



HAL
open science

Response to the comments on ‘dental homologies and evolutionary transformations in caviomorpha (hystricognathi, rodentia): new data from the paleogene of Peruvian amazonia’

Myriam Boivin, Laurent Marivaux

► To cite this version:

Myriam Boivin, Laurent Marivaux. Response to the comments on ‘dental homologies and evolutionary transformations in caviomorpha (hystricognathi, rodentia): new data from the paleogene of Peruvian amazonia’. *Historical Biology*, 2020, 32 (7), pp.928-929. 10.1080/08912963.2018.1555665 . hal-02052219


HAL Id: hal-02052219

<https://hal.umontpellier.fr/hal-02052219>

Submitted on 1 Jul 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.



Response to the comments on 'Dental homologies and evolutionary transformations in Caviomorpha (Hystricognathi, Rodentia): new data from the Paleogene of Peruvian Amazonia'

Journal:	<i>Historical Biology</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Boivin, Myriam; Laboratoire de Planetologie et Geodynamique de Nantes, Thème Terre; Institut des sciences de l'evolution, Laboratoire de Paléontologie Marivaux, Laurent; institut des science de l'évolution
Keywords:	Caviomorph rodents, Peru, South America, dental morphology, homology hypotheses

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 **Response to the comments on ‘Dental homologies and evolutionary transformations in**
4 **Caviomorpha (Hystricognathi, Rodentia): new data from the Paleogene of Peruvian**
5 **Amazonia’**
6
7
8
9

10
11
12
13 Myriam Boivin^{a,b*} and Laurent Marivaux^a
14
15

16
17
18
19 ^a Laboratoire de Paléontologie, Institut des Sciences de l’Évolution de Montpellier (ISE-M),
20 c.c. 064, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, EPHE, place Eugène Bataillon, F-34095
21 Montpellier Cedex 05, France.
22
23
24

25
26
27 ^b Laboratoire de Planétologie et Géodynamique (LPG), UMR 6112, CNRS, Université de
28 Nantes, Bât. 4, 2 Chemin de la Houssinière, F-44300 Nantes Cedex 3, France.
29
30
31

32
33
34
35 *Corresponding author. Email: myriam.boivin@univ-nantes.fr
36
37
38
39
40

41 The current note aims to respond to the comments of Verzi et al. (2018) on our published
42 works (Boivin & Marivaux 2018). Regarding the homologies of the mesial cristids in lower
43 molars in octodontoids (Boivin & Marivaux 2018: p. 8 and figures 13 and 14, p. 17–18),
44 Verzi et al. (2018) highlighted several inaccuracies and misinterpretations by us:
45
46
47
48
49

- 50
51 i. the interpretation of the mesial cristids in terms of homologies in *Myocastor* by
52 Verzi et al. (2014);
53
54 ii. the interpretation of the second cristid in position in *Myocastor* by Verzi et al.
55 (2016). Verzi et al. (2016) have interpreted as a mesolophid and not as a
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 combination of a metalophulid II with a mesolophid. The term “second cristid”
4
5 employed in Boivin & Marivaux (2018: p. 8) can be somewhat ambiguous and
6
7 refers to the position of the cristid in this section;
8
9
- 10 iii. Verzi et al. (2017) stated that the specimen MPM -PV 4193 did not correspond to
11
12 *Acarechimys*. However, this specimen is still assigned to *Acarechimys minutus* in
13
14 the review of the genus made the same year by other authors (Arnal et al., 2017);
15
16
- 17 iv. according to Verzi et al. (2014), a combination “metalophulid II and mesolophid”
18
19 is better illustrated by *Lonchotrix* (Boivin & Marivaux 2018, figure 13(C)),
20
21 *Mesomys* (Boivin & Marivaux 2018, figure 13(E)) and *Trinomys* (Boivin &
22
23 Marivaux 2018, figure 13(F)) than by taxa that we have selected in Boivin &
24
25 Marivaux (2018). It is true that this combination is well illustrated by taxa cited by
26
27 Verzi et al. (2014). It is noteworthy that the term “combination” might not be
28
29 appropriate because it does not necessarily imply a connection between the
30
31 metalophulid II and the mesolophid in Boivin & Marivaux (2018);
32
33
- 34 v. we agree that the description of the interpretations of Verzi et al. (2014, 2016,
35
36 2017) in the section “Historical review and current state of caviomorph dental
37
38 structures (homologies and nomenclature); lower teeth” in Boivin & Marivaux
39
40 (2018: p. 8 and figure 4(F1)) was somewhat oversimplified;
41
42
- 43 vi. the nomenclature associated with the photographs A1 and C1 of figure 13 in
44
45 Boivin & Marivaux (2018) is based on interpretations of Candela & Rasia (2012)
46
47 and Candela (2015), and we should have mentioned these references in the legend
48
49 of the figure.
50
51
52
53

