B) occupy the region of short rostra (although the presence of *Stolokrosuchus lapparenti* in the analysis expands the morphospace occupation of the group towards the “longirostrine region”). Pairwise statistical
assessment using npMANOVA (Table 3.3) reinforces the apparently disparate cranial morphology of these two groups, as it shows that their morphospaces are significantly different to one another, and also from most of the groups tested.

**Figure 3.6.** Morphospace plot (PC1 versus PC2) of crocodylomorph cranial shape variation, using the expanded dataset, after removing the effect of interobserver error (by standardising the landmark digitising protocol). Different colours represent distinct crocodylomorph subgroups: non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs (excluding thalattosuchians), Notosuchia, non-crocodylian neosuchians (excluding tethysuchians and thalattosuchians), Tethysuchia, Thalattosuchia, and Crocodylia.

The morphospaces of thalattosuchians and tethysuchians (Fig. 3.7C, and D) are more restricted to the “longirostrine region” of the scatterplot, and the npMANOVA tests further indicate that their morphospaces do not differ significantly from each other (Table 3.3). The
npMANOVA results also show that the morphospace of non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs is not significantly distinct from that of notosuchians, although they exhibit an apparently less disparate morphospace occupation, with nearly all species confined to the region of shorter snouts (Fig. 3.7E). Lastly, even though the morphospace of non-neosuchian crocodylians is, in general, more restricted than that of crocodylians and they do not differ significantly (Fig. 3.7F; Table 3.3), some species explore regions of the morphospace not occupied by members of the crown-group (e.g., those of extremely short snouts, such as Acynodon and Iharkutosuchus).

Table 3.3. npMANOVA results illustrating differences in the morphospace occupied by distinct crocodylomorph subgroups in a pairwise comparison. *Bonferroni-corrected p-values significant at alpha = 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise comparison</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Notosuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Thalattosuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Tethysuchia</td>
<td>0.0585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Non-crocodileian neosuchians</td>
<td>0.0615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Non-mesoeucrocrocylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Thalattosuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Tethysuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Non-crocodileian neosuchians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Non-mesoeucrocylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalattosuchia – Tethysuchia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalattosuchia – Non-crocodileian neosuchians</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalattosuchia – Non-mesoeucrocylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tethysuchians – Non-crocodileian neosuchians</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tethysuchians – Non-mesoeucrocylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-neosuchians crocodylians – Non-mesoeucrocylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though some crocodylomorph subgroups exhibit morphospaces that are significantly distinct from other groups, no clear signal is recovered when phylogenetic
information is incorporated into tangent space, producing a phylomorphospace plot of PC1 against PC2 (Fig. 3.8). The results were similar across all phylogenetic hypotheses available (i.e., 10 trees for each phylogenetic scenario, with different positions of Thalattosuchia). Indeed, using any of these trees, the phylogenetic signal estimated for the shape data was relatively weak, although significant ($K_{mult}$ values between 0.152 and 0.201, p-values = 0.001), which is consistent with the multiple intersections of branches seen in the phylomorphospace.

![Phylomorphospace](image)

**Figure 3.8.** Phylomorphospace (i.e., phylogenetic relationships plotted on to PC scores of specimens) of crocodylomorph cranial shape variation (PC1 versus PC2). Circles of different colours represent distinct crocodylomorph subgroups: non-mesoecrocrocdylian crocodylomorphs, Notosuchia, non-crocodylian neosuchians, Tethysuchia, Thalattosuchia, and Crocodylia. White circles represent ancestor states (Procrustes coordinates), which were reconstructed using maximum likelihood. Phylogenetic hypothesis from tree number 1, with Thalattosuchia within Neosuchia, but different trees produce very similar results.

I further assessed the morphospace occupation of crocodylomorphs divided into three distinct ecological categories (i.e., aquatic/marine, semi-aquatic/freshwater and terrestrial).
Although most terrestrial taxa are restricted to the region of the morphospace that represents short-snouted skulls (positive end of the PC1 axis in Fig. 3.9), they also range along the entire PC2 axis. Conversely, aquatic crocodylomorphs are more confined to the negative end of the PC1 axis (Fig. 3.9) and are represented by some of the most extreme longirostrine forms (such as *Ikanogavialis gameroi*). Semi-aquatic species are more widespread along the PC1 axis (Fig. 3.9), although their distribution along the PC2 axis seems to be similar to that observed for aquatic forms. These differences between the distinct ecologies are reflected in the npMANOVA results, which indicate that all three categories have significantly different morphospace occupation (p-values < 0.001).

**Figure 3.9.** Morphospace occupation of crocodylomorphs divided into three ecological categories: aquatic/marine (n = 56), semi-aquatic/freshwater (n = 109) and terrestrial (n = 44).
3.3.2. Disparity through time and between groups

Distinct tree topologies, as well as different time sub-sampling methods, had significant impacts on the disparity-through-time analyses (see Appendix D for plots of all disparity-through-time analyses). For each alternative phylogenetic scenario (i.e., changing the position of Thalattosuchia), 10 distinct randomly resolved trees were time-scaled, generating different branch lengths in each tree. Furthermore, as these trees were used for estimating the ancestral states (i.e., landmark coordinates of hypothetical ancestors), they presumably produce distinct PC scores for ancestors. Comparisons of trees sharing the same position of Thalattosuchia show some dissimilarities in the pattern of disparity through time, and these differences are more marked when a greater number of time intervals are used (using either the time binning or the time-slicing methods). Using trees with Thalattosuchia as the sister group of Crocodyliformes as an example (Fig. 3.10), analyses using distinct randomly resolved and time-scaled trees disagree on the timing and magnitude of a disparity peak during the early evolution of the group. Whereas some trees show this peak beginning prior to the Triassic-Jurassic (T–J) boundary, other trees yield a later start, only after the boundary. Other differences include whether there is an increase or a decrease in disparity from the middle of the Neogene (Eocene) to the Recent, as well as if a peak observed during the Early Cretaceous corresponds to the highest disparity seen in the group’s entire evolutionary history (Fig. 3.10). The use of alternative phylogenetic positions of Thalattosuchia did not cause significant changes to the patterns of disparity after the Late Jurassic, having instead the greatest impact on disparity estimation during the Jurassic, since this corresponds to the age range of thalattosuchians.
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Figure 3.10. Comparison between different randomly resolved and time-scaled trees used for disparity-through-time analyses. All trees share the same phylogenetic position of thalattosuchians (as sister to Crocodyliformes) and the analyses used the same time sub-sampling method (time binning method, with 20 equal-length time bins). The sum of variance is used as the disparity metric. Light and dark green shades represent, respectively, 75% and 97.5% confidence intervals from 1,000 bootstrapping replicates.

In general, disparity-through-time analyses using more time intervals (either time bins or time slices) reconstruct more nuanced changes in disparity, even though they also often have larger confidence intervals (Fig. 3.11). When comparing different time sub-sampling methods, similar differences are observed to those seen when different tree topologies are compared (i.e., variation in the timing and magnitude of disparity peaks). For example, analyses using the time-slicing method more frequently detected an increase in disparity during the Palaeogene (Eocene) than those using the time-binning method. Similarly, the magnitude estimated for the peak seen at the end of the Early Cretaceous (i.e., Aptian–Albian)
was usually greater when using the time-slicing method. Furthermore, comparing analyses using only the time-slicing method, but with different numbers of time slices, analyses with 10 time slices more often failed to detect an early disparity peak (during the Early Jurassic) than those using 20 time slices. By contrast, almost identical results were found when different evolutionary models (i.e., punctuated or gradual model) were assumed for analyses using the time-slicing method (Fig. 3.11).

Despite these dissimilarities arising from different time-scaled trees and time sub-sampling methods, most analyses seem to agree on some overall patterns of crocodylomorph cranial shape disparity through time (Figs. 3.10, 3.11 and Appendix D). An early peak in disparity is frequently observed, most often during the Early Jurassic (although sometimes even prior to the Triassic-Jurassic boundary). Following a sharp decrease during the Middle Jurassic, disparity undergoes a continuous increase until the middle of the Cretaceous (Aptian–Albian), when maximum disparity is reached in most analyses. Subsequently, a near constant decline is observed during the Late Cretaceous and the Palaeocene, with analyses only disagreeing whether it continues until the Recent or ceases during the Eocene. In these latter cases (more frequently seen in analyses using the time-slicing method), the sharp increase in disparity seen in the Eocene is sometimes maintained until the Recent.
Figure 3.11. Comparison between different time sub-sampling methods used for calculating crocodylomorph disparity through time. All analyses used the same time-scaled tree (tree number 4 with Thalattosuchia within Neosuchia). A, Time binning method, with 10 equal-length time bins. B, Time binning method, with 20 equal-length time bins. C, Time-slicing method, with 10 time slices, assuming punctuated evolution. D, Time-slicing method, with 20 time slices, assuming punctuated evolution. E, Time-slicing method, with 10 time slices, assuming gradual evolution. F, Time-slicing method, with 20 time slices, assuming gradual evolution. The sum of variance is used as the disparity metric. Light and dark green shades represent, respectively, 75% and 97.5% confidence intervals from 1,000 bootstrapping replicates.
Subsequently, I examined cranial shape disparity among different crocodylomorph subgroups. Analyses with six subsets (i.e., Crocodylia, Notosuchia, Thalattosuchia, Tethysuchia, non-crocodylian neosuchians, and non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs) revealed that Notosuchia has the highest cranial shape disparity among all groups assessed (Fig. 3.12A). Crocodylia exhibits a smaller disparity, although slightly higher than the other four groups (Tethysuchia, Thalattosuchia, non-crocodylian neosuchians, and non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs), which have comparable median values. Pairwise comparisons (Table 3.4) show that disparity in both Notosuchia and Crocodylia is significantly different from that in all other groups analysed, whereas some other groups have statistically equivalent disparities (e.g., thalattosuchians and non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs, as well as tethysuchians and non-crocodylian eusuchians). The same results were recovered when fewer subsets of taxa were analysed (i.e., Notosuchia, Thalattosuchia, non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs, and Neosuchia), with notosuchian disparity still higher and significantly different from the other groups (Fig. 3.12B; Table 3.5). Finally, I assessed the differences in disparity between the three ecological categories (i.e., aquatic/marine, semi-aquatic/freshwater and terrestrial). Whereas aquatic and semi-aquatic species exhibit similar median disparity (Fig. 3.13), which is supported by the npMANOVA results (Table 3.6), terrestrial crocodylomorphs show significantly higher disparity than the other two categories (Fig. 3.13; Table 3.6).
Figure 3.12. Cranial shape disparity (sum of variances) among different crocodylomorph subgroups. 
A, Species divided into six taxonomic subsets (“neosuchians” represent crocodylian neosuchians, without thalattosuchians and tethysuchians; “crocodylomorphs” represent non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs, without thalattosuchians). B, Species divided into four taxonomic subsets (“Neosuchia” also includes crocodylians and tethysuchians). PC scores of specimens were bootstrapped and rarefied for disparity calculation.
Table 3.4. npMANOVA results for pairwise comparisons of cranial shape disparity (sum of variances) in different crocodylomorph subgroups (divided into six subsets). *Bonferroni-corrected p-values significant at alpha = 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise comparison</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Notosuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Thalattosuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Tethysuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Non-crocodylian neosuchians</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylia – Non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0090*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Thalattosuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Tethysuchia</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Non-crocodylian neosuchians</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalattosuchia – Tethysuchia</td>
<td>0.0090*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalattosuchia – Non-crocodylian neosuchians</td>
<td>0.7919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalattosuchia – Non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.6884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tethysuchians – Non-crocodylian neosuchians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tethysuchians – Non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-neosuchians crocodylians – Non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0015*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.5. npMANOVA results for pairwise comparisons of cranial shape disparity (sum of variances) in different crocodylomorph subgroups (divided into four subsets). *Bonferroni-corrected p-values significant at alpha = 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise comparison</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Neosuchia</td>
<td>0.0006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Thalattosuchia</td>
<td>0.0006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notosuchia – Non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neosuchia – Thalattosuchia</td>
<td>0.0006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neosuchia – Non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>0.0006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thalattosuchia – Non-mesoecrocodylian crocodylomorphs</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.13. Cranial shape disparity (sum of variances) with crocodylomorphs subdivided into three different lifestyle categories: marine/aquatic (n = 56), freshwater/semi-aquatic (n = 109), and terrestrial (n = 44) species. PC scores of specimens were bootstrapped and rarefied for disparity calculation.

