Emergence of hystricognathous rodents: Palaeogene fossil record, phylogeny, dental evolution, and historical biogeography

Abstract:
Although phylogenies imply Asia as the ancestral homeland of the Hystricognathi clade, curiously the oldest known fossil occurrences are not from Asia but from Africa and South America, where they appear by the late middle Eocene. Here we performed cladistic and Bayesian assessments of the dental evidence documenting early ctenohystricans, including several Asian “ctenodactyloids”, all Palaeogene Asian and African hystricognaths, and two early South American hystricognaths. Our results provide a phylogenetic context of early hystricognaths (with implications on systematics) and suggest that some Eocene Asian “ctenodactyloids” could be considered as stem hystricognaths, although they were not recognized as such originally. This view does not fill the gap of the Eocene Asian hystricognath record, as the phylogeny implies many ghost lineages extending back to the middle Eocene for several Asian and African taxa. It also implies a complex early historical biogeography of the group, involving multiple dispersal events from Asia to Africa (and possibly from Africa back to Asia) and then to South America sometime during the middle Eocene. Based on these phylogenetic considerations, we discuss the emergence of hystricognathous rodents from a morpho-anatomical perspective, in analysing the differentiation of their masticatory apparatus and the chewing movements, notably though the evolut...
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Abstract

Although phylogenies imply Asia as the ancestral homeland of the Hystricognathi clade (Rodentia, Ctenohystrica), curiously the oldest known fossil occurrences of hystricognathous rodents are not from Asia but from Africa and South America, where they appear suddenly in the fossil record of both landmasses by the late middle Eocene. Here we performed cladistic and Bayesian (standard and tip dating analyses) assessments of the dental evidence documenting early ctenohystricans, including several Asian “ctenodactyloids”, virtually all Palaeogene Asian and African hystricognaths known thus far, and two representatives of the earliest known South American hystricognaths. Our results provide a phylogenetic context of early hystricognaths (with implications on systematics) and suggest that some Eocene Asian “ctenodactyloids” could be considered as stem hystricognaths and pre-hystricognaths, although they were not recognized as such originally. However, this view does not fill the gap of the Eocene Asian hystricognath record, as the proposed phylogeny implies many ghost lineages extending back to the middle Eocene for several Asian and African taxa. It also implies a complex early historical biogeography of the group, involving multiple dispersal events from Asia to Africa (and possibly from Africa back to Asia) and then to South America sometime during the middle Eocene. Based on these phylogenetic considerations, we discuss the emergence of hystricognathous rodents from a morpho-anatomical perspective, in analysing the differentiation of their masticatory apparatus and chewing movements, notably through the evolution of the dental pattern.

INTRODUCTION

Modern African cane-, dassie- and mole-rats, Afro-Asian porcupines, and South American chinchillas, guinea pigs, spiny-rats, New World porcupines, etc., make up the natural group of the hystricognathous rodents (infraorder Hystricognathi Tullberg, 1899). Compared with living African hystricognaths (Phiomorpha Lavocat, 1967) and Afro-Asian porcupines (Hystricidae Fischer, 1817), South American hystricognaths (Caviomorpha Wood, 1955) are by far the most diverse today (e.g., Wilson et al., 2016). For members of the Hystricognathi clade (except for caviid caviomorphs; see Hautier et al., 2011), the hystricognathous condition (i.e., hystricognathy) is described on their lower jaw (mandible, dentary bone), which shows the origin of the angular process distinctly lateral to the plane of the incisor alveolus (Tullberg, 1899). All other rodents (members of the mouse-related clade and squirrel-related-clade, and ctenodactyloids; e.g., Fabre et al., 2015) have in contrast a sciurognathous lower jaw, characterized by an angular process originating in the same plane that includes the incisor alveolus (Tullberg, 1899). A suite of morpho-anatomical traits (notably dental) and genetic data also define hystricognathous rodents (e.g., Lavocat, 1976; Bugge, 1985; George, 1985; Meng, 1990; Martin, 1992, 1994; Huchon & Douzery, 2001; Huchon et al., 2002, 2007; Marivaux et al., 2002, 2004a; Montgelard et al., 2008; Blanga-Kanfi et al., 2009; Churakov et al., 2010; Hautier et al., 2011; Meredith et al., 2011; Fabre et al., 2012, 2015; Patterson & Upham, 2014). Hystricognaths share a common ancestry with the modern African gundis (comb rats) or Ctenodactylidae and the Asian kha-nyou (Laotian rock rat) or Diatomyidae, the latter two being sciurognathous rodents. The current classification of modern rodents recognizes the suborder Ctenohystrica as the clade uniting ctenodactylids and diatomyids (= ctenodactyloids), together with hystricognaths (e.g., Huchon et al., 2000, 2007; Dawson et al., 2006; Patterson & Upham, 2014; Fabre et al., 2015; Wilson et al., 2016). From a palaeontological perspective, the origin of hystricognaths, as that of the kha-nyou and gundis, can be traced back to the Eocene of Asia, as they are nested within the Asian “ctenodactyloid” radiation, also including other extinct sciurognathous rodent families such as the Eocene Chapattimyidae, Yuomyidae, Tamquammyidae, Tataromyidae and Gobiomyidae (e.g., Dawson, 1968, 2003; Hussain et al., 1978; Dawson et al., 1984; Kumar et al., 1997; Wang, 2001; Marivaux et al., 2002, 2004a; Li & Meng, 2015; Li, 2017; Li et al., 2018). From our current knowledge of the rodent fossil record, “ctenodactyloids” are only documented in Asia during the Palaeogene. Although phylogeny implies Asia as the ancestral homeland of the
Hystricognathi clade, curiously the oldest known fossil occurrences of hystricognaths are not from Asia, where they are so far known only from the latest Eocene (Marivaux et al., 2000; de Bruijn et al., 2003), but from Africa and South America, where they appear suddenly in the fossil record of both landmasses by the late middle Eocene (Antoine et al., 2012; Marivaux et al., 2014a). This points out the incompleteness of the Eocene Asian fossil record for hystricognaths, but also that this group rapidly achieved a widespread distribution from Asia throughout Africa and South America, sometime during the middle Eocene (Antoine et al., 2012; Marivaux et al., 2014a; Barbière & Marivaux, 2015; Sallam & Seiffert, 2016).

Earliest known hystricognaths have been mostly documented from North Africa, notably from Egypt (historically: Osborn, 1908; Wood, 1968; Holroyd, 1994; but also more recently: Sallam et al., 2009, 2011, 2012; Sallam & Seiffert, 2016), Algeria (Jaeger et al., 1985), Libya (Fejfar, 1987; Jaeger et al., 2010a; Coster et al., 2010, 2012, 2015a), Tunisia (Marivaux et al., 2014a), Morocco (Marivaux et al., 2017a) and Oman (Thomas et al., 1989, 1992), where they are generally among the most common members of the late Eocene-early Oligocene mammal faunas. Earliest African hystricognaths are recognized as stem members of the group (stem Hystricognathi [# Protophiomyinae]), then by members of the Phiomyidae (stem Phiomorpha) and Phiocricetomyinae (stem ?Phiomorpha), and by members of the Gaudeamuridae (stem ?Hystricoidea). In Asia, the record of hystricognaths is clearly less abundant and limited to the latest Eocene – early Oligocene “Baluchimyinae” from Peninsular Thailand (Marivaux et al., 2000) and Pakistan (Bugti Hills and Zinda Pir Dome, Balochistan; Flynn et al., 1986; Flynn & Cheema, 1994; Marivaux et al., 2002; Marivaux & Welcomme, 2003), and the early Oligocene Tsaganomyidae, a monogeneric family of odd hypsodontous species recorded in Mongolia (e.g., Matthew & Granger, 1923; Bryant & McKenna, 1995). “Baluchimyines” or stem hystricognaths are also recorded in Asia Minor, from Turkey, in deposits dating from the Eocene/Oligocene transition (Süngülü, Lesser Caucasus; de Bruijn et al., 2003). However, the latter were not originally recognized as hystricognaths but as “ctenodactyloids” (Ctenodactyliidae sensu de Bruijn et al., 2003), although dental similarities with “baluchimyines” and basal African phiomyids were underscored by the authors. The same is true for “baluchimyines” from Pakistan, which were also originally considered as “ctenodactyloids” (subfamily of Chapattimyidae sensu Flynn et al., 1986), although strong affinities with early African phiomyids were appropriately advocated by Flynn et al. (1986). The original non-recognition as hystricognaths of these Asian fossil rodents is partly due to the meagre fossil documentation of early hystricognaths at that time, and to the little
knowledge of their morphology as a result. Besides, it also relies on the fact that these Asian species were exclusively documented by isolated teeth, without complete toothrow, and notably without preservation of the dentary bone allowing the recognition of the Tullberg’s character (i.e., lateral displacement of the angular process relative to the plane of the incisors). However, even with a preserved dentary bone, a question arises as to whether the most basal hystricognaths displayed a recognizable hystricognathous condition of their mandible, similar to that observed in more recent or living forms. Based on well-preserved mandibles of African hystricognaths (phiomorphs) from the early Oligocene of Egypt (e.g., Wood, 1968), the additional discoveries of “baluchimyine” fossils from the Oligocene of Pakistan preserving partial dentary bones (e.g., Marivaux et al., 2002), and dental anatomy comparisons associated with cladistic assessments of the dental evidence, it was then possible to identify the Hystricognathi clade from a palaeontological point of view, and to formalize the dental pattern of early and subsequent hystricognathous rodents (e.g., Marivaux, 2000; Marivaux et al., 2002, 2004a). The recognition of hystricognathous rodents based on isolated teeth was therefore particularly critical, because most of Palaeogene fossil discoveries consist primarily of isolated dental specimens. That was the case for most recent discoveries and descriptions of Eocene and Oligocene rodents from Egypt (Sallam et al., 2009), Libya (Jaeger et al., 2010a; Coster et al., 2010, 2012, 2015a), Tunisia (Marivaux et al., 2014a) and Morocco (Marivaux et al., 2017a), which were identified as early hystricognaths primarily on dental morphology basis. The same is true for the earliest caviomorphs to be known from South America (late middle Eocene: Antoine et al., 2012, 2016; Boivin et al., 2017a; ?late Eocene/early Oligocene: Frailey & Campbell, 2004; early Oligocene: e.g., Vucetich et al., 2010; Boivin et al., 2018, etc.), for which isolated teeth widely dominate their fossil record.

