



HAL
open science

Incisor enamel microstructure of Paleogene caviomorph rodents from Contamana and Shapaja (Peruvian Amazonia)

Myriam Boivin, Laurent Marivaux, Rodolfo Salas-Gismondi, Emma Vieytes,
Pierre-Olivier Antoine

► **To cite this version:**

Myriam Boivin, Laurent Marivaux, Rodolfo Salas-Gismondi, Emma Vieytes, Pierre-Olivier Antoine. Incisor enamel microstructure of Paleogene caviomorph rodents from Contamana and Shapaja (Peruvian Amazonia). *Journal of Mammalian Evolution*, 2019, 26 (3), pp.389-406. <10.1007/s10914-018-9430-4>. <hal-01813140>

HAL Id: hal-01813140

<https://hal.umontpellier.fr/hal-01813140v1>

Submitted on 1 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

[Click here to view linked References](#)

1
2
3 Incisor enamel microstructure of Paleogene caviomorph rodents from
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12 Contamana and Shapaja (Peruvian Amazonia)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22 Myriam BOIVIN¹, Laurent MARIVAUX¹, Rodolfo SALAS-GISMONDI², Emma C.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 VIEYTES³ and Pierre-Olivier ANTOINE¹
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
61
62
63
64
65

66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79
80
81
82
83
84
85
86
87
88
89
90
91
92
93
94
95
96
97
98
99
100
101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132
133
134
135
136
137
138
139
140
141
142
143
144
145
146
147
148
149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179
180
181
182
183
184
185
186
187
188
189
190
191
192
193
194
195
196
197
198
199
200
201
202
203
204
205
206
207
208
209
210
211
212
213
214
215
216
217
218
219
220
221
222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235
236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243
244
245
246
247
248
249
250
251
252
253
254
255
256
257
258
259
260
261
262
263
264
265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309
310
311
312
313
314
315
316
317
318
319
320
321
322
323
324
325
326
327
328
329
330
331
332
333
334
335
336
337
338
339
340
341
342
343
344
345
346
347
348
349
350
351
352
353
354
355
356
357
358
359
360
361
362
363
364
365
366
367
368
369
370
371
372
373
374
375
376
377
378
379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390
391
392
393
394
395
396
397
398
399
400
401
402
403
404
405
406
407
408
409
410
411
412
413
414
415
416
417
418
419
420
421
422
423
424
425
426
427
428
429
430
431
432
433
434
435
436
437
438
439
440
441
442
443
444
445
446
447
448
449
450
451
452
453
454
455
456
457
458
459
460
461
462
463
464
465
466
467
468
469
470
471
472
473
474
475
476
477
478
479
480
481
482
483
484
485
486
487
488
489
490
491
492
493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500
501
502
503
504
505
506
507
508
509
510
511
512
513
514
515
516
517
518
519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541
542
543
544
545
546
547
548
549
550
551
552
553
554
555
556
557
558
559
560
561
562
563
564
565
566
567
568
569
570
571
572
573
574
575
576
577
578
579
580
581
582
583
584
585
586
587
588
589
590
591
592
593
594
595
596
597
598
599
600
601
602
603
604
605
606
607
608
609
610
611
612
613
614
615
616
617
618
619
620
621
622
623
624
625
626
627
628
629
630
631
632
633
634
635
636
637
638
639
640
641
642
643
644
645
646
647
648
649
650
651
652
653
654
655
656
657
658
659
660
661
662
663
664
665
666
667
668
669
670
671
672
673
674
675
676
677
678
679
680
681
682
683
684
685
686
687
688
689
690
691
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728
729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784
785
786
787
788
789
790
791
792
793
794
795
796
797
798
799
800
801
802
803
804
805
806
807
808
809
810
811
812
813
814
815
816
817
818
819
820
821
822
823
824
825
826
827
828
829
830
831
832
833
834
835
836
837
838
839
840
841
842
843
844
845
846
847
848
849
850
851
852
853
854
855
856
857
858
859
860
861
862
863
864
865
866
867
868
869
870
871
872
873
874
875
876
877
878
879
880
881
882
883
884
885
886
887
888
889
890
891
892
893
894
895
896
897
898
899
900
901
902
903
904
905
906
907
908
909
910
911
912
913
914
915
916
917
918
919
920
921
922
923
924
925
926
927
928
929
930
931
932
933
934
935
936
937
938
939
940
941
942
943
944
945
946
947
948
949
950
951
952
953
954
955
956
957
958
959
960
961
962
963
964
965
966
967
968
969
970
971
972
973
974
975
976
977
978
979
980
981
982
983
984
985
986
987
988
989
990
991
992
993
994
995
996
997
998
999
1000

1 Laboratoire de Paléontologie, Institut des Sciences de l'Évolution de Montpellier, c.c. 064,
Université de Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, EPHE, place Eugène Bataillon, F-34095 Montpellier
Cedex 05, France; e-mails: myriam.boivin@umontpellier.fr, pierre-

olivier.antoine@umontpellier.fr, laurent.marivaux@umontpellier.fr

² Departamento de Paleontología de Vertebrados, Museo de Historia Natural – Universidad
Nacional Mayor San Marcos (MUSM), Av. Arenales 1256, Lima 11, Peru; e-mail:

rsalagismondi@gmail.com

³ División Zoología Vertebrados, Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, UNLP, Paseo del
Bosque s/n, 1900 La Plata, Argentina; CONICET. e-mail: cvieytes@fcnym.unlp.edu.ar

Abstract

1
2
3 We investigate the enamel microstructure of 37 isolated rodent incisors from several late
4
5 middle Eocene and late Oligocene localities of Contamana (Loreto Department, Peruvian
6
7 Amazonia), and from the early Oligocene TAR-01 locality (Shapaja, San Martín Department,
8
9 Peruvian Amazonia). All incisors show an enamel internal portion with multiseriate Hunter-
10
11 Schreger Bands (HSB). The late middle Eocene localities of Contamana yield incisors with
12
13 subtypes 1, 1–2, and 2 of multiseriate HSB; TAR-01 yielded incisors with 1–2, 2, 2–3, and 3 of
14
15 multiseriate HSB; and the late Oligocene localities of Contamana, incisors with subtypes 1–2,
16
17 2, and 2–3 of multiseriate HSB. Based on our current knowledge of the South American and
18
19 African rodent fossil records and given the primitiveness of the Eocene caviomorph faunas, it
20
21 may be expected that the hystricognath pioneer(s) who have colonized South America from
22
23 Africa sometime during the middle Eocene, most probably had incisors that displayed a
24
25 multiseriate enamel with an **interprismatic matrix** arrangement characterizing the subtype 1 (or
26
27 subtype 1 + the subtype 2 and/or the transitional 1–2) of multiseriate HSB. In contrast, the
28
29 derived subtypes 2–3 and 3 conditions were subsequently achieved but likely rapidly, as
30
31 evidenced by its record as early as the late Eocene/early Oligocene (e.g., Santa Rosa,
32
33 Shapaja, and La Cantera), and seemingly evolved iteratively but only in the Octodontoidea
34
35 clade.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Keywords** Caviomorpha, multiseriate enamel, Hunter-Schreger Bands, South America, Peru,
49
50 Eocene, Oligocene.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Introduction

The study of enamel microstructure has long been practiced, the first accurate works about this dental tissue dating from the late 18th to the early 19th centuries (e.g., [Hunter 1771](#); [Schreger 1800](#)). As enamel is one of the most mineralized and hardest tissues in vertebrates, it is resistant and as such often preserved during fossilization process ([Koenigswald et al. 1993](#); [Boyde 1997](#)). Thanks to these characteristics, study of enamel microstructure is therefore possible in fossil teeth. These enamel investigations have contributed to provide useful characters for mammal systematics and phylogenetic reconstructions (e.g., [Rensberger and Koenigswald 1980](#)), notably in rodents (e.g., [Korvenkontio 1934](#); [Koenigswald 1980, 1985](#); [Martin 1992, 1993, 1997](#); [Marivaux et al. 2004](#)). In mammals, enamel is composed of prisms, which are bundles of hydroxyapatite crystallites with the same orientation. Between the prisms, there is an enamel fraction also formed by parallelly-oriented hydroxyapatite crystallites, but that are not bundled into prisms. This fraction is termed interprismatic matrix (IPM). Two main prismatic enamel types are commonly distinguished: enamel with parallel-oriented and non-decussating prisms, and enamel with decussating prisms. These prism groups form layers in bands named Hunter-Schreger bands (HSB). Different enamel types often coexist in a same tooth, defining the [schmelzmuster](#) ([Koenigswald 1980](#)). In rodent incisors, the enamel is primarily formed by two layers, the [Portio interna](#) (PI), which includes the HSB, and the [Portio externa](#) (PE), which consists of radial enamel ([Korvenkontio 1934](#)). Three major types of HSB can be distinguished in rodent incisors, which were originally defined based on the number of prisms per HSB in the PI: uniserial -one prism wide-, pauciserial -two to six prisms wide (on average three)-, and multiserial -three to seven prism wide- ([Korvenkontio 1934](#); [Martin 1993](#)). These three types roughly characterize major groups of rodents (e.g., [Martin 1992, 1993, 1995, 2007](#); [Kalthoff 2000, 2006](#); [Marivaux et al.](#)

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
61
62
63
64
65

2004). Owing to a wide overlap of the number of prisms between pauciserial and multiserial HSB, Martin (1992, 1993) defined new characters (e.g., configuration of the IPM with respect to the prisms, presence/absence of HSB transitional zones, inclination of HSB...) for clearly distinguishing the two types. Multiserial HSB was originally interpreted as a plesiomorphic condition, while the pauciserial and uniserial types counted as derived stages (Korvenkontio 1934; Koenigswald 1980, 1985). However, in studying a wide array of basal fossil rodents, Martin (1992, 1993) has demonstrated that the presence of pauciserial HSB is the most primitive condition, inasmuch as it is only found in early diverging fossil taxa. Concerning multiserial HSB, Martin (1992, 1993) distinguished three subtypes (considered here as subtypes 1, 2, and 3), on the basis of the angle of the IPM crystallites with respect to the prism long axes. In the subtype 1, IPM crystallites run parallel to those of the prisms, or they form a very low angle with them, but they do not surround totally each prism (thin and sheath-like IPM). In the subtype 2, they form an acute angle and anastomose regularly, whereas in the subtype 3, the IPM shows a few or no anastomoses, and its crystallites run at a right angle to those of the prisms, forming interrow sheets (plate-like IPM). From a biomechanical viewpoint, an increasing angulation of the IPM is considered as strengthening the enamel in all three dimensions (e.g., Martin 1992, 1993, 1994a,b, 1997). On the basis of this biomechanical consideration and the stratigraphic occurrences of taxa, the enamel characterized by multiserial HSB with rectangular IPM (subtype 3) is considered to be the most specialized and derived multiserial condition (Martin 1992, 1993, 1994a,b, 1997). Accordingly, considering the IPM arrangement, the subtype 1 would be the most primitive condition of multiserial HSB, and the subtype 2 would be intermediate, between the subtypes 1 and 3 (Martin 1993, 1994a). Within hystricognathous rodents, among caviomorphs, the subtype 3 primarily characterizes most octodontoids, with the exception of sub-fossil "heptaxodontids" (but see e.g., Wood 1959; Wood and Patterson 1959; Pascual et al. 1990