54 Taking into account these aforementioned points, we propose a correction of the
55
56 problematic sentence p. 18 in Boivin & Marivaux (2018): “Recently, Verzi et al. (2014,
57
58 2016, 2017) have considered the second cristid of lower molars in some octodontoids as a
59
60

1
2
3 mesolophid (*Acaremys* in Verzi et al. 2014, figure 5(D), p. 763; *Myocastor* in Verzi et al.
4
5 2016; gen. et sp. nov. in Verzi et al. 2017, figure 5(F), p. 418) or composed of two parts
6
7 corresponding to a metalophulid II and a mesolophid. The latter case would include many
8
9 configurations (not all similar), characterized by a metalophulid II and a mesolophid
10
11 linked together or not, discontinuous or not, and with a variable position (labially and/or
12
13 lingually placed) (e.g., *Proechimys*, *Lonchotrix*, *Acarechimys*, *Sallamys* in Verzi et al.
14
15 2016, figures 1–2, p. 96–97; and potentially *Acarechimys*, *Plesiacarechimys*, and
16
17 *Protacaremys* in Verzi et al. 2017, figures 4(C), (F) and (G), p. 417; Figure 4 (F1)).”

18
19
20
21
22 Vucetich (1995) noted the reduction of the second transverse crest on upper molars in
23
24 Euryzygomatomyinae and we should have cited this work. Vucetich (1995), followed by
25
26 Verzi et al. (2018), interpreted this second crest as a protoloph, the paracone being
27
28 lacking. However, the lack of well-defined cusps in caviomorphs does not necessarily
29
30 mean the loss of cusps. Indeed, cusp(-id)s and loph(-id)s can also be merged together,
31
32 thereby generating crestiform structures (see Boivin & Marivaux 2018; Rasia & Candela
33
34 2018). In Euryzygomatomyinae, the reduction of this crest seems to occur lingually: this
35
36 crest is long but does not link the mure-posterior arm of the protocone in the extinct
37
38 *Theridomysops* (Late Miocene), and it is reduced to a labial small knob in extant species
39
40 (*Clyomys*, *Euryzygomatomys*) (Verzi et al. 2018, figure 1). Therefore, the second
41
42 transverse crest on upper molars in Euryzygomatomyinae could be the result of the fusion
43
44 between the paracone and the protoloph. Accordingly, the small knob in
45
46 *Euryzygomatomys* would be a relic of the crestiform structure “paracone + protoloph”

47
48
49
50
51
52 In our approach for recognition of dental homologies, there are ambiguities regarding
53
54 the identification of some structures (e.g., in *Hoplomys*, *Lonchotrix*...; Boivin & Marivaux
55
56 2018, figures 13 and 14). These ambiguities derive from the fact that teeth are worn and/or
57
58 that cusps (-ids) cannot be recognized. It is true that the comparison between different
59
60

1
2
3 specimens/loci of the same taxon or close taxa would allow identification of their possible
4 homologous status. However, our observations made over a large taxonomic sample have
5
6 proven that the intraspecific variation is far from being negligible in caviomorphs.
7
8

