

## Evidence for heterochrony in the cranial evolution of fossil crocodyliforms

Lorena Godoy, Pedro; Ferreira, Gabriel; Montefeltro, Felipe; Vila Nova, Bruno; Butler, Richard; Langer, Max C.

DOI:

[10.1111/pala.12354](https://doi.org/10.1111/pala.12354)

License:

Other (please specify with Rights Statement)

*Document Version*

Peer reviewed version

*Citation for published version (Harvard):*

Lorena Godoy, P, Ferreira, G, Montefeltro, F, Vila Nova, B, Butler, R & Langer, MC 2018, 'Evidence for heterochrony in the cranial evolution of fossil crocodyliforms', *Palaeontology*, vol. 61, no. 4, pp. 543-558. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pala.12354>

[Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal](#)

### **Publisher Rights Statement:**

Checked for eligibility: 26/7//2018

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

Godoy, P. L., Ferreira, G. S., Montefeltro, F. C., Vila Nova, B. C., Butler, R. J., Langer, M. C. and Benson, R. (2018), Evidence for heterochrony in the cranial evolution of fossil crocodyliforms. *Palaeontology*, 61 (4), 2018, 543-558, which has been published in final form at doi:10.1111/pala.12354. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving.

### **General rights**

Unless a licence is specified above, all rights (including copyright and moral rights) in this document are retained by the authors and/or the copyright holders. The express permission of the copyright holder must be obtained for any use of this material other than for purposes permitted by law.

- Users may freely distribute the URL that is used to identify this publication.
- Users may download and/or print one copy of the publication from the University of Birmingham research portal for the purpose of private study or non-commercial research.
- User may use extracts from the document in line with the concept of 'fair dealing' under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 (?)
- Users may not further distribute the material nor use it for the purposes of commercial gain.

Where a licence is displayed above, please note the terms and conditions of the licence govern your use of this document.

When citing, please reference the published version.

### **Take down policy**

While the University of Birmingham exercises care and attention in making items available there are rare occasions when an item has been uploaded in error or has been deemed to be commercially or otherwise sensitive.

If you believe that this is the case for this document, please contact [UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk](mailto:UBIRA@lists.bham.ac.uk) providing details and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate.

## Evidence for heterochrony in the cranial evolution of fossil crocodyliforms

PEDRO L. GODOY<sup>1</sup>, GABRIEL S. FERREIRA<sup>2,3,4\*</sup>, FELIPE C. MONTEFELTRO<sup>5</sup>,  
BRUNO C. VILA NOVA<sup>2</sup>, RICHARD J. BUTLER<sup>1</sup> *and* MAX C. LANGER<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>School of Geography, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Birmingham,  
Birmingham, United Kingdom; emails: pedrolorenagodoy@gmail.com,  
r.butler.1@bham.ac.uk

<sup>2</sup>Laboratório de Paleontologia de Ribeirão Preto, FFCLRP, Universidade de São Paulo,  
Ribeirão Preto, Brazil; emails: gsferreirabio@gmail.com, bruno.vilanova@gmail.com,  
mclanger@ffclrp.usp.br

<sup>3</sup>Senckenberg Center for Human Evolution and Palaeoenvironment (HEP), Eberhard Karls  
Universität, Tübingen, Germany

<sup>4</sup>Fachbereich Geowissenschaften, Eberhard Karls Universität, Tübingen, Germany

<sup>5</sup>Departamento de Biologia e Zootecnia, Universidade Estadual Paulista, FEIS, Ilha Solteira,  
Brazil; email: fcmontefeltro@bio.feis.unesp.br

\*Corresponding author

**Abstract:** The southern supercontinent of Gondwana was home to an extraordinary diversity of stem-crocodylians (Crocodyliformes) during the Late Cretaceous. The remarkable morphological disparity of notosuchian crocodyliforms indicates that this group filled a wide range of ecological roles more frequently occupied by other vertebrates. Among

1  
2  
3 notosuchians, the distinctive cranial morphology and large body sizes of Baurusuchidae  
4 suggest a role as apex predators in ecosystems in which the otherwise dominant predatory  
5 theropod dinosaurs were scarce. Large-bodied crocodyliforms, modern and extinct, are known  
6 to have reached large sizes by extending their growth period. In a similar way, peramorphic  
7 heterochronic processes may have driven the evolution of the similarly large baurusuchids. To  
8 assess the presence of peramorphic process in the cranial evolution of baurusuchids, we  
9 applied a geometric morphometric approach to investigate ontogenetic cranial shape variation  
10 in a comprehensive sample of notosuchians. Our results provide quantitative morphological  
11 evidence that peramorphic processes influenced the cranial evolution of baurusuchids. After  
12 applying size and ancestral ontogenetic allometry corrections to our data, we found no support  
13 for the action of either hypermorphosis or acceleration, indicating that these two processes  
14 alone cannot explain the shape variation observed in Notosuchia. Nevertheless, the strong link  
15 between cranial shape variation and size increase in baurusuchids suggests that peramorphic  
16 processes were involved in the emergence of hypercarnivory in these animals. Our findings  
17 illustrate the role of heterochrony as a macroevolutionary driver, and stress, once more, the  
18 usefulness of geometric morphometric techniques for identifying heterochronic processes  
19 behind evolutionary trends.

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41 **Key words:** heterochrony, peramorphosis, ontogenetic scaling, geometric morphometrics,  
42 Crocodyliformes, Baurusuchidae.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 HETEROCHRONY, the shifts in timing and rate of development, has been hypothesized to  
49 drive major phenotypic modifications in many groups (Gould 1977; McKinney 1988;  
50 McNamara and McKinney 2005; Bhullar *et al.* 2012; Koyabu *et al.* 2014). The identification  
51 of heterochronic processes requires information about the ancestral condition and the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 ontogenetic stage (age) of the studied organisms (Alberch *et al.* 1979; Shea 1983;  
4  
5 Klingenberg 1998). However, as well-preserved ontogenetic series and precise information on  
6  
7 absolute ages of individuals are rare for fossil vertebrates, palaeontologists have often used  
8  
9 relative size as a proxy for ontogenetic stage (Erickson *et al.* 2004; Schoch 2010; Ezcurra and  
10  
11 Butler 2015; Foth *et al.* 2016a). In this context, the recent discovery of a beautifully preserved  
12  
13 new specimen of the baurusuchid crocodyliform *Pissarrachampsia sera* (Fig. 1), noticeably  
14  
15 smaller than the other specimens previously reported (Montefeltro *et al.* 2011), provides the  
16  
17 opportunity to investigate the role of ontogenetic changes in the evolution of one of the most  
18  
19 remarkable crocodyliform groups, the notosuchians.  
20  
21

22 Notosuchia is the most diverse crocodyliform group in the Cretaceous of Gondwana  
23  
24 (Turner and Sertich 2010; Godoy *et al.* 2014; Pol *et al.* 2014; Pol and Leardi 2015), showing  
25  
26 an extraordinary taxonomical and ecological diversity (Bronzati *et al.* 2015; Mannion *et al.*  
27  
28 2015; Stubbs *et al.* 2013). Among the notosuchian subclades, baurusuchids are distinguished  
29  
30 by their peculiar anatomy, including a high and laterally compressed skull and blade-like  
31  
32 ziphodont teeth. These features have been used to infer an ecological role as land-dwelling  
33  
34 hypercarnivores, acting as apex predators in specific Gondwanan ecosystems in which  
35  
36 theropod dinosaurs, the dominant terrestrial predators throughout most of the Mesozoic, were  
37  
38 scarce (Montefeltro *et al.* 2011; Riff and Kellner 2011; Godoy *et al.* 2014, 2016). Despite the  
39  
40 long history of research on baurusuchids (Price 1945; Gasparini 1971), few studies have  
41  
42 examined aspects of their ontogeny, as juvenile specimens have been rarely reported and their  
43  
44 preserved fossils are mostly fragmentary (e.g. Carvalho *et al.* 2011). Likewise, although  
45  
46 Crocodyliformes is a highly diverse and fossil-rich clade, studies identifying the role of  
47  
48 heterochronic processes in their evolutionary history are relatively rare and usually focused on  
49  
50 extant crocodylians (e.g. Gignac and O'Brien 2016).  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           When compared to adult baurusuchids, the juvenile individual reported here bears a  
4  
5 general cranial morphology more typically seen in adults of non-baurusuchid notosuchians,  
6  
7 such as *Mariliasuchus amarali*, *Comahuesuchus brachybuccalis*, and the various species of  
8  
9 *Araripesuchus*. Based on these differences, we hypothesized that the ancestral notosuchian  
10  
11 cranial morphology was modified by peramorphic heterochronic processes, leading to the  
12  
13 adult baurusuchid skull. Peramorphosis (“shape beyond”) is identified when the descendant  
14  
15 development (size or shape) extends beyond that of the ancestor, producing exaggerated adult  
16  
17 traits (Alberch *et al.* 1979; Klingenberg 1998). Ancestral adult characters are therefore seen in  
18  
19 juveniles of the descendent. The opposite process is known as paedomorphosis, in which the  
20  
21 descendant retains at adult size the shape (or the characteristics) of the ancestral juvenile  
22  
23 (Alberch *et al.* 1979; Klingenberg 1998).  
24  
25

26           As previously documented (Erickson and Brochu 1999), large extant and extinct  
27  
28 crocodyliforms have achieved larger bodies by extending the growth period, suggesting the  
29  
30 action of time hypermorphosis, a peramorphic process that leads to an increase in size.  
31  
32 Accordingly, the evolution of larger body sizes in baurusuchids may have been the result of  
33  
34 similar processes, but this hypothesis has not been previously examined. In this work, we use  
35  
36 the new specimen of *Pissarrachampsa sera* to document heterochronic changes and assess the  
37  
38 action of peramorphic processes in the cranial evolution of Baurusuchidae.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 *Institutional abbreviations.* LPRP/USP, Laboratório de Paleontologia, Universidade de São  
47  
48 Paulo, Ribeirão Preto, Brazil.  
49  
50  
51