1 regarding the superfamilial assignation of this family), and the extinct *Sallamys*,
2 *Caviocricetus*, *Protadelphomys*, *Willidewu*, and *Plesiacarechimys* (see below). The
3
4 "heptaxodontid" octodontoids (giant hutias) from the Caribbean islands display incisor
5
6 enamel with multiseriate HSB of subtype 2 (Martin 1992). In other caviomorph superfamilies,
7
8 the IPM runs with an acute angle (subtype 2) or parallel (subtype 1) to the prisms (Martin
9
10 1992, 1993). However, distinction of subtypes is not always clear. Indeed, transitional
11
12 subtypes (corresponding to the presence of two subtypes) can be found among caviomorphs,
13
14 but also in other hystricognath groups (e.g., Bathyergidae and Thryonomyidae; Martin 1992).
15
16 There is often a difference in the IPM orientation between upper and lower incisors, the latter
17
18 being usually characterized by the most derived subtypes (Martin 1994a; Vucetich and
19
20 Vieytes 2006). Among caviomorphs, some extinct and extant erethizontoids (*Steiromys*,
21
22 *Chaetomys subspinosus*, *Coendou prehensilis*, and *Erethizon dorsatum*) can show a
23
24 transitional subtype 1–2 (Martin 1994a). This transitional subtype is also present in some
25
26 incisors of early caviomorphs found at Santa Rosa (Peru, ?late Eocene/early Oligocene;
27
28 Martin 2004, 2005) and La Cantera (Argentina, early Oligocene; Vucetich et al. 2010). A
29
30 transitional subtype 2–3 has been also mentioned in *Sallamys* (Bolivia and Peru, late
31
32 Oligocene; Martin 1994a), *Caviocricetus lucasi* (Argentina, early Miocene; Vieytes 2003;
33
34 Vucetich et al. 2010, 2015; Arnal et al. 2014), *Plesiacarechimys koenigwaldi* (Argentina,
35
36 middle Miocene; Vucetich and Vieytes 2006), *Protadelphomys* (Argentina, early Miocene;
37
38 Vieytes 2003; Vucetich et al. 2010, 2015), *Willidewu* (Argentina, early Miocene; Vieytes
39
40 2003; Vucetich et al. 2015), and on some indeterminate incisors from La Cantera (Argentina,
41
42 early Oligocene; Vucetich et al. 2010). In this transitional subtype 2–3, the angle between the
43
44 IPM and the prisms can reach 90° but only in some portions of the lower incisors (between
45
46 60° and 90°), and it is comprised between 45° and 70° in the upper incisors (Vucetich et al.
47
48 2010). Accordingly, the transitional subtype 2–3 was interpreted by Vucetich and Vieytes
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 (2006) as more primitive than the subtype 3. However, Arnal et al. (2014), based on a
2 phylogenetic topology, have shown that the evolution of this character could be more
3 complicated within caviomorphs. Indeed, they proposed that the transitional subtype 2–3
4 might be a plesiomorphic condition from which the subtype 2 and 3 would have been both
5 derived. Besides, owing to the divergence of *Caviocricetus lucasi* and *Plesiacarechimys*
6 *koenigwaldi* within their phylogeny of octodontoids, Arnal et al. (2014) hypothesized that the
7 transitional subtype 2–3 of both taxa would correspond to a reversion from the subtype 3.
8 However, these results may also be linked to lacking data (i.e., missing lineages), because a
9 case of reversion seems difficult to conceive inasmuch as the selective pressure is towards
10 strengthening the enamel of the highly stressed incisor. Therefore, considering this
11 biomechanical constraint, the alternative hypothesis considering an iterative acquisition (i.e.,
12 convergent) of the subtype 3 from subtype 2–3, seems here to be more conceivable (Martin,
13 Jan. 2017 com. pers., that we follow).

14 For several decades, our knowledge of the caviomorph Paleogene record had been
15 limited to late Oligocene forms (i.e., Deseadan South American Land Mammal Age
16 [SALMA]; Loomis 1914; Wood 1949; Wood and Patterson 1959; Patterson and Pascual
17 1968; Hoffstetter and Lavocat 1970; Hartenberger 1975; Lavocat 1976; Mones and
18 Castiglioni 1979; Patterson and Wood 1982; Hartenberger et al. 1984; Vucetich 1989). It was
19 only from the 1990s that several pre-Deseadan rodent faunas were discovered: Termas del
20 Flaco (Tinguirirican SALMA; Wyss et al. 1993; Bertrand et al. 2012), Santa Rosa (Frailey
21 and Campbell 2004) and La Cantera (Vucetich et al. 2010). One locality in the West Indies
22 (west bank of Río Guatemala at Puerto Rico, Greater Antilles; early Oligocene) has yielded
23 only one caviomorph incisor, the enamel of which displays the subtype 2 of multiserial HSB
24 (Vélez-Juarbe et al. 2014). Recently, new Paleogene localities were found at Contamana
25 (Loreto Department) and Shapaja (San Martín Department) in Peruvian Amazonia (Antoine et

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
61
62
63
64
65

al. 2012, 2016, 2017; Boivin et al. 2017a, 2017b, in press). Some of the Contamana localities (CTA-47, CTA-51, CTA-27, CTA-73, CTA-66, and CTA-29) have yielded the oldest known caviomorph assemblages from South America (late middle Eocene, Barrancan SALMA; Antoine et al. 2012, 2016, 2017; Boivin et al. 2017a). Regarding pre-Deseadan localities of South America, only incisor specimens from Santa Rosa (SR) and La Cantera (LC) have been subject to detailed analyses of the enamel microstructure (SR: Martin 2004, 2005; LC: Vucetich et al. 2010). The incisor enamel microstructure of the earliest known caviomorphs from CTA-27 was also briefly mentioned (multiserial subtype 1 to 2) but without detailed description and figuration (Antoine et al. 2012, p. 1321).

The present work provides an exhaustive analysis (description and figuration) of the enamel microstructure of incisors recovered at CTA-27, as well as those from other Paleogene localities of Contamana and Shapaja. This study contributes to further our understanding of the early evolutionary history of the enamel microstructure within caviomorphs.

Material and Methods

The material of this study corresponds to isolated fragments of caviomorph incisors from several Paleogene localities of Contamana (late middle Eocene: CTA-47, CTA-27, CTA-29; late Oligocene: CTA-32, CTA-61; Antoine et al. 2012, 2016, 2017; Boivin et al. 2017a., 2017b) and Shapaja (early Oligocene: TAR-01; Klaus et al. 2017; Boivin et al. in press) in Peruvian Amazonia. The taxonomic content of each studied locality is provided in Table 1. Unfortunately, we have no formal taxonomical identification of these incisors, because they were collected, as for molars and premolars, after wet screening (1 mm mesh) of the sediments (i.e., each tooth is an isolated specimen). We have used a criterion of size

1 compatibility between incisors and molars for orienting our assessment regarding taxonomic
2 identification of incisors, but the latter remains only tentative. Of the hundreds of incisor
3 fragments recovered in the Paleogene localities of Contamana, we have selected 25 specimens
4 for enamel microstructure analyses (two at CTA-47, 15 at CTA-27, one at CTA-29, one at
5 CTA-32, and six at CTA-61; Tables 2–3). Twelve incisor fragments from TAR-01 were
6 chosen over the ~650 dental specimens found at Shapaja (Table 4). For the analyses, we have
7 selected well-preserved upper and lower incisor fragments of different sizes (Table 2–4).

8
9 We have measured the anteroposterior width of each studied incisor (Table 2–4), then
10 followed the protocol of Tabuce et al. (2007) for sample preparation. All specimens were
11 embedded in epoxy resin and polished longitudinally. We subsequently performed 37 %
12 phosphoric acid etching of the samples 30 seconds to make microstructural details visible.
13 After rinsing with distilled water and drying, samples were coated with conductive material
14 (gold-palladium). They were observed and studied with two different scanning electron
15 microscopes (SEM): HITACHI S 4000 and HITACHI S 4800. The datasets (SEM
16 photographs) generated and analyzed during the current study are available from the
17 corresponding author on reasonable request. In contrast, all prepared and analyzed specimens
18 are permanently housed in the paleontological collections of the Museo de Historia Natural of
19 the Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos (MUSM) in Lima, Peru.

20
21 The nomenclature corresponding to enamel microstructure follows that of
22 Koenigswald and Sander (1997) and Martin (1992, 1993). Many standard measures were
23 realized (Tables 2–4) following Martin (1992). For enamel thickness, inclination of prisms in
24 PE and inclination of HSB, ten repeated measures were made for each variable. The
25 inclination of HSB corresponds to the angle between the HSB direction and the perpendicular
26 to the EDJ plan (see Martin 2004: fig. 1). The angle between the IPM crystallites and the
27 prism crystallites was measured at the level of the HSB, where the prism axis is the longest.

1 For an incisor, the identification of a subtype of multiserial HSB was based on the observation
2 of the whole longitudinal section available of the specimen. However, it must be **noted** that
3
4 the distinction between the main subtypes (1, 2, and 3), notably the transitional ones (1–2 and
5
6 2–3) is somewhat subtle, and as such sometimes arbitrary, especially between the subtype 3
7
8 and the transitional 2–3.
9
10

11 **Results**

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20 All studied specimens present a configuration of the enamel microstructure typical of
21
22 hystricognathous rodents: the enamel layer is divided into an external portion (PE) constituted
23
24 of radial enamel and an internal portion (PI), thicker and essentially composed of multiserial
25
26 HSB.
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 *Contamana*

34
35
36
37 CTA-47, late **m**iddle Eocene (Table 2)
38
39

40 The enamel microstructure was studied in two incisor fragments from CTA-47 (MUSM 2649
41
42 and 2650), the earliest rodent-yielding locality of the Contamana section. For both incisors,
43
44 the transitional zone is well developed and the prism cross sections are flattened in PI.
45
46
47

48 The MUSM 2649 incisor is particularly damaged and likely exhibits numerous marks
49
50 of digestion (corrosion due to etching by gastric fluids of a predator). Indeed, its enamel lacks
51
52 PE (seemingly removed) and as such limited to PI. In this layer, the HSB are inclined by 36°,
53
54 and each comprises two to three prisms. The IPM crystallites, arranged as thin sheets,
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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
61
62
63
64
65

anastomose frequently and form acute angles with the prism crystallites (~30°), thereby typifying a subtype 2 of multiserial HSB.

The MUSM 2650 incisor has a total enamel thickness (PI + PE) of 155 µm, with PE representing 16%. As in MUSM 2649, the IPM crystallites in PI form acute angles of ~30° with the prism crystallites. However, MUSM 2650 rather displays a transitional subtype 1–2 [i.e., subtype (1)–2; Table 2], with sheath-like/sheet-like IPM. Indeed, the anastomoses of the IPM crystallites are very frequent. In PI, the HSB display two to four prisms and are inclined by 23°. In PE, prisms are inclined by 69°.

CTA-27, late middle Eocene (Table 3)

The investigated sample of that locality comprised 14 incisor fragments: seven documenting lower incisors, six documenting upper incisors, and one of indeterminate attribution. In this sample, there is a noticeable disparity in the size of the incisors, but that is rather continuous, ranging from 0.6 to 1.4 mm. The width of these incisor fragments is clearly smaller than that of the cheek teeth of *Cachiyacuy contamanensis* and *Eobranisamys javierpradoi*, but compatible to that of the teeth of *Cachiyacuy kummeli*, *Canaanimys maquiensis*, and *Eoespina* sp. (Antoine et al. 2012; Boivin et al. 2017a). The smallest incisors (MUSM 2814, 2815, 2816, and 2817) might belong to juveniles of these taxa, or to species so far not documented by cheek teeth.

One upper incisor (MUSM 2803; Fig. 1a–b) has a very peculiar IPM arrangement, which recalls to some extent that found in the primitive pauciserial enamel condition. Indeed, in this sample the IPM crystallites anastomose very frequently and regularly, and tend to surround each prism. The IPM crystallites run parallel to the prism direction or with a low angle (up to 20°). Transitional zones are scarce and faintly visible. Finally, the HSB are only

1 slightly inclined (15°). However, compared with the pauciserial condition, this enamel
2 microstructure is clearly distinct in having flattened prisms, a thinner IPM that does not
3 completely surround prisms in PI, and a relatively thicker total enamel layer ($181\ \mu\text{m}$,
4 superior to the inferior limit of the multiserial, i.e., $140\ \mu\text{m}$; [Martin 1994b: table 1](#)). There are
5 three to four prisms per HSB. The PE composes 17–26% of the entire enamel thickness.
6
7 Given these observations, the enamel condition of this incisor corresponds therefore to the
8 subtype 1 of multiserial HSB.
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
61
62
63
64
65

One lower incisor (MUSM 2817) has a transitional subtype 1–2 of multiserial HSB [i.e., subtype 1–(2); Table 3]. The IPM appears as a moderately thin sheet, which anastomoses very frequently, and the IPM crystallites run parallel or at a low-medium angle to the prism direction (35°). This multiserial enamel subtype recalls the pauciserial condition, notably in the relatively low inclination of the HSB in PI (26°), and in the rather thin total enamel layer ($93\ \mu\text{m}$). However, this multiserial enamel subtype is distinct from the pauciserial condition, notably in the presence of flattened prisms, a thinner IPM that does not (or very rarely) completely surround prisms in PI, the presence of transitional zones between HSB, and in showing a strong inclination of the prisms in PE (85°). The HSB have three to four prisms. The PE composes 18–25% of the entire enamel thickness.