Given the apparent and surprising Eocene gap (phylogenetically implied) for early hystricognaths in the Asian fossil record, we decided here to re-investigate several Eocene rodents from Asia, most of them known by isolated teeth and (initially) identified as “Ctenodactyloidea”, in order to assess if some of them could be in fact basal hystricognaths or closely related to that group. For this purpose, we think that performing a cladistic assessment (i.e., using the parsimony criterion) of the dental evidence documenting several early Asian “ctenodactyloids” and virtually all Palaeogene African and Asian hystricognaths known thus far (or recognized as such), should test the phylogenetic status of some species potentially misidentified originally. With the same data set, Bayesian approaches (standard and tip-dating analyses) will be also undertaken in order to compare the phylogenetic results and to identify
possible discrepancies. If consistent, the structures of such phylogenetic contexts should strengthen support for the recognition of possible early Asian hystricognathous rodents not originally recognized as such (as was the case for the “baluchimyines” from Pakistan and Turkey; Flynn et al., 1986; de Bruijn et al., 2003), and then to have a better idea of the palaeodiversity of the Eocene Asian hystricognathous rodents. These approaches will also attempt to formalize the phylogenetic relationships among Eocene and Oligocene African hystricognaths, notably in considering the numerous taxa recently discovered in Africa (see Table 1; e.g., Sallam et al., 2009, 2011, 2012; Jaeger et al., 2010a; Coster et al., 2012, 2015a; Marivaux et al., 2012, 2014a, 2017a; Sallam & Seiffert, 2016), and to depict the relationships between Palaeogene Asian and African (plus earliest South American) hystricognathous rodents. Based on these phylogenetic considerations, we will discuss the emergence of hystricognathous rodents from a morpho-anatomical perspective (differentiation of their masticatory apparatus). Phylogeny and stratigraphy will also be considered for assessing the ghost lineages phylogenetically implied, and the quality of the Palaeogene fossil record for early hystricognathous rodents. Finally, we will discuss the palaeobiogeographic implications deriving from this/these phylogenetic context(s), notably the faunal exchanges between South Asia and Africa (plus South America), in order to better specify the modalities, timing, and number of dispersals between these landmasses.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

SELECTED TAXA

For these phylogenetic analyses, we considered as in-group several Palaeogene Ctenohystrica species known from Asia (China, Inner Mongolia, Mongolia, Thailand, Pakistan, India, and Turkey; see Appendix S1) and Africa (Egypt, Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco, and Kenya; see Appendix S1), species for which it was possible to score at best a maximum of dental characters (on upper and lower teeth) based on original fossils, high resolution epoxy replicas, and/or fine illustrations. However, a few species, although not well-documented, were also included in the analyses as they provide dental morphologies that appear critical for
understanding the evolutionary transformations of characters. Taxa were entered in the matrix at the specific level. We sampled several genera and often several species of a same genus. But we considered each species as a terminal taxonomic unit and did not introduce chimeric species summarizing the morphological features of several species of a genus.

We selected as out-groups a basal Glires (Tribosphenomys) and two stem Rodentia (Archetypomys and Cocomys), all three being recorded in the early Tertiary of Asia (Appendix S2). Asian taxa of the in-group were primarily sampled by a set of “ctenodactyloid” members, including representatives (originally recognized as such; Appendix S2) of the Tataromyidae-Tamquammyidae (or stem Ctenodactylidae), Yuomyidae, Gobiomyidae, Chapattimyidae, and by all known “baluchimyine” hystricognaths (recognized as such; Appendix S2). As advocated in the introduction of this paper, given the apparent Eocene gap in the Asian fossil record of early hystricognaths, we sampled Asian species widely to assess if some “ctenodactyloids” could be in fact basal hystricognaths. For Africa, sampled taxa were exclusively hystricognaths (recognized as such; Appendix S2), the only ctenohystricans found in Africa during the Palaeogene. We have notably included several taxa from the latest Eocene of Egypt and the earliest Oligocene of Morocco that were recently described by Sallam & Seiffert (2016) and Marivaux et al. (2017a), respectively. Palaeogene Asian and African hystricognaths were sampled as thoroughly as possible (all genera so far known, and nearly all species) in order to have a better idea of the phylogenetic relationships among early African taxa known (for systematics purposes), and between African and Asian taxa in order to decipher how early African hystricognaths are related to non-African forms and vice versa (for systematics and palaeobiogeographic purposes). We have also sampled two early hystricognaths from South America, among the oldest (but perhaps not the earliest) caviomorphs to be known thus far (Appendix S2), to determine in which Old World hystricognath group they are nested, or which are their African (or Asian) sister group and closest out-group.

**SELECTED CHARACTERS**

We employed most of the dental characters and character states listed by Marivaux in Antoine et al. (2012). However, some characters were re-interpreted or added in order to better describe the extent and variation of the character states within the Palaeogene Ctenohystrica
(see updated dental nomenclature; Fig. 1, modified after Marivaux et al., 2004a, 2014a, 2017a; Boivin et al., 2017a,b, 2019; Boivin & Marivaux, 2018). As in Antoine et al. (2012), some multistate characters were considered as ordered if changes from one state to another required passing through intermediate states (Slowinski, 1993). With such an ad hoc assumption, character state assignments do not convey a priori judgments about character polarity (unconstrained parsimony). However, for these new analyses, the additive multistate characters were scaled by the number of character states, such that the sum of the steps in the morphocline equals “1”. For some characters, multistate taxa were considered and characters were scored primarily as polymorphism (0 and 1 [0+1]; i.e., morphological variability within a given species) or as uncertain (0 or 1 [0/1]; i.e., when a character state observed within a species/individual was ambiguous). The description of characters (including added + amended characters), character states, and the scaling value (sv) for each character are presented as Supplementary Material online (Appendix S3). For the taxa preserved from the original matrix published by Antoine et al. (2012), we have rechecked all the former scores, and adjusted/modified and completed the score of the upper and lower tooth characters according to our amendments. Characters were polarized via the out-group comparison method (Watrous & Wheeler, 1981).

The final character-taxon matrix included 198 characters and 60 taxa (contra 182/39 in Antoine et al., 2012). The data matrix (Nexus format) was edited with NDE (Nexus Data Editor v. 0.5.0; Page, 2001).