## 52 **SYSTEMATIC PALAEOLOGY**

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 CROCODYLIFORMES Benton and Clark 1988

4  
5 MESOEUCROCODYLIA Whetstone and Whybrow 1983

6  
7 BAURUSUCHIDAE Price 1945

8  
9 PISSARRACHAMPSINAE Montefeltro *et al.* 2011

10  
11 *Pissarrachampsa sera* Montefeltro *et al.* 2011

12  
13  
14  
15  
16 *Holotype.* LPRP/USP 0019; nearly complete skull and mandibles lacking the rostralmost  
17 portion of the rostrum, seven dorsal vertebrae, partial forelimb, pelvic girdle, and hindlimbs  
18 (Montefeltro *et al.* 2011; Godoy *et al.* 2016).  
19

20  
21  
22  
23  
24 *Newly referred specimen.* LPRP/USP 0049; a juvenile individual comprised of a complete  
25 skull with lower jaws, articulated neck/trunk vertebrae and partial right scapula and forelimb  
26 (Fig. 1).  
27  
28  
29

30  
31  
32  
33 *Locality.* Inhaúmas-Arantes Farm, Gurinhatã, Minas Gerais state, Brazil (Martinelli and  
34 Teixeira 2105).  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 *Age and horizon.* Adamantina Formation, Bauru Group, Bauru Basin; Late Cretaceous,  
40 Campanian–Maastrichtian (Marsola *et al.* 2016; Batezelli 2017).  
41  
42  
43

44  
45  
46 *Diagnosis.* The new specimen LPRP/USP 0049 was identified as *Pissarrachampsa sera* based  
47 on the presence of the following combination of features, unique to that taxon (Montefeltro *et*  
48 *al.* 2011; Godoy *et al.* 2016): a longitudinal depression on the rostral portion of frontal;  
49 frontal longitudinal ridge extending rostrally beyond the frontal midlength; supratemporal  
50 fenestra with equally developed medial and rostral rims; lacrimal duct positioned at the  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 angular junction between the dorsal and lateral surfaces of the lacrimal; well-developed  
3 rounded foramen between the anterior and posterior palpebrals; quadratojugal and jugal do  
4 not form a continuous ventral border (a notch is present due to the ventral displacement of the  
5 quadratojugal); four subtympanic foramina (*sensu* Montefeltro *et al.* 2016) visible laterally; a  
6 single ventral parachoanal fenestra and one ventral parachoanal fossa (divided into medial and  
7 lateral parachoanal subfossae); lateral Eustachian foramina larger than the medial one; a deep  
8 depression on the caudodorsal surface of the pterygoid wings; complete absence of  
9 postcranial osteoderms.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

## 22 **METHODS**

### 23 *Heterochronic terminology*

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 It is important to clearly define the peramorphic processes used in the context of this work, as  
32 distinct heterochronic processes have been defined using different formalisms (evolutionary  
33 *versus* developmental concepts, for example) in the past (Klingenberg 1998). The definitions  
34 of the peramorphic processes used herein (Fig. 2) follow mainly the works of Gould (1977),  
35 Alberch *et al.* (1979), Shea (1983), and Klingenberg (1988). Accordingly, we recognize that  
36 the effects of heterochrony on the phenotype may be realized on three different and  
37 independent dimensions – shape of a given structure, body size, and age (Klingenberg 1998).  
38 The variation of three parameters – rate of change (either of a structure or the entire body),  
39 and times of onset and offset of growth (either of a structure or the entire body) – can be used  
40 to describe the processes (Alberch *et al.* 1979; Klingenberg 1998).  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Acceleration is identified when anatomical structures of the descendant develop faster  
53 (increased rate) than the rest of the body, when compared to the ancestor. There is a break of  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the ancestral allometry (size-shape relations), so these changes are not ontogenetically scaled  
4  
5 (i.e., heterochronic changes do not maintain the ancestral allometric relationships). There is  
6  
7 no change of the times of onset and offset of growth. The outcome is a peramorphic structure,  
8  
9 in an individual with the same body size and an equivalent period of development as the  
10  
11 ancestor (Fig. 2).  
12

13  
14         Hypermorphosis can be divided in two subtypes (Shea 1983). Time hypermorphosis,  
15  
16 is when the entire body of the descendant (including the studied part) develops for a longer  
17  
18 period than in the ancestor. The ancestral allometry is maintained, so the changes are  
19  
20 ontogenetically scaled. There is no change in the time of growth onset, but the offset is  
21  
22 delayed. The outcome is a peramorphic structure, in an individual with larger body size and a  
23  
24 longer period of development than the ancestor (Fig. 2). By contrast, in rate hypermorphosis  
25  
26 the entire body of the descendant (including the studied part) develops faster than in the  
27  
28 ancestor. The ancestral allometry is maintained, so the changes are ontogenetically scaled.  
29  
30 There is no change in the times of onset and offset of growth. The outcome is a peramorphic  
31  
32 structure, in an individual with a larger body size and the same period of development as in  
33  
34 the ancestor (Fig. 2). The distinction between rate and time hypermorphosis, introduced by  
35  
36 Shea (1983), was not part of the original classification of Alberch *et al.* (1979), and the use of  
37  
38 the term rate hypermorphosis has been criticized by some authors (e.g. Gould 2000). In any  
39  
40 case, the resulting morphology (i.e. the descendant's morphology) is ontogenetically scaled in  
41  
42 both time and rate hypermorphosis.  
43  
44

45  
46         Finally, predisplacement is when a structure of the descendant starts to develop earlier  
47  
48 than in the ancestor. This often leads to a break of the ancestral allometry, but not if the entire  
49  
50 body also starts developing earlier. The onset of growth is anticipated (at least that of the  
51  
52 structure), but the offset is maintained. The outcome is a peramorphic structure, in an  
53  
54 individual with the same body size and the same period of development as the ancestor or  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 with a larger body size and a longer period of development than the ancestor if the earlier  
4  
5 onset also affected the entire body (Fig. 2).  
6  
7

### 8 9 *Data collection*

10  
11  
12  
13 To test if the cranial modifications seen in Baurusuchidae were generated by heterochronic  
14  
15 processes, we assessed the cranial disparity of Notosuchia using 2D geometric morphometric  
16  
17 analyses of general skull shape. The specimens/species sampling took into account the  
18  
19 phylogenetic positions within Notosuchia of the species and the preservation of the  
20  
21 specimens. Only fairly complete skulls, for which most of the landmarks could be readily  
22  
23 identified and digitized, were sampled. Specimens too deformed or lacking important parts of  
24  
25 the skull were not included. However, to maximise the sample size, we also included  
26  
27 specimens in which only a small portion of the skull was missing (e.g. the rostralmost tip of  
28  
29 the snout) or specimens that were slightly deformed. In these cases, we used closely related  
30  
31 taxa to project the landmark positions during the digitization.  
32  
33  
34

35 As a result, we sampled 38 specimens, from a total of 27 taxa across Notosuchia,  
36  
37 including four juvenile specimens: the baurusuchids *Pissarrachampsa sera* and  
38  
39 *Campinasuchus dinizi*, as well as *Anatosuchus minor* and *Mariliasuchus amarali* (for the  
40  
41 complete list, see Supporting Information, Table S1). To obtain more detailed interpretations  
42  
43 of skull shape variation, we used both lateral and dorsal views for the analyses (Openshaw *et*  
44  
45 *al.* 2016), with 19 and 17 landmarks respectively (see Supporting Information for the position  
46  
47 and description of landmarks, Fig. S1; Table S3). Landmarks were digitized using the  
48  
49 software tpsDig 2.22 (Rohlf 2015). We used both right and left sides of the skulls, choosing  
50  
51 the side that offered the best conditions for digitization (considering either preservation or  
52  
53 quality of photographs). Then, we extract the reflected shape of the specimens that were  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 digitized on the right side while performing the Procrustes fit in MorphoJ. To minimize error,  
3  
4 landmarks were collected twice for each specimen (by a single person), and the subsequent  
5  
6 analyses employed the average coordinates from the two digitizations of each specimen.  
7  
8  
9