Table 3.6. npMANOVA results (pairwise comparisons) of cranial shape disparity (sum of variances) of crocodylomorphs assessed in different lifestyle categories. *Bonferroni-corrected p-values (q-values) significant at alpha = 0.05.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise comparison</th>
<th>q-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic – Semi-aquatic</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic – Terrestrial</td>
<td>0.0003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semi-aquatic – Terrestrial</td>
<td>0.0003*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.4. Discussion

3.4.1. Assessing the different methods to minimise the effects of interobserver error

Among the two methods applied for diminishing the effects of interobserver error, only the standardisation of the landmark digitising protocol proved itself useful in the context of this Chapter. Although other studies previously successfully applied Burnaby’s (1966) projection method, most of these were able to create a model to more appropriately represent the extraneous variable, which can be either a size-factor or undesirable morphological features (e.g., Gharaibeh 2005; Valentin et al. 2008). For example, Valentin et al. (2008) presented a protocol for removing the effects of upward and downward arching in the body of fish due to preservation. For that approach, the authors digitised landmarks from 10 arched specimens (photographed 20 times each) to create a deformation model that represented the arching effect. The landmark data of this model was then subjected to GPA and RWA (equivalent to PCA), and the first eigenvector (i.e., principal component), representing 97.3% of total variation, accurately described the arching effect. Subsequently, Burnaby’s (1966) projection method was applied, by projecting the original landmark data to a subspace orthogonal to the first eigenvector of the deformation model. This procedure was further applied in other studies (e.g.; Fruciano et al. 2011; 2012; Franchini et al. 2014; Ingram 2015; Fruciano et al. 2016), for which it also provided satisfactory results.

For the analyses in this Chapter, however, the extraneous variable (i.e., interobserver error) could not be modelled. Thus, the second principal component (PC2) was used as a proxy, since among all PCs, PC2 described the largest amount of interobserver error (~30% of the variation described by this eigenvector). Nevertheless, after applying Burnaby’s projection method, other components of morphological variation described by PC2 were also removed, generating in unrealistic result (which could be assessed after performing GPA and PCA; Fig.
3.4A). Similar issues were reported by Berner (2011), which used simulated data to assess the effectiveness of size-correction methods based on principal components, a widely applied approach (Klingenberg 2016). This approach assumes that, in datasets with a substantial amount of variation correlated with size, PC1 should mostly reflect size variation, and could hypothetically be used as a proxy vector for Burnaby’s projection method. Nevertheless, Berner (2011) demonstrated that this method produced systematic statistical artefacts, especially when all traits in the dataset were strongly correlated with size, making it inappropriate for size correction. Likewise, similar artefacts are expected in the context of the present Chapter, since the interobserver error is very likely correlated with all aspects of morphological variation (described by the principal components).

By contrast, the second approach used (i.e., looking for differences in the landmark digitising protocol) sensibly reduced the effects of interobserver error (from 7.35% to 1.6% of total shape variation; Tables 3.1 and 3.2). After performing GPA and PCA, it was possible to confirm that the aspects of morphology described by the principal components were realistic and compatible with the variation seen in the actual specimens (Fig. 3.4B). These results demonstrate, in practice, the importance of well-described, standardised digitisation protocols. Similarly, Fruciano et al. (2017) suggested that, if more than one observer/operator is required during the digitisation of landmarks, the exclusion of landmarks that are potentially difficult to digitise can robustly reduce interobserver error. Thus, if we are to more frequently use landmark data from different sources in geometric morphometric studies, by either combining published datasets with newly digitised specimens or using more than one operator during the digitisation process, approaches towards best practice should include clearer, simpler and well-described digitisation protocols.
3.4.2. Crocodylomorph cranial shape variation

The geometric morphometric analyses showed that most of the shape variation in crocodylomorph skulls represents changes in the snout, particularly in its length and width (Figs. 3.5 and 3.6). This is consistent with what was found in previous geometric morphometric studies (e.g., Pierce et al. 2008; Sadleir and Makovicky 2008; Pierce et al. 2009a; Piras et al. 2009; Young et al. 2010; Foth et al. 2017a; Wilberg 2017; Chapter 4), indicating that this region of the skull has the highest morphological variation. High variability in crocodylomorph snout length has long been acknowledged (Langston 1973; Busbey 1995; Brochu 2001), even leading early taxonomists (e.g., Lydekker 1888) to erroneously classify crocodylomorphs into different groups (Pierce et al. 2008). More recently, however, the high plasticity of crocodylomorph snouts has been more frequently recognised, resulting from the strong ecological selective pressures on this region of the skull, such as those arising from feeding behaviour (see Mc Curry et al. [2017a] for an exceptional example of convergent evolution in snouts of crocodylians and odontocete cetaceans).

Consequently, cladistic studies (e.g., Clark 1994; Jouve et al. 2006; Pol and Gasparini 2009; Wilberg 2015) have suggested that convergences in crocodylomorph snouts during their evolutionary history have created the “longirostrine problem”, in which clades that are not necessarily closely related tend to be grouped together in phylogenetic analyses. Even though the variation seen within snout lengths may differ between different crocodylomorph groups (for example, in Notosuchia snout length variation seems to represent a less substantial amount of total skull shape variation; Chapter 4), this seems to be a key feature during the group’s evolutionary history.

Snout length can provide useful insights into ecological specializations (Taylor 1987; Busbey 1995; Brochu 2001; McHenry et al. 2006; Pierce et al. 2008; Walmsley et al. 2013).
For example, longer snouts are traditionally associated with a piscivorous diet, since the tip of the snout moves faster through water, facilitating the capture of small prey such as fish (Thorbjarnarson 1990; McHenry et al. 2006; Walmsley et al. 2013; McCurry et al. 2017b). Similarly, snout width also has important biomechanical implications, such as impacting on hydrodynamic pressure drag (e.g., longirostrine animals compensate the higher pressure from dragging with narrower snouts; McHenry et al. 2006; Walmsley et al. 2013). Unfortunately, the two-dimensional nature of the geometric morphometric data used in the present study, using skulls only in dorsal view, prevents the assessment of crocodylomorph snout height, which represents a relevant aspect of rostral morphology and has important biomechanical implications (Taylor 1987; Busbey 1995; McHenry et al. 2006).

Other regions of the crocodylomorph skull also vary significantly according to the aspects of morphology described by the principal components. Changes in the quadrate condyle width and in the caudolateral region of the skull are described by both PC1 and PC2 (Fig. 3.6). As for the variation seen in among crocodylomorph snouts, modifications in the quadrate condyle, presumably associated with the craniomandibular joint, also have important implications for biomechanics and feeding strategies (Kley et al. 2010; Stubbs et al. 2013; Øsi 2014).

Some crocodylomorph subgroups occupy regions of the morphospace that are significantly distinct from other groups (Fig. 3.7; Table 3.3), which might indicate that clade-specific innovations led to the exploration of new cranial morphologies. However, the relatively weak phylogenetic signal estimated, independently of the phylogenetic hypothesis used, is consistent with the multiple intersections of branches seen in the phylomorphospace (Fig. 3.8). Indeed, it seems clear that whereas some clades, such as Thalattosuchia, are more confined to a given region of the morphospace, others are more widespread, including
Neosuchia, Crocodylia and Notosuchia. Previous work also found only weak to moderate correlations between phylogeny and morphospace occupation in some crocodylomorph subgroups (such as crocodylians and thalattosuchians; Pierce et al. 2008; 2009a, b), indicating the highly convergent nature of crocodylomorph cranial shape evolution. However, if Thalattosuchia are considered to be within Neosuchia, non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs are almost entirely restricted to the brevirostrine region of morphospace. If this “longirostrine region” represents a new adaptive zone (sensu Simpson 1953; Hansen 2012), this could be reflecting an episode of adaptive zone invasion (i.e., evolution into a region of the morphospace never explored by non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs). If real, the timing of this evolutionary innovation (i.e., mesoeucrocodylians exploring a new region of the morphospace) would be consistent with the shifts in diversity and body size identified at the base of Mesoeucrocodylia (Bronzati et al. 2015; Chapter 2).

### 3.4.3. Crocodylomorph cranial shape disparity

Disparity-through-time results were highly sensitive to changes in the time sub-sampling method and in the phylogenetic hypothesis used (Figs. 3.10 and 3.11). The considerable variation seen in these results has multiple causes. First, distinct time-scaled trees vary in assuming different stratigraphic dates for the occurrences of individual taxa (reflecting the uncertainties in the stratigraphic occurrences of most taxa used in these analyses, with many taxa known from point occurrences but with stratigraphic uncertainty often spanning two or more stages), as well as in different resolutions for polytomies (which were randomly resolved in each tree). For similar reasons, although not tested here, it is very likely that alternative time-scaling methods (e.g., cal3 and the extended Hedman methods; Bapst 2013; Lloyd et al. 2016) would also impact on disparity-through-time estimation (see “Material and
Furthermore, the use of distinct phylogenetic hypotheses, in this case the variable position of Thalattosuchia, results in different ancestral state estimations. Similarly, distinct approaches to estimating ancestral states could also potentially impact on the results (see Ekman et al. 2008; Slater et al. 2012). Finally, the use of distinct time sub-sampling methods, as well as different numbers of time intervals (either time bins or time slices), results in different taxa being sampled in each time interval, since the rates of sedimentation (and fossilisation) are uneven in space and time (Butler et al. 2012; Guillerme and Cooper 2018).

These results shed light on the importance of using multiple time sub-sampling methods and trees for these analyses (as previously highlighted by Guillerme and Cooper 2018), but also multiple phylogenetic hypotheses (for groups with major uncertainties in stratigraphic occurrence dates and phylogenetic relationships). However, many previous studies have ignored this issue, often presenting results based on one time-scaled phylogeny and one time binning approach (e.g., Brusatte et al. 2008a, b; Stubbs et al. 2013; Foth and Joyce 2016). Accordingly, rather than using a single analysis, a better way to report the results might be by describing shared patterns among the outputs, as I have done here.

The overall disparity patterns seen in most disparity-through-time analyses resemble those found by Wilberg (2017), in that a clear peak is observed in the Cretaceous, followed by a nearly continuous decline towards the Recent. Some differences, however, are also noted. Since Wilberg (2017) used different disparity metrics in his analyses, my comparisons between my results and his focus on the results of variance-based disparities. The first discrepancy arises from the fact that Wilberg (2017) restricted his study to Crocodyliformes (with the exception of thalattosuchians) and did not include any Late Triassic species, resulting in an absence of information about crocodylomorph disparity prior to the Jurassic.
When using stratigraphic intervals as time bins for his disparity-through-time analyses (resulting in 36 time bins), Wilberg (2017) found two significant disparity peaks during the Jurassic (one in the Pliensbachian and another in the Aalenian–Bajocian), whereas in most of my analyses a single Jurassic peak was estimated, usually occurring from the Sinemurian to the Toarcian (Figs. 3.10 and 3.11). However, similarly to my results, Wilberg’s analyses did not detect Jurassic peaks in disparity when using fewer, equal-length time bins (n = 9), at least not with comparable magnitude to the peak in the Cretaceous. The timing of the disparity peak in the Cretaceous is another divergence between the two studies, with the analyses performed by Wilberg (2017) indicating a Late Cretaceous peak (Cenomanian), whereas most of my analyses show a slightly earlier peak (Aptian–Albian). Finally, another difference was found in the pattern of disparity from the Eocene to the Recent. Whereas many of my analyses (particularly when using the time-slicing method) indicate a disparity increase starting in the Eocene, this increase is not identified by the variance-based analyses in Wilberg (2017).

The discrepancies between these two studies can be explained by the increase in the sample size, by the differences in ages assigned to both terminal taxa and lineage divergences, and by methodological differences in time sub-sampling strategies and the consideration of divergent phylogenetic hypotheses. A similar argument may explain differences seen between my results and those presented by Stubbs et al. (2013). Stubbs et al. (2013) found that mandibular morphological disparity was greater during the Late Cretaceous. Besides using a different proxy for morphological disparity (mandibular shape instead of cranial), Stubbs et al. (2013) also sampled 23 non-crocodylomorphs (such as phytosaurs and aetosaurs), as they were interested in pseudosuchian disparity more broadly.

Regarding the disparity patterns that are common to most of my results, the early peak seen during the Jurassic is very likely associated with the origin and diversification of
thalattosuchians, as already pointed out by Wilberg (2017) and Stubbs et al. (2013). The subsequent sharp decline, which is detected prior to the Jurassic-Cretaceous boundary in many analyses, is probably related to the extinction of some thalattosuchians (mostly teleosaurids, as suggested by Stubbs et al. [2013]). However, it might further indicate that the Early Jurassic peak was also driven by the diversity of non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs (such as protosuchids, Dibothrosuchus, Litargosuchus and Sphenosuchus), most of which disappear from the record after the Toarcian. Subsequently, the peak seen in the Cretaceous is presumably related to the diversification of notosuchians, as also noted by Wilberg (2017) and Stubbs et al. (2013). Indeed, comparisons of disparity between groups indicate that notosuchians have the highest disparity among the groups assessed (Fig. 3.12). However, other groups also contribute to this Cretaceous increase in disparity, such as the aquatic tethysuchian dyrosaurids.

The subsequent decrease in disparity seen from the Late Cretaceous to Eocene can be explained by the extinction of most notosuchians and dyrosaurids, as well as some non-crocodilian eusuchians. Finally, the peak in the Eocene, identified by some analyses, might reflect the thermal optimum during the epoch (Early Eocene Climatic Optimum; Zachos et al. 2008), as also suggested by Wilberg (2017). This event possibly contributed to an expansion of the geographic range of crocodylians, leading to an increase in diversity (Mannion et al. 2015). Some analyses using the time-slicing method show disparity subsequently either increasing until the Recent or at least sustained at similar levels to that in the Eocene. Conversely, most analyses using the time binning method did not detect this increase in disparity during the Eocene, suggesting caution is required in interpreting Eocene–Recent patterns.
3.4.4. Ecological diversity and crocodylomorph skull shape

The high variability of the crocodylomorph snout, which associated with ecological specializations (particularly the ones related to feeding; McHenry et al. 2006; Walmsley et al. 2013), combined with the weak phylogenetic signal found for cranial shape data, suggests that crocodylomorph cranial shape evolution is mostly driven by ecology. I further examined the effect of ecology on shape variation by subdividing the species into three ecological categories (aquatic/marine, semi-aquatic/freshwater and terrestrial), using habitat (i.e., the hypothesised environment in which these species lived in) as a proxy for ecological diversity. The npMANOVA results provide further support for this hypothesis, as they show that all three categories have significantly distinct morphospaces.