Most other incisors from this locality (seven lower, five upper, and one indeterminate) exhibit the subtype 2 of multiserial HSB, which is characterized by sheet-like IPM, and IPM crystallites that form acute angles with the prism crystallites. Although sometimes elevated (up to 79°), the average angles between crystallites of IPM and prisms of these incisors range from 40° to 65° . Anastomoses of IPM sheets are rare in most of the incisors, but they can be frequent (MUSM 2805, 2806, and 2811) or very frequent (MUSM 2813) in some cases. The transitional zones are well developed, except for three specimens (MUSM 2807, 2804, and 2816). In most cases, the HSB comprise four prisms, but punctually, two to five prisms per

1 band can be observed. In all incisors, prisms in PI are flattened in cross section. In PI, HSB
2 are inclined from 22° to 45°, and in PE, prisms are inclined from 55° to 85°. Total enamel
3 thickness is very variable, but it always exceeds 100 µm (averages ranging from 115 to 246
4 µm). The PE composes 17–23% of the total enamel thickness. MUSM 2805 tends to develop
5 a thin prismless external layer (PLEX).
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14
15
16 CTA-29, late middle Eocene (Table 2)
17

18 The only studied specimen from CTA-29 (lower incisor, MUSM 2840; Fig. 2a–b) displays
19 the subtype 2 of multiserial HSB, characterized by HSB with sheet-like IPM and IPM
20 crystallites forming acute angles with the direction of the prism crystallites (from 32° to 58°).
21 Anastomoses of the IPM are rare and transitional zones between two adjacent HSB are well
22 marked. The HSB have between two and four prisms. The prism cross sections are flattened
23 or round in PI. The HSB are inclined by 33° in PI and prisms by 84° in PE. Total enamel
24 thickness is about 174 µm, with a PE representing 20%.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 CTA-32, late Oligocene (Table 2)
41

42 Enamel of the lower incisor from CTA-32 (MUSM 2873) corresponds to the subtype 2 of
43 multiserial HSB, characterized by sheet-like IPM and IPM crystallites that form acute angles
44 with the direction of prism crystallites (between 40° and 52°). Anastomoses of the IPM sheets
45 are rare. Transitional zones between adjacent HSB are scarce, and when present, they are
46 weakly pronounced. The HSB comprise between two and four prisms, which are flattened in
47 cross section. In PI, HSB are inclined by 37°, and in PE, prisms are inclined by 74°. Enamel is
48 about 88 µm thick and the PE composes 27% of the total thickness.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3 CTA-61, late Oligocene (Table 2)
4
5

6 One incisor (MUSM 2902) exhibits a transitional subtype 1–2 of multiserial HSB [i.e.,
7
8 subtype 1–(2); Table 2]. The PI of that enamel displays sheet-like IPM, the crystallites of
9
10 which anastomose very frequently, running parallel or at a low-medium angle to the prism
11
12 direction (up to 10°). This subtype of multiserial enamel somewhat recalls the pauciserial
13
14 condition, notably in the IPM arrangement and in showing a relatively low inclination of the
15
16 HSB (23°). However, this subtype of multiserial enamel differs specifically from the
17
18 pauciserial condition in having flattened prisms, a thinner IPM that does not completely
19
20 surround the prisms in PI, the presence of transitional zones between HSB, a strong
21
22 inclination of the prisms in PE (83°), and in showing a relatively thicker total enamel layer
23
24 (173 µm; cf. [Martin 1994b: table 1](#)). The HSB comprise three to five prisms. The PE
25
26 composes 18% of the entire enamel thickness.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 Most incisors (two lower, one upper, and one indeterminate) display the subtype 2 of
34
35 multiserial HSB, characterized by the presence of sheet-like IPM and with IPM crystallites
36
37 that form acute angles with the direction of the prism crystallites (between 27° and 60°).
38
39 Anastomoses of IPM crystallites can be rare (MUSM 2904 and 2905), frequent (MUSM
40
41 [2906](#)) or absent (MUSM 2907). Transitional zones are well marked. The HSB comprise
42
43 between three and four prisms, except for MUSM 2907, in which there are two to four prisms
44
45 per band. In all incisors, prisms in PI are flattened in cross section. The HSB are inclined from
46
47 27° to 37°. In MUSM 2907, prisms are less inclined in PE (57°) than in other incisors where
48
49 they are inclined by 73° to 80°. Total enamel thickness is very variable but always exceeding
50
51 100 µm (between 139 and 284 µm). The PE composes 15–22% of entire enamel thickness.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 One lower incisor (MUSM 2903; Fig. 1c–d) shows a transitional subtype 2–3 of
2 multiserial HSB. The angle between the orientation of the IPM crystallites and that of prism
3 crystallites is acute, and in some cases reaches up to 85° (almost right-angled). Anastomoses
4 of the IPM are frequent. Transitional zones are well marked between two adjacent HSB. The
5 latter comprise from three to four prisms. In PI, the HSB are strongly inclined (40°), and
6 prisms are flattened or round in cross section. In PE, the prisms are very strongly inclined
7 (83°). Total enamel thickness is 156 µm, with a PE representing 21%.

20 *Shapaja* (early Oligocene)

23 TAR-01 (Table 4)

26 The investigated sample comprises seven upper and five lower incisors, which show a
27 noticeable disparity in size, ranging from 0.6–2.6 mm (continuous range). The MUSM 3342
28 incisor is clearly set apart from other incisors by its larger size (width = 2.6 mm), compatible
29 with the size of cheek teeth of *Eoincamys* cf. *E. pascuali* and *Shapajamys* (recorded in TAR-
30 01; [Boivin et al. in press](#)), thereby suggesting that this incisor could be referred to one of these
31 two taxa. Like in CTA-27, the smallest incisors (MUSM 3351, 3352, and 3353) might either
32 belong to juveniles of the smallest taxa (*Mayomys* and *Tarapotomys*) or to adults of even
33 more tiny taxa still not documented by cheek teeth.

36 Two subtypes of multiserial HSB are clearly identified, the subtype 2 (acute IPM) and
37 subtype 3 (rectangular IPM), but also few transitional subtypes (1–2 and 2–3).

39 Two upper incisors (MUSM 3344 and 3353; Fig. 1c–d) have a transitional subtype 1–
40 2 [including subtype (1)–2; Table 4] of multiserial HSB. Both specimens are characterized by
41 frequently anastomosed sheet-like IPM and by IPM crystallites that run parallel or at a low
42 angle to the prism crystallites (up to 40–43°). This multiserial enamel subtype is distinct from
43

1 the pauciserial condition in showing PI bearing HSB with oval or flattened prisms, a thinner
2 IPM that does not (or very rarely) completely surround the prisms, the presence of transitional
3
4 zones between HSB, moderately inclined HSB (23–24°), and a strong inclination of the
5
6 prisms in PE (62° and 80°). The HSB comprise three to four prisms. Compared with MUSM
7
8 3344, enamel microstructure of MUSM 3353 would be more similar to the pauciserial
9
10 condition, notably in the noticeable strong IPM thickness, which nearly forms a sheath-like
11
12 structure surrounding the prisms, and in showing a relatively thinner total enamel layer (cf.
13
14 [Martin 1994b: table 1](#)).
15
16
17
18
19

20 Five incisors (three upper and two lower) have multiseriate HSB with sheet-like IPM
21
22 and with IPM crystallites that form acute angles with prism crystallites (subtype 2).
23
24 Anastomoses of IPM sheets are rare, except for two incisors (MUSM [3350](#) and 3351) in
25
26 which they are frequent. Transitional zones are well marked, except in one specimen (MUSM
27
28 3351). The two largest incisors (MUSM 3342 [and 3345](#)) can have up to five prisms per HSB,
29
30 whereas others only display three to four prisms per band. In virtually all incisors, prism cross
31
32 section is flattened in PI, except for two of them (MUSM 3342 and 3347), which can also
33
34 show rounded prisms. The HSB are inclined from 17° to 40° in PI, and the prisms from 63° to
35
36 83° in PE. Total enamel thickness varies between 111 and 176 µm, with PE representing 13 to
37
38 23%. Three of the five considered incisors (MUSM [3345, 3347, and 3351](#)) tend to develop a
39
40 small prismless external layer (PLEX).
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Two incisors (one lower and one upper) show a transitional subtype 2–3 of multiseriate
48
49 HSB [including subtype (2)–3; Table 4]. The angle between the orientation of the IPM
50
51 crystallites and that of prism crystallites is acute to rectangular, but always higher than that
52
53 found in the subtype 2 of multiseriate HSB. Anastomoses of IPM sheets are rare (MUSM
54
55 3343) or not observed (MUSM 3348). Transitional zones between adjacent HSB are well
56
57 marked. The HSB comprise three to four prisms in MUSM 3343, and two to three prisms in
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 MUSM 3348. In these two incisors, the prisms in PI are flattened in cross section. The HSB
2 are inclined from 29° to 34°, and the prisms from 57° to 67° in PE. MUSM 3348 and MUSM
3
4 3343 have a distinct total enamel thickness: 133 and 301 µm, respectively, contrary to the
5
6 percentage of PE, which is virtually similar in both incisors (13–16%).
7
8
9

10 Three incisors (two lower and one upper) have an IPM arrangement typifying a
11
12 subtype 3 of multiserial HSB. Indeed, the angle between the orientation of IPM crystallites
13
14 and that of prism crystallites is very close to 90° (between 70–90°). Besides, the IPM forms
15
16 plates (interrow sheets) without any anastomose. Transitional zones between adjacent HSB
17
18 are well marked, except in one specimen (MUSM 3349). There are three to four prisms per
19
20 HSB. In MUSM 3346 (Fig. 3a–b) and MUSM 3349, the prisms in PI are flattened in cross
21
22 section, whereas they can be more round in MUSM 3352 (Fig. 3c–d). Overall, the HSB are
23
24 strongly inclined (34°–46°), as well as the prisms in PE (69° and 88°). MUSM 3346 and 3349
25
26 have a thicker enamel layer (224 and 215 µm, respectively) than that of MUSM 3352 (106
27
28 µm), but the latter displays a thicker PE (25% contra 12% for MUSM 3346 and 15% for
29
30 MUSM 3349).
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Discussion

45 46 47 48 *Bearing of incisor enamel microstructure in phylogenetic relationships of hystricognathous* 49 50 51 *rodents*

52
53
54
55
56 During the 20th century, two main hypotheses surrounding the origin of caviomorph rodents
57
58 were proposed and ardently debated. Some have advocated and long defended a North
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 American origin (“Franimorpha” [Ischyromyidae and Reithroparamyidae] or Paramyidae or
2 Sciuravidae; Wood 1949, 1950, 1959, 1962, 1965, 1972, 1973, 1974, 1975, 1980, 1983, 1984,
3 1985a,b; Wood and Patterson 1959, 1970; Patterson and Wood 1982), while others have
4 strongly defended an African origin (Thryonomyoidea, Phiomorpha; Lavocat 1969, 1971,
5 1973, 1974a,b, 1976, 1977a,b, 1980; Hoffstetter 1971, 1972, 1975; Hoffstetter and Lavocat
6 1970). On the basis of an increasing body of anatomical (e.g., Mossman and Luckett 1968;
7 Dawson 1977; Korth 1984; Bugge 1985; Meng 1990; Luckett and Hartenberger 1993; Martin
8 1994b; Marivaux et al. 2002, 2004) and molecular (e.g., Nedbal et al. 1996; Huchon and
9 Douzery 2001; Poux et al. 2006; Montgelard et al. 2008; Blanga-Kanfi et al. 2009; Churakov
10 et al. 2010; Fabre et al. 2012) evidence, and also parasite studies (e.g., Durette-Desset 1971;
11 Quentin 1973; Hugot 1982), the African origin of caviomorphs has gained strong support over
12 the past two decades, and reached a well-accepted consensus. This African hypothesis has
13 been substantially strengthened in recent years by the discovery in Peruvian Amazonia
14 (Contamana) of very ancient fossil caviomorphs, dating from the late middle Eocene (Antoine
15 et al. 2012), which exhibit strong morphological affinities with sub-coeval African
16 hystricognathous rodents (i.e., stem hystricognaths and phiomorphs; see Barbière and
17 Marivaux 2015).

18
19 In the 1990s, study of enamel microstructure has significantly contributed to
20 substantiating the relationships between New World caviomorphs and Old World phiomorphs
21 (Martin 1992, 1993, 1994b, 2004, 2005). Indeed, these two groups share the same incisor
22 enamel microstructure (multiserial HSB), a condition which is also shared with ctenodactylids
23 (gundis) and pedetids (springhares; e.g., Martin 1995; Marivaux et al. 2011). Subsequently,
24 molecular and morpho-paleontological evidence has supported the existence of the
25 Ctenohystrica, a clade which clusters ctenodactylids with hystricognathous rodents
26 (phiomorphs + caviomorphs; e.g., George 1985; Huchon et al. 2000, 2002, 2007; Marivaux et

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
61
62
63
64
65

al. 2002, 2004), thereby underscoring the derived/shared multiserial enamel condition for all advanced stem and crown members of this clade (Martin 1994b; Marivaux et al. 2004). Enamel microstructure was therefore a key morphological character for rejecting the hypothesis of a North American origin for caviomorphs. In fact, in being characterized by changes from the pauciserial to the uniserial condition, incisor enamel microstructure of Eocene rodents from North America (formerly involved into a possible ancestry of caviomorphs; sensu Wood) has proven to be entirely divergent from that of Ctenohystrica (e.g., Martin 1992, 1993, 1994b, Marivaux et al. 2004).