### 10 11 *Phylogenetic framework* 12

13  
14  
15 Notosuchia is a group of mesoeucrocodylians that has been consistently supported as  
16  
17 monophyletic, even though its exact taxonomic content may vary in different phylogenetic  
18  
19 hypotheses (e.g. Turner and Sertich 2010; Andrade *et al.* 2011; Bronzati *et al.* 2012;  
20  
21 Montefeltro *et al.* 2013; Pol *et al.* 2014; Sertich and O'Connor 2014; Turner 2015; Wilberg  
22  
23 2015). The placement of Baurusuchidae deeply nested within Notosuchia is supported even  
24  
25 by studies that have highly distinct taxonomic and character samples (Montefeltro *et al.* 2013;  
26  
27 Pol *et al.* 2014; Turner 2015; Martin and Lapparent de Broin 2016; Meunier and Larsson  
28  
29 2016), but uncertainties remain regarding the nearest relatives of baurusuchids. The  
30  
31 morphological similarities with Sebecidae, a group of Cenozoic terrestrial crocodyliforms,  
32  
33 have led many phylogenetic studies to cluster Baurusuchidae and Sebecidae into  
34  
35 Sebecosuchia (Turner and Sertich 2010; Kellner *et al.* 2014; Pol *et al.* 2014). Alternative  
36  
37 positions placed Baurusuchidae closer to other Cretaceous notosuchians, such as  
38  
39 Sphagesauridae, with Sebecidae placed closer to other groups such as Peirosauridae and  
40  
41 Mahajangasuchidae (Sereno and Larson 2009; Montefeltro *et al.* 2013; Wilberg 2015;  
42  
43 Meunier and Larsson 2016). It is almost universally agreed, however, that baurusuchids are  
44  
45 not very closely related to a set of mostly small-bodied notosuchians, such as *Mariliasuchus*,  
46  
47 *Araripesuchus*, *Notosuchus*, and *Uruguaysuchus* (Kellner *et al.* 2014; Pol *et al.* 2014; Leardi  
48  
49 *et al.* 2015a, b; Martin and Lapparent de Broin 2016).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The phylogenetic hypothesis proposed by Montefeltro *et al.* (2013) was selected as the  
4 primary phylogenetic framework for our geometric morphometric analyses (Fig. 3A). We  
5 added four taxa to the original topology of Montefeltro *et al.* (2013), for which we had  
6 morphometric data available: *Aplestosuchus sordidus*, *Campinasuchus dinizi*, *Candidodon*  
7 *itapecuruensis*, and *Pakasuchus kapilimai*. We employed information from Godoy *et al.*  
8 (2014) to define the phylogenetic position of the first two taxa, and from Pol *et al.* (2014) for  
9 the latter two. Following this phylogenetic framework, we divided the sampled specimens  
10 into four different taxonomic groups, which was necessary to test our hypothesis of  
11 peramorphosis in baurusuchid evolution: “Baurusuchidae”, “Sphagesauridae”, “Peirosauridae  
12 + Sebecidae”, and the remaining notosuchians falling outside of these groups (clustered here  
13 as “other notosuchians”). As *Sebecus icaeorhinus* was the only representative of Sebecidae  
14 included, it was combined with peirosaurids into a single group for the analyses.

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 In order to test the robustness of our results to changes in phylogenetic hypotheses, we  
30 also divided the sampled specimens to fit an alternative phylogenetic framework. We selected  
31 the topology of Pol *et al.* (2014), as the data matrix presented in this work has formed the  
32 basis of many subsequent phylogenetic analyses of notosuchians (e.g. Leardi *et al.* 2015a, b;  
33 Godoy *et al.* 2016). As a result, we reallocated the specimens within three alternative  
34 taxonomic groups: “Sebecosuchia” (baurusuchids + *Sebecus icaeorhinus*), “Uruguaysuchidae  
35 + Peirosauridae” (*Araripesuchus* species, *Uruguaysuchus* and *Anatosuchus* in  
36 Uruguaysuchidae + peirosaurids) and “other notosuchians” (all remaining species, including  
37 sphagesaurids).

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50 *Geometric morphometrics analyses*  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 To extract shape information from both lateral and dorsal view datasets, we first applied a  
4 Procrustes fit with reflection, using the software MorphoJ 1.06e (Klingenberg 2011), and also  
5 obtained centroid size, to be used in subsequent analyses as a proxy for size. Next, to  
6  
7 visualize the skull shape transformations during the postnatal ontogeny of *Pissarrachampsa*  
8  
9 *sera*, we performed a thin plate spline (Bookstein 1991), using the lateral view dataset of both  
10  
11 the juvenile and adult specimens of this taxon. This procedure was conducted using  
12  
13 ‘geomorph’ package (Adams and Otárola-Castillo 2013) in R (R Core Team 2017), and shape  
14  
15 variation (the position of the Procrustes coordinates) of the adult against the juvenile was  
16  
17 plotted in a deformation grid. We then conducted principal component analyses (PCA) in  
18  
19 MorphoJ to investigate the morphospace occupied by the sampled taxa. For these  
20  
21 comparisons, we divided the specimens into taxonomic groups using both phylogenetic  
22  
23 frameworks outlined above. The position of individual specimens within the morphospace  
24  
25 will not change using alternative phylogenetic frameworks – the only difference should be in  
26  
27 the morphospace occupation by the different taxonomic groups. We also mapped the topology  
28  
29 of Montefeltro *et al.* (2013) onto centroid size (using only the lateral view dataset) to explore  
30  
31 the size differences among the sampled taxa.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Subsequently, we performed a set of analyses to assess which specific heterochronic  
38  
39 processes could be driving baurusuchid cranial evolution. Peramorphic changes in the shape  
40  
41 of structures can be decoupled from (acceleration) or accompanied by (hypermorphosis and  
42  
43 predisplacement) changes in size (Gould 1977; Alberch *et al.* 1979; Shea 1983; Klingenberg  
44  
45 1998). To explore this relation, we employed a size-correction to our datasets to test whether  
46  
47 the shape differences remained after removing the effect of allometric changes (Gould 1966;  
48  
49 Revell 2009; Klingenberg 2016). Using MorphoJ, we obtained the residuals of a multivariate  
50  
51 regression of the Procrustes coordinates against centroid size (Monteiro 1999; Klingenberg *et*  
52  
53 *al.* 2012; Klingenberg 2016). For this, we used a subset restricted to adult specimens, as we  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 were interested only in interspecific size variation. The residuals from this regression were  
4  
5 then used as the input for a second PCA to explore the occupied morphospace after removing  
6  
7 the effect of size on the observed variation. As for the first PCA, the specimens were also  
8  
9 divided into taxonomic groups using both the primary and alternative phylogenetic  
10  
11 frameworks. To test the significance of the differences in the distributions of groups in the  
12  
13 morphospace, we used a non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance, npMANOVA,  
14  
15 which, in contrast to a parametric MANOVA, does not require the data to be normally  
16  
17 distributed, and tests for significant differences on the basis of permutations (Anderson 2001;  
18  
19 Foth *et al.* 2016b). These tests were performed in PAST (Hammer *et al.* 2001), and we used  
20  
21 the PC scores that represent at least 95 per cent of shape variation. These scores were then  
22  
23 transformed into a Euclidean distance matrix (Euclidean similarity index), and permuted with  
24  
25 10,000 replications. Comparisons were made using the Bonferroni correction, to reduce the  
26  
27 likelihood of type 1 statistical errors (Rice 1989). Additionally, we projected the topology  
28  
29 based on the hypothesis of Montefeltro *et al.* (2013) onto the PC scores (using both dorsal and  
30  
31 lateral view datasets), creating a phylomorphospace to explore the evolutionary history of  
32  
33 shape changes in the sampled taxa.  
34  
35

36  
37 To evaluate the specific action of time hypermorphosis, we applied the methodology  
38  
39 described by Strelin *et al.* (2016), to test whether the shape modifications seen in the  
40  
41 baurusuchid skull evolved by ontogenetic scaling. Time hypermorphosis corresponds to an  
42  
43 extension of the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory, a pattern previously detected in other  
44  
45 crocodyliforms known to extend the growth period and attain larger body sizes (e.g. Erickson  
46  
47 and Brochu 1999). As such, based on whether the differences among taxa remain or not after  
48  
49 this procedure, we can reject or confirm hypermorphosis as the sole peramorphic process  
50  
51 acting on baurusuchid skull evolution, as this is the only process that extends the ontogenetic  
52  
53 trajectory in time.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 For this, we compared skull size and shape variation from juvenile to adult  
4 baurusuchids to those changes seen along the ontogenetic trajectory of a hypothetical  
5 ancestral notosuchian. The ancestral ontogenetic trajectory was inferred via a phylogenetic  
6 approach based on outgroup taxa to Baurusuchidae. Ideally, this approach would incorporate  
7 information from as many non-baurusuchid notosuchians as possible. However, only two  
8 non-baurusuchid notosuchians have juvenile specimens reported with well-preserved skulls.  
9 Those two species are *Mariliasuchus amarali*, with one juvenile and five adult specimens  
10 included in our sample, and *Anatosuchus minor*, with one juvenile and one adult specimen  
11 sampled. Although using only two taxa is not ideal, the phylogenetic positions of these two  
12 species relative to baurusuchids support their use as the best available proxies for the ancestral  
13 condition of baurusuchids (see Supporting Information for further discussion).  
14  
15

16 Accordingly, we created an ontogenetic regression model for both *Mariliasuchus*  
17 *amarali* and *Anatosuchus minor*, using all sampled specimens (including juveniles), by  
18 regressing the Procrustes coordinates against the log-transformed centroid size in MorphoJ  
19 (Klingenberg 2011; Strelin *et al.* 2016). This ontogenetic regression model was used to  
20 perform an allometric size-correction (which we refer to here as the “ancestral ontogenetic  
21 allometry correction”) for all other taxa in our sample (Strelin *et al.* 2016). Regression  
22 residuals were calculated in MorphoJ, by using the vector of regression coefficients for the  
23 ontogenetic allometry estimated for the two taxa and applying them to our shape data. This  
24 process removes the potential effect of ontogenetic scaling from the variation among taxa.  
25 These residuals were then used as the input data for a third PCA, again including only adults,  
26 to explore the morphospace occupied after removing the effect of the ancestral ontogenetic  
27 allometry trajectory from our data. As for the first and second PCA, we investigated  
28 morphospace occupation using both primary and alternative phylogenetic frameworks. As  
29 also done following the size-correction, we used npMANOVA to test the significance of the  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2 differences between groups and created phylomorphospaces, by projecting the topology of  
3  
4 Montefeltro *et al.* (2013) onto the PC scores.  
5  
6