Closer inspection of the morphospace reveals that semi-aquatic/freshwater forms are more widespread along the PC1 axis in comparison to terrestrial and aquatic/marine crocodylomorphs (Fig. 3.9), suggesting a higher diversity of feeding strategies in semi-aquatic/freshwater species. However, when cranial shape disparity is quantified, terrestrial forms show higher disparity than both aquatic and semi-aquatic categories (Fig. 3.13). Disparity estimation includes the shape variation described by all principal components, not just that shown in the morphospace scatterplot of PC1 against PC2. Thus, although exhibiting less variability in terms of snout length, skulls of terrestrial species are more disparate in general.

This higher disparity in terrestrial taxa is possibly related to the cranial shape variation of notosuchians, which show greater disparity than any other crocodylomorph subgroup (Fig. 3.12). Notosuchians explored a wide range of cranial morphologies, some of which are unique within crocodylomorph evolutionary history (such as mammal-like adaptations and putative herbivory; Buckley et al. 2000; O’Connor et al. 2010; Ösi 2014). The remarkable species
diversity and morphological disparity of notosuchians have previously been recognised by other studies (e.g., Stubbs et al. 2013; Bronzati et al. 2015; Leardi and Pol 2015; Mannion et al. 2015; Wilberg; 2017), and could be explained by either extrinsic (e.g., specific environmental conditions; Carvalho et al. 2010) or intrinsic factors, including adaptations and biological innovations (such as their unique feeding apparatus; Ösi 2014; Pol et al. 2014) potentially driven by modes of evolution distinct from that of other crocodylomorphs (as suggested by the body size analyses in Chapter 2).

Apart from notosuchians, other crocodylomorph subgroups contribute to the higher disparity of terrestrial forms, mainly non-mesoeucrocodylian crocodylomorphs (such as protosuchids, gobiosuchids and shartegosuchoids; Pol and Norell 2004; Clark 2011; Irmis et al. 2013; Buscalioni 2017; Dollman et al. 2018), for which a series of cranial specialisations have been previously reported (Buscalioni 2017; Dollman et al. 2018). Among these, modifications related to brachycephaly (e.g., snout length reduction, rounded neurocranial shape, dorsal rotation of the mandibles, mandibular asymmetry, and tooth loss and/or orientation change; Buscalioni 2017) are possibly associated with feeding behaviour and might represent the result of ecological selective pressures.

Finally, the lower disparity of aquatic/marine taxa, together with the more restricted morphospace occupation along both PC1 and PC2 axes, suggests that marine taxa are more morphologically constrained, at least regarding some aspects of cranial shape variation. This would be consistent with other phenotypic constraints possibly associated with an aquatic lifestyle in crocodylomorphs, such as body size limits, as indicated by the shifts towards larger body sizes that is more frequently detected at the bases of marine clades (Chapter 2).
3.5. Conclusions

In this Chapter, I assessed crocodylomorph cranial shape variation with 2D landmark-based geometric morphometrics, using the most phylogenetically comprehensive dataset to date, including 209 species. To do that, I combined a previously published dataset with newly digitised specimens. After manually assessing the differences in the landmarks digitised by multiple observers/operators, which could be causing a significant amount of interobserver error, I was able to substantially reduce the error (from ~30% to ~1.5%), demonstrating the importance of a standardised digitisation protocol.

Most of cranial shape variation of crocodylomorphs is related to changes in the snout, in terms of both length and width. This is consistent with previous work and provides additional evidence of a strong link between ecology and crocodylomorph cranial morphology, since changes in snout length are likely related to feeding behaviour. Indeed, the weak phylogenetic signal in the shape data, as well as the significantly different morphospace occupied by distinct ecological categories (i.e., aquatic/marine, semi-aquatic/freshwater and terrestrial groupings), further supports the hypothesis that ecological selective pressures could be driving crocodylomorph cranial shape variation.

Disparity quantified between different crocodylomorph subgroups shows that the species-rich and ecologically diverse clade Notosuchia exhibits the highest disparity, which is also probably the greatest contributor to the peak in disparity seen in the Cretaceous, as well as to the higher disparity seen among terrestrial forms (when compared to aquatic and semi-aquatic species). Although less disparate, crocodylians also display substantial cranial shape variability, mainly in snout lengths. Tighter morphological constraints seem to apply to marine/aquatic crocodylomorphs, as these forms are more restricted in terms of morphospace occupation.
Finally, perhaps most importantly, the results of this Chapter provide valuable evidence that disparity-through-time analyses are highly sensitive to methodological assumptions, since changes in the time sub-sampling method and in the phylogenetic hypothesis used in these analyses had significant impacts on the results. Although previous works have already acknowledged the importance of time sub-sampling, given the uneven nature of the fossil record, it is demonstrated here that the use of different time-scaled trees can also be a major cause of variability. Thus, future work quantifying disparity of long-lived clades, especially those with substantial phylogenetic and stratigraphic uncertainties (such as vertebrates), should ideally perform multiple analyses (with different time sub-sampling methods, numbers of time intervals, phylogenetic hypotheses, ancestral states estimation methods, and time-scaling methods), reporting shared patterns and treating incongruent results with caution.
Chapter 4: Heterochrony in the cranial evolution of notosuchians

This chapter is a modified version of a paper already published in the journal *Palaeontology*, with the following citation:


During the development of this project, my collaboration involved leading all parts of the research, including collecting the data, analysing it and interpreting the results, as well as writing the manuscript. My colleagues collaborated by co-designing the project, collecting part of the data, running some geometric morphometric analyses, providing feedback on interpretation of results, and giving important comments on earlier versions of the manuscript.

4.1. Background

Heterochrony, the shifts in timing and rate of development, has been hypothesized to drive major phenotypic modifications in many groups (Gould 1977; McKinney 1988; McNamara and McKinney 2005; Bhullar *et al.* 2012; Koyabu *et al.* 2014). The identification of heterochronic processes requires information about the ancestral condition and the ontogenetic stage (age) of the studied organisms (Alberch *et al.* 1979; Shea 1983; Klingenberg 1998). However, as well-preserved ontogenetic series and precise information on absolute ages of individuals are rare for fossil vertebrates, palaeontologists have often used relative size as a proxy for ontogenetic stage (Erickson *et al.* 2004; Schoch 2010; Ezcurra and
Butler 2015; Foth et al. 2016b). In this context, the recent discovery of a beautifully preserved new specimen of the baurusuchid crocodylomorph *Pissarrachampsia sera* (Fig. 4.1), noticeably smaller than the other specimens previously reported (Montefeltro et al. 2011), provides the opportunity to investigate the role of ontogenetic changes in the evolution of one of the most remarkable crocodylomorph groups, the notosuchians.

Notosuchia is the most diverse crocodylomorph group in the Cretaceous of Gondwana (Turner and Sertich 2010; Godoy et al. 2014; Pol et al. 2014; Pol and Leardi 2015), showing an extraordinary taxonomical and ecological diversity (Stubbs et al. 2013; Bronzati et al. 2015; Mannion et al. 2015). Additionally, as indicated by the results in Chapters 2 and 3 of this thesis, notosuchians have a remarkable morphological disparity, which was likely driven by ecological diversification and might have been the result of modes of evolution distinct to that of most other crocodylomorphs.

Among the notosuchian subclades, baurusuchids are distinguished by their peculiar anatomy, including a high and laterally compressed skull and blade-like ziphodont teeth. These features have been used to infer an ecological role as land-dwelling hypercarnivores, acting as apex predators in specific Gondwanan ecosystems in which theropod dinosaurs, the dominant terrestrial predators throughout most of the Mesozoic, were scarce (Montefeltro et al. 2011; Riff and Kellner 2011; Godoy et al. 2014; 2016). Despite the long history of research on baurusuchids (Price 1945; Gasparini 1971), few studies have examined aspects of their ontogeny, as juvenile specimens have been rarely reported and their preserved fossils are mostly fragmentary (e.g., Carvalho et al. 2011). Likewise, although Crocodylomorpha is a highly diverse and fossil-rich clade, studies identifying the role of heterochronic processes in their evolutionary history are relatively rare and usually focused on extant crocodylians (e.g., Gignac and O’Brien 2016).
Figure 4.1. Photographs of the newly reported *Pissarrachampsia sera* juvenile specimen (LPRP/USP 0049) in dorsal (A), ventral (B) and lateral (C) views. Scale bar equals 5 cm.

When compared to adult baurusuchids, the juvenile individual reported here bears a general cranial morphology more typically seen in adults of non-baurusuchid notosuchians, such as *Mariliasuchus amarali, Comahuesuchus brachybuccalis*, and the various species of *Araripesuchus*. Based on these differences, peramorphic heterochronic processes are hypothesized to have modified the ancestral notosuchian cranial morphology, leading to the adult baurusuchid skull. Peramorphosis (“shape beyond”) is identified when the descendant
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development (size or shape) extends beyond that of the ancestor, producing exaggerated adult traits (Alberch et al. 1979; Klingenberg 1998). Ancestral adult characters are therefore seen in juveniles of the descendent. The opposite process is known as paedomorphosis, in which the descendant retains at adult size the shape (or the characteristics) of the ancestral juvenile (Alberch et al. 1979; Klingenberg 1998).

As previously documented (Erickson and Brochu 1999), large extant and extinct crocodylomorphs have achieved larger bodies by extending the growth period, suggesting the action of time hypermorphosis, a peramorphic process that leads to an increase in size. Accordingly, the evolution of larger body sizes in baurusuchids may have been the result of similar processes, but this hypothesis has not been previously examined. In this Chapter, the new specimen of Pissarrachamphsa sera is used to document heterochronic changes and assess the action of peramorphic processes in the cranial evolution of Baurusuchidae.

4.1.1. Heterochrony terminology

It is important to clearly define the peramorphic processes used in the context of this Chapter, as distinct heterochronic processes have been defined using different formalisms (evolutionary versus developmental concepts, for example) in the past (Klingenberg 1998). The definitions of the peramorphic processes used herein (Fig. 4.2) follow mainly the works of Gould (1977), Alberch et al. (1979), Shea (1983), and Klingenberg (1998). Accordingly, it is acknowledged that the effects of heterochrony on the phenotype may be realized on three different and independent dimensions – shape of a given structure, body size, and age (Klingenberg 1998). The variation of three parameters – rate of change (either of a structure or the entire body), and times of onset and offset of growth (either of a structure or the entire body) – can be used to describe the processes (Alberch et al. 1979; Klingenberg 1998).
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Figure 4.2. Caption on next page.
**Figure 4.2.** A, Comparison between effects of time hypermorphosis, rate hypermorphosis and acceleration on size (large arch), shape (small arch), and age (bottom bar) of ancestors (dotted midline) and descendants (filled bars), using the clock model devised by Gould (1977). B, Representation of morphological evolution and their relations to ontogenetic scaling (modified from Strelin et al. 2016). Full black circle and line represent the ancestor and ancestral ontogenetic trajectory, respectively. Dotted lines are descendant trajectories, and arrows are the deviations from the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory. Circles I and II represent modifications not predicted and modifications predicted by the ontogenetic scaling hypothesis, respectively. C, Pairwise comparison of the effects of time hypermorphosis, rate hypermorphosis, acceleration, and predisplacement on size, shape (trait) and ages, using hypothetical ontogenetic trajectories (lines), from the onset (square) to the offset of growth (circles) of ancestors (full lines) and descendants (dashed lines). The effects of predisplacement on size are not completely known and can potentially occur in two forms: size and shape (trait) growth are coupled and both are “predisplaced” in time (age); (i.e. the onset in descendant occurs earlier than in the ancestor), or size and trait growth are decoupled and predisplacement affects only descendant’s shape, and size growth follows the same ancestral path.

Acceleration is identified when anatomical structures of the descendant develop faster (increased rate) than the rest of the body, when compared to the ancestor. There is a break of the ancestral allometry (size-shape relationship), so these changes are not ontogenetically scaled (i.e., heterochronic changes do not maintain the ancestral allometric relationship). There is no change of the times of onset and offset of growth. The outcome is a peramorphic structure, in an individual with the same body size and an equivalent period of development as the ancestor.

Hypermorphosis can be divided into two subtypes (Shea 1983). Time hypermorphosis, is when the entire body of the descendant (including the studied part) develops for a longer period than in the ancestor. The ancestral allometry is maintained, so the changes are ontogenetically scaled. There is no change in the time of growth onset, but the offset is delayed. The outcome is a peramorphic structure, in an individual with larger body size and a longer period of development than the ancestor. By contrast, in rate hypermorphosis the entire
body of the descendant (including the studied part) develops faster than in the ancestor. The ancestral allometry is maintained, so the changes are ontogenetically scaled. There is no change in the times of onset and offset of growth. The outcome is a peramorphic structure, in an individual with a larger body size and the same period of development as in the ancestor.