The early stages of multiserial HSB (subtypes 1, 1–2, and 2) in caviomorph incisors

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
61
62
63
64
65

Incisors of extinct or extant caviomorphs display a multiserial enamel microstructure, but with different degrees of IPM arrangement (i.e., presence of additive derived subtypes 1, 2, 3, including transitional stages 1–2 and 2–3; e.g., Martin 1992, 1993, 1994a, 2004, 2005; Vieytes, 2003; Vucetich and Vieytes 2006; Vucetich et al. 2010; Supplementary Table S1). The same is true for African hystricognaths, which display similar but convergent derived subtypes of multiserial HSB, as those observed in caviomorphs (Martin 1992, 1993, 1994b; Coster et al. 2010; Marivaux et al. 2012, 2014; Supplementary Table S1). Until recently, the incisor enamel microstructure of early caviomorphs was only documented by fossils dating from the Oligocene (La Cantera and Salla; e.g., Martin 1992; 1993; Vucetich et al. 2010; Supplementary Table S1) and from the ?latest Eocene/early Oligocene (Santa Rosa; Martin 2004, 2005). In analyzing enamel microstructure of incisors recovered from Contamana and Shapaja (in addition to the preliminary analysis mentioned but not figured in Antoine et al. 2012:1321), we then provide here new data regarding microstructural enamel pattern of

1 Oligocene forms, but also that of late middle Eocene forms, which represent the oldest
2 caviomorphs to be known thus far.
3

4
5 It is worth noting that based on the set of incisor fragments analyzed from Contamana
6 or Shapaja, no specimen displays the pauciserial condition characterizing the primitive
7 enamel microstructure found in basal rodents (e.g., Martin 1993; Marivaux et al. 2004),
8 notably in early ctenodactylids, the group in which Ctenodactylidae and Hystricognathi are
9 nested within (e.g., Marivaux et al. 2002, 2004). Nor are there incisors displaying an enamel
10 transitional from the pauciserial to the multiserial condition. The most primitive subtype, the
11 subtype 1 of multiserial HSB, is documented only for one incisor from CTA-27 (MUSM
12 2803; Fig. 1a–b). However, two other specimens, MUSM 2817 (lower incisor) and 2902
13 (indeterminate incisor) from CTA-27 and CTA-61, respectively, show a rather primitive
14 enamel type close to the subtype 1 [i.e., transitional subtype 1–(2); the subtype 2 being
15 dominant in both localities; see Tables 2–3 and discussion below]. CTA-27, late middle
16 Eocene in age, record the most ancient and primitive caviomorphs (i.e., stem Caviomorpha:
17 *Cachiyacuy* and *Canaanimys*; Table 1) to be known in South America (Antoine et al. 2016;
18 Boivin et al. 2017a). Given that the dental pattern of these rodents is strikingly reminiscent of
19 that of their Paleogene African hystricognathous counterparts, Antoine et al. (2012) have
20 suggested that these South American taxa could represent “the earliest stages of caviomorph
21 evolution (i.e., their first adaptive radiation in South America).” Interestingly, the oldest
22 known African hystricognathous rodent (*Protophiomys tunisiensis*; Marivaux et al. 2014),
23 which was recently reported from Tunisia, in late middle Eocene deposits sub-coeval to those
24 of CTA-47 and CTA-27, has incisors documenting a very similar subtype 1 of multiserial
25 HSB (Supplementary Table S1). In North Africa, the subtype 2 of multiserial HSB is also
26 recorded as early as the early late Eocene (*Protophiomys algeriensis*, Bir el Ater, Algeria;
27 Martin 1993; Marivaux et al. 2014; Supplementary Table S1). The presence of similar incisor
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
61
62
63
64
65

1 enamel conditions (multiserial subtypes 1 and 2) shared by some representatives of the most
2 ancient and sub-coeval Afro-Asian and South American hystricognaths (Marivaux et al.
3 submitted), and given the close phylogenetic relationships between both groups, it might be
4 expected that the subtype 1 of multiserial HSB (or the subtype 1 + subtype 2 and/or the
5 transitional 1–2) characterized the incisor enamel microstructure of the caviomorph
6 ancestor(s) that colonized South America (seemingly shortly before their first appearance in
7 the South American fossil record). Based on enamel incisor microstructure observations on
8 the ?late Eocene/early Oligocene rodents from Santa Rosa, Martin (2004) advocated a similar
9 scenario regarding the multiserial enamel pattern of the earliest caviomorphs (see also
10 Vucetich and Vieytes 2006).

11 Although it was not unexpected to record an enamel with multiserial HSB exhibiting a
12 plesiomorphic IPM arrangement [i.e., subtype 1–(2)] in late middle Eocene localities, the
13 presence of a similar microstructure in a late Oligocene taxon (CTA-61; MUSM 2902) could
14 appear somewhat singular. However, pre-Deseadan and post-Barrancan localities (Santa Rosa
15 and La Cantera; Martin 2004, 2005; Vucetich et al. 2010) have also yielded rodent incisors
16 displaying the subtype 1/subtype 1–2 of multiserial HSB (Supplementary Table S1). Besides,
17 several Miocene taxa (e.g., the chinchilloids *Perimys procerus* and *Cephalomys arcidens*, and
18 the cavioid *Neoreomys australis*) and a wide array of extant taxa (e.g., the erethizontoid
19 *Coendou mexicanus*, the chinchilloids *Chinchilla lanigera* and *Lagidium peruanum*, and
20 several cavioids such as *Hydrochoeris hydrochoeris* and *Cavia porcellus*) harbor this
21 primitive subtype 1 condition of multiserial HSB (Martin 1992, 1994a, 1997; Supplementary
22 Table S1), a large taxonomic and temporal distribution which then underscores the
23 evolutionary conservative pattern of that enamel subtype. In contrast, in the Shapaja section
24 that yields the TAR-01 locality dating from the earliest Oligocene, incisors displaying the
25 subtype 1 [or subtype 1– (2)] of multiserial HSB are surprisingly not recorded, although this

1 kind of multiserial enamel subtype is well documented in the stratigraphically close Santa
2 Rosa locality (Martin 2004, 2005; Supplementary Table S1). Considering that cavioids,
3 chinchilloids, and erethizontoids include both species with incisors displaying subtype 1 of
4 multiserial HSB and species having incisors with subtype 2 (Martin 1992, 1993, 1994a;
5 Supplementary Table S1), the possibility exists that we would not have processed incisors
6 with subtype 1 in our TAR-01 sample (i.e., 12 out of 650 available incisors), whereas these
7 superfamilies are documented by cheek teeth in this locality (Boivin et al. in press; Table 1).
8 Some extant and extinct erethizontoids (*Steiromys*, *Chaetomys*, *Coendou*, and *Erethizon*) also
9 have incisors with transitional subtype 1–2 (Martin 1992, 1994a; Supplementary Table S1).
10 Incisors displaying the subtype 2 of multiserial HSB are common in TAR-01 and two upper
11 incisors (MUSM 3344 and 3353) from that locality have transitional subtype 1–2/(1)–2 (Table
12 4). All these incisors likely belonged to representatives of these aforementioned superfamilies
13 (the erethizontoid *Shapajamys labocensis*; the cavioid or chinchilloid *Eoincamys* cf. *E.*
14 *pascuali*; an unidentified chinchilloid; plus a taxon of indeterminate suprafamiliar affinities
15 [*Tarapotomys mayoensis*]). The MUSM 3342 incisor, which is clearly set apart from other
16 incisors by its large size, could be referred to *Eoincamys* cf. *E. pascuali* or *Shapajamys* (see
17 Results).

18 The subtype 2 of multiserial HSB is also well represented by incisors from the
19 Oligocene localities of Contamana (CTA-61 and CTA-32; Table 2), which record
20 representatives of erethizontoids (*Plesiosteiomys newelli* and *Paleosteiomys amazonensis*),
21 chinchilloids (*Scleromys praecursor* and *Ucayalimys crassidens*), octodontoids (*Deseadomys*
22 cf. *arambourgi*, Adelphomyinae indet. 1 and 2, *Loretomys minutus*), and a taxon of
23 indeterminate superfamily (*Chambiramys*; Boivin et al. 2017b; Table 1). As for the earliest
24 stratigraphic interval considered here (late middle Eocene, Contamana; CTA-47 + CTA-27 +
25 CTA-29; Antoine et al. 2012; Boivin et al. 2017a), except the few specimens showing the

1 subtype 1 (or transitional subtypes 1–2), there are primarily incisors displaying the subtype 2
2 of multiserial HSB (as mentioned above; Tables 2–3). In these Eocene localities, most
3
4 recorded taxa are not formally identified as representatives of extant superfamilies (Table 1),
5
6 and are considered as basal caviomorphs (stem Caviomorpha: *Cachiyacuy* and *Canaanimys*).
7
8 The absence of a direct association between incisors and molars precludes a formal
9
10 assignment of the multiserial incisor enamel subtypes 1 and 2 [or 1–(2) or (1)–2] to either of
11
12 these stem taxa. In the Eocene localities of Contamana, the alleged cavioid *Eobranisamys* and
13
14 the octodontoid *Eoespina* are also recorded (Antoine et al. 2012; Boivin et al. 2017a; Table
15
16 1). They might have displayed incisors with an enamel characterized by the subtype 2 of
17
18 multiserial HSB.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Subtypes 2–3 and 3 of multiserial HSB*

27
28
29
30
31 Noteworthy is the lack of incisors displaying the subtype 3 of multiserial HSB in Eocene
32
33 localities of Contamana (Tables 2–3). Among extinct and extant caviomorphs, the subtype 3
34
35 is otherwise found only in octodontoid incisors (Supplementary Table S1). This
36
37 microstructural arrangement is considered to be the most derived multiserial condition on the
38
39 basis of stratigraphic occurrence of taxa and biomechanical considerations (i.e., better
40
41 resistance to crack propagation; Martin 1992, 1993, 1994a,b, 1997). In this context, given that
42
43 other pre-Deseadan faunas in South America (Santa Rosa, La Cantera, and Shapaja TAR-01)
44
45 record incisors documenting the subtype 3 of multiserial HSB (in addition to subtypes 1 and
46
47 2; Martin 2004, 2005; Vucetich et al. 2010; this paper), the absence of the subtype 3 in
48
49 Eocene localities of Contamana (CTA-47, CTA-27, and CTA-29) is consistent with the
50
51 primitiveness of incisor enamel microstructures recorded for rodents in these older localities.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 This is also congruent with less advanced cheek tooth pattern of recorded taxa (Antoine et al.
2 2012, 2016, 2017; Boivin et al. 2017a).

3
4 In the early Oligocene locality of Shapaja (TAR-01), the subtype 3 plus transitional 2–
5 3 [included the transitional subtype (2)–3] are frequent (Table 4). The subtype 3 is found in
6 three sampled incisors of TAR-01 [MUSM 3346 (upper incisor), 3349 (lower incisor), and
7 3352 (lower incisor); Fig. 3]. In addition to having the IPM perpendicular to prism direction,
8 enamel of these incisors displays a strong inclination of the HSB, as well as of prisms in PE,
9 despite the fact that some incisors with a subtype 2 or transitional subtype 2–3 have also high
10 values for these variables (e.g., MUSM 3347, 3348, and 3351). These three microstructural
11 features (i.e., subtype 3 of multiserial HSB, high inclination of the HSB and of the prisms in
12 PE) are characteristic of octodontoid incisors (Martin 1992, 1993, 1994a,b, 1997, 2004). The
13 only octodontoid described at TAR-01 is *Mayomys confluens* Boivin et al. in press (Table 1),
14 the numerous cheek teeth of which have a size compatible with MUSM 3346, 3349, and
15 3352. The latter incisors likely could document this taxon. At TAR-01, two incisors display a
16 transitional subtypes 2–3/(2)–3 [MUSM 3343 (lower incisor) and 3348 (upper incisor)]. This
17 transitional subtype is also only found in octodontoids (Martin 1994a; Vieytes 2003; Vucetich
18 and Vieytes 2006; Vucetich et al. 2010, 2015; Supplementary Table S1). At TAR-01, the
19 presence of the transitional subtype 2–3 in addition to the subtype 3 could indicate the
20 presence of another undocumented octodontoid. *Tarapotomys mayoensis* from TAR-01, of
21 uncertain suprafamiliar assignment (Cavioidea, Chinchilloidea, or Octodontoidea; Boivin et
22 al. in press; Table 1), could be a possible candidate for either of multiserial subtypes (2–3 and
23 3). Indeed, the molars of the latter are compatible in size with the MUSM 3343, 3346, 3348,
24 3349, and 3352 incisors (Boivin et al. in press). Interestingly, in caviomorphs, the same
25 individual can show differences in IPM orientation between upper and lower incisors, the
26 latter being usually characterized by the most derived subtype (Martin 1994a; Vucetich and
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
61
62
63
64
65

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
61
62
63
64
65

Vieytes 2006). Given that MUSM 3348 is an upper incisor, similar in size to the lower incisors displaying a subtype 3 (MUSM 3349 and 3352), so this upper incisor could also document *Mayomys confluens*. In this context, *Mayomys* would have hence displayed upper and lower incisors with the transitional subtype 2–3 and the subtype 3, respectively. But this assumption of association required further morphological support (i.e., articulated craniomandibular elements) than current data allow.