7 Finally, we note that the use of *Anatosuchus minor* as a proxy for the ancestral  
8 ontogenetic trajectory should be treated with caution. The holotype specimen of *Anatosuchus*  
9 *minor*, which has been interpreted as a juvenile, is not much smaller than the only other  
10 known specimen of this taxon, which has been interpreted as an adult. Moreover, this taxon  
11 also exhibits a cranial morphology notably distinct from those of other notosuchians (Sereno  
12 *et al.* 2003; Sereno and Larsson 2009). Accordingly, as a sensitivity test, we also estimate the  
13 ancestral ontogenetic trajectory without including *Anatosuchus minor*, instead performing the  
14 ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction using only the *Mariliasuchus amarali* specimens.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

## 26 RESULTS

27  
28  
29  
30

31 The thin plate spline shows that the cranial changes observed during the ontogeny of  
32 *Pissarrachampsia sera* include an expansion of the rostrum (both rostrocaudally and  
33 dorsoventrally), a rostrocaudal shortening of the skull roof (orbitotemporal region), and the  
34 reduction of the relative size of the orbits and the lower temporal fenestrae (Fig. 3B).  
35 Furthermore, based on the primary phylogenetic framework (Montefeltro *et al.* 2013), the first  
36 PCA shows that juvenile and adult baurusuchids occupy different regions of the  
37 morphospace. In both the lateral (PC1 accounting for 60.6 per cent of the variation, PC2 = 9.9  
38 per cent) and dorsal views (PC1 = 57.9 per cent, PC2 = 11.3 per cent), juvenile baurusuchids  
39 fall outside the morphospace of adult baurusuchids, but within the morphospace occupied by  
40 non-baurusuchid notosuchians. By contrast, when compared to juveniles, adult baurusuchids  
41 occupy a distinct part of the morphospace, mainly displaced along the PC1 axis for the lateral  
42 view dataset (Fig. 3A), and along both PC1 and PC2 axes for the dorsal view dataset  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (Supporting Information, Fig. S2). A similar pattern of morphospace occupation was found  
4  
5 when we used the alternative phylogenetic framework (Pol *et al.* 2014), with the sampled taxa  
6  
7 rearranged into different groups. In both lateral and dorsal views (Supporting Information,  
8  
9 Fig. S3, S4) juvenile sebecosuchians (the group that includes baurusuchids) are displaced in  
10  
11 relation to the morphospace occupied by adults.  
12

13  
14 The allometric regression of the Procrustes coordinates against log-transformed  
15  
16 centroid size shows that changes related to size differences accounted for 36.4 and 40.5per  
17  
18 cent of the variation in the dorsal and lateral view datasets, respectively (see Supporting  
19  
20 Information for more about this allometric regression, Table S4, S5; Fig. S5). The second  
21  
22 PCA, with size-corrected data, shows that size variation strongly influences morphospace  
23  
24 occupation of the different lineages, in both lateral and dorsal views (Fig. 5A, B). For the  
25  
26 primary phylogenetic framework (Montefeltro *et al.* 2013), the confidence ellipses (90 per  
27  
28 cent) for baurusuchids, sphagesaurids, and even peirosaurids/sebecids overlapped with the  
29  
30 confidence ellipse of other notosuchians (see Supporting Information for the  
31  
32 phylomorphospaces, Fig. S6). The absence of significant differences in the distribution of  
33  
34 these groups was supported by the npMANOVA test (Table 1), showing that changes in size  
35  
36 can explain the apparent separation of groups found in our previous analyses (first PC plots).  
37  
38 Additionally, when the alternative phylogenetic framework (Pol *et al.* 2014) was taken into  
39  
40 account through rearranging the specimens into different taxonomic groups (see Methods  
41  
42 above), we found very similar results. The npMANOVA results also indicate that the  
43  
44 morphospaces of sebecosuchians (i.e. baurusuchids) and other notosuchians are not  
45  
46 significantly different, in both dorsal and lateral views (Supporting Information, Fig. S7, S8).  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 Finally, the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory was estimated by using the ontogenetic  
52  
53 trajectories of *Mariliasuchus amarali* and *Anatosuchus minor* as proxies. First, to assure that  
54  
55 the ontogenetic trajectories of these two species (representing the ancestral condition) differ  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 from that of *Pissarrachampsa sera* (representing the baurusuchid trajectory), we compared  
4  
5 the reconstructed trajectories of these three taxa with a regression analysis. As expected, the  
6  
7 trajectories of these three species are clearly displaced in relation to one another (Fig. 6).  
8  
9 However, in dorsal view, whereas the trajectories of *Mariliasuchus amarali* and  
10  
11 *Pissarrachampsa sera* exhibit a similar slope, that of *Anatosuchus minor* is clearly different.  
12  
13 This might indicate that the use of *Anatosuchus minor* for reconstructing the ancestral  
14  
15 ontogenetic trajectory should be treated with caution, given its unique cranial morphology  
16  
17 among Notosuchia (see Methods above).  
18  
19

20         The distinction between those ontogenetic trajectories (that of the hypothetical  
21  
22 ancestor, represented by *Mariliasuchus* and *Anatosuchus*, and that of baurusuchids,  
23  
24 represented by *Pissarrachampsa*) allowed us to progress further with the ancestral  
25  
26 ontogenetic allometry correction (i.e. removing the effect of ontogenetic scaling from our  
27  
28 data). The results of the third PCA, after this correction, employing the primary phylogenetic  
29  
30 framework (Montefeltro *et al.* 2013), are apparently conflicting. Using the lateral view  
31  
32 dataset, the morphospaces occupied by adult baurusuchids and other notosuchians overlap and  
33  
34 are not significantly separated (Fig. 5D; Table 1), suggesting that the shape variation observed  
35  
36 in baurusuchids could be ontogenetically scaled. However, the dorsal dataset shows a  
37  
38 different result, with baurusuchid and other notosuchian morphospaces significantly separated  
39  
40 (Fig. 5C, Table1). Furthermore, when using the alternative phylogenetic framework (Pol *et al.*  
41  
42 2014), we found the morphospaces of sebecosuchians (i.e. baurusuchids) and other  
43  
44 notosuchians to be significantly separated, in both dorsal and lateral views (Supporting  
45  
46 Information, Fig. S10, S11; Table S10, S11). Finally, to test the influence of the ontogenetic  
47  
48 trajectory of *Anatosuchus minor* on our results (given its unique morphology, see Methods  
49  
50 above), we applied an ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction using only *Mariliasuchus*  
51  
52 *amarali* for estimating the ancestral trajectory. The results, in both dorsal and lateral views,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 show the morphospaces of baurusuchids and other notosuchians to be significantly separated  
4  
5 (Supporting Information, Fig. S13, S14; Table S14, S15).  
6  
7

## 8 9 **DISCUSSION**

### 10 11 12 13 *Peramorphosis in Baurusuchidae*

14  
15  
16  
17 The results of the initial analyses (first PCA and thin plate spline) indicate that juvenile  
18 baurusuchids bear a more generalized notosuchian morphotype, whereas adults diverge from  
19 this morphotype in later ontogenetic stages. This supports our hypothesis of peramorphic  
20 processes operating in the evolution of notosuchians, even when considering different  
21 phylogenetic frameworks (Supporting Information, Fig. S3, S4). During their ontogeny,  
22 baurusuchids seem to expand their rostrum (both rostrocaudally and dorsoventrally), shorten  
23 their skull roof rostrocaudally, and reduce the relative sizes of the orbits and the lower  
24 temporal fenestrae, differences that can be observed on the deformation grid of the thin plate  
25 spline (Fig. 3B). The first PCA corroborates these ontogenetic transformations. In lateral view  
26 (Fig. 4A), the PC1 axis, from negative to positive values, represents relative rostrocaudal  
27 shortening of the rostrum as well as relative enlargement of the orbit, and the PC2 axis  
28 displays changes in skull height (higher skulls represented by more negative values). Adult  
29 baurusuchids are all located on the negative side of the PC1 axis, whereas the juvenile  
30 *Pissarrachampsia sera* is positioned in a positive region along this axis, illustrating the  
31 rostrocaudal expansion of the rostrum during the ontogeny of this taxon. Other modifications  
32 can be observed in the dorsal view morphospace (Supporting Information, Fig. S2), in which  
33 the PC1 axis also represents rostrocaudal shortening of the rostrum (as in lateral view). The  
34 PC2 axis accounts for the mediolateral compression of the skull (from negative to positive  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 values), and illustrates the mediolateral compression of the skull that occurs during the  
4  
5 ontogeny of *Pissarrachampsa*.

6  
7         Studies using geometric morphometric methods to investigate the ontogenetic  
8  
9 trajectories of extant crocodylians (e.g. Piras *et al.* 2010; Watanabe and Slice 2014; Foth *et al.*  
10  
11 2017) allowed us to identify similarities between the morphological modifications during the  
12  
13 ontogeny of *Pissarrachampsa sera* and the ontogenies of living taxa. For example, the best  
14  
15 documented transformation is the relative reduction of the orbits, also found in living  
16  
17 representatives of the three main lineages of Crocodylia: Gavialoidea, Crocodyloidea and  
18  
19 Alligatoroidea (e.g. Piras *et al.* 2010; Foth *et al.* 2015, 2017). Other common modifications  
20  
21 previously reported include the mediolateral compression of the rostrum, although in *Caiman*  
22  
23 *latirostris* the opposite process is observed (i.e. snouts relatively broader later in ontogeny;  
24  
25 Bona and Desojo 2011; Foth *et al.* 2017). Nevertheless, quantitative investigations of possible  
26  
27 heterochronic processes acting on the evolution of Crocodyliformes are rare (e.g. Gignac and  
28  
29 O'Brien 2016), and our work represents the first attempt to verify the action of heterochrony  
30  
31 in fossil lineages of the group using geometric morphometric methods.  
32  
33

34  
35         However, given the lack of juveniles of other baurusuchids with complete skulls,  
36  
37 further assumptions cannot be quantitatively tested. For example, we can only hypothesize the  
38  
39 phylogenetic distribution of cranial peramorphism within Baurusuchidae (i.e. determining  
40  
41 whether the action of peramorphic processes started at the base of Baurusuchidae or later  
42  
43 within the lineage). The size and phylogenetic positions of *Cynodontosuchus rothi* and  
44  
45 *Gondwanasuchus scabrosus* suggest that the peramorphic changes occurred just prior or  
46  
47 within the clade composed of Pissarrachampsinae + Baurusuchinae (Godoy *et al.* 2014).  
48  
49 These two early-diverging species, known from fragmentary remains, have been suggested to  
50  
51 be adults, but are substantially smaller than other baurusuchids (estimated as approximately  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 50 per cent the size of an adult *Pissarrachampsa sera*; Montefeltro *et al.* 2011; Godoy *et al.*  
4  
5 2014).