**PHYLOGENETIC ANALYSES**

For estimating the relationships of the taxa, the final data matrix was subjected to both cladistic (using the maximum parsimony criterion) and Bayesian (based on the likelihood concept) phylogenetic analyses. For the cladistic analyses, the phylogenetic reconstructions were performed with PAUP* 4.0b10 (Swofford, 2002). Polymorphic (0+1; {01} under PAUP) versus uncertain (0/1; {01} under PAUP) character states (multistate taxa) were considered and both treated distinctly by PAUP (options MSTaxa= Variable). Given the high number of selected taxa, analyses were carried out using the Heuristic search method (Hsearch), with a random step-wise addition (1,000 replications with randomized input order of taxa) and tree-bisection-reconnection (TBR) branch swapping options. The clade robustness was measured
by the Bremer Index (Bremer, 1988) and the Bootstrap percentages (BP) in equally weighted maximum-parsimony (after 1,000 iterations comprising two replications with randomized input order of taxa). The character-taxon matrix plus the assumptions (Nexus format) for the cladistic analyses are provided as Supplementary Material online (Appendix S4).

Two types of Bayesian analyses were performed with MrBayes 3.2.6 (Ronquist et al., 2012a), using the public resource CIPRES Science Gateway V. 3.3. (Miller et al., 2015; https://www.phylo.org/): a standard Bayesian approach and a Bayesian tip-dating approach (Ronquist et al., 2012b). For the two Bayesian analyses, we selected the conditional version of the Markov-k model (Mkv; Lewis, 2001) for our total dataset, which included only morphological data, with the assumption of a gamma-distributed rate variation across characters, thereby with coding set to “variable”. For the standard Bayesian (SB) analysis, two independent runs were performed simultaneously with four Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) chains for 25 million generations. Each run had one cold chain and three heated chains (temp= 0.02). The chains were sampled every 1,000 generations and the first 25% of the trees were discarded as the “burn-in” period. The remaining trees were summarized via an “allcompat” consensus tree (majority-rule plus compatible groups). The effective sample sizes (ESSs) and standard deviation of the mean of split frequencies in the final generation were checked in order to assess convergence. The ESSs were checked using Tracer 1.7.1 (Rambaut et al., 2018). The character-taxon matrix and the command lines for this standard Bayesian analysis are provided as Supplementary Material online (Appendix S5).

We also estimated simultaneously both phylogeny and divergence dates among taxa in performing a Bayesian tip-dating (BTD) analysis, which takes into account the ages of fossil taxa and rates of character evolution (e.g., Pyron, 2011; Ronquist et al., 2012b; Borths et al., 2016; Sallam & Seiffert, 2016). The independent gamma rates (IGR) relaxed-clock model was applied to account for variation in morphological evolutionary rates among branches. The fossilized birth-death (FBD) process was used as a tree prior on branch lengths in setting “samplestrat” to “fossiltip”, thereby considering that tips left no descendants. Each tip was calibrated with a uniform prior on age, corresponding to minimum and maximum ages of each taxon (i.e., error range of an absolute radiometric age, upper and lower bounds of geological stages or Palaeogene Land Mammal Ages to which a fossil has been assigned, or stratigraphic range of a taxon; see Appendix S1). Given that the FBD process begins at some time to > 0 Myr in the past (here ca. 56 Myr, i.e., the root of the Rodentia clade) and ends when t = 0 (today), we added an extant hystricognathous taxon, *Thryonomys swinderianus* (African cane
rat; Phiomorpha Thryonomyidae), to our data matrix, which so far included only extinct Palaeogene taxa for the purpose of this paper. Considering the addition of this living taxon (calibrated with a fixed prior on age, i.e., modern days: fixed(0)), the percentage of extant species sampled in the analysis (“sampleprob”) was set to 0.005 (Sallam & Seiffert, 2016). The root node was constrained to fall within a broad uniform prior on node age from 50 Myr to 60 Myr, beyond which no ctenohystrican (or even rodent and rodentiaform) has been recognized in the fossil record (e.g., Meng & Wyss, 2001; Marivaux et al., 2004a; Meng et al., 2007). We opt for flat beta priors (1.0, 1.0) associated to the FBD process (“fossilizationpr” and “extinctionpr”). The prior on the net speciation rate (“speciationpr”) was set to exp(50). Regarding the gamma distribution from which the branch lengths are drawn (“igrvarpr”), this prior was set to exp(3). The prior on the “base substitution” rate (morphological changes), measured in number of changes per “site” per Myr (“clockratepr”), was set to normal(0.25, 0.05). MCMC analyses consisted of two independent runs of four chains (one cold and three heated; temp = 0.01), sampling every 1,000 generations for 50 million generations per run, with a burn-in percentage of 25%. An “allcompat” consensus tree was generated, summarizing all post-burn-in sampled trees. Convergence was also assessed here by checking the ESSs and the average standard deviation of split frequencies in the final generation. The character-taxon matrix plus its assumptions for this Bayesian tip-dating analysis are provided as Supplementary Material online (Appendix S6). Several additional analyses with various perturbations of the priors, notably “speciationpr”, “igrvarpr” and “clockratepr” (see Appendix S7) returned similar topologies and age estimates. Results of these additional analyses with different prior values are not reported here.

RESULTS

Taxa above the generic level (families or subfamilies) are not defined here and not formally endorsed, but are indicated when evident by informal terminations of “-id(s)” or “-ine(s)”, reflecting previous usage.
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Heuristic searches yielded two equally most parsimonious trees of 1042.46 steps each (Consistency Index, CI= 0.373; Retention Index, RI= 0.637). The cladogram presented in Figure 2 corresponds to a strict consensus tree of the two trees generated. In this phylogeny, the numerous Asian “ctenodactyloid” taxa illustrating tamquammyids, yuomyids, chapattimyids, gobiomyids and “ctenodactyloids” incertae sedis (see Appendix S2) are separated from taxa so far recognized as early hystricognaths and forming the Hystricognathi clade (i.e., all Palaeogene Asian [Ottomania and Confiniummys, plus “baluchimyines”] and African [protophiomyines, phiocricetomyines, metaphiomyines, phiomyids, and gaudeamurids] taxa, plus Canaanimys and Cachiyacy [the two early South American taxa]). Here, the monophyly of the yuomyids is not recovered but the sampled members (Yuomys, Petrokozlovia, Advenimus, and Saykanomys) of this apparent paraphyletic family are found closely related to each other nonetheless. Interesting is the position of the two species of Dianomys (D. obscuratus and D. exigus) as well as Anadianomys, which appear as the closest out-groups of the Asian taxa so far considered as basal members of the Hystricognathi clade (i.e., Ottomania, Confiniummys, and some other “baluchimyines”). The two species of Dianomys were originally considered as representatives of the Yuomyidae (Wang, 1984), later Ctenodactyloidea without familial attribution (Wang, 2001). Given the phylogenetic position of Dianomys and Anadianomys, a taxonomic enlargement regarding the basal content of the Hystricognathi clade is envisaged below.

Regarding the phylogenetic structure within the Hystricognathi clade, several subclades are revealed, clustering taxa that illustrate families and/or subfamilies (with revisited content of some), or that could suggest new taxonomic units (Fig. 2). In contrast, some of the taxonomic units are not identified, appearing as paraphyletic or even polyphyletic. It is notably the case of the Asian “baluchimyines” (Baluchimys, Lindsaya, Hodsahibia, Bugtimys, Lophibaluchia, plus Ottomania and Confiniummys), for which certain taxa form subclades ([Baluchimys, Lindsaya] and [Ottomania, Confiniummys]) that are sequentially arranged at the base of the Hystricognathi clade, while other taxa ([Hodsahibia, Bugtimys] and Lophibaluchia) are nested separately within the basal African taxa (Marivaux et al., 2002, 2004a; Sallam et al., 2011, 2012; Coster et al., 2010, 2012; Antoine et al., 2012; Sallam & Seiffert, 2016). Such a scattered phylogenetic distribution of “baluchimyines” at the base of the Hystricognathi clade requires the recognition of distinct taxonomic units of Asian hystricognaths. Indeed, Hodsahibia plus Bugtimys, as well as Lophibaluchia, being placed...
apart and hierarchically higher on the tree with respect to the other “baluchimyines”, are considered here as advanced “baluchimyines” (*sensu* Sallam & Seiffert, 2016), and as such could represent new higher taxonomic units (Fig. 2). Interesting is the clade clustering the different species of *Protophiomys* (*P. algeriensis*, *P. aegyptensis*, and *P. durattalahensis*, to the exception of *P. tunisiensis* [see below]) plus *Waslamys attiai*, inasmuch as it constitutes a clade of late Eocene African taxa occupying an intermediate position nested within the Asian “baluchimyines” (basal + advanced). *Waslamys* has been often regarded as a possible junior synonym of *Protophiomys* (Coster *et al.*, 2012; Marivaux *et al.*, 2014a, 2017a), a taxonomic option which is emphasized here by our phylogenetic results. Regardless of the possible synonymy of *Waslamys*, the phylogenetic position of the African protophiomyines (*sensu* Coster *et al.*, 2012), nested within Asian taxa, has important biogeographic implications, not only for the protophiomyines, but also for the Asian advanced “baluchimyines” (African origin?). We analyse and discuss below those biogeographic aspects that imply seemingly complex dispersals between Asia and Africa.