Like for Eocene localities of Contamana, late Oligocene localities of this section (CTA-32 and CTA-61; Table 2) have not yielded incisors displaying the subtype 3 of multiseriate HSB, although many octodontoids are identified at CTA-61 (*Adelphomyia* gen. et sp. indet. 1, *Deseadomys* cf. *D. arambourgi*, and octodontoid indet. 1) and CTA-32 (*Loretomys minutus*, aff. *Eosallamys* sp., *Adelphomyia* gen. et sp. indet. 2, and octodontoid indet. 2) (Boivin et al. 2017b; Table 1). Only one specimen (MUSM 2903) from CTA-61 displays a transitional subtype 2–3 of multiseriate HSB. Two hypotheses can be advocated for explaining the absence of incisors with the subtype 3 in these localities. Firstly, taxa with incisors exhibiting the subtype 3 of multiseriate HSB were perhaps present at CTA-61 and CTA-32, but their incisors would not have been sampled for enamel microstructure analyses. Indeed, only a few incisors were analyzed from these two late Oligocene localities (seven contra 18 for the Eocene CTA localities, with notably only one incisor at CTA-32). Secondly, the numerous octodontoid taxa found at CTA-61 and CTA-32 had incisors that eventually displayed a less advanced enamel microstructure, in having multiseriate HSB with the IPM characterizing the transitional subtype 2–3 rather than the subtype 3. The MUSM 2903 incisor from CTA-61 exhibits such a condition. No data are available for incisor enamel microstructure in *Eosallamys* and most adelphomyines (including *Deseadomys*). For Adelphomyinae, enamel microstructure was only studied on incisors of early Miocene

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10 *Adelphomys* and *Stichomys*, which display the subtype 3 of multiserial HSB (Martin 1992,
11 1994a; Supplementary Table S1).

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 61 62 63 64 65

Most of the oldest caviomorph-bearing localities (i.e., Eocene localities of Contamana, Santa Rosa, Shapaja localities, and La Cantera) have primarily yielded isolated teeth documenting plurispecific rodent assemblages. The absence of incisor-molar formal associations does not allow for any incisor accurate enamel microstructure/taxon pairings, thereby limiting drastically our comprehension of the evolution of incisor enamel microstructure in a specific group. Despite this lack, analysis of incisor enamel microstructure in a temporal context provides substantial pieces of information regarding the setting and timing of different multiserial enamel subtypes. From our current knowledge of the South American rodent fossil record, it must be underscored that the oldest localities (late middle Eocene) yield incisors displaying multiserial enamel conditions with IPM arrangements primarily typifying the subtypes 1, 1–2, and 2 of multiserial HSB. In contrast, the most crack-resistant subtype 3 of multiserial HSB is only recorded from the late Eocene/early Oligocene localities onward. Given the primitiveness of the Eocene caviomorph faunas, it may be expected that hystricognath pioneer(s) who colonized South America from Africa sometime during the middle Eocene, most probably had incisors that displayed a multiserial enamel with an IPM arrangement characterizing subtype 1 (or subtype 1 + the subtype 2 and/or the transitional 1–2) of multiserial HSB. Based on incisor enamel microstructure observed in subsequent extinct and extant taxa, subtypes 1, 1–2, and 2 were maintained in most caviomorph superfamilies through time. In contrast, derived subtypes 2–3 and 3 condition were subsequently achieved

1 but likely rapidly, as evidenced by their record as early as the ?late Eocene/early Oligocene
2 (Santa Rosa) and early Oligocene (Shapaja and La Cantera), and they seemingly evolved
3 iteratively, yet only in the octodontoid clade (see also Vucetich and Vieytes 2006; Vucetich et
4 al. 2010). Continuing the analysis of incisor enamel in fossil taxa for which microstructure is
5 undocumented and performing a cladistic assessment of morphological evidence, including a
6 large set of morphological characters (plus those describing incisor enamel microstructure)
7 through a comprehensive taxonomic sampling (with several phiomorphs as branching group
8 (sensu Antoine 2003), and a wide array of caviomorphs including a maximum of Paleogene
9 taxa, several Neogene taxa, and extant ones) would allow for a better understanding of the
10 evolutionary pattern of different subtypes of multiseriate enamel within caviomorphs. It would
11 also be useful to point out external (ecological and paleoenvironmental) and internal (genetic
12 and developmental) drivers for the setting of different multiseriate enamel subtypes through
13 time. Given these stimulating macroevolutionary issues, the study of enamel microstructure of
14 incisors – and molars – should attract much more attention. When fossils are abundant and
15 available, we then encourage scientists to systematically carry out these kinds of analyses.
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 **Acknowledgments**

42
43
44
45 We especially thank the Canaan Shipibo Native Community in the Contamana region for their
46 help during the field seasons. Many thanks to Sylvain Adnet (ISEM, Montpellier, France), Ali
47 J. Altamirano-Sierra (MUSM, Lima, Peru), Guillaume Billet (MNHN, Paris, France), Maëva
48 J. Orliac (ISEM), Francis Duranthon (Muséum de Toulouse, France), Alba Boada-Saña
49 (Spain), François Pujos (IANIGLA, Mendoza, Argentina), Rafael M. Varas-Malca (MUSM,
50 Lima, Peru), Julia V. Tejada-Lara (Columbia University, USA and MUSM, Lima, Peru), and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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
61
62
63
64
65

whoever helped us in the field and in the lab. We thank Léanie Alloing-Séguier (ISEM) and Sébastien Enault (ISEM) for their advices regarding enamel microstructure protocol and taking images. We warmly thank Chantal Cazevieille (Montpellier RIO Imaging, Institut des Neurosciences de Montpellier, France) and Didier Cot (Institut Européen des Membranes [IEM], Montpellier, France) for granting access to a scanning electron microscope facility. We are much indebted to Léanie Alloing-Séguier and Thomas Martin (Steinmann-Institut, Bereich Paläontologie, Universität Bonn, Germany) for useful discussions on enamel microstructure. This work was supported from the National Geographic Society (grant 9679-15), the Doctoral School SIBAGHE/Gaïa of the Université de Montpellier to MB, from the Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution, and from the Leakey Foundation to LM. This work was further supported by an “Investissements d’Avenir” grant managed by the “Agence Nationale de la Recherche” (CEBA, ANR-10-LABX-0025-01), and by the COOPINTEER CNRS/CONICET and the ECOS-SUD/FONCyT (A14-U01) international collaboration programs, in the frame of the ongoing cooperation agreement between the Museo de Historia Natural de la Universidad Nacional Mayor San Marcos (Lima, Peru) and the Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution of the Université de Montpellier. This is ISEM publication n°2017-311-Sud.

References

Antoine P-O (2003) Middle Miocene elasmotheriine Rhinocerotidae from China and Mongolia: taxonomic revision and phylogenetic relationships. *Zool Scripta* 32:95–118

1 Antoine P-O, Abello M, Adnet S, Altamirano Sierra AJ, Baby P, Billet G, Boivin M,
2 Calderón Y, Candela A, Chabain J, Corfu F, Croft DA, Ganerød M, Jaramillo C, Klaus S,
3
4 Marivaux L, Navarrete RE, Orliac MJ, Parra F, Perez ME, Pujos F, Rage J-C, Ravel A,
5
6 Robinet C, Roddaz M, Tejada-Lara JV, Vélez-Juarbe J, Wesselingh FP, Salas-Gismondi R
7
8 (2016) A 60-million-year Cenozoic history of western Amazonian ecosystems in Contamana,
9
10 eastern Peru. *Gondwana Res* 31:30–59
11
12
13
14
15

16 Antoine P-O, Marivaux L, Croft DA, Billet G, Ganerød M, Jaramillo C, Martin T, Orliac MJ,
17
18 Tejada-Lara J, Altamirano AJ, Duranthon F, Fanjat G, Rousse S, Salas-Gismondi RS (2012)
19
20 Middle Eocene rodents from Peruvian Amazonia reveal the pattern and timing of caviomorph
21
22 origins and biogeography. *Proc Roy Soc Lond B* 279:1319–1326
23
24
25
26
27

28 Antoine P-O, Salas-Gismondi R, Pujos F, Ganerød M, Marivaux L (2017) Western Amazonia
29
30 as a hotspot of mammalian biodiversity throughout the Cenozoic. *J Mammal Evol* 24:5–17
31
32
33
34
35

36 Arnal M, Kramarz AG, Vucetich MG, Vieytes EC (2014) A new **early** Miocene octodontoid
37
38 rodent (Hystricognathi, Caviomorpha) from Patagonia (Argentina) and a reassessment of the
39
40 early evolution of Octodontoidea. *J Vertebr Paleontol* 34(2):397–406
41
42
43
44
45

46 Barbière F, Marivaux L (2015) Phylogeny and evolutionary history of hystricognathous
47
48 rodents from the Old World during the Tertiary: new insights into the emergence of modern
49
50 "phiomorph" families. In: Cox FG, Hautier L (eds) *Evolution of the Rodents: Advances in*
51
52 *Phylogenetics, Functional Morphology and Development*. Cambridge University Press,
53
54 Cambridge, pp 87–138
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Blanga-Kanfi S, Miranda H, Penn O, Pupko T, DeBry RW, Huchon D (2009) Rodent
2 phylogeny revised: analysis of six nuclear genes from all major rodent clades. BMC Evol Biol
3
4 9(1):71
5
6
7
8

9 Bertrand OC, Flynn JJ, Croft DA, Wyss AR (2012) Two new taxa (Caviomorpha, Rodentia)
10 from the early Oligocene Tinguiririca fauna (Chile). Am Mus Novitates 3750:1–36
11
12
13
14
15

16 Boivin M, Marivaux L, Orliac MJ, Pujos F, Salas-Gismondi R, Tejada-Lara JV, Antoine P-O
17 (2017a) Late middle Eocene caviomorph rodents from Contamana, Peruvian Amazonia.
18
19 Palaeontol Elect 20.1.19A:1–50
20
21
22
23

24 Boivin M, Marivaux L, Candela AM, Orliac MJ, Pujos F, Salas-Gismondi R, Tejada-Lara JV,
25
26 Antoine P-O (2017b) Late Oligocene caviomorph rodents from Contamana, Peruvian
27
28 Amazonia. Pap Palaeontol 3(1):69–109
29
30
31
32
33

34 Boivin M, Marivaux L, Pujos F, Salas-Gismondi R, Tejada-Lara JV, Varas-Malca RM,
35
36 Antoine P-O Early Oligocene caviomorph rodents from Shapaja, Peruvian Amazonia.
37
38 Palaeontogr Abt A in press.
39
40
41
42
43

44 Boyde A (1997) Microstructure of enamel. In: Chadwick DJ, Cardew G (eds) Dental Enamel.
45
46 Wiley, Chichester (Ciba Foundation Symposium 205), pp 18–31
47
48
49
50

51 Bugge J (1985) Systematic value of the carotid arterial pattern in rodents. In: Lockett WP,
52
53 Hartenberger J-L (eds), Evolutionary Relationships Among Rodents: A Multidisciplinary
54
55 Analysis. Plenum Press, New York, pp 355–379
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Churakov G, Sadasivuni MK, Rosenbloom KR, Huchon D, Brosius J, Schmitz J (2010)

3
4
5 Rodent evolution: back to the root. *Mol Biol Evol* 27(6):1315–1326

6
7
8
9
10 Coster P, Benammi M, Lazzari V, Billet G, Martin T, Salem M, Bilal AA, Chaimanee Y,
11
12 Schuster M, Valentin X, Brunet M, Jaeger J-J (2010) *Gaudeamus lavocati* sp. nov. (Rodentia,

13
14 Hystricognathi) from the early Oligocene of Zallah, Libya: first African caviomorph?