6  
7  
8  
9 *Acceleration, predisplacement or hypermorphosis?*

10  
11  
12  
13 Among the known peramorphic processes (i.e. acceleration, predisplacement, and  
14  
15 hypermorphosis; Fig. 2; Gould 1977; Alberch *et al.* 1979; Shea 1983; Klingenberg 1998),  
16  
17 acceleration is the only one that does not affect total body size (i.e. based on the definition  
18  
19 used here, shape and size are not coupled; Fig. 2A) (Klingenberg 1998). Our results show that  
20  
21 the apparent separation between baurusuchids and other notosuchians seen in the first PCA  
22  
23 disappears after applying the size-correction (Fig. 5A, B), suggesting a strong correlation  
24  
25 between cranial shape and size (centroid size) variation in baurusuchids. Therefore, according  
26  
27 to our results, acceleration cannot, as a sole process, explain the shape changes observed in  
28  
29 the baurusuchid skull.  
30  
31

32  
33 We further examined if hypermorphosis could explain the shape variation seen in  
34  
35 baurusuchid cranial morphology, by testing the ontogenetic scaling hypothesis. The  
36  
37 ontogenetic scaling hypothesis predicts that heterochronic changes can occur by maintaining  
38  
39 the ancestral allometric relationships, generating a descendant morphology via proportional  
40  
41 changes in size and shape that follow the same ancestral ontogenetic pathway (Fig. 2B) (Shea  
42  
43 1983; Klingenberg 1998; Strelin *et al.* 2016). Based on the definitions used here,  
44  
45 hypermorphosis is the peramorphic process that incorporates the concept of ontogenetic  
46  
47 scaling, either by increasing the duration of ontogeny (time hypermorphosis) or by increasing  
48  
49 the rate of size and shape changes during the same period of growth (rate hypermorphosis)  
50  
51 (Fig. 2A, C; Shea 1983). Accordingly, in both time and rate hypermorphosis the shape  
52  
53 variation is ontogenetically scaled.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 As such, if our data fit the predictions of the ontogenetic scaling model, after removing  
4 the effects of the ancestral ontogenetic allometry the confidence ellipses of baurusuchids  
5 should collapse to the same morphospace as other notosuchians. This should be true for all  
6 shape variation observed in our sample, in both lateral and dorsal views. Accordingly, our  
7 results do not corroborate the ontogenetic scaling hypothesis, since the apparently  
8 ontogenetically scaled shape variation seen in lateral view (Fig. 5D) is not congruent with the  
9 results for the dorsal view or for the other analyses performed. In dorsal view (Fig. 5D), the  
10 morphospaces of baurusuchids and other notosuchians remain separate after the ancestral  
11 ontogenetic allometry correction (significantly separated, as confirmed by the npMANOVA  
12 tests; Table 1), which indicates that the shape variation is not ontogenetically scaled (see  
13 Supporting Information for further information and results, Table S4, S5, S8, S9, S12, S11;  
14 Fig. S6, S9, S12). This also highlights the importance of using different views when studying  
15 skull shape and interpreting their evolutionary patterns (Openshaw *et al.* 2016). Furthermore,  
16 when we used a different phylogenetic framework, which essentially rearranged the sampled  
17 species into different taxonomic groups (see Methods), the morphospaces of sebecosuchians  
18 (which includes baurusuchids) and other notosuchians remain significantly separated  
19 (Supporting Information, Fig. S10, S11; Table S10, S11). The same is observed when we  
20 removed the *Anatosuchus minor* specimens from the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory  
21 estimation (Supporting Information, Fig. S13, S14; Table S14, S15). These complementary  
22 results corroborate the idea that the cranial shape variation observed in baurusuchids is not  
23 ontogenetically scaled.

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48 The lack of support for the ontogenetic scaling hypothesis demonstrates that neither  
49 time nor rate hypermorphosis can be considered as the single, isolated driver of baurusuchid  
50 peramorphism (Shea 1983; Strelin *et al.* 2016). Accordingly, the only process that acting  
51 alone could possibly explain the peramorphism observed in baurusuchids is predisplacement,  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 in which the onset age of growth of a structure occurs earlier than in the ancestor (Alberch *et*  
4 *al.* 1979; McNamara 1986) (Fig. 2C). However, changes in the time of onset can only be  
5  
6 comprehensively assessed by comparing changes in traits (shape) as a function of ontogenetic  
7  
8 stages (age) (Klingenberg 1998). As such, we cannot, at present, confirm the role of  
9  
10 predisplacement in the evolution of the baurusuchid skull. Indeed, information such as growth  
11  
12 rates and time of onset and offset would be necessary to precisely identify the action of any  
13  
14 specific heterochronic process, not only predisplacement. Histological studies comparing  
15  
16 growth patterns among different notosuchians have the potential to test whether the onset of  
17  
18 baurusuchid traits occurred earlier than in their close relatives (e.g. Cubo *et al.* 2017), which  
19  
20 would allow further investigation on the action of peramorphic processes on the evolution of  
21  
22 this group. Moreover, the action of a single evolutionary process on morphological structures  
23  
24 is expected to be rare (Alberch *et al.* 1979; Klingenberg 1998) and one should expect a  
25  
26 combination of two (or more) heterochronic processes acting in the evolution of such  
27  
28 complex traits (Klingenberg 1998). Accordingly, as our results are derived from indirect  
29  
30 investigation of the action of heterochrony, they only allow us to discard acceleration and  
31  
32 hypermorphosis acting in isolation in the cranial evolution of baurusuchids.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

### 39 *Heterochrony explains hypercarnivory*

40  
41  
42  
43 Hypercarnivores, as defined by Van Valkenburgh (1991), are taxa that consume at least 70  
44  
45 per cent of vertebrate flesh. They frequently have a specialized dentition, such as the  
46  
47 ziphodont teeth of baurusuchids (Riff and Kellner 2011), in which the primary function is  
48  
49 slicing. Our documentation of peramorphosis in the evolution of the baurusuchid skull  
50  
51 provides important palaeoecological insights, as it supports a strong relation between the  
52  
53 reported cranial modifications and size, changes that might have occurred together with the  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 shift to a hypercarnivorous habit. A link between size increase and the evolution of  
4 hypercarnivory has been previously documented in other vertebrate lineages, such as  
5 carnivoran and creodont mammals (Werdelin 1996; Van Valkenburgh 1999; Van  
6  
7 Valkenburgh *et al.* 2004; Wesley-Hunt 2005). Furthermore, heterochrony is commonly  
8  
9 associated with evolutionary trends leading to size increase (McNamara 1982, 1990), and one  
10  
11 of the possible triggers of these trends is the positive pressure caused by competition (Van  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

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, 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 crocodyliform 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 *Pissarrachampsa 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

1  
2  
3 *et al.* 2015). The smaller egg clutches of notosuchians (and baurusuchids) is also dissimilar to  
4  
5 those of extant crocodylians, in which the number of eggs varies from a lower limit of 10 and  
6  
7 reaches up to 80 eggs (Brazatis and Watanabe 2011; Marsola *et al.* 2016). The features of *K*-  
8  
9 selected organisms are commonly associated with hypermorphosis, primarily because this  
10  
11 process is classically related to size increase. Even though our results do not support the  
12  
13 action of hypermorphosis as the single process in the cranial evolution of baurusuchids,  
14  
15 predisplacement can also lead to size increase (Fig. 2C), and it may similarly be linked to the  
16  
17 evolution of *K*-selection strategies.  
18