Within the Hystricognathi clade, phiocricetomyines can be recognized as a subclade clustering markedly cuspidate and low crested African taxa, exemplified by *Phiocricetomys*, *Talahphiomys* and *Neophiomys*, to which are also associated here *Mubhammys*, *Birkamys*, *Phenacophiomys* and *Protophiomys tunisiensis*. *Mubhammys* and *Birkamys* were originally interpreted as advanced phiomorph taxa of an indeterminate family, closely related to the extant *Thryonomys* (cane-rat) and some other Miocene taxa such as *Paraphiomys*, and sequentially arranged after the Palaeogene phiomorph taxa such as *Phiomys*, *Acritophiomys*, *Turkanamys*, *Metaphiomys*, etc. (see Sallam & Seiffert, 2016: fig. 10). Our results propose distinct affinities for *Mubhammys* and *Birkamys*, considering these bunodont and low crested taxa from the latest Eocene/earliest Oligocene of North Africa (Sallam & Seiffert, 2016; Marivaux *et al.*, 2017a) as phiocricetomyines, clearly set apart from the phiomyids and the stem thryonomyids (?metaphiomyines). Concerning *Phenacophiomys*, this taxon was recently recognized as a distinct phiomiyd genus from the earliest Oligocene of Morocco, notably by a suite of dental traits which would place this taxon between *Phiomys/Acricophiomys* and *Protophiomys/Waslamys* (see Marivaux *et al.*, 2017a). *Phenacophiomys* is here phylogenetically interpreted as the basalmost phiocricetomyine taxon (the earliest offshoot of the large clade considered here as the phiocricetomyine clade; Fig. 2). A phiocricetomyine status is also proposed here for *Protophiomys tunisiensis*, the oldest African representative of the Hystricognathi clade to be known thus far (late middle Eocene of Tunisia; Marivaux *et al.*,...
2014a). The teeth of this species are still moderately cuspidate (main cusps and cuspids not strongly bulbous but still well-defined) and low crested, with upper molars mostly tetralophodont, but with some specimens exhibiting an incipient pentalophodonty (presence of a very short mesolophule). Originally, this species was tentatively attributed to the genus Protophiomys, the well-known genus documented by species dating from the late Eocene of Algeria and Egypt (P. algeriensis and P. aegyptensis, respectively; Jaeger et al., 1985; Sallam et al., 2009). However, P. tunisiensis appearing morphologically less advanced than the Egyptian and Algerian (even Libyan; Jaeger et al., 2010a) species, it was regarded as documenting a primitive morph of that lineage. Our phylogenetic analyses clearly set the Tunisian species apart from the other species of Protophiomys, and rather propose a phiocricetomyine status for that species. Given these results (consistent with those of Sallam & Seiffert, 2016), “Protophiomys” tunisiensis should be then attributed to another genus, probably a new genus. The same is true for Neophiomys paraphiomyoides, which is found here within the phiocricetomyine clade clearly separated from the other species of that genus (N. minutus and N. dawsonae). Neophiomys had been included among the Thryonomyidae (e.g., Coster et al., 2015a), but our phylogenetic results rather opt for a phiocricetomyine status of Neophiomys.

Finally, within the Hystricognathi clade (Fig. 2), another large subclade, rooted here by Lophibaluchia (Asian taxon), clusters species of Metaphiomys (metaphiomyines), followed by a subclade recognized here as the phiomyid clade clustering the different species of Phiomys with Acrithophiomys and Turkanamys, and sister to another subclade uniting the species of Gaudeamus (gaudeamurids) with Canaanimys and Cachiyaucy, two taxa being among the oldest South American representatives of the Hystricognathi clade (i.e., stem Caviomorpha; Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin, 2017; Boivin et al., 2019). Regarding what we identify here as the Phiomyidae clade, we could then envisage that Acrithophiomys and Turkanamys are junior synonyms of Phiomys, as recently suggested and discussed for Acrithophiomys by Marivaux et al. (2017a). From these phylogenetic results, gaudeamurids and caviomorphs seem to share a common ancestry. Several phylogenetic results have already advocated the possible relationships between gaudeamurids and caviomorph rodents (e.g., Coster et al., 2010; Sallam et al., 2011, 2012; Antoine et al., 2012; Sallam & Seiffert, 2016), whereas others envisage gaudeamurids as potentially stem representatives of the Hystricoidea clade (a lineage, leading to the extant Afro-Asian Hystrix and African Atherurus; i.e., porcupines; Sallam et al., 2011; Barbière & Marivaux, 2015; Marivaux et al., 2017a). The dental pattern of Gaudeamus is
very specialized as early as the latest Eocene, the first occurrence known for that genus (L-41, Fayum, Egypt; Sallam et al., 2011), and somewhat evolutionarily advanced over that of the coeval African or Asian genera known. Furthermore, there is so far no precursor known in Africa (middle and late Eocene), which would exhibit a dental morphology clearly indicating transformations toward a Gaudeamus dental pattern. Curiously, the dental morphology of Gaudeamus is strikingly very similar to that of Eoincamys, a coeval taxon from the New World (Peruvian Amazonia; Frailey and Campbell, 2004; Coster et al., 2011; Boivin, 2017; Boivin & Marivaux, 2018; Boivin et al., 2018, 2019). Gaudeamus, as Eoincamys, displays some dental features, which are otherwise found primarily in Cachiyacuy and Canaanimys, but at a different degree of development in the latter (e.g., on upper teeth: presence of a well-defined mesostyle associated with a buccal mesoloph, well-marked parastyle; on lower teeth: moderately long and high posterior arm of the metaconid, well-defined mesostylid associated with the development of a neomesolophid, absence of hypoconulid). One noteworthy point is that some of these dental features can be also observed, to some extent (i.e., less marked; e.g., mesostyle, mesostylid, and neomesolophid), in certain specimens of phiomyids (Phiomys, Acritophiomys, and Turkanamys). Although tenuous, these dental traits suggest that gaudeamurids share an ancient common ancestry with the caviomorph ancestor and phiomyids, ancestry which would be so far undocumented in the fossil record of Africa. In this context, the strong dental similarities between Gaudeamus and Eoincamys would indicate that these two lineages evolved in parallel from a more ancient African common ancestry. Given the age of the first known species of Gaudeamus and Eoincamys (i.e., latest Eocene/earliest Oligocene) and the presence of much more ancient hystricognathous species in South America (recorded in the late middle Eocene; Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin, 2017; Boivin et al., 2017a, 2019), the hypothesis of a close Gaudeamus-Eoincamys phylogenetic relationships would necessarily imply an extra (second, later) dispersal from Africa to South America during the latest Eocene, in addition to the dispersal (likely the first) of the ancestor of the earliest caviomorphs known from Peruvian Amazonia (Cachiyacuy, Canaanimys, Eoebrianamys, Eoespina, Pozomys, etc.; Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin, 2017; Boivin et al., 2017a, 2019). The latter palaeobiogeographic scenario is rather difficult to conceive. In sum, the phylogenetic view considering a common ancestry between gaudeamurids, protocaviomorphs and phiomyids (plus metaphiomyines) does not favour a gaudeamurid-hystricid link (but see constrained alternative hypothesis of Sallam et al., 2011; see also Barbière & Marivaux, 2015). Indeed, if we take into consideration molecular phylogenies, hystricids are not closely related to South American caviomorphs, but would have diverged before the
Caviomorpha/Phiomorpha split (e.g., Huchon et al., 2002, 2007; Blanga-Kanfi et al., 2009; Sallam et al., 2009; Meredith et al., 2011; Patterson & Upham, 2014; Fabre et al., 2015). In other words, Hystricidae are regarded as the earliest offshoots of the crown Hystricognathi clade. From a palaeontological point of view and based on our phylogenetic results, stem hystricids (if they had been known and sampled here) would then be expected outside the clade uniting proto-caviomorphs, gaudeamurids and phiomyids, the latter assumed to be the unique stem representatives of the extant Phiomorpha clade (see below). In this context, the root of the Hystricidae should perhaps be sought within the phiocricetomyines or perhaps within the protophiomyines, or even the bugtimyids and the basal “baluchimyines”, as all are stem groups of the Hystricognathi clade, preceding the Phiomorpha-Caviomorpha split. The possibility also exists that hystricids are not closely related to these known stem hystricognaths, and that their earliest representatives remain undocumented in the Palaeogene fossil record (either of Asia or Africa).