15
16
17 *Naturwissenschaften* 97:697–706

18
19
20
21 Dawson MR (1977) Late Eocene rodent radiation: North America, Europe and Asia. *Geobios*

22
23
24 *Mém Spéc* 1:195–209

25
26
27
28 Durette-Desset M-C (1971) Essai de classification des Nématodes Héligmosomes. Corrélation
29
30 avec la paléobiogéographie des hôtes. *Mém Mus Natl Hist Nat, Série A, Zoologie* 49:1–126

31
32
33
34
35
36 Fabre P-H, Hautier L, Dimitrov D, Douzery EJ (2012) A glimpse on the pattern of rodent
37
38 diversification: a phylogenetic approach. *BMC Evol Biol* 12(1):88

39
40
41
42
43 Frailey CD, Campbell KE (2004) Palaeogene rodents from Amazonian Peru: the Santa Rosa
44
45 local fauna. In: Campbell KE (ed) *The Palaeogene Mammalian Fauna of Santa Rosa,*
46
47 *Amazonian Peru. Nat Hist Mus Los Angeles County, Science Series* 40:71–130

48
49
50
51
52
53 George W (1985) Reproductive and chromosomal characters of ctenodactylids as a key to
54
55 their evolutionary relationships. In: Lockett WP, Hartenberger J-L (eds) *Evolutionary*

1 Relationships Among Rodents: A Multidisciplinary Analysis. Plenum Press, New York, pp
2 453–474
3

4
5
6
7 Hartenberger J-L (1975) Nouvelles découvertes de rongeurs dans le Déseadien (Oligocène
8 inférieur) de Salla Luribay (Bolivie). C R Acad Sc Paris 280:427–430
9

10
11
12
13
14 Hartenberger J-L, Mégard F, Sigé B (1984) Faunules à rongeurs de l'Oligocène inférieur à
15 Lircay (Andes du Pérou Central) : datation d'un épisode karstique; intérêt
16
17 paléobiogéographique des remplissages tertiaires en Amérique du Sud. C R Acad Sc Paris
18
19 299(9):565–568
20
21
22
23

24
25
26 Hoffstetter R (1971) Le peuplement mammalien de l'Amérique du Sud. Rôle des continents
27 austraux comme centres d'origine, de diversification et de dispersion pour certain groupes
28
29 mammaliens. An Acad Brasil Cienc 43 (Sup):125–143
30
31
32

33
34
35
36 Hoffstetter R (1972) Origine et dispersion des Rongeurs Hystricognathes. C R Acad Sc Paris
37
38 274:2867–2870
39
40

41
42
43 Hoffstetter R (1975) El origen de los Caviomorpha y el problema de los Hystricognathi
44 (Rodentia). Actas del Primer Congreso Argentino de Paleontología y Bioestratigraphia,
45 Tucumán, Agosto 1974, 2:505–528
46
47
48
49

50
51
52
53 Hoffstetter R, Lavocat R (1970) Découverte dans le Déséadien de Bolivie des genres
54 pentalophodontes appuyant les affinités africaines des rongeurs caviomorphes. C R Acad Sc
55
56 Paris 271:172–175
57
58
59
60

1
2 Huchon D, Douzery EJ (2001) From the Old World to the New World: a molecular chronicle
3
4 of the phylogeny and biogeography of hystricognath rodents. *Mol Phyl Evol* 20(2):238–251
5
6

7
8
9 Huchon D, Catzeflis FM, Douzery EJP (2000) Variance of molecular datings, evolution of
10
11 rodents, and the phylogenetic affinities between Ctenodactylidae and Hystricognathi. *Proc*
12
13 *Roy Soc Lond B* 267:393–402
14
15
16

17
18
19 Huchon D, Chevret P, Jordan U, Kilpatrick CW, Ranwez V, Jenkins PD, Brosius J, Schmitz, J
20
21 (2007) Multiple molecular evidences for a living mammalian fossil. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*
22
23 104(18):7495–7499
24
25
26

27
28
29 Huchon D, Madsen O, Sibbald MJ, Ament K, Stanhope MJ, Catzeflis F, Jong WW de,
30
31 Douzery EJ (2002) Rodent phylogeny and a timescale for the evolution of Glires: evidence
32
33 from an extensive taxon sampling using three nuclear genes. *Mol Biol Evol* 19(7):1053–1065
34
35
36

37
38
39 Hugot JP (1982) Sur le genre *Wellcomia* (Oxyuridae, Nematoda), parasite de Rongeurs
40
41 archaïques. *Bull Mus Natl Hist Nat Paris* 4:25–48
42
43
44

45
46 Hunter J (1771) *The Natural History of the Human Teeth. Explaining their Structure, Use,*
47
48 *Formation, Growth, and Diseases.* Robert Hardwicke, London
49
50
51

52
53 Kalthoff D (2000) Die Schmelzmikrostruktur in den Incisiven der hamsterartigen Nagetiere
54
55 und anderer Myomorpha (Rodentia, Mammalia). *Palaeontographica Abt A* 259:1–193
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Kalthoff D (2006) Incisor enamel microstructure and its implications to the systematics of
2 Eurasian Oligocene and lower Miocene hamsters. *Palaeontographica Abt A* 277:67–80
3

4
5
6
7 Klaus S, Magalhaes C, Salas-Gismondi R, Gross M, Antoine P-O (2017) Paleogene and
8
9 Neogene brachyurans of the Amazon basin: a revised first appearance date for primary
10
11 freshwater crabs (Crustacea, Brachyura, Trichodactylidae). *Crustaceana* 90:953–967
12
13

14
15
16 Koenigswald W von (1980) Schmelzstruktur und Morphologie in den Molaren der
17
18 Arvicolidae (Rodentia). *Abh Senckenberg Nat Ges* 539:1–129
19
20

21
22
23
24 Koenigswald W von (1985) Evolutionary trends in the enamel of rodent incisors. In: Lockett
25
26 WP, Hartenberger J-L (eds) *Evolutionary Relationships Among Rodents: A Multidisciplinary*
27
28 *Analysis*. Plenum Press, New York, pp 403–422
29
30

31
32
33
34 Koenigswald W von, Sander PM (1997) Glossary of terms used for enamel microstructures.
35
36 In: Koenigswald W von, Sander PM (eds) *Tooth Enamel Microstructure*. Balkema,
37
38 Rotterdam, pp 267–280
39
40

41
42
43 Koenigswald W von, Martin T, Pfretzschner HU (1993) Phylogenetic interpretation of enamel
44
45 structures in mammalian teeth: possibilities and problems. In: Szalay FS, Novacek MJ,
46
47 McKenna MC (eds) *Mammal Phylogeny, Placentals*. Springer-Verlag, New York, pp 303–
48
49 314
50
51

52
53
54
55
56 Korth WW (1984) Earliest Tertiary evolution and radiation of rodents in North America. *Bull*
57
58 *Carnegie Mus Nat Hist* 24:1–71
59
60

1
2 Korvenkontio VA (1934) Mikroskopische Untersuchungen an Nagerincisiven, unter Hinweis
3
4 auf die Schmelzstruktur der Backenzähne. Ann Zool Soc Zool-Bot Fenn Vanamo 2:1–274
5
6

7
8
9 Lavocat R (1969) La systématique des rongeurs hystricomorphes et la dérive des continents.
10
11 C R Acad Sc Paris 269:1496–1497
12
13

14
15
16 Lavocat R (1971) Affinités systématiques des caviomorphes et des phiomorphes et origine
17
18 africaine des caviomorphes. An Acad brasil Cienc 41(Sup):515–622
19
20
21

22
23
24 Lavocat R (1973) Les rongeurs du Miocène d’Afrique orientale. 1. Miocène inférieur. Mem.
25
26 Trav EPHE, Montpellier 1:1–284
27
28

29
30
31 Lavocat R (1974a) The interrelationships between the African and South American rodents
32
33 and their bearing on the problem of the origin of South American monkeys. J Hum Evol
34
35 3(4):323–326
36
37
38

39
40
41 Lavocat R (1974b) What is an hystricomorph? In: Rowlands IW, Weir BJ (eds) The Biology
42
43 of Hystricomorph Rodents. Symp Zool Soc Lond 34:7–20, 55–60
44
45
46

47
48 Lavocat R (1976) Rongeurs caviomorphes de l’Oligocène de Bolivie. Rongeurs du bassin
49
50 déséadien de Salla. Palaeovertebrata 7:15–90
51
52
53

54
55
56 Lavocat R (1977a) Sur l’origine des faunes sud-américaines de mammifères du Mésozoïque
57
58 terminal et du Cénozoïque ancien C R Acad Sc Paris 285:1423–1426
59
60
61

1
2 Lavocat R (1977b) Les relations faunistiques Afrique-Amérique. Colloque de Montpellier
3
4 (12–16 Sept.). Mem Trav EPHE, Montpellier 1(4):169–179
5
6

7
8
9 Lavocat R (1980) The implications of rodent paleontology and biogeography to the
10
11 geographical sources and origin of the platyrrhine primates. In: Ciochon RL, Chiarelli AB
12
13 (eds) Evolutionary Biology of the New World Monkeys and Continental Drift. Plenum Press,
14
15 New York, pp. 93–102
16
17
18

19
20
21 Loomis FB (1914) The Deseado Formation of Patagonia. Rumford Press, Concord, New
22
23 Hampshire
24
25

26
27
28
29 Lockett WP, Hartenberger J-L (1993) Monophyly or polyphyly of the order Rodentia:
30
31 possible conflict between morphological and molecular interpretations. J Mammal Evol
32
33 1(2):127–147
34
35
36

37
38
39 Marivaux L, Adaci M, Bensalah M, Gomes Rodrigues H, Hautier L, Mahboubi M, Mebrouk
40
41 F, Tabuce R, Vianey-Liaud M (2011) Zegdoumyidae (Rodentia, Mammalia), stem
42
43 anomaluroid rodents from the early to middle Eocene of Algeria (Gour Lazib, western
44
45 Sahara): new dental evidence. J Syst Palaeontol 9:563–588
46
47
48

49
50
51 Marivaux L, Boivin M, Mahboubi M Incisor enamel microstructure of hystricognathous and
52
53 anomaluroid rodents from the earliest Oligocene of Dakhla, Atlantic Sahara (Morocco). J
54
55 Mammal Evol submitted
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Marivaux L, Essid EM, Marzougui W, Khayati Ammar H, Adnet S, Marandat B, Merzeraud
2 G, Tabuce R, Vianey-Liaud M (2014) A new and primitive species of *Protophiomys*
3
4 (Rodentia, Hystricognathi) from the late middle Eocene of Djebel el Kébar, Central Tunisia.
5
6
7 *Palaeovertebrata* 38(1-e2):1–17
8
9

10
11 Marivaux L, Lihoreau F, Manthi KF, Ducrocq R (2012) A new basal phiomorph (Rodentia,
12
13 Hystricognathi) from the late Oligocene of Lokone (Turkana Basin, Kenya). *J Vertebr*
14
15 *Paleontol* 32(3):646–657
16
17
18

19
20
21 Marivaux L, Vianey-Liaud M, Jaeger J-J (2004) High-level phylogeny of early Tertiary
22
23 rodents: dental evidence. *Zool J Linn Soc* 142(1):105–134
24
25
26

27
28
29 Marivaux L, Welcomme JL, Vianey-Liaud M, Jaeger J-J (2002) The role of Asia in the origin
30
31 and diversification of hystricognathous rodents. *Zool Scripta* 31:225–239
32
33
34

35
36 Martin T (1992) Schmelzstruktur in den Inzisiven alt- und neuweltlicher hystricognather
37
38 Nagetiere. *Palaeovertebrata Mém extra*:1–168
39
40
41

42
43 Martin T (1993) Early rodent incisor enamel evolution: phylogenetic implications. *J Mammal*
44
45 *Evol* 1(4):227–254
46
47
48

49
50
51 Martin T (1994a) On the systematic position of *Chaetomys subspinosus* (Rodentia:
52
53 Caviomorpha) based on evidence from the incisor enamel microstructure. *J Mammal Evol*
54
55 *2*(2):117–131
56
57
58

1 Martin T (1994b) African origin of caviomorph rodents is indicated by incisor enamel
2 microstructure. *Paleobiology* 20:5–13
3

4
5
6
7 Martin T (1995) Incisor enamel microstructure and phylogenetic interrelationships of
8
9 Pedetidae and Ctenodactyloidea (Rodentia). *Berliner Geowiss Abh* 16:693–707
10

11
12
13
14 Martin T (1997) Incisor enamel microstructure and systematics in rodents. In: Koenigswald
15
16 W von, Sander PM (eds) *Tooth Enamel Microstructure*. Balkema, Rotterdam, pp 163–175
17
18

19
20
21 Martin T (2004) Incisor enamel microstructure of South America's earliest rodents:
22
23 implications for caviomorph origin and diversification. In: Campbell KE Jr (ed) *The*
24
25 *Palaeogene Mammalian Fauna of Santa Rosa, Amazonian Peru*. Nat Hist Mus Los Angeles
26
27 County, Los Angeles, pp 131–140
28
29
30

31
32
33
34 Martin T (2005) Incisor Schmelzmuster diversity in South America's oldest rodent fauna and
35
36 early caviomorph history. *J Mammal Evol* 12(3/4):405–417
37
38

39
40
41 Martin T (2007) Incisor enamel microstructure and the concept of Sciuravida. *Bull Carnegie*
42
43 *Mus Nat Hist* 39:127–140
44
45