19  
20 Here we demonstrate that changes in the skull shape of baurusuchids, likely  
21  
22 accompanied by highly specialized cranial modifications, were strongly linked to size  
23  
24 increase in the lineage. As these shape changes occurred through their ontogeny, they provide  
25  
26 evidence for the action of heterochronic processes in the shift to a hypercarnivorous diet  
27  
28 during baurusuchid evolutionary history. These are interesting advances in the knowledge of  
29  
30 the underlying processes that drove notosuchian evolution, and provide important clues for  
31  
32 understanding the exceptional diversity displayed by this peculiar group of crocodyliforms.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 *Acknowledgments.* We thank the excavation crew from the Laboratório de Paleontologia de  
4  
5 Ribeirão Preto (Universidade de São Paulo). We also thank Christian P. Klingenberg for  
6  
7 insightful comments on the research design, and Hans Larsson for comments on an earlier  
8  
9 version of the manuscript. Access to fossil collections was possible thanks to Carl Mehling,  
10  
11 Mark Norell, Alan Turner, Tayler Keillor, Paul Sereno, William Simpson, David Evans,  
12  
13 Kevin Seymour, Oliver Rauhut, Mario Bronzati, Thiago Marinho, Sandra Tavares, Fabiano  
14  
15 Iori, Rodrigo da Rocha Machado, Stella Alvarez, and Alejandro Kramarz. We thank Sally  
16  
17 Thomas, Christian Foth, and one anonymous reviewer for their helpful comments. This  
18  
19 research was supported by the University of Birmingham (funding to P.L.G. and R.J.B.);  
20  
21 CAPES (grant numbers 3581-14-4 to P.L.G.; and 20131696 to B.C.V.N.); FAPESP (grant  
22  
23 numbers 2014/25379-5 and 2016/03934-2 to G.S.F.; 2014/03825-3 to M.C.L.); and UNESP  
24  
25 (grant “Primeiros Projetos PROPe UNESP”, number 730, to F.C.M.).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 *Author contributions.* G.S.F. and M.C.L. designed the research. G.S.F., P.L.G., F.C.M. and  
32  
33 B.C.V.L. collected the data. F.C.M., R.J.B., and M.C.L. provided evolutionary expertise for  
34  
35 the project. G.S.F. and P.L.G. performed the analyses, jointly wrote the manuscript and  
36  
37 created the figures and tables. G.S.F., P.L.G., F.C.M., B.C.V.L., R.J.B. and M.C.L. discussed  
38  
39 the results and contributed to manuscript revisions.  
40  
41  
42  
43

#### 44 **DATA ARCHIVING STATEMENT**

45  
46 Data for this study, including the Supporting Information (with supplementary text, tables,  
47  
48 and figures) as well as the TPS files with digitized landmarks (of both lateral and dorsal  
49  
50 views), and the R and MorphoJ scripts for conducting the geometric morphometrics analyses  
51  
52 described here, are available in the Dryad Digital Repository:  
53

54 <http://datadryad.org/review?doi=doi:10.5061/dryad.7m48r> [please note that the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 data for this paper are not yet published and this temporary link should not be  
4  
5 shared without the express permission of the author]  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 REFERENCES