Finally, in this phylogenetic context, another critical issue is the recognition of the stem Phiomorpha. Gene-based phylogenies (e.g., Huchon et al., 2007; Blanga-Kanfi et al., 2009; Patterson & Upham, 2014; Fabre et al., 2015; Upham & Patterson, 2015) support a close relationship between extant Phiomorpha (including Thryonomyidae plus Petromuridae, and Bathyergidae plus Heterocephalidae) and extant Caviomorpha (including Octodontoidea plus Chinchilloidea, and Cavioida plus Erethizontoidea). According to our phylogenetic results, phiomyids (as sister of the gaudeamurid-caviomorph clade; Fig. 2) would be the only group recognized as stem Phiomorpha. The Phiomorpha-Caviomorpha split would be then illustrated here by the split between the ancestor of Phiomys (plus Acritophiomys and Turkanamys) and the African ancestor of Cachiyacuy/Canaanimys (plus Gaudeamus, the latter would be an African caviomorph?; see also Coster et al., 2010). The two lineages would have then subsequently evolved separately on the two landmasses leading to the modern diversity of both groups. In this context, gaudeamurids, as African sister of the stem caviomorphs, would have rapidly become extinct in Africa. But such a view regarding the Phiomorpha-Caviomorpha split is overly simplistic and weakly supported because we are far from having an exhaustive late middle and late Eocene fossil record in Africa documenting that phylogenetic event (see section below dedicated to the analysis of the quality of the fossil record). Furthermore, in this study, we have voluntarily limited our taxonomic sampling to Palaeogene taxa. A more comprehensive phylogenetic analysis associating Palaeogene taxa with more recent and extant taxa (among phiomorphs and caviomorphs) would certainly
provide a broader framework for deciphering the phylogenetic pattern related to the emergence of crown taxa. However, although our taxonomic sampling is limited, interesting evolutionary aspects are revealed nonetheless. For instance, one key dental synapomorphy of crown Phiomorpha is the retention throughout life of the deciduous premolars (DP4 and dp4; i.e., the eruption of the permanent premolars being suppressed; e.g., Wood, 1968). If phiomyids are stem Phiomorpha, as our phylogenetic results suggest, it is worth noting that their representatives (Phiomys, Acritophiomys, etc.) did not show a retention of the deciduous premolars, thereby indicating that this dental feature was achieved subsequently in more recent representatives of the Phiomorpha clade. In describing Mubhammys and Birkamys from the latest Eocene of Egypt (L-41), Sallam & Seiffert (2016) have shown that these two taxa were already characterized by the suppression of lower and upper permanent premolar eruption, an observation thereby strengthening support for the phiomorph status of these two fossil taxa (both being nested within Phiomorpha in the proposed phylogeny of Sallam & Seiffert, 2016: 29-30). Based on our phylogenetic results, Mubhammys and Birkamys would be rather phiocricetomyines, i.e., stem hystricognaths, not phiomorphs. If the retention of the deciduous premolars characterizes crown Phiomorpha (but not all stem members of the clade) but also the extinct metaphiomyines (species of Metaphiomys) and some members of the phiocricetomyines (Mubhammys and Birkamys), accordingly this dental feature was achieved independently several times among African stem and crown hystricognaths. The iterative pattern of this dental feature is emphasized even more by the fact that several extinct and extant representatives of crown caviomorphs (octodontoids) also have suppressed the eruption of permanent lower and upper premolars, whereas a replacement of the deciduous premolars is observed in most stem caviomorphs for which these dental loci are documented (e.g., Frailey & Campbell, 2004; Vucetich et al., 2010; Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin et al., 2017a, 2018, 2019; Pérez et al., 2019; except for Eobranisamys romeropittmanae, see Frailey & Campbell, 2004).

**STANDARD BAYESIAN PHYLOGENETIC ANALYSIS**

The “allcompat” consensus tree (majority-rule plus compatible groups) of 25,000 post-burn-in trees retained by the Bayesian (SB) analysis is provided in Figure 3. As for the results of the cladistic analyses, the Bayesian inferences reveal a neat separation of most Asian
“ctenodactyloid” taxa illustrating tamquammyids, yuomyids, chapattimyids, gobiomyids and “ctenodactyloids” incertae sedis, from taxa recognized as early hystricognaths and forming the Hystricognathi clade. Although the global phylogenetic structure is similar between the results of the two analyses, there are, however, some points of disagreement. Among the “ctenodactyloid” taxa, there are some rearrangements, notably regarding the stem members of the extant Ctenodactylidae (i.e., tamquammyids and tataromyids), which are successively arranged (except Protataromys) at the base of the tree, rather than forming a clade (Fig. 3). Protataromys, while closely related to the tamquammyids in the cladistic results, is found situated hierarchically higher in the tree, near the Hystricognathi clade. The gobiomyids occupy a hierarchically lower position in the tree, situated sequentially after the paraphyletic “yuomyids”. Next come chapattimyids, forming again a monophyletic group (including some internal rearrangements), to which agglomerates Stelmomys forming the basalmost branch of the clade. As for the cladistic results, the two Asian species of Dianomys (D. obscuratus and D. quijingensis) are particularly interesting for reconsidering the basal content of the Hystricognathi clade. Indeed, the two species occupy here a critical position in being no more considered as the closest out-groups of the Hystricognathi clade, but in being deeply nested “within” the Hystricognathi clade. Indeed, the two species form a clade closely related to some basal “baluchimyines” ([Ottomania, Confiniummys] plus Baluchimys krabiense). That clade is sister to the African protophiomyines, which clusters here only Protophiomyx algeriensis, P. aegyptensis and Waslamys attai. Protophiomyx durattalahensis, which was the basalmost member of the protophiomyines in the results of the cladistic analyses (Fig. 2), occupies here a phylogenetic position hierarchically much higher, in being closely related to the clade uniting the basal phiomorphs and caviomorphs (see below). The possibility that this taxon represents a distinct genus, outside of the protophiomyines, was already advocated by Marivaux et al. (2014a), who regarded the dental morphology of “P.” durattalahensis as more derived with respect to that of the other protophiomyines. In contrast, Sallam et al. (2012) then Sallam & Seiffert (2016) considered “P.” durattalahensis as closely related to Waslamys, and phylogenetically distinct to the other species of Protophiomyx (P. algeriensis and P. aegyptensis). The Bayesian inferences here are rather in favour of the recognition of “P.” durattalahensis as a distinct genus (new) from Protophiomyx and Waslamys. This conclusion and the cladistic results support the assumption according to which Waslamys would be a junior synonym of Protophiomyx (following Coster et al., 2012; Marivaux et al., 2014a, 2017a). As for the cladistics results, these Bayesian inferences reveal again the polyphyly of the “baluchimyines”. If some members (Ottomania, Confiniummys, and Baluchimys
krabiense) are closely related to Dianomys (as discussed above), other taxa (Lindsaya and Baluchimys barryi) form a clade situated at the root of the Hystricognathi clade, whereas Hodsaibia, Bugtimys and Lophibaluchia form another clade situated higher in the tree, and sister to the clade uniting the basal phiomorphs and caviomorphs (see below). Here, unlike the cladistic results, Lophibaluchia is agglomerated with Hodsaibia and Bugtimys. As advocated previously with the cladistic results, such a scattered phylogenetic distribution of “baluchimyines” really requires the recognition of distinct taxonomic units of Asian hystricognaths, notably units for the different basal “baluchimyines” and another unit for the advanced “baluchimyines” (bugtimyids; Figs 2, 3).