The distinction between rate and time hypermorphosis, introduced by Shea (1983), was not part of the original classification of Alberch et al. (1979), and the use of the term rate hypermorphosis has been criticized by some authors (e.g., Gould 2000). In any case, the resulting morphology (i.e., the descendant’s morphology) is ontogenetically scaled in both time and rate hypermorphosis.

Finally, predisplacement is when a structure of the descendant starts to develop earlier than in the ancestor. This often leads to a break of the ancestral allometry, but not if the entire body also starts developing earlier. The onset of growth is anticipated (at least that of the structure), but the offset is maintained. The outcome is a peramorphic structure, in an individual with the same body size and the same period of development as the ancestor or with a larger body size and a longer period of development than the ancestor if the earlier onset also affected the entire body.

4.2. Material and Methods

4.2.1. Systematic Palaeontology

CROCODYLIFORMES Benton and Clark 1988
MESOEUCROCODYLIA Whetstone and Whybrow 1983
BAURUSUCHIDAE Price 1945
PISSARRACHAMPSINAE Montefeltro et al. 2011

Pissarrachamps a sera Montefeltro et al. 2011
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**Holotype.** LPRP/USP 0019; nearly complete skull and mandibles lacking the rostralmost portion of the rostrum, seven dorsal vertebrae, partial forelimb, pelvic girdle, and hindlimbs (Montefeltro et al. 2011; Godoy et al. 2016).

**Newly referred specimen.** LPRP/USP 0049; a juvenile individual comprised of a complete skull with lower jaws, articulated neck/trunk vertebrae and partial right scapula and forelimb (Fig. 4.1).

**Locality.** Inhaúmas-Arantes Farm, Gurinhatã, Minas Gerais state, Brazil (Martinelli and Teixeira 2105).

**Age and horizon.** Adamantina Formation, Bauru Group, Bauru Basin; Late Cretaceous, Campanian–Maastrichtian (Marsola et al. 2016; Batezelli 2017).

**Diagnosis.** The new specimen LPRP/USP 0049 was identified as *Pissarrachampsia sera* based on the presence of the following combination of features, unique to that taxon (Montefeltro et al. 2011; Godoy et al. 2016): a longitudinal depression on the rostral portion of frontal; frontal longitudinal ridge extending rostrally beyond the frontal midlength; supratemporal fenestra with equally developed medial and rostral rims; lacrimal duct positioned at the angular junction between the dorsal and lateral surfaces of the lacrimal; well-developed rounded foramen between the anterior and posterior palpebrals; quadratojugal and jugal do not form a continuous ventral border (a notch is present due to the ventral displacement of the quadratojugal); four subtympanic foramina (*sensu* Montefeltro et al. 2016) visible laterally; a
single ventral parachoanal fenestra and one ventral parachoanal fossa (divided into medial and lateral parachoanal subfossae); lateral Eustachian foramina larger than the medial one; a deep depression on the caudodorsal surface of the pterygoid wings; complete absence of postcranial osteoderms.

4.2.2. Sampling and data collection
To test if the cranial modifications seen in Baurusuchidae were generated by heterochronic processes, the cranial disparity of Notosuchia was assessed using 2D geometric morphometric analyses of general skull shape. The specimens/species sampling took into account the phylogenetic positions within Notosuchia of the species and the preservation of the specimens. Only fairly complete skulls, for which most of the landmarks could be readily identified and digitized, were sampled. Specimens too deformed or lacking important parts of the skull were not included. However, to maximise the sample size, specimens in which only a small portion of the skull was missing (e.g., the rostralmost tip of the snout) and specimens that were only slightly deformed were also included. In these cases, closely related taxa were used to project the landmark positions during the digitization.

As a result, 38 specimens were sampled, from a total of 27 taxa across Notosuchia, including four juvenile specimens: the baurusuchids *Pissarrachampsa sera* and *Campinasuchus dinizi*, as well as *Anatosuchus minor* and *Mariliasuchus amarali* (see Appendix E for further information on the sampled specimens). To obtain more detailed interpretations of skull shape variation, both lateral and dorsal views were used for the analyses (Openshaw *et al.* 2016), with 19 and 17 landmarks respectively (Fig. 4.3; see Appendix E for further information on the landmarks). Landmarks were digitized using the software tpsDig 2.22 (Rohlf 2015). Landmarks were digitised on both right and left sides of
the skulls, choosing the side that offered the best conditions for digitization (considering either preservation or quality of photographs). Then, the reflected shape of the specimens that were digitized on the right side was extracted while performing the Procrustes fit in MorphoJ. To minimize error, landmarks were collected twice for each specimen (by a single person), and the subsequent analyses employed the average coordinates from the two digitizations of each specimen.

Figure 4.3. Example, using one specimen (*Araripesuchus wegeneri*, MNN GAD19), of the position of the landmarks for the geometric morphometrics analyses in this Chapter. **A**, dorsal view. **B**, lateral view.
4.2.3. Phylogenetic framework

Notosuchia is a group of mesoeucrocodylians that has been consistently supported as monophyletic, even though its exact taxonomic content may vary in different phylogenetic hypotheses (e.g., Turner and Sertich 2010; Andrade et al. 2011; Bronzati et al. 2012; Montefeltro et al. 2013; Pol et al. 2014; Sertich and O’Connor 2014; Turner 2015; Wilberg 2015). The placement of Baurusuchidae deeply nested within Notosuchia is supported even by studies that have highly distinct taxonomic and character samples (Montefeltro et al. 2013; Pol et al. 2014; Turner 2015; Martin and de Lapparent de Broin 2016; Meunier and Larsson 2017), but uncertainties remain regarding the nearest relatives of baurusuchids. The morphological similarities with Sebecidae, a group of Cenozoic terrestrial crocodylomorphs, have led many phylogenetic studies to cluster Baurusuchidae and Sebecidae into Sebecosuchia (Turner and Sertich 2010; Kellner et al. 2014; Pol et al. 2014). Alternative positions placed Baurusuchidae closer to other Cretaceous notosuchians, such as Sphagesauridae, with Sebecidae placed closer to other groups such as Peirosauridae and Mahajangasuchidae (Sereno and Larson 2009; Montefeltro et al. 2013; Wilberg 2015; Meunier and Larsson 2017). It is almost universally agreed, however, that baurusuchids are not very closely related to a set of mostly small-bodied notosuchians, such as Mariliasuchus, Araripesuchus, Notosuchus, and Uruguaysuchus (Kellner et al. 2014; Pol et al. 2014; Leardi et al. 2015a, b; Martin and de Lapparent de Broin 2016).

The phylogenetic hypothesis proposed by Montefeltro et al. (2013) was selected as the primary phylogenetic framework for the geometric morphometric analyses (Fig. 4.4A). Four additional taxa were added to the original topology of Montefeltro et al. (2013), for which morphometric data was available: Aplestosuchus sordidus, Campinasuchus dinizi, Candidodon itapecuruensis, and Pakasuchus kapilimai. The information from Godoy et al.
(2014) was employed to define the phylogenetic position of the first two taxa, and from Pol et al. (2014) for the latter two. Following this phylogenetic framework, the sampled specimens were divided into four different taxonomic groups, which was necessary to test the hypothesis of peramorphosis in baurusuchid evolution: “Baurusuchidae”, “Sphagesauridae”, “Peirosauridae + Sebecidae”, and the remaining notosuchians falling outside of these groups (clustered here as “other notosuchians”). As *Sebecus icaeorhinus* was the only representative of Sebecidae included, it was combined with peirosaurids into a single group for the analyses.

**Figure 4.3.** A, Phylogenetic hypothesis of the Notosuchia taxa included in our geometric morphometric analyses (based on Montefeltro et al. 2013), with clades Baurusuchidae, Sphagesauridae, and Peirosauridae/Sebecidae indicated, and other notosuchians distributed along the tree. The skulls of some notosuchians (not to scale) were selected to illustrate the cranial disparity of the group (clockwise, from the top left): adult *Araripesuchus wegeneri*, adult *Mariliasuchus amarali*, juvenile *Pissarrachampsa sera*, and an undescribed adult baurusuchid (LPRP/USP 0697). B, Morphological transformation during *Pissarrachampsa sera* ontogeny, shown by the results of the thin plate spline analysis with the juvenile (top) and adult (bottom) specimens, also illustrating the position of the landmarks (in lateral view).
In order to test the robustness of the results to changes in phylogenetic hypotheses, the sampled specimens were also divided to fit an alternative phylogenetic framework. For this, the topology of Pol et al. (2014) was selected, as the data matrix presented in this work has formed the basis of many subsequent phylogenetic analyses of notosuchians (e.g., Leardi et al. 2015a, b; Godoy et al. 2016). As a result, the specimens were reallocated within three alternative taxonomic groups: “Sebecosuchia” (baurusuchids + Sebecus icaeorhinus), “Uruguaysuchidae + Peirosauridae” (Araripesuchus species, Uruguaysuchus and Anatosuchus in Uruguaysuchidae + peirosaurids) and “other notosuchians” (all remaining species, including sphagesaurids).

4.2.4. Geometric morphometric analyses

To extract shape information from both lateral and dorsal view datasets, a Procrustes fit with reflection was applied using the software MorphoJ 1.06e (Klingenberg 2011), and also obtained centroid size, to be used in subsequent analyses as a proxy for size. Next, to visualize the skull shape transformations during the postnatal ontogeny of Pissarrachampsa sera, a thin plate spline was performed (Bookstein 1991), using the lateral view dataset of both the juvenile and adult specimens of this taxon. This procedure was conducted using geomorph package (Adams and Otárola-Castillo 2013) in R (R Core Team 2017), and shape variation (the position of the Procrustes coordinates) of the adult against the juvenile was plotted in a deformation grid. Then, a principal component analyses (PCA) was conducted in MorphoJ, to investigate the morphospace occupied by the sampled taxa. For these comparisons, the specimens were divided into taxonomic groups using both phylogenetic frameworks outlined above. The position of individual specimens within the morphospace will not change using
alternative phylogenetic frameworks (i.e., the only difference should be in the morphospace occupation by the different taxonomic groups). Furthermore, the topology of Montefeltro et al. (2013) was mapped onto centroid size (using only the lateral view dataset) to explore the size differences among the sampled taxa.

Subsequently, a set of analyses was performed to assess which specific heterochronic processes could be driving baurusuchid cranial evolution. Peramorphic changes in the shape of structures can be decoupled from (acceleration) or accompanied by (hypermorphosis and predisplacement) changes in size (Gould 1977; Alberch et al. 1979; Shea 1983; Klingenberg 1998). To explore this relationship, a size-correction was employed to both datasets to test whether the shape differences remained after removing the effect of allometric changes (Gould 1966; Revell 2009; Klingenberg 2016). Using MorphoJ, the residuals of a multivariate regression of the Procrustes coordinates against centroid size were obtained (Monteiro 1999; Klingenberg et al. 2012; Klingenberg 2016). For this, a subset restricted to adult specimens was used, as only interspecific size variation was being analysed. The residuals from this regression were then used as the input for a second PCA to explore the occupied morphospace after removing the effect of size on the observed variation. As for the first PCA, the specimens were also divided into taxonomic groups using both the primary and alternative phylogenetic frameworks. Non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance (npMANOVA) was used to test the significance of the differences in the distributions of groups in the morphospace. These tests were performed in PAST (Hammer et al. 2001), using the PC scores that represent at least 95 per cent of shape variation. These scores were then transformed into a Euclidean distance matrix (Euclidean similarity index), and permuted with 10,000 replications. Comparisons were made using Bonferroni correction for adjusted p-values. Additionally, the topology based on the hypothesis of Montefeltro et al. (2013) was
projected onto the PC scores (using both dorsal and lateral view datasets), creating a phylomorphospace to explore the evolutionary history of shape changes in the sampled taxa.

To evaluate the specific action of time hypermorphosis, the methodology described by Strelin et al. (2016) was applied, to test whether the shape modifications seen in the baurusuchid skull evolved by ontogenetic scaling. Time hypermorphosis corresponds to an extension of the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory, a pattern previously detected in other crocodylomorphs known to extend the growth period and attain larger body sizes (e.g., Erickson and Brochu 1999). As such, based on whether the differences among taxa remain or not after this procedure, hypermorphosis could be either rejected or confirmed as the sole peramorphic process acting on baurusuchid skull evolution, as this is the only process that extends the ontogenetic trajectory in time.