- 11 ADAMS, D. C. and OTÁROLA-CASTILLO, E. 2013. geomorph: an R package for the  
12 collection and analysis of geometric morphometric shape data. *Methods in Ecology &*  
13 *Evolution*, **4**, 393–399.
- 14 ALBERCH, P., GOULD, S. J., OSTER, G. F. and WAKE, D. B. 1979. Size and shape in  
15 ontogeny and phylogeny. *Paleobiology*, **5**, 296–317.
- 16 ANDERSON, M. J. 2001. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of  
17 variance. *Austral Ecology*, **26**, 32–46.
- 18 ANDRADE, M. B., EDMONDS, R., BENTON, M. J. and SCHOUTEN, R. 2011. A new  
19 Berriasian species of *Goniopholis* (Mesoeucrocodylia, Neosuchia) from England, and a  
20 review of the genus. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **163**, 66–108.
- 21 BARRIOS, F., PAULINA-CARABAJAL, A. and BONA P. 2016. A New Peirosaurid  
22 (Crocodyliformes, Mesoeucrocodylia) from the Upper Cretaceous of Patagonia,  
23 Argentina. *Ameghiniana*, **53**, 14–25.
- 24 BATEZELLI, A. 2017. Continental systems tracts of the Brazilian Cretaceous Bauru Basin  
25 and their relationship with the tectonic and climatic evolution of South America. *Basin*  
26 *Research*, **29**, 1–25.
- 27 BENTON, M. and CLARK, J. M. 1988. Archosaur phylogeny and the relationships of the  
28 Crocodylia. 295–338. In BENTON, M. (ed). *The phylogeny and classification of the*  
29 *tetrapods*. Clarendon Press, Oxford.
- 30 BHULLAR, B. A., MARUGÁN-LOBÓN, J., RACIMO, F., BEVER, G. S., ROWE, T. B.,  
31 NORELL, M. A. and ABZHANOV, A. 2012. Birds have paedomorphic dinosaur skulls.  
32 *Nature*, **487**, 223–226.
- 33 BONA, P. and DESOJO, J. B. 2011. Osteology and cranial musculature of *Caiman latirostris*  
34 (Crocodylia: Alligatoridae). *Journal of Morphology*, **272**, 780–795.
- 35 BOOKSTEIN, F. L. 1991. *Morphometric tools for landmark data*. Cambridge University  
36 Press, New York, NY.
- 37 BRAZAITIS, P. and WATANABE, M. E. 2011. Crocodylian behaviour: a window to  
38 dinosaur behaviour? *Historical Biology*, **23**, 73–90.
- 39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 BRONZATI, M., MONTEFELTRO, F. C. and LANGER, M. C. 2012. A species-level  
4 supertree of Crocodyliformes. *Historical Biology*, **24**, 598–606.  
5  
6 --- --- --- 2015. Diversification events and the effects of mass extinctions on Crocodyliformes  
7 evolutionary history. *Royal Society open science*, **2**, 140385.  
8  
9 CARVALHO, I. S., VASCONCELLOS, F. M. and TAVARES, S. A. S. 2007.  
10 *Montealtosuchus arrudacamposi*, a new peirosaurid crocodile (Mesoeucrocodylia) from  
11 the Late Cretaceous Adamantina Formation of Brazil. *Zootaxa*, **1607**, 35–46.  
12  
13 --- TEIXEIRA, V. P. A., FERRAZ, M. L. F., RIBEIRO, L. C. B., MARTINELLI, A. G.,  
14 NETO, F. M., SERTICH, J. J. W., CUNHA, G. C., CUNHA, I. C. and FERRAZ, P. F.  
15 2011. *Campinasuchus dinizi* gen. et sp. nov., a new Late Cretaceous baurusuchid  
16 (Crocodyliformes) from the Bauru Basin, Brazil. *Zootaxa*, **2871**, 19–42.  
17  
18 CUBO, J., KÖHLER, M. and BUFFRENIL, V. 2017. Bone histology of *Iberosuchus*  
19 *macrodon* (Sebecosuchia, Crocodylomorpha). *Lethaia*, **50**, 495–503.  
20  
21 ERICKSON, G. M. and BROCHU, C. A. 1999. How the ‘terror crocodile’ grew so big.  
22 *Nature*, **398**, 205–206.  
23  
24 --- MAKOVICKY, P. J., CURRIE, P. J., NORELL, M. A., YERBY, S. A. and BROCHU, C.  
25 A. 2004. Gigantism and comparative life-history parameters of tyrannosaurid dinosaurs.  
26 *Nature*, **430**, 772–775.  
27  
28 --- GIGNAC, P. M., STEPPAN, S. J., LAPPIN, A. K., VLIET, K. A., BRUEGGEN, J. D.,  
29 INOUE, B. D., KLEDZIK, D. and WEBB, G. J. 2012. Insights into the ecology and  
30 evolutionary success of crocodylians revealed through bite-force and tooth-pressure  
31 experimentation. *PLoS One*, **7**, e31781.  
32  
33 EZCURRA, M. D. and BUTLER, R. J. 2015. Post-hatchling cranial ontogeny in the Early  
34 Triassic diapsid reptile *Proterosuchus fergusi*. *Journal of Anatomy*, **226**, 387–402.  
35  
36 FOTH, C., BONA, P. and DESOJO, J. B. 2015. Intraspecific variation in the skull  
37 morphology of the black caiman *Melanosuchus niger* (Alligatoridae, Caimaninae). *Acta*  
38 *Zoologica*, **96**, 1–13.  
39  
40 --- HEDRICK, B. P. and EZCURRA MD. 2016a. Cranial ontogenetic variation in early  
41 saurischians and the role of heterochrony in the diversification of predatory dinosaurs.  
42 *PeerJ*, **4**, e1589.  
43  
44 --- FERNANDEZ BLANCO, M. V., BONA, P. and SCHEYER, T. M. 2017. Cranial shape  
45 variation in jacarean caimanines (Crocodylia, Alligatoroidea) and its implications in the  
46 taxonomic status of extinct species: The case of *Melanosuchus fisheri*. *Journal of*  
47 *Morphology*. Published online on 15 November 2017 (doi: 10.1002/jmor.20769).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 --- EZCURRA, M. D., SOOKIAS, R. B., BRUSATTE, S. L. and BUTLER RJ. 2016b.  
4 Unappreciated diversification of stem archosaurs during the Middle Triassic predated the  
5 dominance of dinosaurs. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*, **16**, 188.  
6  
7 GASPARINI, Z. B. 1971. Los Notosuchia del Cretácico de América del Sur como un nuevo  
8 Infraorden de los Mesosuchia (Crocodilia). *Ameghiniana*, **8**, 83–103.  
9  
10 GIGNAC, P. and O'BRIEN, H. 2016. Suchian Feeding Success at the Interface of Ontogeny  
11 and Macroevolution. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, **56**, 449–458.  
12  
13 GODOY, P. L., MONTEFELTRO, F. C., NORELL, M. A. and LANGER, M. C. 2014. An  
14 additional Baurusuchid from the cretaceous of Brazil with evidence of interspecific  
15 predation among crocodyliformes. *PLoS One*, **9**, e97138.  
16  
17  
18 --- BRONZATI, M., ELTINK, E., MARSOLA, J. C. A., CIDADE, G. M., LANGER, M. C.  
19 and MONTEFELTRO, F. C. 2016. Postcranial anatomy of *Pissarrachampsia sera*  
20 (Crocodyliformes, Baurusuchidae) from the Late Cretaceous of Brazil: insights on  
21 lifestyle and phylogenetic significance. *PeerJ*, **4**, e2075.  
22  
23  
24  
25 GOULD, S. J. 1966. Allometry and size in ontogeny and phylogeny. *Biological reviews of the*  
26 *Cambridge Philosophical Society*, **41**, 587–640.  
27  
28 --- 1977. *Ontogeny and phylogeny*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.  
29  
30 --- 2000. Of coiled oysters and big brains: how to rescue the terminology of heterochrony,  
31 now gone astray. *Evolution & Development*, **2**, 241–248.  
32  
33  
34 HAMMER, Ø., HARPER, D. A. T. and RYAN, P. D. 2001. PAST: Paleontological Statistics  
35 Software Package for Education and Data Analysis. *Paleontologia Electronica*, **4**, 1–9.  
36  
37 KELLNER, A. W., PINHEIRO, A. E. and CAMPOS, D. A. 2014. A new sebecid from the  
38 paleogene of Brazil and the crocodyliform radiation after the K-Pg boundary. *PLoS One*  
39 **9**, e81386.  
40  
41  
42 KLINGENBERG, C. P. 1998. Heterochrony and allometry: the analysis of evolutionary  
43 change in ontogeny. *Biological reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, **73**, 79–  
44 123.  
45  
46 --- 2011. MorphoJ: an integrated software package for geometric morphometrics. *Molecular*  
47 *Ecology Resources*, **11**, 353–357.  
48  
49 --- 2016. Size, shape, and form: concepts of allometry in geometric morphometrics.  
50 *Development Genes and Evolution*, **226**, 113–137.  
51  
52 --- DUTTKE, S., WHELAN, S. and KIM, M. 2012. Developmental plasticity, morphological  
53 variation and evolvability: a multilevel analysis of morphometric integration in the shape  
54 of compound leaves. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, **25**, 115–129.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 KOYABU, D., WERNEBURG, I., MORIMOTO, N., ZOLLIKOFER, C. P., FORASIEPI, A.  
4 M., ENDO, H., KIMURA, J., OHDACHI, S. D., SON, N. T. and SANCHEZ-  
5 VILLAGRA, M. R. 2014. Mammalian skull heterochrony reveals modular evolution and  
6 a link between cranial development and brain size. *Nature Communications*, **5**, 3625.  
7  
8 LEARDI, J. M., FIORELLI, L. E. and GASPARINI, Z. 2015a. Redescription and  
9 reevaluation of the taxonomical status of *Microsuchus schilleri* (Crocodyliformes:  
10 Mesoeucrocodylia) from the Upper Cretaceous of Neuquén, Argentina. *Cretaceous*  
11 *Research*, **52**, 153–166.  
12  
13 --- POL, D., NOVAS, F. E. and SUÁREZ RIGLOS, M. 2015b. The postcranial anatomy of  
14 *Yacarerani boliviensis* and the phylogenetic significance of the notosuchian postcranial  
15 skeleton. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, **35**, e995187.  
16  
17 MANNION, P. D., BENSON, R. B., CARRANO, M. T., TENNANT, J. P., JUDD, J. and  
18 BUTLER, R. J. 2015. Climate constrains the evolutionary history and biodiversity of  
19 crocodylians. *Nature Communications*, **6**, 8438. (doi:10.1038/ncomms9438)  
20  
21 MARSOLA, J. C. A., BATEZELLI, A., MONTEFELTRO, F. C., GRELLET-TINNER, G.  
22 and LANGER, M. C. 2016. Palaeoenvironmental characterization of a crocodylian  
23 nesting site from the Late Cretaceous of Brazil and the evolution of crocodyliform  
24 nesting strategies. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, **457**, 221–232.  
25  
26 MARTIN, J. E. and LAPPARENT DE BROIN, F. A. 2016. A miniature notosuchian with  
27 multicuspid teeth from the Cretaceous of Morocco. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*,  
28 **36**, e1211534.  
29  
30 MCKINNEY, M. L. 1988. Classifying heterochrony: allometry, size, and time. 17–34. In  
31 MCKINNEY, M. L. (ed). *Heterochrony in evolution. A Multidisciplinary Approach*.  
32 Plenum Press, New York, NY.  
33  
34 --- 1990. Classifying and analyzing evolutionary trends. 28–58. In MCNAMARA, K. J. (ed).  
35 *Evolutionary trends*. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.  
36  
37 MCNAMARA, K. J. 1982. Heterochrony and phylogenetic trends. *Paleobiology*, **8**, 130–142.  
38  
39 --- 1986. A guide to the nomenclature of heterochrony. *Journal of Paleontology*, **60**, 4–13.  
40  
41 --- 1990. The role of heterochrony in evolutionary trends. 59–74. In MCNAMARA, K. J.  
42 (ed). *Evolutionary trends*. The University of Arizona Press, Tucson, AZ.  
43  
44 --- and MCKINNEY, M. L. 2005. Heterochrony, disparity, and macroevolution.  
45 *Paleobiology*, **31**, 17–26.  
46  
47 MÉNDEZ, A. H., NOVAS, F. E. and IORI FV. 2012. First record of Megaraptora  
48 (Theropoda, Neovenatoridae) from Brazil. *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, **11**, 251–256.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 MEUNIER, L. and LARSSON, H. C. 2016. Revision and phylogenetic affinities of *Elosuchus*  
4 (Crocodyliformes). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **179**, 169–200.
- 5  
6 MONTEFELTRO, F. C., LARSSON, H. C. and LANGER, M. C. 2011. A new baurusuchid  
7 (Crocodyliformes, Mesoeucrocodylia) from the late cretaceous of Brazil and the  
8 phylogeny of Baurusuchidae. *PLoS One* **6**, e21916.
- 9  
10 --- ANDRADE, D. V. and LARSSON, H. C. 2016. The evolution of the meatal chamber in  
11 crocodyliforms. *Journal of Anatomy*, **228**, 838–863.
- 12  
13 --- LARSSON, H. C. FRANCA, M. A. and LANGER, M. C. 2013. A new neosuchian with  
14 Asian affinities from the Jurassic of northeastern Brazil. *Naturwissenschaften*, **100**, 835–  
15 841.
- 16  
17  
18  
19 MONTEIRO, L. R. 1999. Multivariate regression models and geometric morphometrics: the  
20 search for causal factors in the analysis of shape. *Systematic Biology*, **48**, 192–199.
- 21  
22 O'CONNOR, P. M., SERTICH, J. J. W., STEVENS, N. J., ROBERTS, E. M., GOTTFRIED,  
23 M. D., HIERONYMUS, T. L., JINNAH, Z. A., RIDGELY, R., NGASALA, S. E., and  
24 TEMBA, J. 2010. The evolution of mammal-like crocodyliforms in the Cretaceous  
25 Period of Gondwana. *Nature*, **466**, 748–751.
- 26  
27  
28  
29 OPENSHAW, G. H., D'AMORE, D. C., VIDAL-GARCÍA, M., and KEOGH, J. S. 2016.  
30 Combining geometric morphometric analyses of multiple 2D observation views improves  
31 interpretation of evolutionary allometry and shape diversification in monitor lizard  
32 (*Varanus*) crania. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **120**, 539–552.
- 33  
34  
35 ÖSI, A. 2014. The evolution of jaw mechanism and dental function in heterodont  
36 crocodyliforms. *Historical Biology*, **26**, 279–414.
- 37  
38  
39 PIRAS, P., COLANGELO, P., ADAMS, D. C., BUSCALIONI, A., CUBO, J., KOTSAKIS,  
40 T., MELORO, C. and RAIÁ, P. 2010. The *Gavialis–Tomistoma* debate: the contribution  
41 of skull ontogenetic allometry and growth trajectories to the study of crocodylian  
42 relationships. *Evolution & Development*, **12**, 568–579.
- 43  
44  
45 POL, D. and LEARDI, J. M. 2015. Diversity patterns of Notosuchia (Crocodyliformes,  
46 Mesoeucrocodylia) during the Cretaceous of Gondwana. 172–186. In FERNÁNDEZ, M.  
47 and HERRERA, Y. (eds). *Reptiles Extintos - Volumen en Homenaje a Zulma Gasparini*.  
48 Publicación Electrónica de la Asociación Paleontológica Argentina, Buenos Aires,  
49 Argentina.
- 50  
51  
52  
53 --- NASCIMENTO, P. M., CARVALHO, A. B., RICCOMINI, C., PIRES-DOMINGUES, R.  
54 A. and ZAHER, H. 2014. A new notosuchian from the Late Cretaceous of Brazil and the  
55 phylogeny of advanced notosuchians. *PLoS One*, **9**, e93105.
- 56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 PRICE, L. I. 1945. A new reptil from the Cretaceous of Brazil. *Divisão de Geologia e*  
4 *Mineralogia, Notas Preliminares e Estudos*, **25**, 1–8.  
5  
6 R CORE TEAM. 2017. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. v. 3.4.1.  
7 <https://www.R-project.org/>.  
8  
9 REVELL, L. J. 2009. Size-correction and principal components for interspecific comparative  
10 studies. *Evolution*, **63**, 3258–3268.  
11  
12 RICE, W. R. 1989. Analyzing tables of statistical tests. *Evolution*, **43**, 223–225.  
13  
14 RIFF, D. and KELLNER AWA. 2011. Baurusuchid crocodyliforms as theropod mimics:  
15 clues from the skull and appendicular morphology of *Stratiotosuchus maxhechti* (Upper  
16 Cretaceous of Brazil). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, **163**, 37–56.  
17  
18 ROHLF, F. J. 2015. *tpsDig v. 2.22, digitize landmarks and outlines*. Department of Ecology  
19 & Evolution, State University of New York at Stony Brook,  
20 <http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph>.  
21  
22  
23 RUSSO, J., MATEUS, O., BALBINO, A. and MARZOLA, M. 2014. Crocodylomorph eggs  
24 and eggshells from the Lourinhã Fm. (Upper Jurassic), Portugal. *Comunicações*  
25 *Geológicas*, **101**, 563–566.  
26  
27  
28 SCHOCH, R. R. 2010. Heterochrony: the interplay between development and ecology  
29 exemplified by a Paleozoic amphibian clade. *Paleobiology*, **36**, 318–334.  
30  
31  
32 SERENO, P. and LARSSON, H. 2009. Cretaceous crocodyliforms from the Sahara. *ZooKeys*,  
33 **28**, 1–143.  
34  
35 --- SIDOR, C. A., LARSSON, H. C. E. and GADO, B. 2003. A new notosuchian from the  
36 Early Cretaceous of Niger. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, **23**, 477–482.  
37  
38 SERTICH, J. J. W. and O’CONNOR, P. M. 2014. A new crocodyliform from the middle  
39 Cretaceous Galula Formation, southwestern Tanzania. *Journal of Vertebrate*  
40 *Paleontology*, **34**, 576–596.  
41  
42  
43 SHEA, B. T. 1983. Allometry and heterochrony in the African apes. *American Journal of*  
44 *Physical Anthropology*, **62**, 275–289.  
45  
46 SRIVASTAVA, R., PATNAIK, R., SHUKLA, U. K., and SAHNI, A. 2015. Crocodilian nest  
47 in a Late Cretaceous sauropod hatchery from the type Lameta Ghat locality, Jabalpur,  
48 India. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0144369.  
49  
50  
51 STRELIN, M. M., BENITEZ-VIEYRA, S., FORNONI, J., KLINGENBERG, C. P. and  
52 COCUCCI, A. A. 2016. Exploring the ontogenetic scaling hypothesis during the  
53 diversification of pollination syndromes in *Caiophora* (Loasaceae, subfam. Loasoideae).  
54 *Annals of Botany*, **117**, 937–947.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 STUBBS, T. L., PIERCE, S. E., RAYFIELD, E. J. and ANDERSON, P. S. 2013.  
4 Morphological and biomechanical disparity of crocodile-line archosaurs following the  
5 end-Triassic extinction. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B*, **280**, 20131940.  
6  
7 TURNER, A. H. 2015. A review of *Shamosuchus* and *Paralligator* (Crocodyliformes,  
8 Neosuchia) from the Cretaceous of Asia. *PLoS One*, **10**, e0118116.  
9  
10 TURNER, A. and SERTICH, J. J. W. 2010. Phylogenetic history of *Simosuchus clarki*  
11 (Crocodyliformes: Notosuchia) from the Late Cretaceous of Madagascar. *Journal of*  
12 *Vertebrate Paleontology*, **30**, 177–236.  
13  
14 VAN VALKENBURGH, B. 1991. Iterative evolution of hypercarnivory in canids  
15 (Mammalia: Carnivora): evolutionary interactions among sympatric predators.  
16 *Paleobiology*, **17**, 340–361.  
17  
18 --- 1999. Major patterns in the history of carnivorous mammals. *Annual Review of Earth and*  
19 *Planetary Sciences*, **27**, 463–493.  
20  
21 --- WANG, X. and DAMUTH, J. 2004. Cope's rule, hypercarnivory, and extinction in North  
22 American canids. *Science*, **306**, 101–104.  
23  
24 WATANABE, A. and SLICE, D. E. 2014. The utility of cranial ontogeny for phylogenetic  
25 inference: a case study in crocodylians using geometric morphometrics. *Journal of*  
26 *Evolutionary Biology*, **27**, 1078–1092.  
27  
28 WERDELIN, L. 1996. Carnivoran ecomorphology: a phylogenetic perspective. 582–624. In  
29 GITTLEMAN, J. (ed). *Carnivore Behavior, Ecology and Evolution*. Cornell University  
30 Press, Ithaca, NY.  
31  
32 WESLEY-HUNT, G. D. 2005. The morphological diversification of carnivores in North  
33 America. *Paleobiology*, **31**, 35–55.  
34  
35 WHETSTONE, K. N. and WHYBROW, P. J. 1983. A "cursorial" crocodylian from the  
36 Triassic of Lesotho (Basutoland), southern Africa. *Occasional Papers of the Museum of*  
37 *Natural History of University of Kansas*, **106**, 1–37.  
38  
39 WILBERG, E. W. 2015. What's in an outgroup? The impact of outgroup choice on the  
40 phylogenetic position of Thalattosuchia (Crocodylomorpha) and the origin of  
41 Crocodyliformes. *Systematic Biology*, **64**, 621–637.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**FIGURES AND TABLE CAPTIONS**