A large phiocricetomyine clade is also well identified here (Fig. 3), clustering the same taxa grouped by the cladistic analyses (Fig. 2). These results corroborate the phiocricetomyine status of Mubhammys, Birkamys and “Protophiomys” tunisiensis, underscoring the need to provide a new generic attribution to “P.” tunisiensis. Although the content of this clade is here similar to that obtained by the cladistic analyses, there are, however, some taxonomic rearrangements, notably in revealing a closer phylogenetic relationship between Talahphiomys (T. lavocati and T. libycus) and Phiocricetomys, and a closer relationships between Birkamys and Neophiomys (N. minutus and N. dawsonae). Birkamys and Phiocricetomys were positioned hierarchically lower on the tree generated by the parsimony analyses (Fig. 2). Given these results, it is not excluded that additional dental material for these fossil taxa (notably for Neophiomys, Talahphiomys, and Phiocricetomys), demonstrates that Birkamys is potentially a junior synonym of Neophiomys (as suggested by Marivaux et al., 2017a). Talahphiomys may also be a junior synonym of Phiocricetomys, although less certainly given the highly derived and specialized dental pattern of Phiocricetomys (see Wood, 1968; Coster et al., 2012; Marivaux et al., 2017a) with respect to Talahphiomys.

The last large subclade identified within the Hystricognathi clade, is that clustering metaphiomyines, phiomyids, stem caviomorphs and gaudeamurids. Unlike the cladistic results, this clade also includes at its base “Protophiomys” durattalahensis, and here phiomyids are sequentially arranged (i.e. appearing paraphyletic). Indeed, the two sampled species of Phiomys (P. andrewsi and P. hammudai) are not associated to the subclade uniting Acritophiomys and Turkanamys, but are successively positioned before that subclade. The critical issue raised previously (see cladistic results) regarding the recognition of the stem Phiomorpha is here even more complicated to assess given the sequential arrangement of “P.” durattalahensis, metaphiomyines, “phiomyids”, stem caviomorphs and gaudeamurids. Dental
characters are perhaps not sufficient for identifying a Phiomorpha clade, which could cluster “P.” durattalahensis, Metaphiomys, Phiomys, Acrithophiomys and Turkanamys (allied with more recent, e.g., Paraphiomys, Lavocatomys, Diamantomys, etc., see Lavocat, 1973, and crown phiomorph taxa). Based on our phylogenetic results (cladistics or Bayesian), the problem here is that caviomorphs are nested within a clade that could be identified as the Phiomorpha clade, thereby making the latter paraphyletic. Among extant hystricognaths, if crown phiomorphs (Thryonomyidae, Petromuridae, Bathyergidae, and Heterocephalidae) form a clear monophyletic group, sister to crown Caviomorpha, to the exclusion of the Hystricidae, this simple dichotomous pattern deriving from gene-based phylogenies is far from well established by palaentological data, which includes extinct lineages.

**BAYESIAN TIP-DATING ANALYSIS WITH THE FOSSILIZED BIRTH-DEATH PRIOR**

The “allcompat” consensus tree (majority-rule plus compatible groups) of 50,000 post-burn-in trees retained by the Bayesian tip-dating (BTD) analysis is provided in Figure 4. Here, we only describe and discuss the phylogenetic relationships in comparison with the results of the cladistic and standard Bayesian (SB) analyses. We discuss the estimated node ages later (see “Discussion” section about the adaptive radiation and historical biogeography of hystricognaths). As for the cladistic and SB analyses, the results of the BTD analysis point out a net separation of the “ctenodactyloid” taxa from the large Hystricognathi clade, for which the Dianomys clade occupies a well-supported (PP = 1) sister taxon position. The position of the Dianomys clade is similar to that found by the cladistic analyses (Fig. 2), and contrasts with the SB results where the Dianomys clade is outright nested within the basal hystricognaths (Fig. 3). Regarding the internal relationships of the “ctenodactyloids”, as for the cladistic results (Fig. 2), the BTD analysis recovers the monophyly of the tamquammyid group situated at the base of the ctenohystrican tree, whereas the SB analysis has failed to recover the monophyly of this group (Fig. 3). As for the cladistic and SB analyses, the monophyly of the Yuomyidae is also not demonstrated by the BTD analysis. In the previous analyses, if the “yuomyid” taxa were found closely related, forming two successive clades arranged after the tamquammyids (Figs 2, 3), here some taxa (Advenimus plus Saykanomys) form a basal clade situated consistently after the tamquammyid clade, and the other taxa sampled (Yuomys and Petrokozlovia) occur surprisingly arranged successively higher in the
tree, close to the *Dianomys* clade (Fig. 4). The BTD analysis recovers the chapattimyid clade similar to the results of the cladistic analyses (Fig. 2). This clade was also found by the SB analysis, but with the addition of *Stelmomys*, which appears in these results as the first offshoot of the chapattimyid clade (Fig. 3). Here, *Stelmomys* is found outside of the chapattimyid clade, and positioned higher in the “ctenodactyloid” tree, appearing as basal to a clade uniting the Gobiomyidae and *Xueshimys* (as for the cladistic results) plus a clade uniting *Anadianomys* and *Protataromys* (Fig. 4). In the cladistic results, *Protataromys* was found much lower in the “ctenodactyloid” tree, and nested within the tamquammyids (Fig. 2). In both Bayesian analyses, this taxon is found higher in the trees, and close to the root of the Hystricognathi clade.

Concerning the large Hystricognathi clade, the results of BTD analysis are similar to those of the cladistic and SB analyses in identifying the main hystricognath subclades corresponding to the basal baluchimyines, protophiomyines, advanced “baluchimyines” (bugtimyids), phiocricetomyines, gaudeamurids, “phiomyids”, “metaphiomyines” (or thryonomyids) and stem caviomorphs (Fig. 4). However, the high-level relationships between these subclades are resolved differently by the BTD approach. It is particularly noteworthy that the basal Asian baluchimyines (i.e., *Baluchimys krabiense*, *B. barryi*, *Lindsaya*, *Ottomania*, and *Confiniummys*) are found here, for the first time, forming a monophyletic group, sister to the African protophiomyines. The baluchimyine-protophiomyine clade is itself sister to the bugtimyid clade (Fig. 4). Given the latter clustering obtained by the BTD analysis, the phylogenetic position of the bugtimyid clade then contrasts with the results of the cladistic and SB analyses, being here neither sister to the large subclade clustering the “phiomorphs”, gaudeamurids and caviomorphs (as resolved by the SB analysis; Fig. 3), nor sister of the former large subclade plus phiocricetomyines (as resolved by the cladistic analyses; Fig. 2). As for the SB analysis (Fig. 3), *Lophibaluchia* is placed at the base of the bugtimyid clade, contrary to the cladistic results (Fig. 2), where it was set apart from that clade, and placed as a succeeding branch. The position of the phiocricetomyines also contrasts with that found by the cladistic and SB analyses. Phiocricetomyines are here sister to the large clade clustering *baluchimyines, protophiomyines plus bugtimyids* (Fig. 4), whereas their position was resolved as sister of the clade clustering the “phiomorphs”, gaudeamurids and caviomorphs by the cladistic analyses (Fig. 2), or as a basal subclade of the Hystricognathi clade by the SB analysis (Fig. 3). Within the phiocricetomyine clade, with the BTD approach there are also few changes regarding the position of some taxa, notably at the root nodes of
the clade, compared with the results of the cladistic and SB analyses. “Protophiomys” tunisiensis occupies here the basalmost position of the phiocricetomyine clade in place of Phenacophiomys as proposed by the cladistic and SB analyses. Phenacophiomys and “Neophiomys” paraphiomyoides form a succeeding clade to “P.” tunisiensis, rather than being positioned as successive basal branches in the results of the cladistic and SB analyses.

The large clade uniting the phiomyids, metphiomyines (plus here Thryonomys) and the gaudeamurids plus the two stem caviomorphs is here resolved hierarchically less highly nested within the Hystricognathi clade than in the results of the cladistic and SB analyses (Figs 2, 3). With the BTD approach (Fig. 4), this clade appears basal and at the same hierarchical level as the phiocricetomyine clade and the bugtimyid-protophiomyne-baluchimyine clade. As for the cladistic and SB results, gaudeamurids remain the African diverging group of the South American caviomorphs (gaudeamurids would be the African caviomorphs?), and together form a distinct clade, sister to the clade uniting “Protophiomys” durattalahensis, the different phiomyid taxa (the two species of Phiomys, Acritophiomys, and Turkanamys) and the metphiomyines (the two species of Metaphiomys) plus here Thryonomys (thryonomyids) (Fig. 4). These results do not support the monophyly of the phiomyids and metphiomyines, but this large subclade gathering “P.” durattalahensis, the “phiomyid” and “metphiomyine” taxa plus Thryonomys could represent here a more inclusive Phiomorpha clade than that deriving from the cladistic analyses, where only phiomyid taxa were considered as representing phiomorphs (Fig. 2). From the SB analysis (as here), “phiomyids” were not resolved as a monophyletic group (Fig. 3). Based on the cladistic and SB results, applying this more inclusive taxonomic association describing basal phiomorphs as suggested by the BTD results, would make the phiomorphs paraphyletic inasmuch as basal caviomorphs would then appear to be nested within that more inclusive phiomorph clade (Figs 2, 3; see previous discussions on cladistic and SB results).