For this, skull size and shape variation from juvenile to adult baurusuchids was compared to those changes seen along the ontogenetic trajectory of a hypothetical ancestral notosuchian. The ancestral ontogenetic trajectory was inferred via a phylogenetic approach based on outgroup taxa to Baurusuchidae (i.e., using trajectories of other notosuchians as proxies for estimating this ancestral condition). Good proxies would, ideally, fulfil two requirements: (1) have at least one juvenile specimen, as well as at least one adult specimen, both with skulls sufficiently well-preserved to be sampled for the geometric morphometric analyses; (2) be unequivocally non-baurusuchid notosuchians (with their positions relative to baurusuchids supported by alternative phylogenetic hypotheses), as the aim was an ontogenetic trajectory of a hypothetical notosuchian ancestor that was at least outside Baurusuchidae. Preferably, this approach would incorporate information from as many species as possible. However, only two non-baurusuchid notosuchians satisfy the first requirement: Mariliasuchus amarali and Anatosuchus minor. Among the six Mariliasuchus
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*amarali* specimens sampled for the geometric morphometric analyses, one (the holotype, UFRJ DG 50-R) is clearly a juvenile (Carvalho and Bertini 2009). The second species, *Anatosuchus minor*, has two specimens sampled, and its holotype (MNN GAD603) is a putative juvenile, due to its smaller size (Sereno and Larsson 2009). Although using only two taxa is not ideal, the phylogenetic positions of these two species relative to baurusuchids support their use as the best available proxies for the ancestral condition of baurusuchids (see Martinelli 2003; Sereno *et al.* 2003; Pol *et al.* 2009; Sereno and Larsson 2009; Turner and Sertich 2010; Andrade *et al.* 2011; Pol *et al.* 2012; Montefeltro *et al.* 2013; Kellner *et al.* 2014; Pol *et al.* 2014; Sertich and O’Connor 2014; Leardi *et al.* 2015a, b; Godoy *et al.* 2016; Meunier and Larsson 2017).

Accordingly, an ontogenetic regression model was created for both *Mariliasuchus amarali* and *Anatosuchus minor*, using all sampled specimens of these species (including juveniles), by regressing the Procrustes coordinates against the log-transformed centroid size in MorphoJ (Klingenberg 2011; Strelin *et al.* 2016). This ontogenetic regression model was used to perform an allometric size-correction (referred here as the “ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction”) for all other taxa in the datasets (Strelin *et al.* 2016). Regression residuals were calculated in MorphoJ, by using the vector of regression coefficients for the ontogenetic allometry estimated for the two taxa and applying them to the shape data. This process removes the potential effect of ontogenetic scaling from the variation among taxa. These residuals were then used as the input data for a third PCA, again including only adults, to explore the morphospace occupied after removing the effect of the ancestral ontogenetic allometry trajectory from the landmark data. As for the first and second PCA, morphospace occupation was investigated using both primary and alternative phylogenetic frameworks. As also done following the size-correction, npMANOVA was used to test the significance of the
differences between groups and created phylomorphospaces, by projecting the topology of Montefeltro et al. (2013) onto the PC scores.

Finally, it is worth noting that the use of *Anatosuchus minor* as a proxy for the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory should be treated with caution. The holotype specimen of *Anatosuchus minor*, which has been interpreted as a juvenile, is not much smaller than the only other known specimen of this taxon, which has been interpreted as an adult. Moreover, this taxon also exhibits a cranial morphology notably distinct from those of other notosuchians (Sereno et al. 2003; Sereno and Larsson 2009). Accordingly, as a sensitivity test, the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory was also estimated without including *Anatosuchus minor*, instead performing the ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction using only the *Mariliasuchus amarali* specimens.

### 4.3. Results

The thin plate spline shows that the cranial changes observed during the ontogeny of *Pissarrachampsa sera* include an expansion of the rostrum (both rostrocaudally and dorsoventrally), a rostrocaudal shortening of the skull roof (orbitotemporal region), and the reduction of the relative size of the orbits and the lower temporal fenestrae (Fig. 4.4B). Furthermore, based on the primary phylogenetic framework (Montefeltro et al. 2013), the first PCA shows that juvenile and adult baurusuchids occupy different regions of the morphospace. In both the lateral (PC1 accounting for 60.6% of the variation, PC2 = 9.9 per cent) and dorsal views (PC1 = 57.9 per cent, PC2 = 11.3 per cent), juvenile baurusuchids fall outside the morphospace of adult baurusuchids, but within the morphospace occupied by non-baurusuchid notosuchians. By contrast, when compared to juveniles, adult baurusuchids occupy a distinct part of the morphospace, mainly displaced along the PC1 axis for the lateral
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view dataset (Fig. 4.5A), and along both PC1 and PC2 axes for the dorsal view dataset (see Appendix E for information on additional results). A similar pattern of morphospace occupation was found when the alternative phylogenetic framework (Pol et al. 2014) was used, with the sampled taxa rearranged into different groups. In both lateral and dorsal views (Appendix E) juvenile sebecosuchians (the group that includes baurusuchids) are displaced in relation to the morphospace occupied by adults.

**Figure 4.5.** A, Two-dimensional morphospace (PCA results plot) of the first two PCs of the lateral view dataset, with deformation grids for hypothetical extremes along the two axes. The coloured polygons show the morphospace occupation by each of the four groups considered in this study. Crosses represent juvenile specimens, squares, stars, hexagons and circles represent adults of Baurusuchidae, Sphagesauridae, Peirosauridae/Sebecidae and other notosuchians, respectively (average values were used for taxa with more than one adult specimen sampled). The arrows represent an ontogenetic trajectory along this two-dimensional morphospace. B, Topology based on the phylogenetic hypothesis of Montefeltro et al. (2013) projected onto the log-transformed centroid size. The centroid size was obtained from the lateral view dataset using only adults. Silhouettes from Godoy et al. (2014).
The allometric regression of the Procrustes coordinates against log-transformed centroid size shows that changes related to size differences accounted for 36.4 and 40.5 per cent of the variation in the dorsal and lateral view datasets, respectively (see Appendix E for more information about this allometric regression, as well as additional results). The second PCA, with size-corrected data, shows that size variation strongly influences morphospace occupation of the different lineages, in both lateral and dorsal views (Fig. 4.6A and B). For the primary phylogenetic framework (Montefeltro et al. 2013), the confidence ellipses (90 per cent) for baurusuchids, sphagesaurids, and even peirosaurids/sebecids overlapped with the confidence ellipse of other notosuchians (see Appendix E for additional results). The absence of significant differences in the distribution of these groups was supported by the npMANOVA test (Table 4.1), showing that changes in size can explain the apparent separation of groups found in the previous analyses (first PC plots). Additionally, when the alternative phylogenetic framework (Pol et al. 2014) was taken into account through rearranging the specimens into different taxonomic groups (see above), very similar results were found. The npMANOVA results also indicate that the morphospaces of sebecosuchians (i.e., baurusuchids) and other notosuchians are not significantly different, in both dorsal and lateral views (see Appendix E for additional npMANOVA results).
Figure 4.6. Two-dimensional morphospace (plot of PCA results) after the size-correction (A, dorsal view; B, lateral view) and after the ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction (C, dorsal view; D, lateral view). Average values were used for taxa with more than one adult specimen sampled. The 90 per cent confidence ellipses were added for each of the four groups considered in the other analyses: Peirosauridae/Sebecidae (hexagons), Baurusuchidae (circles), Sphagesauridae (stars), and other notosuchians (squares).

Finally, the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory was estimated by using the ontogenetic trajectories of *Mariliasuchus amarali* and *Anatosuchus minor* as proxies. First, to assure that the ontogenetic trajectories of these two species (representing the ancestral condition) differ from that of *Pissarrachampsas sera* (representing the baurusuchid trajectory), the reconstructed trajectories of these three taxa were compared with a regression analysis. As expected, the trajectories of these three species are clearly displaced in relation to one another.
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(Fig. 4.7). However, in dorsal view, whereas the trajectories of *Mariliasuchus amarali* and *Pissarrachampsia sera* exhibit a similar slope, that of *Anatosuchus minor* is clearly different. This might indicate that the use of *Anatosuchus minor* for reconstructing the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory should be treated with caution, given its unique cranial morphology among Notosuchia (see above).

**Table 4.1.** Pairwise comparison between morphospace occupation of different taxonomic groups. Bonferroni-corrected p-values obtained from npMANOVA, using PC scores of all specimens after both size and ancestral ontogenetic allometry corrections, with lateral and dorsal view datasets. Taxonomic groups based on the phylogenetic framework from Montefeltro *et al.* (2013). Significant differences are indicated by an asterisk.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pairwise comparisons</th>
<th>p-values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Size correction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dorsal view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baurusuchidae – other notosuchians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baurusuchidae – Peirosauridae/Sebecidae</td>
<td>0.1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baurusuchidae – Sphagesauridae</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peirosauridae/Sebecidae – other notosuchians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peirosauridae/Sebecidae – Sphagesauridae</td>
<td>0.3732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sphagesauridae – other notosuchians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The distinction between those ontogenetic trajectories (that of the hypothetical ancestor, represented by *Mariliasuchus* and *Anatosuchus*, and that of baurusuchids,
represented by *Pissarrachampsa*) allowed us to progress further with the ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction (i.e., removing the effect of ontogenetic scaling from the data). The results of the third PCA, after this correction, employing the primary phylogenetic framework (Montefeltro *et al.* 2013), are apparently conflicting. Using the lateral view dataset, the morphospaces occupied by adult baurusuchids and other notosuchians overlap and are not significantly separated (Fig. 4.6D; Table 4.1), suggesting that the shape variation observed in baurusuchids could be ontogenetically scaled. However, the dorsal dataset shows a different result, with baurusuchid and other notosuchian morphospaces significantly separated (Fig. 4.6C, Table 4.1). Furthermore, when using the alternative phylogenetic framework (Pol *et al.* 2014), the morphospaces of sebecosuchians (i.e., baurusuchids) and other notosuchians is significantly separated, in both dorsal and lateral views (Appendix E).

Finally, to test the influence of the ontogenetic trajectory of *Anatosuchus minor* on these results (given its unique morphology, see above), an ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction was applied using only *Mariliasuchus amarali* for estimating the ancestral trajectory. The results, in both dorsal and lateral views, show the morphospaces of baurusuchids and other notosuchians to be significantly separated (Appendix E).
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Figure 4.7. Comparisons between the ontogenetic trajectories of *Mariliasuchus amarali* and *Anatosuchus minor* (used as proxies for the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory) and that of *Pissarrachampsia sera* (representing the baurusuchid condition), based on regression analyses of Procrustes coordinates against log-transformed centroid size, in both dorsal (A) and lateral (B) views. Squares and circles represent juveniles and adults, respectively.

4.4. Discussion

4.4.1. Peramorphosis in Baurusuchidae

The results of the initial analyses (first PCA and thin plate spline) show that adult baurusuchids occupy distinct morphospaces in comparison to juveniles, even when using different phylogenetic frameworks (Appendix E). This could indicate that juvenile
baurusuchids bear a more generalized notosuchian morphotype (since they occupy the morphospace associated to other notosuchians), whereas adults diverge from this morphotype in later ontogenetic stages, supporting the hypothesis of peramorphic processes operating in the evolution of notosuchians. However, given that only one juvenile baurusuchid specimen was included in the lateral view dataset, while only two juvenile specimens were used in the dorsal view, these results should be taken with caution. Only new discoveries of juvenile specimens would provide us with information to clarify if other baurusuchids have similar ontogenetic trajectories.

Nevertheless, our results allow us to describe the cranial transformations during *Pissarrachampsa sera* ontogeny, which can serve as a reference for other baurusuchids. According to our results, during their ontogeny baurusuchids seem to expand their rostrum (both rostrocaudally and dorsoventrally), shorten their skull roof rostrocaudally, and reduce the relative sizes of the orbits and the lower temporal fenestrae, differences that can be observed on the deformation grid of the thin plate spline (Fig. 4.3B). The first PCA corroborates these ontogenetic transformations. In lateral view (Fig. 4.5A), the PC1 axis, from negative to positive values, represents relative rostrocaudal shortening of the rostrum as well as relative enlargement of the orbit, and the PC2 axis displays changes in skull height (higher skulls represented by more negative values). Adult baurusuchids are all located on the negative side of the PC1 axis, whereas the juvenile *Pissarrachampsa sera* is positioned in a positive region along this axis, illustrating the rostrocaudal expansion of the rostrum during the ontogeny of this taxon. Other modifications can be observed in the dorsal view morphospace (Appendix E), in which the PC1 axis also represents rostrocaudal shortening of the rostrum (as in lateral view). The PC2 axis accounts for the mediolateral compression of
the skull (from negative to positive values), and illustrates the mediolateral compression of the skull that occurs during the ontogeny of *Pissarrachampsia*.

Studies using geometric morphometric methods to investigate the ontogenetic trajectories of extant crocodylians (e.g., Piras *et al.* 2010; Watanabe and Slice 2014; Foth *et al.* 2017a) suggest similarities between the morphological modifications during the ontogeny of *Pissarrachampsia sera* and the ontogenies of living taxa. For example, the best documented transformation is the relative reduction of the orbits, also found in living representatives of the three main lineages of Crocodylia: Gavialoidea, Crocodyloidea and Alligatoroidea (e.g., Piras *et al.* 2010; Foth *et al.* 2015; 2017a). Other common modifications previously reported include the mediolateral compression of the rostrum, although in *Caiman latirostris* the opposite process is observed (i.e., snouts relatively broader later in ontogeny; Bona and Desojo 2011; Foth *et al.* 2017a). Nevertheless, quantitative investigations of possible heterochronic processes acting on the evolution of crocodylomorphs are rare (e.g., Gignac and O’Brien 2016), and the present work represents the first attempt to verify the action of heterochrony in fossil lineages of the group using geometric morphometric methods.