FIG. 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.

FIG. 2. Comparison between effects of time hypermorphosis, rate hypermorphosis and acceleration (A) 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). Representation of morphological evolution and their relations to ontogenetic scaling (B) (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.

FIG. 3. (A) Phylogenetic hypothesis of the *Notosuchia* taxa included in our geometric morphometric analyses (based on Montefeltro *et al.* 2013), with clades Baurusuchidae,

1  
2  
3 Sphagesauridae, and Peirosauridae/Sebecidae indicated, and other notosuchians distributed  
4  
5 along the tree. The skulls of some notosuchians (not to scale) were selected to illustrate the  
6  
7 cranial disparity of the group (clockwise, from the top left): adult *Araripesuchus wegeneri*,  
8  
9 adult *Mariliasuchus amarali*, juvenile *Pissarrachampsa sera*, and an undescribed adult  
10  
11 baurusuchid (LPRP/USP 0697). (B) Morphological transformation during *Pissarrachampsa*  
12  
13 *sera* ontogeny, shown by the results of the thin plate spline analysis with the juvenile (top)  
14  
15 and adult (bottom) specimens, also illustrating the position of the landmarks (in lateral view).

16  
17  
18  
19  
20 FIG. 4. Two-dimensional morphospace (PCA results plot) of the first two PCs of the lateral  
21  
22 view dataset (A), with deformation grids for hypothetical extremes along the two axes. The  
23  
24 coloured polygons show the morphospace occupation by each of the four groups considered  
25  
26 in this study. Crosses represent juvenile specimens, squares, stars, hexagons and circles  
27  
28 represent adults of Baurusuchidae, Sphagesauridae, Peirosauridae/Sebecidae and other  
29  
30 notosuchians, respectively (average values were used for taxa with more than one adult  
31  
32 specimen sampled). The arrows represent an ontogenetic trajectory along this two-  
33  
34 dimensional morphospace. (B) Topology based on the phylogenetic hypothesis of Montefeltro  
35  
36 *et al.* (2013) projected onto the log-transformed centroid size. The centroid size was obtained  
37  
38 from the lateral view dataset using only adults. Silhouettes from Godoy *et al.* (2014).

39  
40  
41  
42  
43 FIG. 5. Two-dimensional morphospace (plot of PCA results) after the size-correction (A,  
44  
45 dorsal view; B, lateral view) and after the ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction (C,  
46  
47 dorsal view; D, lateral view). Average values were used for taxa with more than one adult  
48  
49 specimen sampled. The 90 per cent confidence ellipses were added for each of the four groups  
50  
51 considered in the other analyses: Peirosauridae/Sebecidae (hexagons), Baurusuchidae  
52  
53 (circles), Sphagesauridae (stars), and other notosuchians (squares).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 FIG. 6. Comparisons between the ontogenetic trajectories of *Mariliasuchus amarali* and  
6  
7 *Anatosuchus minor* (used as a proxies of the ancestral ontogenetic trajectory) and that of  
8  
9 *Pissarrachampsa sera* (representing the baurusuchid condition), based on regression analyses  
10  
11 of Procrustes coordinates against log-transformed centroid size, in both dorsal (A) and lateral  
12  
13 (B) views. Squares and circles represent juveniles and adults, respectively.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 TABLE 1. Pairwise comparison between morphospace occupation of different taxonomic  
23  
24 groups. Bonferroni-corrected *P* values obtained from npMANOVA, using PC scores of all  
25  
26 specimens after both size and ancestral ontogenetic allometry corrections, with lateral and  
27  
28 dorsal view datasets. Taxonomic groups based on the phylogenetic framework from  
29  
30 Montefeltro *et al.* (2013). Significant differences are indicated by an asterisk.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




FIG. 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.

179x192mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIG. 2. Comparison between effects of time hypermorphosis, rate hypermorphosis and acceleration (A) 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). Representation of morphological evolution and their relations to ontogenetic scaling (B) (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

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

decoupled and predisplacement affects only descendant's shape, and size growth follows the same ancestral path.

199x240mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIG. 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).

112x63mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIG. 4. Two-dimensional morphospace (PCA results plot) of the first two PCs of the lateral view dataset (A), 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).

88x48mm (300 x 300 DPI)






FIG. 5. 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).

127x97mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIG. 6. Comparisons between the ontogenetic trajectories of *Mariliasuchus amarali* and *Anatosuchus minor* (used as a proxies of 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.

159x162mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

Groups	<i>P</i> values			
	Size correction		Ancestral ontogenetic allometry correction	
	Dorsal view	Lateral view	Dorsal view	Lateral view
Baurusuchidae – other notosuchians	1	0.9923	0.0126*	0.06419
Baurusuchidae – Peirosauridae/Sebecidae	0.1122	0.008399*	0.267	0.0192*
Baurusuchidae – Sphagesauridae	1	0.048*	0.1416	0.048*
Peirosauridae/Sebecidae – other notosuchians	1	1	0.0138*	0.0138*
Peirosauridae/Sebecidae – Sphagesauridae	0.3732	0.0402*	0.1836	0.0402*
Sphagesauridae – other notosuchians	1	0.1668	0.0126*	0.1944