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

The phylogenetic inferences deriving from the cladistic and Bayesian (SB and BTD) analyses are consistent for many taxonomic relationships, but they differ in some cases, notably in the
position of certain taxa, which are either considered as members of a given clade or outside that clade, but often remaining closely related to that given clade. The monophyly of some main taxonomic units (families and/or sub-families) is not systematically recovered when parsimony results are compared with Bayesian results. Therefore, establishing a precise and formal phylogenetic systematics of basal ctenohystrican rodents may appear somewhat premature. We must keep in mind that most of taxa sampled here are documented only by dental remains, most often by isolated teeth (not complete toothrows). In addition, some dental loci are simply not documented (not recovered or not fossilized). But such is the current nature of the fossil record for early representatives of the Ctenohystrica clade. However, although incomplete, these fossil data are crucial as they provide unique glimpses into the past diversity and evolution of that rodent group. The establishment of a phylogenetic context is a prerequisite for better understanding morphological transformation/evolution, and for identifying homoplasies. We must keep in mind that the phylogenetic relationships proposed here represent current hypotheses, based on palaeontological data available today and on the dataset we have assembled and employed. This dataset will certainly grow and will be modified as the knowledge of early ctenohystrican rodents accumulates. For these reasons, we do not provide here a fixed systematics of early ctenohystricans, but underscore the main groups and main relationships that seems to emerge from these phylogenetic assessments of the dental evidence. The names proposed on the main groups (former names or new declination, and new ones; Figs 2-4, Appendix S2) are only indicative of possible future formalization of families and/or subfamilies, which would be tested by additional morphological supports.

The phylogenetic approaches employed here separate the numerous “ctenodactyloid” taxa as tamquammyids, “yuomyids”, chapattimyids, gobiomyids and “ctenodactyloids” incertae sedis, from taxa so far recognized as early hystricognaths and forming the Hystricognathi clade (i.e., all Palaeogene African and Asian taxa, plus Canaanimys and Cachiyacuy, the two early South American taxa). The latter clade is nested within the “Ctenodactyloidea”, thereby making this superfamily paraphyletic (“ctenodactyloids”). Particularly interesting is the phylogenetic position of the two Asian species of Dianomys (D. obscuratus and D. qujingensis), which led us to envisage a taxonomic enlargement regarding the basal content of the Hystricognathi clade. These two species were originally considered as representatives of the Yuomyidae (Wang, 1984), than subsequently to the Ctenodactyloidea, without familial attribution (Wang, 2001). From the results of our cladistic analyses (Fig. 2) and BTD analysis
(Fig. 4), these two species form a clade closely related to the Asian taxa (*Ottomania*, *Confiniummys*, and other basal “baluchimyines”) considered as basal members of the Hystricognathi clade. From the results of the SB analysis (Fig. 3), they form a clade nested within the Hystricognathi clade (closely related to the same aforementioned Asian taxa considered as early hystricognaths). Given these phylogenetic results, a reconsideration of the systematic status of *Dianomys*, i.e., stem Hystricognathi (rather than “Ctenodactyloidea”), can be envisaged. Furthermore, as the two species of *Dianomys* always form a distinct clade, they could be recognized as representing a distinct family (i.e., Dianomyidae) of stem hystricognaths. We will evaluate the Hystricognathi taxonomic option for *Dianomys* later in the text, through a detailed comparative examination of its dental morphology and the possible chewing movements associated. The dental morphology and chewing pattern of other taxa such as *Anadianomys*, *Xueshimys* and *Gobiomys*, also occupying a phylogenetic position close to the Hystricognathi clade (Fig. 2), will be scrutinized as well.

**HYSTRICOGNATHY VS Masticatory Apparatus within Ctenohystrica**

Given that the Hystricognathi clade is nested within the paraphyletic radiation of the Eocene “ctenodactyloids”, and considering the close phylogenetic relationships between modern Ctenodactylidae+Diatomyidae (Ctenodactylomorphi) and Hystricognathi (e.g., Dawson et al., 2006; Huchon et al., 2007; Fabre et al., 2015), the morphological differentiation of hystricognathous jaws derives *de facto* from the primitive sciurognathous condition. This is a somewhat simplistic view from a macroevolutionary perspective, inasmuch as the hystricognathy is not a unique character defined by the apparent lateral displacement of the angular process of the mandible, but a suite of morpho-anatomical attributes of the whole masticatory apparatus. Furthermore, among modern hystricognaths, the lateralization of the angular process is shaped differently from one family (sub-family) to another, and diverse morphotypes exist as a result (e.g., Vassalo & Verzi, 2001; Hautier et al., 2011). The other characters associated to the lateralization of the angular process and its multiple morphotypes are notably the position and shape of the mandibular condyles (generally occupying a low to moderately high position with respect to the occlusal tooth plane, i.e., above of the toothrow; Vassalo & Verzi, 2001; Hautier et al., 2011), the correlated arrangements/developments of the masticatory muscles (notably masseter and internal pterygoid muscles), and various dental
patterns (see below). All of these morpho-anatomical features are related to the mechanics of
the masticatory apparatus for performing primarily oblique chewing movements, but also
other types of movements (e.g., Butler, 1980, 1985; Vassalo & Verzi, 2001; Hautier et al.,
2010, 2011). Further extant Hystricognathi indisputably form a natural group supported by a
corpus of morphological and molecular data, but that clade does not rely chiefly on the
recognition of the “hystricognathous” condition of their mandible. Modern caviid
omorphs for instance, although classified among the hystricognathous rodents, display a
mandible that is very similar to that of some sciurognathous rodents (Hautier et al., 2011).
Indeed, their mandibles are characterized by a weak lateralization of the angular process, by a
lower position of the mandibular condyles with respect to the tooth plane (compared to other
cavoids and other hystricognaths [i.e., phiomorphs and hystricids]), and they bear high
crowned teeth with flat occlusal surfaces, resulting in a chewing mode unusual among
hystricognaths (i.e., nearly propalinal mastication rather than oblique; see Vassalo & Verzi,
2001; Hautier et al., 2010, 2011). It is clear that the inclusion of caviids within the
Hystricognathi clade relies on characters other than that of the mandibular morphology.