However, given the lack of juveniles of other baurusuchids with complete skulls, further assumptions cannot be quantitatively tested. For example, it is difficult to determine the phylogenetic distribution of cranial peramorphism within Baurusuchidae (i.e., asserting whether the action of peramorphic processes started at the base of Baurusuchidae or later within the lineage). The size and phylogenetic positions of *Cynodontosuchus rothi* and *Gondwanasuchus scabrosus* suggest that the peramorphic changes occurred just prior or within the clade composed of Pissarrachampsinae + Baurusuchinae (Godoy *et al.* 2014). These two early-diverging species, known from fragmentary remains, have been suggested to be adults, but are substantially smaller than other baurusuchids (estimated as approximately...
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50 per cent the size of an adult Pissarrachampsa sera; Montefeltro et al. 2011; Godoy et al. 2014).

4.4.2. Acceleration, predisplacement or hypermorphosis

Among the known peramorphic processes (i.e., acceleration, predisplacement, and hypermorphosis; Fig. 4.2; Gould 1977; Alberch et al. 1979; Shea 1983; Klingenberg 1998), acceleration is the only one that does not affect total body size (i.e., based on the definition used here, shape and size are not coupled; Fig. 4.2A) (Klingenberg 1998). The results show that the apparent separation between baurusuchids and other notosuchians seen in the first PCA disappears after applying the size-correction (Fig. 4.6A and B), suggesting a strong correlation between cranial shape and size (centroid size) variation in baurusuchids. Therefore, according to these results, acceleration cannot, as a sole process, explain the shape changes observed in the baurusuchid skull.

Further examination aimed to assess if hypermorphosis could explain the shape variation seen in baurusuchid cranial morphology, by testing the ontogenetic scaling hypothesis. The ontogenetic scaling hypothesis predicts that heterochronic changes can occur by maintaining the ancestral allometric relationships, generating a descendant morphology via proportional changes in size and shape that follow the same ancestral ontogenetic pathway (Fig. 4.2B) (Shea 1983; Klingenberg 1998; Strelin et al. 2016). Based on the definitions used here, hypermorphosis is the peramorphic process that incorporates the concept of ontogenetic scaling, either by increasing the duration of ontogeny (time hypermorphosis) or by increasing the rate of size and shape changes during the same period of growth (rate hypermorphosis) (Fig. 4.2A and C; Shea 1983). Accordingly, in both time and rate hypermorphosis the shape variation is ontogenetically scaled.
As such, if the data fit the predictions of the ontogenetic scaling model, after removing the effects of the ancestral ontogenetic allometry the confidence ellipses of baurusuchids should collapse to the same morphospace as other notosuchians. This should be true for all shape variation observed in the sampled specimens, in both lateral and dorsal views. Accordingly, the results do not corroborate the ontogenetic scaling hypothesis, since the apparently ontogenetically scaled shape variation seen in lateral view (Fig. 4.6D) is not congruent with the results for the dorsal view or for the other analyses performed. In dorsal view (Fig. 4.6C), the morphospaces of baurusuchids and other notosuchians remain separate after the ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction (significantly separated, as confirmed by the npMANOVA tests; Table 4.1), which indicates that the shape variation is not ontogenetically scaled. This also highlights the importance of using different views when studying skull shape and interpreting their evolutionary patterns (Openshaw et al. 2016). Furthermore, when a different phylogenetic framework was used, which essentially rearranged the sampled species into different taxonomic groups (see above), the morphospaces of sebecosuchians (which includes baurusuchids) and other notosuchians remain significantly separated (Appendix E). The same is observed when the Anatosuchus minor specimens were removed from the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory estimation (Appendix E). These complementary results corroborate the idea that the cranial shape variation observed in baurusuchids is not ontogenetically scaled.

Nevertheless, as highlighted before, the small number of juvenile specimens included in these analyses, particularly when estimating the ancestral trajectory, can be problematic. Only two species were used for inferring the ancestral state, with only one juvenile specimen each, making the analyses more susceptible to abnormalities derived from taphonomic
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deformations, for example. As in the case of the transformations during baurusuchid ontogeny, only new specimens can corroborate or reject the results found here.

Even though the results should be interpreted carefully, the lack of support for the ontogenetic scaling hypothesis found here indicates that neither time nor rate hypermorphosis could be considered as the single, isolated driver of baurusuchid peramorphism (Shea 1983; Strelin et al. 2016). Accordingly, the only process that acting alone could possibly explain the peramorphism observed in baurusuchids is predisplacement, in which the onset age of growth of a structure occurs earlier than in the ancestor (Alberch et al. 1979; McNamara 1986) (Fig. 4.2C). However, changes in the time of onset can only be comprehensively assessed by comparing changes in traits (shape) as a function of ontogenetic stages (age) (Klingenberg 1998). As such, at present, it is not possible to confirm the role of predisplacement in the evolution of the baurusuchid skull. Indeed, information such as growth rates and time of onset and offset would be necessary to precisely identify the action of any specific heterochronic process, not only predisplacement. Histological studies comparing growth patterns among different notosuchians have the potential to test whether the onset of baurusuchid traits occurred earlier than in their close relatives (e.g., Cubo et al. 2017), which would allow further investigation on the action of peramorphic processes on the evolution of this group. Moreover, the action of a single evolutionary process on morphological structures is expected to be rare (Alberch et al. 1979; Klingenberg 1998) and one should expect a combination of two (or more) heterochronic processes acting in the evolution of such complex traits (Klingenberg 1998). Accordingly, as these results are derived from indirect investigation of the action of heterochrony, they only allow us to discard acceleration and hypermorphosis acting in isolation in the cranial evolution of baurusuchids.
4.4.3. Heterochrony explains hypercarnivory

Hypercarnivores, as defined by Van Valkenburgh (1991), are taxa that consume at least 70 per cent of vertebrate flesh. They frequently have a specialized dentition, such as the ziphodont teeth of baurusuchids (Riff and Kellner 2011), in which the primary function is slicing. The documentation presented here of peramorphosis in the evolution of the baurusuchid skull provides important palaeoecological insights, as it supports a strong relation between the reported cranial modifications and size, changes that might have occurred together with the shift to a hypercarnivorous habit. A link between size increase and the evolution of hypercarnivory has been previously documented in other vertebrate lineages, such as carnivoran and creodont mammals (Werdelin 1996; Van Valkenburgh 1999; Van Valkenburgh et al. 2004; Wesley-Hunt 2005). Furthermore, heterochrony is commonly associated with evolutionary trends leading to size increase (McNamara 1982; 1990), and one of the possible triggers of these trends is the positive pressure caused by competition (Van Valkenburgh et al. 2004; McKinney 1990b).

Theropod dinosaurs, the top predators of most terrestrial environments in the Mesozoic, are scarce in the Adamantina Formation, from which the greatest diversity of baurusuchids has been recovered (Méndez et al. 2012; Godoy et al. 2014). Thus, the large size of baurusuchids (Chapter 2), coupled with their cranial specializations, could have granted access to new feeding resources (Erickson et al. 2012), efficiently occupying the niches more commonly filled by theropods elsewhere. Baurusuchids coexisted and interacted with other crocodylomorph taxa in Gondwanan palaeoecosystems during the Late Cretaceous, including carnivorous forms such as peirosaurids (Carvalho et al. 2007; Barrios et al. 2016). Interestingly, the coeval notosuchians (including baurusuchids) are inferred to have filled a broad range of feeding habits (herbivorous, omnivorous, and carnivorous), with a high degree
of niche/resource partitioning (O'Connor et al. 2010; Stubbs et al. 2013; Ősi 2014). In this context, the peramorphic size increase of baurusuchids may have played a key role in this niche partitioning, and may also have influenced other aspects of their unique palaeobiology. The life history strategy hypothesized for baurusuchids, and notosuchians in general, includes a shift to the $K$-selected end of the $r/K$ selection spectrum. The shift is suggested by the consistently smaller egg clutches present in notosuchians, including *Pissarrachampsia sera* (2–5 eggs per clutch; Marsola et al. 2016) when compared to fossil neosuchians, such as atoposaurids and dyrosaurids (approximately 12 eggs per clutch; Russo et al. 2014; Srivastava et al. 2015). The smaller egg clutches of notosuchians (and baurusuchids) is also dissimilar to those of extant crocodylians, in which the number of eggs varies from a lower limit of 10 and reaches up to 80 eggs (Brazaitis and Watanabe 2011; Marsola et al. 2016). The features of $K$-selected organisms are commonly associated with hypermorphosis, primarily because this process is classically related to size increase. Even though the results of the geometric morphometric analyses performed in this Chapter do not support the action of hypermorphosis as the single process in the cranial evolution of baurusuchids, predisplacement can also lead to size increase (Fig. 4.2C), and it may similarly be linked to the evolution of $K$-selection strategies.

### 4.5. Conclusions

In this Chapter, it is demonstrated that changes in the skull shape of baurusuchids, likely accompanied by highly specialized cranial modifications, were strongly linked to size increase in the lineage. As these shape changes occurred through their ontogeny, they provide evidence for the action of heterochronic processes (peramorphosis) in the shift to a hypercarnivorous diet during baurusuchid evolutionary history. These are interesting
advances in the knowledge of the underlying processes that drove notosuchian evolution, and provide important clues for understanding the exceptional diversity displayed by this peculiar group of crocodylomorphs.
5.1. General conclusions

This thesis employed a phylogenetic comparative approach to quantitatively and comprehensively investigate body size and cranial shape variation in Crocodylomorpha. Given the fundamental nature of these two aspects of animal morphology in evolutionary biology, the results presented here represent an important contribution to current knowledge of the groups’ phenotypic evolution over the last ~220 million years.

In Chapter 2, model-fitting analyses used to investigate the modes of evolution that gave rise to the body size patterns during the group’s evolutionary history provided overwhelmingly strong support for a multi-peak Ornstein-Uhlenbeck model (SURFACE). This indicates that the macroevolutionary dynamics of crocodylomorph body size evolution are better described within the concept of an adaptive landscape, with most body size variation emerging after shifts to new adaptive zones, which are represented by the macroevolutionary body size regimes. These results do not support, for example, the hypothesis of Cope's rule (i.e., a consistent evolutionary trend towards larger sizes based on Brownian motion dynamics) in crocodylomorphs.

Consistently, long-term crocodylomorph body size patterns (i.e., of maximum and mean body size values, as well as body size disparity) could not be fully explained by the abiotic factors tested here (i.e., palaeolatitude and palaeotemperature). Thus, on large phylogenetic scales, shifts between macroevolutionary regimes (representing lineage-specific innovations) are more important than isolated climatic factors. At more refined scales, however, body size variation may track changes in climate, as in the case of crocodylians, in which a global cooling event might explain the long-term increases in body size (as a result of
systematic reduction of available habits/niches, with differential extinction of smaller-bodied species).

In particular, the evolution of a more aquatic lifestyle (especially marine) correlates, in several clades, with increases in average body size, though not without exceptions. This is reflected in the shifts leading to larger body sizes that are more frequently detected at the base of predominantly aquatic or semi-aquatic groups, and suggests a link between ecological diversification and body size evolution in crocodylomorphs.

Indeed, ecology also seems to play an important role in determining cranial shape variation in crocodylomorphs, as indicated by the results of Chapters 3 and 4. Comprehensive investigation of cranial shape variation and disparity (Chapter 3) corroborates previous work in that most of it is related to changes in the dimensions of the crocodylomorph snout, in terms of both length and width. Given the tight relationship between snout morphology and feeding behaviour, strong ecological selective pressures are expected, suggesting that ecology may be driving most of the variability. This is supported by the relatively weak phylogenetic signal found in the shape data. Additionally, when subdivided into distinct lifestyle categories, crocodylomorphs occupy significantly different morphospaces, which further emphasises the association between crocodylomorph cranial shape variation and ecological specializations.

Among the crocodylomorph subgroups assessed, the highest cranial shape disparity was found among notosuchians, a group known for its species richness, but also for a remarkable variety of feeding strategies, including omnivorous, hypercarnivorous and even herbivorous diets. This higher disparity could be the result of more relaxed modes of evolution in the group, as suggested by the investigation of body size evolution performed exclusively within notosuchians (Chapter 2).
Finally, one of the processes that might have underpinned the cranial evolution of notosuchians is investigated in Chapter 4. The results demonstrated that the changes observed in the cranial shape of baurusuchids, a group of top-predator notosuchians, were linked to a size increase in the lineage, providing evidence for the action of heterochronic processes (peramorphosis). In this case, heterochrony would be related to the shift to a hypercarnivorous diet, possibly accompanied by highly specialized cranial modifications, reinforcing the importance of ecological selective pressures in determining phenotypic changes during crocodylomorph evolutionary history.

5.2. Prospects and future work

Chapter 2 of this thesis represents the first comprehensive investigation of the modes of evolution underlying crocodylomorph body size through the entire history of the group. Accordingly, the results presented here can pave the way for new studies, addressing more specific questions (e.g., association between larger sizes and aquatic lifestyle; correlation between body size and other biotic and abiotic factors) or testing the impact of different approaches (e.g., distinct proxies for body size or direct estimates of body mass; increases in taxon sample size; changes in the phylogenetic hypotheses).