46
47
48 Meng J (1990) The auditory region of *Reithroparamys delicatissimus* (Mammalia, Rodentia)
49
50 and its systematic implications. *Am Mus Novitates* 2972:1–35
51
52

53
54
55 Mones A, Castiglioni LR (1979) Additions to the knowledge on fossil rodents of Uruguay
56
57 (Mammalia: Rodentia). *Paläontol Z* 53:77–87
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2 Montgelard C, Forty E, Arnal V, Matthee CA (2008) Suprafamilial relationships among
3
4 Rodentia and the phylogenetic effect of removing fast-evolving nucleotides in mitochondrial,
5
6 exon and intron fragments. BMC Evol Biol 8(321):1–16
7
8
9

10
11
12 Mossman HW, Luckett WP (1968) Phylogenetic relationship of the African mole rat
13
14 (*Bathyergus janetta*) as indicated by the fetal membranes. Am Zool 8:806
15
16
17
18

19
20 Nedbal MA, Honeycutt RL, Schilitter DA (1996) Higher-level systematics of rodents
21
22 (Mammalia, Rodentia): evidence from the mitochondrial 12S rRNA gene. J Mammal Evol
23
24 3(3):201–237
25
26
27
28

29
30 Pascual R, Vucetich MG, Scillato-Yané GJ (1990) Extinct and Recent South American and
31
32 Caribbean edentates and rodents: outstanding examples of isolation. In: Azzarolin A (ed)
33
34 Biogeographical Aspects of Insularity. Atti Convegna Lincei 87:627–640
35
36
37
38

39
40 Patterson B, Pascual R (1968) New echimyid rodents from the Oligocene of Patagonia, and a
41
42 synopsis of the family. *Breviora* Mus Comp Zool 301:1–14
43
44
45

46
47 Patterson B, Wood AE (1982) Rodents from the Deseadan Oligocene of Bolivia and the
48
49 relationships of the Caviomorpha. Bull Mus *Comp* Zool 149:371–543
50
51
52

53
54 Poux C, Chevret P, Huchon D, De Jong WW, Douzery EJ (2006) Arrival and diversification
55
56 of caviomorph rodents and platyrrhine primates in South America. Syst Biol 55(2):228–244
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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
61
62
63
64
65

Quentin JC (1973) Affinités entre les Oxyures parasites de rongeurs Hystricidés,
Erethizontidés et Dinomyidés. Intérêt paléobiogéographique. C R Acad Sc Paris 276:2015–
2017

Rensberger JM, Koenigswald W von (1980) Functional and phylogenetic interpretation of
enamel microstructure in rhinoceroses. Paleobiology 6(4):477–495

Schreger BNG (1800) Beitrag zur Geschichte der Zähne. Beitr Zerglied 1:1–7

Tabuce R, Delmer C, Gheerbrant E (2007) Evolution of the tooth enamel microstructure in
the earliest proboscideans (Mammalia). Zool J Linn Soc 149(4):611–628

Vélez-Juarbe J, Martin T, MacPhee RDE, Ortega-Ariza D (2014) The earliest Caribbean
rodents: Oligocene caviomorphs from Puerto Rico. J Vertebr Paleontol 34:157–163

Vieytes EC (2003) Microestructura del esmalte de roedores Hystricognathi sudamericanos
fósiles y vivientes: significado morfofuncional y filogenético. PhD Dissertation, Universidad
Nacional de La Plata, Argentina

Vucetich, MG (1989) Rodents (Mammalia) of the Lacayani fauna revisited (Deseadan,
Bolivia). Comparison with new Chinchillidae and Cephalomyidae from Argentina. Bull Mus
Natl Hist Nat 11(4):233–247

1 Vucetich MG, Vieytes EC (2006) A middle Miocene primitive octodontoid rodent and its
2 bearing on the early evolutionary history of the Octodontoidea. *Palaeontographica Abt A* 81–
3
4 91
5
6
7

8
9 Vucetich MG, Arnal M, Deschamps CM, Pérez ME, Vieytes EC (2015) A brief history of
10 caviomorph rodents as told by the fossil record. In: Vassallo AI, Antenucci D (eds) *Biology of*
11
12 *Caviomorph Rodents: Diversity and Evolution*. Soc Argentina Est Mam (SAREM), Buenos
13
14 Aires, Argentina, pp 11–62
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Vucetich MG, Vieytes EC, Pérez ME, Carlini AA (2010) The rodents from La Cantera and
22 the early evolution of caviomorphs in South America In: Madden RH, Carlini AA, Vucetich
23
24 MG, Kay RF (eds) *The Paleontology of Gran Barranca, Evolution and Environmental Change*
25
26 through the Middle Cenozoic of Patagonia. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 189–
27
28 201
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36 Wood AE (1949) A new Oligocene rodent genus from Patagonia. *Am Mus Novitates* 1435:1–
37
38 54
39
40
41

42
43 Wood AE (1950) Porcupines, paleogeography, and parallelism. *Evolution* 4(1):87–98
44
45

46
47
48 Wood AE (1959) Eocene radiation and phylogeny of the rodents. *Evolution* 13(3):354–361
49
50
51

52
53 Wood AE (1962) The early Tertiary rodents of the family Paramyidae. *Trans Am Phil Soc*
54
55 52:1–261
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 Wood AE (1965) Grades and clades among rodents. *Evolution* 19(1):115–130

2
3
4 Wood AE (1972) An Eocene hystricognathous rodent from Texas: its significance in
5 interpretations of continental drift. *Science* 175(4027):1250–1251
6
7

8
9
10
11 Wood AE (1973) Eocene rodents, Pruett Formation, southwest Texas: their pertinence to the
12 origin of the South American Caviomorpha. *Pearce-Sellards Series Texas Mem Mus* 20:1–41
13
14

15
16
17
18 Wood AE (1974) The evolution of the Old World and New World hystricomorphs. *Symp*
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
61
62
63
64
65

Zool Soc *Lond* 34:21–60

Wood AE (1975) The problem of the hystricognathous rodents. *Univ Mich Pap Paleontol*
12:75–80

Wood AE (1980) The origin of the caviomorph rodents from a source in Middle America. In:
Ciochon RL, Chiarelli AB (eds) *Evolutionary Biology of the New World Monkeys and*
Continental Drift. Plenum Press, New York, pp 79–91

Wood AE (1983) The radiation of the Order Rodentia in the southern continents: the dates,
numbers and sources of the invasions. *Schriftenr, Geol Wiss Berlin* 19(20):381–394

Wood AE (1984) Hystricognathy in the North American Oligocene rodent *Cylindrodon* and
the origin of the Caviomorpha. In: *Mengel RM (ed) Papers in Vertebrate Paleontology*
Honoring Robert Warren Wilson. *Carnegie Mus Nat Hist Spec* Pub 9:151–160

1 Wood AE (1985a) The relationships, origin and dispersal of the hystricognathous rodents. In:
2 Luckett WP, Hartenberger J-L (eds) Evolutionary Relationships Among Rodents: A
3 Multidisciplinary Analysis. Plenum Press, New York, pp 475–513
4
5
6
7
8

9 Wood AE (1985b) Northern waif primates and rodents. In: Stehli FS, Webb SD (eds) The
10 Great American Biotic Interchange. Plenum Press, New York, pp 267–282
11
12
13
14
15

16 Wood AE, Patterson B (1959) The rodents of the Deseadan Oligocene of Patagonia and the
17 beginnings of South American rodent evolution. Bull Mus Comp Zool 120:281–428
18
19
20
21
22

23 Wood AE, Patterson B (1970) Relationships among hystricognathous and hystricomorphous
24 rodents. Mammalia 34(4):628–639
25
26
27
28
29

30 Wyss AR, Flynn JJ, Norell MA, Swisher CC III, Charrier R, Novacek MJ, McKenna MC
31 (1993) South America's earliest rodent and recognition of a new interval of mammalian
32 evolution. Nature 365:434–437
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Figure captions:**

42
43 **Fig. 1** Scanning electron micrographs of caviomorph incisors from Paleogene localities of
44 Peruvian Amazonia. **a–b.** lower incisor enamel (MUSM 2803) from CTA-27 with a subtype 1
45 multiserial HSB; **c–d.** upper incisor enamel (MUSM 3353) from TAR-01 with an
46 intermediate subtype 1–2 multiserial HSB. **a, c.** overview of longitudinal section; **b, d.** detail
47 of PI in longitudinal section. PI, Portio interna; PE, Portio externa; HSB, Hunter Schreger
48 Bands; P, prism; IPM, interprismatic matrix; D, dentine. Scale bar equals 10µm.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

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
61
62
63
64
65

Fig. 2 Scanning electron micrographs of caviomorph incisors from Paleogene localities of Peruvian Amazonia. **a–b.** upper incisor enamel (MUSM 2840) from CTA-29 with a subtype 2 multiserial HSB; **c–d.** lower incisor enamel (MUSM 2903) from CTA-61 with an intermediate subtype 2–3 multiserial HSB. **a, c.** overview of longitudinal section; **b, d.** detail of PI in longitudinal section. For abbreviations, see caption of the Figure 1. Scale bar equals 10µm.

Fig. 3 Scanning electron micrographs of caviomorph incisors from Paleogene localities of Peruvian Amazonia. **a–b.** upper incisor enamel (MUSM 3346) from TAR-01; **c–d.** lower incisor enamel (MUSM 3352) from TAR-01 with a subtype 3 multiserial HSB. **a, c.** overview of longitudinal section; **b, d.** detail of PI in longitudinal section. For abbreviations, see caption of the Figure 1. Scale bar equals 10µm.


Table captions:


Table 1 List of taxa found at Contamana (CTA-47, CTA-27, CTA-29, CTA-61, and CTA-32) and Shapaja (TAR-01) localities.


Table 2 Incisor enamel microstructure characters of the studied specimens from CTA-47, CTA-29, CTA-32 and CTA-61.

Table 3 Incisor enamel microstructure characters of the studied specimens from CTA-27.

Table 4 Incisor enamel microstructure characters of the studied specimens from TAR-01.








| Taxa | Locality | Age | References |
|--------------------------------------------------|----------|--------------------|-----------------------------------------------|
| ERETHIZONTOIDEA | | | |
| <i>Shapajamys labocensis</i> | TAR-01 | Early Oligocene | Boivin et al., in press |
| <i>Paleosteiomys amazonensis</i> | CTA-32 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| ?ERETHIZONTOIDEA | | | |
| <i>Plesiosteiomys newelli</i> | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| ?Erethizontoidea indet. | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| OCTODONTOIDEA | | | |
| cf. <i>Eoespina</i> sp. | CTA-27 | late Middle Eocene | Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin et al., 2017a |
| <i>Mayomys confluens</i> | TAR-01 | Early Oligocene | Boivin et al., in press |
| <i>Loretomys minutus</i> | CTA-32 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| aff. <i>Eosallamys</i> sp. | CTA-32 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| aff. <i>Mayomys</i> sp. (Octodontoidea indet. 1) | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b; Boivin et al., in press |
| Octodontoidea indet. 2 | CTA-32 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| ECHIMYIDAE | | | |
| Adelphomyinae indet. 1 | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| Adelphomyinae indet. 2 | CTA-32 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| <i>Deseadomys</i> cf. <i>arambourgi</i> | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| CAVIOIDEA | | | |
| <i>Eobranisamys javierpradoi</i> | CTA-27 | late Middle Eocene | Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin et al., 2017a |
| CHINCHILLOIDEA | | | |
| Chinchilloidea indet. | TAR-01 | Early Oligocene | Boivin et al., in press |
| DINOMYIDAE | | | |
| <i>Scleromys praecursor</i> | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| ?CHINCHILLOIDEA | | | |
| <i>Eoincamys</i> cf. <i>pascuali</i> | TAR-01 | Early Oligocene | Boivin et al., in press |
| <i>Ucayalimys crassidens</i> | CTA-32 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| CAVIOIDEA or CHINCHILLOIDEA | | | |
| Cavioidea or Chinchilloidea indet. | CTA-29 | late Middle Eocene | Boivin et al., 2017a |
| SUPERFAMILY INDETERMINATE | | | |
| <i>Cachiyacuy contamanensis</i> | CTA-27 | late Middle Eocene | Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin et al., 2017a |
| <i>Cachiyacuy</i> cf. <i>contamanensis</i> 2 | CTA-29 | late Middle Eocene | Boivin et al., 2017a |
| <i>Cachiyacuy kummeli</i> | CTA-27 | late Middle Eocene | Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin et al., 2017a |
| ? <i>Cachiyacuy kummeli</i> | CTA-47 | late Middle Eocene | Boivin et al., 2017a |
| <i>Canaanimys maquiensis</i> | CTA-27 | late Middle Eocene | Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin et al., 2017a |
| ? <i>Canaanimys</i> sp. | CTA-47 | late Middle Eocene | Boivin et al., 2017a |
| <i>Pozomys ucayaliensis</i> | CTA-29 | late Middle Eocene | Boivin et al., 2017a |
| <i>Tarapotomys mayoensis</i> | TAR-01 | Early Oligocene | Boivin et al., in press |
| <i>Chambiramys sylvaticus</i> | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| <i>Chambiramys shipiborum</i> | CTA-32 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| Caviomorpha indet. 1 | CTA-47 | late Middle Eocene | Boivin et al., 2017a |
| Caviomorpha indet. 5 | CTA-29 | late Middle Eocene | Boivin et al., 2017a |
| Caviomorpha indet. 6 | CTA-29 | late Middle Eocene | Boivin et al., 2017a |
| Caviomorpha indet. 1 | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| Caviomorpha indet. 2 | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| Caviomorpha indet. 3 | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| Caviomorpha indet. 4 | CTA-61 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |
| Caviomorpha indet. 5 | CTA-32 | Late Oligocene | Boivin et al., 2017b |