9
10 Between individuals of a same species, it can be expressed by morphological
11
12 modifications of pre-existing structures (in terms of connections, shape...) and the
13
14 appearance of several neostructures (i.e., supernumerary cusp(-id)s and loph(-id)s). They
15
16 can involve different structures on a same locus or across different loci (e.g., *Cachiyacuy*
17
18 *contamanensis*, *Incamys bolivianus*), in occupying analogous (similar) positions and
19
20 configurations, and with a same final functional action during chewing movements. Many
21
22 of these dental structures exist and are functional, but remain constrained by the need of
23
24 preserving an occlusal integrity and the associated functional aspects. For these
25
26 ambiguous cases in the structural determination/recognition linked to variation, two
27
28 cladistic methods could be used in order to select one homology hypothesis over another:
29
30 i. to assess alternative homology correspondences for the ambiguous structure (production
31
32 of several matrices), and proceed to a selection of the one that produces the most
33
34 consistent results (Candela 2015); ii. not to score ambiguities (“?” in the matrix), and
35
36 consider *a posteriori* the most parsimonious state (i.e., optimization = hypothesis on what
37
38 could be a non-scored character state, deduced from the phylogenetic inferences
39
40 reconstructed by the whole characters assembled in the matrix). We have carried out the
41
42 latter approach in our large-scale cladistic analyses (Boivin 2017; Boivin et al. in press),
43
44 which was performed on one hundred terminal taxa. The matrix assembled includes both
45
46 fossil and modern caviomorphs, but certain taxa could not be considered, such as
47
48 *Hoplomys*, *Lonchotrix*, *Mesomys* and *Trinomys*. The inclusion of all extant representatives
49
50 of caviomorphs would be prohibitively time consuming and was beyond the scope of the
51
52 analyses (Boivin 2017; Boivin et al. in press).
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, based on comparisons among caviomorph taxa, but also with taxa outside this
4
5 clade, notably with phiomorphs and other taxa of the Ctenohystrica clade (or even with
6
7 members of the mouse-related clade or of the squirrel related clade), and using a cladistic
8
9 assessment of the dental evidence (i.e., providing a phylogenetic context; Boivin 2017;
10
11 Boivin et al. in press), it is clear for us that structural similarities in dental patterns are
12
13 often not necessarily synonym of homologies. Phylogenies highlight the existence of
14
15 homoplasies on structures, which were considered *a priori* as primary homologies due to
16
17 their topographical and configuration similarities (Boivin 2017; Boivin et al. in press).
18
19 These phylogenetic results indicate that some final dental patterns, although similar, can
20
21 be convergent and may have resulted from very different evolutionary transformations.
22
23 Fossils, notably ancient species, in providing unusual dental patterns often characterized
24
25 by intermediary dental morphologies, are particularly useful for deciphering such
26
27 morphological evolutionary aspects.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Acknowledgements**

38
39 We are particularly grateful to Susan Conway (LPG, France) who kindly read the text and
40
41 improved the English. We thank Diego H. Verzi (MLP, Argentina), Cecilia C. Morgan (MLP)
42
43 and A. Itatí Olivares (MLP) for their comments on our publication, which have allowed us to
44
45 correct, clarify and refine our statements. We also thank the Editor in Chief of *Historical*
46
47 *Biology* (G. Dyke) who have invited us to respond to the comments of Verzi et al. (2018).
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **References**

55
56
57 Boivin M 2017. Rongeurs paléogènes d'Amazonie péruvienne: anatomie, systématique,
58
59 phylogénie et paléobiogéographie Unpublished PhD thesis, Montpellier.
60

- 1
2
3 Boivin M, Marivaux L. 2018. Dental homologies and evolutionary transformations in
4
5 Caviomorpha (Hystricognathi, Rodentia): new data from the Paleogene of Peruvian
6
7 Amazonia. *Hist Biol* DOI: 10.1080/08912963.2018.1506778
8
9
10
11 Candela 2015. Analyzing the impact of conflictive dental characters on the phylogeny of
12
13 octodontoid rodents. *Acta Palaeontol Pol* 61:455–468.
14
15
16 Candela AM, Rasia L. 2012. Tooth morphology of Echimyidae (Rodentia, Caviomorpha):
17
18 homology assessments, fossils, and evolution. *Zool J Linn Soc.* 164:451–480.
19
20
21 Rasia LL, Candela AM. 2018. Upper molar morphology, homologies and evolutionary
22
23 patterns of chinchilloid rodents (Mammalia, Caviomorpha). *J Anat.*
24
25 <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12895>
26
27
28
29 Verzi DH, Olivares AI, Morgan CC. 2014. Phylogeny and evolutionary patterns of South
30
31 American octodontoid rodents. *Acta Palaeontol Pol* 59:757–769.
32
33
34 Verzi DH, Olivares AI, Morgan CC, Álvarez A. 2016. Contrasting phylogenetic and diversity
35
36 patterns in octodontoid rodents and a new definition of the family Abrocomidae. *J Mammal*
37
38 *Evol.* 23:93–115.
39
40
41 Verzi DH, Olivares AI, Morgan CC. 2017. Systematics and evolutionary significance of the
42
43 small Abrocomidae from the early Miocene of southern South America. *Hist Biol.* 29:411–
44
45 422.
46
47
48
49 Verzi DH, Morgan CC, Olivares AI. 2018. Comments on ‘Dental homologies and
50
51 evolutionary transformations in Caviomorpha (Hystricognathi, Rodentia): new data from the
52
53 Paleogene of Peruvian Amazonia’. *Hist Biol* DOI: xxxx.
54
55
56
57 Vucetich MG. 1995. *Theridomysops parvulus* (Rovereto, 1914), un primitivo Eumysopinae
58
59 (Rodentia, Echimyidae) del Mioceno tardío de Argentina. *Matozool Neotrop.* 2:167–172.
60