Chapters 3 and 4 represent attempts to more deeply understand the patterns of cranial shape variation in crocodylomorphs. For instance, allometric changes can be assessed by testing the correlation between size and shape, and similar methodological approaches to that used in Chapter 4 can be used to investigate the presence of heterochrony in other crocodylomorph subgroups. Chapter 3 sheds light on the importance of methodological assumptions when estimating disparity through time, and future work will likely explore the impact of other differences (e.g., the use of distinct methods for time-scaling the trees), as
well as trying to clarify patterns that are currently ambiguous (e.g., evidence for either
disparity increase or disparity decline from the Eocene onwards). Additionally, with the most
comprehensive landmark dataset available for the group, other questions can be addressed.
For example, the presence of integrated components in morphometric data can be tested by
setting *a priori* defined modules (i.e., specific regions of the skull, such as the snout). Rates of
morphological evolution can be also calculated, and a model fitting-approach could be used
for investigating the modes of evolution underlying cranial shape variation in the group.
Furthermore, patterns of cranial shape disparity through time can be compared to other
evolutionary patterns (e.g., species diversity, body size disparity, and morphological disparity
measured from discrete characters), as well as tested for correlations with abiotic
environmental factors. Finally, unequal morphological diversification in different
crocodylomorph groups can be investigated using the phylomorphospace approach proposed
by Sidlauskas (2008), assessing, for example, if the unique morphological disparity seen in
notosuchians significantly deviates from that expected for other crocodylomorphs.
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Appendix A: Supplementary information for Chapter 2

The supplementary material for Chapter 2 (“Crocodylomorph body size evolution”) was uploaded to the online repository Zenodo (Godoy et al. 2018c) and can be found at:

https://zenodo.org/record/1344593. The online content includes three documents (Additional files 1, 2, and 3) and four subfolders (Additional files 4, 5, 6, and 7), which are detailed below:

- Additional file 1: Supplementary methods and results, including information on (1) total length estimation from cranial measurements, (2) supertree construction, (3) time bins used for time series correlations and disparity calculation, and (4) regression results tables of all correlation analyses performed.

- Additional file 2: Datasets with information on crocodylomorph body size (cranial measurements), palaeolatitude, specimens and lifestyle.

- Additional file 3: AICc scores of all models fitted in our macroevolutionary analyses.

- Additional file 4: Folder containing all plots of SURFACE model fits.

- Additional file 5: Folder containing cross plotting of all SURFACE model fits, using distinct time-scaling methods.

- Additional file 6: Folder containing alternative crocodylomorph trees and FAD (First Appearance Datum) and LAD (Last Appearance Datum) of all species used in our analyses.

- Additional file 7: Folder containing R functions and data for running an example script of our model-fitting analyses.
### Appendix B: List of specimens sampled for the geometric morphometric analyses of Chapter 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Specimen number</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Lifestyle (source)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Acynodon adriaticus</em></td>
<td>MCSNT 57248</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acynodon iberoccitanus</em></td>
<td>ACAP-FX1</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agaresuchus fontisensis</em></td>
<td>HUE-02502</td>
<td>Narváez <em>et al.</em> (2016)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Agaresuchus subjuniperus</em></td>
<td>MPZ 2012/288</td>
<td>Puértolas-Pascual <em>et al.</em> (2014)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Albertochampsia langstoni</em></td>
<td>SMM P67 15 3</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alligator mcgrewi</em></td>
<td>FMNH P 26242</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alligator mefferdi</em></td>
<td>AMNH 7016</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alligator mississippiensis</em></td>
<td>UF 10941</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alligator olseni</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>White (1942)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alligator prenasalis</em></td>
<td>YPM-PU 14063</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alligator sinensis</em></td>
<td>IVPP 1342</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Alligator thomsoni</em></td>
<td>AMNH 1736</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Allodaposuchus precedens</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Allognathosuchus haupti</em></td>
<td>HLMD-Me 1435</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amphicotylus gilmorei</em></td>
<td>OMNH 2322</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Amphicotylus lucasi</em></td>
<td>CM 1339</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anatosuchus minor</em></td>
<td>MNN GAD603</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Anteophthalmosuchus hooley</em></td>
<td>IRSNB R47</td>
<td>Martin <em>et al.</em> (2016)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Specimen Code</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthracosuchus balrogus</td>
<td>UF/IGM 67</td>
<td>Hastings et al. (2015)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aplestosuchus sordidus</td>
<td>LPRP/USP 0229a</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araripesuchus gomesii</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Hecht (1991)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araripesuchus patagonicus</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araripesuchus tsangatsangana</td>
<td>FMNH PR 2297</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Araripesuchus wegeneri</td>
<td>MNN GAD 19</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum</td>
<td>MPZ ELI-1</td>
<td>Puértolas-Pascual et al. (2011)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argochampsas krebsi</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Armadillosuchus arrudai</td>
<td>UFRJ DG 303-R</td>
<td>Marinho and Carvalho (2009)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asiatosuchus germanicus</td>
<td>GM XIV 4757-a</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atlantosuchus coupatezi</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australosuchus clarkae</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baurusuchus salgadoensis</td>
<td>MPMA 62-0001-02</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bernissartia fagesi</td>
<td>IRSNB R46</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borealosuchus acutidentatus</td>
<td>NMC 8544</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borealosuchus formidabilis</td>
<td>SMM P75.22.29</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borealosuchus sternbergii</td>
<td>MOR 701</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borealosuchus wilsoni</td>
<td>FMNH PR 1647</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boverisuchus magnifrons</td>
<td>GM XVIII 3094</td>
<td>Brochu (2012)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boverisuchus vorax</td>
<td>FMNH PR 399</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachychampsas montana</td>
<td>UCMP 133901</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brachyuranosuchas eversolei</td>
<td>AMNH 4993</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman crocodilus apaporiensis</td>
<td>FMNH 69823</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman crocodilus chiapianus</td>
<td>FMNH 73739</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Catalog Number</td>
<td>Creator</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman crocodilus fuscus</td>
<td>FMNH 69852</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman latirostris</td>
<td>MACN 1232 7.021</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caiman yacare</td>
<td>MLP 9147</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caipirasuchus montealtensis</td>
<td>MPMA 68-0003-12</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caipirasuchus paulistanus</td>
<td>MPMA 67-0001-00</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caipirasuchus stenognathus</td>
<td>MZSP-PV 139</td>
<td>Pol et al. (2014)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidodon itapecuruense</td>
<td>UFRJ DG 114-R</td>
<td>Photos from other researchers</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceratosuchus burdoshi</td>
<td>FMNH P 15576</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerrejonisuchus improcerus</td>
<td>UF/IGM 29</td>
<td>Hastings et al. (2010)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chalawan thailandicus</td>
<td>CAS42-20</td>
<td>Martin et al. (2014)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chenanisuchus lateroculi</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comahuesuchus brachybhucalis</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricosaurus araucanensis</td>
<td>MLP 72-IV-7-1</td>
<td>Parrilla-Bel et al. (2013)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricosaurus lithographicus</td>
<td>MOZ-PV 5787</td>
<td>Herrera et al. (2013)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus acer</td>
<td>AMNH 1240</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus acutus</td>
<td>TMM m-6040</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus affinis</td>
<td>YPM 1345</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus depressifrons</td>
<td>IRSNB R251</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus intermedius</td>
<td>FMNH 75659</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus johnstoni</td>
<td>USNM 064091</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus megarhinus</td>
<td>AMNH 5061</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus mindorensis</td>
<td>FMNH 19891</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus moreletii</td>
<td>TMM m-4980</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Name</td>
<td>Collection Number</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Habitat Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus niloticus</td>
<td>TMM m-1786</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus novaeguina</td>
<td>FMNH 2854</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus palaeindicus</td>
<td>NHMUK 39795</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus palustris</td>
<td>AMNH 96134</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus porosus</td>
<td>AMNH 29949</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus rhombifer</td>
<td>AMNH 6179</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodylus siamensis</td>
<td>AMNH (unknown no.)</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dakosaurus andiniensis</td>
<td>MOZ 6146P</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dibothrosuchus elaphros</td>
<td>IVPP V7907</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplocolodon darwini</td>
<td>IRSNB R 0412</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplocolodon deponiae</td>
<td>HLMD-Be 147</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplocolodon hantoniensis</td>
<td>AMNH 27632</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplocolodon ratelii</td>
<td>MNHN.F SG 13728 a b</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dollosuchoides densmorei</td>
<td>IRSNB 1748</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dromicosuchus grallator</td>
<td>UNC 15574</td>
<td>Sues et al. (2003)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyrosaurus magribensis</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyrosaurus phosphaticus</td>
<td>OUMNH KX.15904</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elosuchus cherifiensis</td>
<td>MNHN.R MRS 340–25</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eogavialis africanus</td>
<td>YPM 6263</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eoneustes bathonicus</td>
<td>unnumbered specimen</td>
<td>Mercier (1933)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eosuchus lerichei</td>
<td>IRSNB R 48</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eosuchus minor</td>
<td>USNM V 299730</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eothoracosaurus mississippiensis</strong></td>
<td>MSU 3293</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euthecodon arambourgi</strong></td>
<td>MNHN ZEL 001</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Euthecodon brumpti</strong></td>
<td>KNM-ER 1773</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eutretauranosuchus delfsi</strong></td>
<td>BYU 17628</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fruitachampsa callisoni</strong></td>
<td>LACM 120455a</td>
<td>Clark (2011)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gavialis gangeticus</strong></td>
<td>NHMUK unnumbered</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gavialosuchus americana</strong></td>
<td>BHI 126440</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gavialosuchus eggenburgensis</strong></td>
<td>KM F/1358</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Geosaurus grandis</strong></td>
<td>BSPG AS-VI-1</td>
<td>Young and Andrade (2009)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gobiosuchus kielanae</strong></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goniopholis baryglyphaeus</strong></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goniopholis kiplingi</strong></td>
<td>DORCM 12154</td>
<td>Andrade <em>et al.</em> (2011)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Goniopholis sinus</strong></td>
<td>NHMUK R 41098</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gracilineustes leedsi</strong></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R3015</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gryposuchus pachakanue</strong></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Salas-Gismondi <em>et al.</em> (2016)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Guarinisuchus munici</strong></td>
<td>DG-CTG-UFPE 5723</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hamadasuchus rebouli</strong></td>
<td>ROM 52620</td>
<td>Photos from other researchers</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hemiprotoptosuchus leali</strong></td>
<td>PVL 3829</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hesperosuchus agilis</strong></td>
<td>CM 29894</td>
<td>Clark <em>et al.</em> (2000)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hsisosuchus chungkingensis</strong></td>
<td>cast of CNM V 1090</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hsisosuchus dashanpuensis</strong></td>
<td>ZDM 3405</td>
<td>Gao (2001)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hyposaurus rogersii</strong></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Iharkutosuchus makadii</strong></td>
<td>MTM 2006.52.1</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Collection</td>
<td>Preparation</td>
<td>Habitat/Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikanogavialis gameroi</td>
<td>MCNC unnumbered</td>
<td>Photos from other researchers</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isisfordia duncani</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Salisbury et al. (2000)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junggarsuchus sloani</td>
<td>IVPP V14010</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kambara impexidens</td>
<td>QM F29662</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaprosuchus saharicus</td>
<td>MNN IGU12</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoetschkesuchus guimarotae</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knoetschkesuchus langenbergenensis</td>
<td>DFMMh/FV 200</td>
<td>Schwarz et al. (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leidyosuchus canadensis</td>
<td>ROM 1903</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libycosuchus brevirostris</td>
<td>BSPG 1912 VIII 574</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litargosuchus leptorhynchus</td>
<td>BP/1/5237</td>
<td>Clark and Sues (2002)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lomasuchus palpebrosus</td>
<td>MOZ 4084 PV</td>
<td>Gasparini et al. (1991)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorosuchus nodosus</td>
<td>PVL 6219</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (Kellner et al. 2014)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machimosaurus buffetauti</td>
<td>SMNS 91415</td>
<td>Martin and Vincent (2013)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machimosaurus hugii</td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Krebs (1967)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machimosaurus mosae</td>
<td>BHN2R 1100</td>
<td>Young et al. (2014)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maledictosuchus ricaensis</td>
<td>MPZ 2001/130a</td>
<td>Parrilla-Bel et al. (2013)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maomingosuchus petrollica</td>
<td>DM-F0001</td>
<td>Shan et al. (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mariliasuchus amarali</td>
<td>UFRJ-106R</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maroccosuchus zennaroi</td>
<td>UF unnumbered</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecistops cataphractus</td>
<td>AMNH 10075</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanosuchus fisheri</td>
<td>MCNC 243</td>
<td>Medina (1976)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanosuchus niger</td>
<td>UF 53600</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metriorhynchus brachyrhynchus</td>
<td>NHMUK R3804</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specimen Name</td>
<td>Collection ID</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>metriorhynchus brachyrhynchus</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R3699</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>metriorhynchus casamiquelai</em></td>
<td>MGHF 1-08573</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Metriorhynchus Geoffroyii</em></td>
<td>OUMNH J.29823</td>
<td>Grange and Benton (1996)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Metriorhynchus superciliosus</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R6860</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Metriorhynchus superciliosus</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R6859</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Montealtosuchus arrudacampsi</em></td>
<td>MPMA 16-0007-04</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mourasuchus amazonensis</em></td>
<td>DGM 526-R</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Nanousuchus gracilidens</em></td>
<td>NHMUK 48217</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Notostrachus terrestris</em></td>
<td>MACN-PV RN 1037</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oceanosaurus boecensis</em></td>
<td>MHNH 9036</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Orthogenysuchus olsenii</em></td>
<td>AMNH 5178</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Orthosuchus stormbergi</em></td>
<td>SAM-PK-K409</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Osteolaemus osborni</em></td>
<td>AMNH 10082</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Osteolaemus tetraspis</em></td>
<td>FMNH 98936</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pakassuchus kapilimai</em></td>
<td>RRPB 08631</td>
<td>O'Connor et al. (2010)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paleosuchus palpebrosus</em></td>
<td>YPM R 11407</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paleosuchus trigonatus</em></td>
<td>AMNH R-58136</td>
<td>Photos from other researchers</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paralligator gradilifrons</em></td>
<td>PIN 554-1</td>
<td>Turner (2015)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paralligator major</em></td>
<td>PIN 3726/501</td>
<td>Turner (2015)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Peipehsuchus teleorhinus</em></td>
<td>IVPP V10098</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pelagosaurus typus</em></td>
<td>BRLSI M 1413</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pholidosaurus purbeckensis</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pietraroia suchus ormezzanoi</em></td>
<td>Specimen PC-2</td>
<td>Buscalioni et al. (2011)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Catalogue</td>
<td>Examination Method</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Piscogavialis jugaliperforatus</em></td>
<td>SMNK PAL 1282</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Planocrania datangensis</em></td>
<td>IVPP V5016</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Platysochus multicrobiculatus</em></td>
<td>SMNS 9930</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Procaimanoidea kayi</em></td>
<td>CM 9600</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Prodiplacynodon langi</em></td>
<td>AMNH 108</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Protosuchus haughtoni</em></td>
<td>BP/1/4770</td>
<td>Gow (2000)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Protosuchus richardsoni</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pseudhesperosuchus jachaleri</em></td>
<td>PVL 3830</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parussaurus brasiliensis</em></td>
<td>UFAC 1403</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parussaurus mirandae</em></td>
<td>UNEFM-CIAAP-1369</td>
<td>Aguilera <em>et al.</em> (2006)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Parussaurus neivensis</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhabdognathus keiniensis</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rhachesaurus gracilis</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R3948</td>
<td>Parrilla-Bel <em>et al.</em> (2013)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rimasuchus lloydii</em></td>
<td>NHMUK R 14145</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rulosuchus nongangensis</em></td>
<td>IGV 33</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sarcosuchus imperator</em></td>
<td>MNN 604</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sebecus icaeorhinus</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Shantungsosuchus brachycephalus</em></td>
<td>IVPP V4020</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Siamosuchus phuphokensis</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sichuanosuchus shuhanensis</em></td>
<td>IVPP V10594</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Simosuchus clarki</em></td>
<td>UA 8679</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sokotosuchus ianwilsoni</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Specimen Details</td>
<td>Examination Details</td>
<td>Habitats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sphagesaurus huenei</em></td>
<td>cast of MACN-PV 19037</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sphenosuchus acutus</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Walker (1990)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stangerochampsia mccabei</em></td>
<td>RTMP.86.61.1</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Steneosaurus bollensis</em></td>
<td>MNHN.F 1885-28</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Steneosaurus edwardsi</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R2865</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Steneosaurus gracilirostris</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R15500</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Steneosaurus leedsi</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R3320</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Steneosaurus leedsi</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R3806</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Steneosaurus megistorhynchus</em></td>
<td>OUMNH J.29850</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stolokrosuchus kapparenti</em></td>
<td>MNN GDF 600</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Stratiosuchus maxhechtii</em></td>
<td>DGM 1477-R</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Suchodus darobrivensis</em></td>
<td>NHMUK PV R2618</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sasisuchus anatoceps</em></td>
<td>SMNK PAL 3804</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Teleidosaurus calvadosii</em></td>
<td>cast of NHMUK PV R 2681</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Teleosaurus cadomensis</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Terminonaris browni</em></td>
<td>AMNH 5851</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Terminonaris robusta</em></td>
<td>AMNH 5850</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Terrestrisuchus gracilis</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Crush (1984)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thecachampsa antiqua</em></td>
<td>USNM 25243</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thecachampsa carolinensis</em></td>
<td>ChM PV 4279</td>
<td>Erickson and Sawyer (1996)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Thoracosaurus macrorhynchus</em></td>
<td>LO 3076T</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tomistoma schlegelii</em></td>
<td>RMBR unnumbered</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (extant taxon)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Torvoneustes carpenteri</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilkinson et al. (2008)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion et al. 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Species</strong></td>
<td><strong>Catalogue Number</strong></td>
<td><strong>Reference</strong></td>
<td><strong>Habitat</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Toyotamaphimeia machikanensis</em></td>
<td>MOUF00001</td>
<td>Kobayashi <em>et al.</em> (2006)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tsoabichi greenriverensis</em></td>
<td>SMNK PAL 2334 cast</td>
<td>First-hand examination</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tyrannoneustes lythrodictikos</em></td>
<td>PETMG:R176</td>
<td>Foffa and Young (2014)</td>
<td>marine (Mannion <em>et al.</em> 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Uberabasuchus terrificus</em></td>
<td>CPP 0630*</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vectissuchus leptognathus</em></td>
<td>reconstruction</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Voay robustus</em></td>
<td>NHMUK R 36685</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Wannaganosuchus brachymans</em></td>
<td>SMM P76.28.247*</td>
<td>Wilberg (2017)</td>
<td>semi-aquatic (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Yacarerani boliviensis</em></td>
<td>MNK-PAL 5063*</td>
<td>Novas <em>et al.</em> (2009)</td>
<td>terrestrial (PBDB)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Example R script of the geometric morphometric analyses performed in Chapter 3