| | Locality | Specimen number | Incisor | Incisor width (mm) | Enamel thickness (µm) | Percentage of PE | Percentage of PI | Inclination of prisms in PE (°) | Inclination of HSB (°) | Prisms per HSB | Prisms of transitional zone | Division HSB | Prism cross section | Anastomose IPM | Angle crystallites of IPM and prism in PI | IPM configuration in PI | Multiserial subtype (sbt) | Figure |
|------|----------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| Mean | CTA-47 | MUSM 2649 | upper left | 1.0 | 74 | | | | 36 | 2-3 | well marked | no | flattened | frequent | Acute (c. 30°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 62 | | | | 28 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 79 | | | | 48 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-47 | MUSM 2650 | ? | 1.2 | 155 | 16 | 83 | 69 | 23 | 2-4 | well marked | very frequent | flattened | very frequent | Acute (c. 30°) | sheath-like / sheet-like | Multiserial sbt (1)-2 | |
| Min | | | | | 79 | | | | 14 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 167 | | | | 18 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-29 | MUSM 2840 | lower right | 1.1 | 174 | 20 | 76 | 84 | 33 | 2-4 | well marked | very frequent | round / flattened | rare | Acute (32-58°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | Fig. 2a-b |
| Min | | | | | 171 | | | | 18 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 175 | | | | 21 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-32 | MUSM 2873 | lower | 1.0 | 88 | 27 | 70 | 74 | 37 | 2-4 | scarcely visible | yes | flattened | rare | Acute (40-52°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 88 | | | | 25 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 89 | | | | 29 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-61 | MUSM 2902 | ? | 2.7 | 173 | 18 | 78 | 83 | 23 | 3-5 | well marked | no | round / flattened | very frequent | Parallel to acute (0-10°) | sheath-like / sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 1-(2) | |
| Min | | | | | 172 | | | | 15 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 173 | | | | 21 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-61 | MUSM 2903 | lower right | 2.5 | 156 | 21 | 78 | 83 | 40 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | round / flattened | frequent | Acute to rectangular (50-85°) | sheet-like / interrow sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2-3 | Fig. 2c-d |
| Min | | | | | 153 | | | | 19 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 160 | | | | 22 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-61 | MUSM 2904 | lower | 2.3 | 139 | 22 | 79 | 73 | 37 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | flattened | rare | Acute (30-40°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 137 | | | | 20 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 142 | | | | 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-61 | MUSM 2905 | lower left | 1.8 | 284 | 15 | 84 | 80 | 37 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | flattened | rare | Acute (45-60°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 281 | | | | 14 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 289 | | | | 16 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-61 | MUSM 2906 | upper right | 1.1 | 151 | 17 | 81 | 76 | 32 | 3-4 | well marked | no | flattened | frequent | Acute (33-60°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 149 | | | | 15 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 153 | | | | 21 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-61 | MUSM 2907 | ? | 0.8 | 187 | 18 | 80 | 57 | 27 | 2-4 | well marked | very frequent | flattened | no | Acute (27-40°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 181 | | | | 17 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 195 | | | | 18 | | | | | | | | | |

| | Locality | Specimen number | Incisor | Incisor width (mm) | Enamel thickness (μm) | Percentage of PE | Percentage of PI | Inclination of prisms in PE ($^{\circ}$) | Inclination of HSB ($^{\circ}$) | Prisms per HSB | Prisms of transitional zone | Division HSB | Prism cross section | Anastomose IPM | Angle crystallites of IPM and prism in PI | IPM configuration in PI | Multiserial subtype (sbt) | Figure |
|------|----------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|------------------------------------|------------------|------------------|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2803 | upper | 1.4 | 181 | 21 | 78 | 74 | 15 | 3-4 | scarcely visible | yes | round / fattened | very frequent | Parallel to acute (0-20 $^{\circ}$) | sheath-like / sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 1 | Fig. 1a-b |
| Min | | | | | 176 | 17 | 66 | 59 | 6 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 186 | 26 | 84 | 86 | 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2804 | ? | 1.4 | 192 | 18 | 82 | 66 | 24 | 3-4 | scarcely visible | yes | flattened | rare | Acute (27-55 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 189 | 12 | 79 | 58 | 9 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 195 | 22 | 85 | 73 | 41 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2805 | upper | 1.3 | 185 | 18 | 80 | 69 | 26 | 4 | well marked | yes | flattened | frequent | Acute (45-79 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 182 | 15 | 76 | 53 | 15 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 188 | 22 | 82 | 90 | 37 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2806 | upper | 1.3 | 156 | 18 | 79 | 60 | 25 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | flattened | frequent | Acute (23-46 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 155 | 16 | 75 | 53 | 17 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 157 | 21 | 81 | 64 | 35 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2807 | lower | 1.2 | 246 | 18 | 78 | 56 | 29 | 2-4 | scarcely visible | yes | flattened | rare | Acute (29-74 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 237 | 14 | 73 | 46 | 19 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 252 | 20 | 82 | 66 | 36 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2808 | upper | 1.1 | 182 | 17 | 81 | 58 | 22 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | flattened | rare | Acute (17-60 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 181 | 15 | 79 | 50 | 12 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 184 | 19 | 82 | 78 | 34 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2809 | lower right | 1.1 | 174 | 21 | 77 | 64 | 27 | 4 | well marked | yes | flattened | rare | Acute (50-79 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 171 | 15 | 73 | 49 | 18 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 177 | 28 | 80 | 70 | 36 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2810 | lower right | 1.0 | 181 | 17 | 80 | 55 | 34 | 4 | well marked | no | flattened | rare | Acute (34-67 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 173 | 11 | 75 | 26 | 18 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 188 | 23 | 87 | 67 | 42 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2811 | upper | 1.0 | 126 | 23 | 76 | 85 | 31 | 4 | well marked | yes | flattened | frequent | Acute (17-46 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 92 | 18 | 71 | 68 | 25 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 153 | 27 | 85 | 90 | 35 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2812 | lower | 0.9 | 148 | 20 | 78 | 57 | 31 | 3-5 | well marked | yes | flat | rare | Acute (29-65 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 144 | 15 | 74 | 26 | 22 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 155 | 25 | 83 | 90 | 41 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2813 | upper | 0.8 | 121 | 23 | 75 | 71 | 32 | 2-3 | well marked | rare | flat | very frequent | Acute (27-63 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 120 | 20 | 68 | 26 | 22 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 122 | 27 | 79 | 90 | 41 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2814 | lower | 0.7 | 119 | 20 | 79 | 73 | 25 | 2-4 | well marked | no | flat | frequent | Acute (29-67 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 115 | 17 | 75 | 52 | 17 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 121 | 24 | 81 | 82 | 36 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2815 | lower left | 0.6 | 115 | 20 | 77 | 83 | 26 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | flat | rare | Acute (25-68 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 111 | 16 | 71 | 78 | 15 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 118 | 27 | 81 | 90 | 43 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2816 | lower | 0.6 | 127 | 19 | 79 | 79 | 45 | 4 | scarcely visible | yes | flat | rare | Acute (22-73 $^{\circ}$) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 124 | 16 | 76 | 65 | 33 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 130 | 21 | 82 | 88 | 55 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | CTA-27 | MUSM 2817 | lower | 0.6 | 93 | 22 | 77 | 85 | 26 | 3(-4) | well marked | yes | flat | very frequent | Parallel to acute (0-57 $^{\circ}$) | sheath-like / sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 1(-2) | |
| Min | | | | | 91 | 18 | 73 | 68 | 16 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 95 | 25 | 79 | 90 | 39 | | | | | | | | | |

| | Locality | Specimen number | Incisor | Incisor width (mm) | Enamel thickness (µm) | Percentage of PE | Percentage of PI | Inclination of prisms in PE (°) | Inclination of HSB (°) | Prisms per HSB | Prisms of transitional zone | Division HSB | Prism cross section | Anastomose IPM | Angle crystallites of IPM and prism in PI | IPM configuration in PI | Multiserial subtype (sbt) | Figure |
|------|----------|-----------------|-------------|--------------------|-----------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|------------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------------|----------------------------------|---------------------------|-----------|
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3342 | lower | 2.6 | 152 | 13 | 79 | 71 | 22 | (3)-5 | well marked | no | round / flattened | rare | Acute (29-58°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 150 | 12 | 74 | 63 | 20 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 153 | 14 | 81 | 76 | 26 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3343 | lower | 1.8 | 301 | 14 | 136 | 57 | 29 | 4-5 | well marked | yes | flattened | rare | Acute to rectangular (59-85°) | sheet-like / interrow sheet-like | Multiserial sbt (2)-3 | |
| Min | | | | | 284 | 11 | 79 | 51 | 27 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 320 | 16 | 199 | 62 | 33 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3344 | upper | 1.5 | 171 | 18 | 80 | 62 | 23 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | oval / flattened | very frequent | Parallel to acute (0-40°) | sheet-like / sheath-like | Multiserial sbt 1-2 | |
| Min | | | | | 167 | 15 | 76 | 50 | 15 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 179 | 21 | 85 | 69 | 29 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3345 | lower left | 1.3 | 176 | 14 | 84 | 66 | 17 | 3-5 | well marked | no | flattened | rare | Acute (14-52°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 172 | 11 | 80 | 60 | 4 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 182 | 17 | 88 | 72 | 37 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3346 | upper right | 1.3 | 224 | 12 | 83 | 87 | 34 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | flattened | rare | Rectangular (74-89°) | interrow sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 3 | Fig. 3a-b |
| Min | | | | | 212 | 11 | 79 | 81 | 16 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 233 | 14 | 86 | 90 | 40 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3347 | upper | 1.3 | 140 | 19 | 80 | 74 | 40 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | round / flattened | rare | Acute (19-59°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 139 | 17 | 78 | 69 | 29 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 142 | 21 | 84 | 77 | 48 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3348 | upper left | 1.2 | 133 | 16 | 81 | 67 | 34 | 2-3 | well marked | yes | flattened | no | Acute to rectangular (70-84°) | sheet-like / interrow sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2-3 | |
| Min | | | | | 131 | 14 | 78 | 58 | 22 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 133 | 17 | 83 | 74 | 42 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3349 | lower | 1 | 215 | 15 | 85 | 88 | 37 | 3-4 | scarcely visible | yes | flattened | no | Rectangular (72-90°) | interrow sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 3 | |
| Min | | | | | 209 | 13 | 82 | 85 | 28 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 218 | 18 | 87 | 90 | 43 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3350 | upper left | 0.9 | 133 | 22 | 78 | 63 | 34 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | flattened | frequent | Acute (18-45°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 131 | 18 | 73 | 56 | 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 134 | 25 | 82 | 72 | 45 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3351 | upper right | 0.8 | 111 | 23 | 77 | 83 | 30 | 3-4 | scarcely visible | yes | flattened | frequent | Acute (28-47°) | sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 2 | |
| Min | | | | | 110 | 17 | 74 | 72 | 24 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 112 | 26 | 79 | 89 | 38 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3352 | lower right | 0.8 | 106 | 25 | 72 | 69 | 46 | 3-4 | well marked | no? | round / flattened | no | Rectangular (71-90°) | interrow sheet-like | Multiserial sbt 3 | Fig. 3c-d |
| Min | | | | | 104 | 19 | 68 | 64 | 36 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 107 | 31 | 74 | 80 | 57 | | | | | | | | | |
| Mean | TAR-01 | MUSM 3353 | upper | 0.6 | 104 | 22 | 73 | 80 | 24 | 3-4 | well marked | yes | round / flattened | frequent | Parallel to acute (0-43°) | sheet-like / sheath-like | Multiserial sbt (1)-2 | Fig. 1c-d |
| Min | | | | | 101 | 18 | 67 | 74 | 16 | | | | | | | | | |
| Max | | | | | 105 | 29 | 76 | 87 | 38 | | | | | | | | | |



Click here to access/download
Supplemental Material
Supple Info.pdf