###########################################################################
# Crocodylomorpha cranial shape variation and disparity
# Example script

# set work directory
setwd("C:/R/9 - GM Crocs")

# load required packages
library(geomorph)
library(phytools)
library(paleotree)
library(dispRity)
library(RVAideMemoire)

###########################################################################
# loading landmark data for geometric morphometric analyses
# reads the .tps file with landmark data:
landmark_data <- readland.tps(file = "GM_Crocs.tps", specID="ID",
readcurves = TRUE)

# reads classifier (for groups):
classifiers <- read.table(file = "Classifiers.txt", header = T)

# sorting taxa for matching order of classifiers
taxa <- dimnames(landmark_data)
taxa <- taxa[[3]]
order_taxa <- match(classifiers$ID, taxa)
which(is.na(order_taxa)) # looking for NAs
landmark_data <- landmark_data[,,order_taxa]

# reads semi-landmark curve
semi_landmarks <- read.csv("curveslide.csv")
#performs GPA onto landmark data
landmarks_aligned <- gpagen(landmark_data, curves = semi_landmarks,
surfaces = NULL, PrinAxes = TRUE, max.iter = NULL, ProcD = F, Proj = TRUE,
print.progress = TRUE)

#performs PCA and plots morphospace (PC1 vs PC2) with tip labels
PCA_crocs <- plotTangentSpace(landmarks_aligned$coords, label =
names(landmarks_aligned$Csize))

#estimating interobserver error in shape data
#converting data to "geomorph data frame" format
#different groups represent different observer/operator during landmarks
digitisation
#information about observer/operator has to be in the classifiers file
gdf <- geomorph.data.frame(shape = landmarks_aligned$coords, groups =
classifiers$observer)

#performs Procrustes ANOVA
ANOVA_test <- procD.lm(shape ~ groups, data = gdf, iter=999)

#calculates the percentage of variation explained by interobserver error
interobserver_error <- (ANOVA_test$SS[1]/ANOVA_test$SS[3])*100

#Burnaby's back-projection method (BBPM) or orthogonal projection method
#using PC2 as a proxy for measurement error
#calculating L (the orthogonal subspace)
f1 <- as.numeric(PCA_crocs$pc.scores[,2])
names(f1) <- names(landmarks_aligned$Csize)
I <- diag(1,209)
L <- I-f1 %*% ginv(t(f1) %*% f1) %*% t(f1)

#transforming landmark data into a two-dimensional array
landmark_data_2D <- two.d.array(landmark_data)
landmark_data_2D <- t(landmark_data_2D) #transpose
#projecting landmarks to orthogonal subspace
corrected_landmark_data <- landmark_data_2D %*% L

#back to three-dimensional array (64 landmarks and 2 dimensions)
corrected_landmark_data <- arrayspecs(corrected_landmark_data, 64, 2)

#performs GPA onto corrected landmark data
corrected_landmarks_aligned <- gpagen(corrected_landmark_data, curves = semi_landmarks, surfaces = NULL, PrinAxes = TRUE, max.iter = NULL, ProcD = F, Proj = TRUE, print.progress = TRUE)

#performs PCA
PCA_crocs_corrected <- plotTangentSpace(corrected_landmarks_aligned$coords, label = names(corrected_landmarks_aligned$Csize))

#estimating ancestral states for phylomorphospace
#loads crocodylomorph tree
tree <- read.tree("croc_tree.tre")

#reads the age data (FADs and LADs)
ages <- read.table("croc_ages.txt", header=T)
rownames(ages) as taxa names
rownames(ages) <- ages$taxa
ages <- ages[, -1]

trees <- timePaleoPhy(tree, ages, type="mbl", randres=T, vartime=1, ntrees=20, dateTreatment="minMax")

#dropping taxa from trees for which I do not have landmark data
for (i in 1:length(ttrees)) {
  ttrees[[i]] <- drop.tip(ttrees[[i]],
trees[[i]]$tip.label[!(trees[[i]]$tip.label %in% unlist(dimnames(landmarks_aligned$coords)[3]]))}

# sorting taxa for matching order of trees' tip labels
taxa2 <- ttrees[[1]]$tip.label
order_taxa2 <- match(taxa2, classifiers$ID)
which(is.na(order_taxa2)) # looking for NAs
classifiers <- classifiers[order_taxa2,]
landmark_data <- landmark_data[,order_taxa2]

# performs GPA onto landmark data
landmarks_aligned <- gpagen(landmark_data, curves = semi_landmarks,
surfaces = NULL, PrinAxes = TRUE, max.iter = NULL, ProcD = F, Proj = TRUE,
print.progress = TRUE)

# performs PCA and plots morphospace (PC1 vs PC2) with tip labels
PCA_crocs <- plotTangentSpace(landmarks_aligned$coords, label =
names(landmarks_aligned$Csize))

# estimates ancestral states and plots phylomorphospace using one time-scaled tree
PhyloMorphoSpace <- plotGMPhyloMorphoSpace(ttrees[[1]],
landmarks_aligned$coords, tip.labels=F, node.labels=F)

# estimating phylogenetic signal (Kmult) of shape data
phylo_signal <- physignal(landmarks_aligned$coords, ttrees[[1]],iter=999)

# disparity analyses

# gets Principal Components (PC) scores from landmark data previously subjected to GPA
PC_scores <- geomorph.ordination(landmarks_aligned)

# gets PC scores for ancestors (from previous ancestral states estimation)
ancestral_states_array <- arrayspecs(PhyloMorphoSpace, 64, 2)
ancestral_states_aligned <- gpagen(ancestral_states_array, curves =
semi_landmarks, surfaces = NULL, PrinAxes = TRUE, max.iter = NULL, ProcD =
F, Proj = TRUE, print.progress = TRUE)
ancestral_PC_scores <- geomorph.ordination(ancestral_states_aligned)

# merges PC scores from tips and ancestors in a single object
PC_scores_all <- rbind(PC_scores, ancestral_PC_scores)
# disparity-through-time analysis using time-slicing method with 20 time slices and gradual model
# creates time subsets
subsets <- chrono.subsets(data = PC_scores_all, tree = ttrees[[1]], method = "continuous", model = "proximity", time = 20, FADLAD = ages)

# bootstrapping the time subsets
boot_subsets <- boot.matrix(subsets, bootstraps = 1000)

# calculates disparity (sum of variances)
disparity <- disparity(boot_subsets, metric = c(sum, variances))
Appendix D: Supplementary results of the disparity-through-time analyses of Chapter 3
Time binning method (20 time bins), Thalattosuchia sister to Crocodyliformes
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Appendix E: Supplementary information for Chapter 4

The supplementary material for Chapter 4 (“Heterochrony in the cranial evolution of notosuchians”) was uploaded to the online repository Dryad (Godoy et al. 2018d) and can be found at: https://datadryad.org/resource/doi:10.5061/dryad.7m48r. The online content includes three documents and one compacted (ZIP file) file:

- Supporting information: file (.docx) containing supplementary text (with further explanation on the reconstruction of the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory), the complete list of sampled specimens, the description of the landmarks, as well as further tables and figures with supplementary results (including additional morphospaces, phylomorphospaces, regression scores and additional npMANOVA results).
- MorphoJ script (.morphoj): script used for all geometric morphometric analyses performed in Chapter 2.
- Thin plate spline: R script used for thin plate spline analyses.
- TPS files: compacted file containing .tps files with digitized landmarks of both lateral and dorsal view datasets.
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