DENTAL PATTERNS OF EARLY “CTENODACTYLOIDS” AND CHEWING MOVEMENTS

From an evolutionary palaeontological perspective, the morphological differentiation of
hystricognathous jaws (or sciurognathous-hystricognathous switching) may imply gradual
modifications of the whole masticatory apparatus and its mechanics though time,
modifications which were constrained by the need of preserving continuously efficient dental
occlusion. Molars of early “ctenodactyloids” (e.g., chapattimyids, “yuomyids”,
tamquammyids/ctenodactylids, or “ctenodactyloids” incertae sedis; see Fig. 5A-D) were
cuspidate (bearing bulbous cusps and cuspids) and low crested (when crests and cristids are
present). Upper molars have generally a strong and rounded protocone, a moderately
developed and rounded hypocone (smaller than the protocone), well-defined and strong
paracone and metacone, and bear prominent, even inflated conules (especially the
metaconule; Fig. 5A-D). The mesialmost and distalmost transverse crests are not elevated and
trenchant, remaining at a stage of cingulum (not loph), the metaloph is discreet, often limited
to a short and low buccal branch (situated between the metacone and the metaconule), and its
lingual branch being either absent (Fig. 5B) or often very thin and incomplete (from the
metaconule, it reaches or does not reach the protocone; Fig. 5A, C-E). The same is true for the
protoloph, which is low and often incomplete (buccal part between the protoconule and the
paracone, often absent; Fig. 5B). The protoloph can also be complete and transverse (links the
paracone to the protocone) when the protoconule is reduced to absent, but it remains relatively
low compared to the height of the main cusps (Fig. 5A, C-D). The anterior arm of the
hypocone is low, thin, short or moderately long, and always longitudinal, i.e., directed toward
the distal flank of the protocone or its short posterior outgrowth (thereby forming an
endoloph; Fig. 5A-D). With this configuration of the protocone and the hypocone with its
anterior arm, there is no internal sinus (no hypoflexus), and the lingual margin of upper teeth
is walled-off. Only a shallow groove is present, formed by the coalescence of the distal flank
of the protocone with the mesial flank of the hypocone. Lower molars also exhibit well-
defined and rounded main cuspids (metaconid, protoconid, entoconid and hypoconid, and
often a well-marked hypoconulid), and the main transverse cristids (metalophulid I,
metalophulid II, hypolophid, and posterolophid) are thin and low with respect to the cuspid
height, and often incomplete or absent (notably the hypolophid and metalophulid II). The
longitudinal cristids (ectolophid and posterior arm of the metaconid) are thin, often short,
mesially interrupted and not trenchant (Fig. 5A-D). The dental pattern of early
“ctenodactyloids” is basically comparable to that characterizing other primitive rodents such
as the Eocene ichyromyids and paramyids (members of the Ichyromyiformes clade, sensu
Marivaux et al., 2004a). For those latter basal rodents, in comparing the attrition facets with
those of extant sciurids, which harbour a primitive ichyromyoid-like dental pattern, Butler
(1980, 1985) suggested that the lower jaw movements in these fossils were more or less
transverse, and chewing involved a two-phase movement (“Grade A” sensu Butler, 1985:
383): firstly, lower molars pass medially across the upper in a relatively transverse direction
(buccal phase), then obliquely forward (lingual phase). Given the dental pattern similarities
between early ichyromyiforms and early ctenohystricans (bunodont, and low or not crested
upper and lower teeth), it may be then expected that early “ctenodactyloids” had similar or
close chewing patterns (i.e., two-phase type), with a marked forward component in the lingual
phase.

**DENTAL PATTERNS OF EARLY HYSTRICOGNATHS AND CHEWING MOVEMENTS**
If we analyse the dental transformations through the cladogram obtained here (Fig. 2), and notably those of the branches and nodes corresponding to the early offshoots of the Hystricognathi clade, we can report a suite of dental traits that allows for a clear distinction of early hystricognaths from within early “ctenodactyloids”. Basically, the dental patterns of early hystricognaths (Fig. 5) are much more crested, display less protruding main cusps and cuspids, the conules decrease in size and can disappear (they become indistinct, being subsumed within transverse crests, or lost), some crests and cristids change orientation and connection, and additional transverse and longitudinal crests and cristids can appear. These changes in cusp (-id) and crest (cristid) developments and arrangements were likely associated to a significant change in the masticatory movements though time. On upper teeth, the anterior and posterior crests are much more elevated than in “ctenodactyloids”, appearing as loph (anteroloph and posteroloph, respectively). The anterior arm of the hypocone is better differentiated, it increases in length, and is displaced toward the centre of the crown (oblique, mesiobuccally oriented). In some taxa, the mesial extremity of the anterior arm of the hypocone reaches the short and relictual lingual metaloph or enterocrest (Fig. 5J-K, M), or can directly connect to the reduced metaconule, which is slightly displaced mesially (e.g., Fig. 5L, N-X). In the latter case, the lingual metaloph is lost. In contrast, due to the slight mesial displacement and size reduction of the metaconule, but also the slight reduction in size of the metacone, the buccal metaloph is much more differentiated. It forms a well-defined transverse or slightly oblique crest, the lingual extremity of which can remain free (without connection; Fig. 5W-X), or can connect either to the metaconule (Fig. 5J-N, S, V) or connected backward to the posteroloph (Fig. 5O-P). Some taxa display a double connection of the metaloph (metaconule + posteroloph; Fig. 5Q-R, T). In more advanced hystricognath taxa, a short longitudinal crest can appear from the metaconule or from the mesialmost extremity of the anterior arm of the hypocone (when the metaconule is lost). This longitudinal crest, called mure (Fig. 1), can reach mesially the protoloph (Fig. 5L, P-U), and together, with the oblique anterior arm of the hypocone and the hypocone itself (slightly mesiodistally compressed), hence provide additional cutting edges. The same is true with the protocone, which becomes slightly mesiodistally compressed and obliquely oriented, and develops a more or less long posterior outgrowth, thereby forming an oblique ridge (Fig. 5L, N-W). In some taxa (on the M1 of Ottomania proavita, on the M2 of Protophiomys algeriensis, P. aegyptensis and Waslamys attiai, and on the molars of Baluchimys krabiense; Fig. 5J, K, M), the posterior outgrowth of the protocone can be long with an unusual distobuccal orientation, and connects to the anterior arm of the hypocone. Except for the latter taxa, in the other early
hystricognaths, the mesiodistally compressed and oblique protocone and hypocone are no more in connection, and are separated by a valley (i.e., internal sinus or hypoflexus; Fig. 1). From the metaconule or, if the latter is no more distinct, at the mesial extremity of the anterior arm of the hypocone (i.e., the location where a metaconule would normally occur), an additional transverse crest, the mesolophule (Fig. 1), variably develops among taxa (Fig. 5J-T, X). This new crest can reach in some cases the buccal margin of the crown (connected or not to a mesostyle or a short mesoloph; Fig. 1). Lower molars also display important modifications. In addition to the development of stronger and higher transverse (metalophulid I, hypolophid, and posterolophid) and longitudinal (ectolophid and posterior arm of the metaconid) cristids, the buccal cuspids (protoconid and hypoconid), are mesiodistally compressed and somewhat mesio-distolingually oriented, thereby forming oblique and parallel ridges. The anterior arm of the hypoconid is well defined and can be long, joining both the buccal extremity of the hypolophid and the distal branch of the ectolophid (Figs 1, 5). The ectolophid tends to be centrally displaced, and together with the oblique protoconid and hypoconid ridges, plus the anterior arm of the hypoconid, they delimit a wide external valley (i.e., sinusid or hypoflexid; Fig. 1). The posterior arm of the protoconid is variably developed in length. In some cases, it can reach the lingual margin of the crown, thereby forming a complete and trenchant transverse cristid (= metalophulid II), but often it remains moderately developed (short), and may be limited to a short buccal spur. An accessory central cristid (mesolophid or neomesolophid, or both; Fig. 1 and Fig. 5J, L, Q, S-U) can also occur in some taxa.

All these numerous apparent changes in the dental morphology can be only appreciated when fossils are placed in their temporal and phylogenetic contexts. Considering the changes on upper molars, characterized notably by the addition of a central crest (mesolophule), the presence of a better differentiated metaloph, a stronger protoloph, the development of elevated and trenchant anteroloph and posteroloph, associated with the development of stronger and equally elevated ectolophid, metalophulid I, hypolophid and posterolophid (and sometimes metalophulid II and neo/mesolophid) on lower molars, it is obvious that such incremental dental transformations, whatever their configuration (i.e., various morphotypes across species), have progressively increased the efficiency of the grinding function during the lingual phase of chewing (involving oblique forward movements of the lower jaw). For most species documented here (Fig. 5G-T, V-W), only the paracone and metacone on upper molars, and the metaconid and entoconid on lower molars, although reduced, still rise above
from the plane of these grinding surfaces of upper and lower teeth. This recalls Butler’s (1985) “Grade B”, performed by rodents having upper and lower teeth developing crests and cristids, with protocone and hypocone on upper molars, and protoconid and hypoconid on lower molars tending to form oblique ridges, the whole providing an increased grinding function of teeth, whereas buccal cusps on upper molars and lingual cuspsids on lower molars, still standing up to the plane of the grinding surfaces. For this “Grade B”, Butler (1985) noticed that the buccal phase movement is more oblique than in “Grade A”, tending to line up with the oblique forward lingual phase movement. Butler (1985) also described “Grade C”, when the entire crown surface forms a flattened grinding area (i.e., by reduction in height of the upstanding buccal cusps on upper molars and lingual cuspsids on lower molars). In the latter case, chewing is simplified to a single oblique movement, and the teeth usually become hypsodont (as observed for instance in different species of Gaudeamus; Fig. 5U).

EMERGENCE OF THE HYSTRICOGNATHY

The acquisition of a pentalophodont pattern (notably on upper molars) and other anatomical details (see above) increasing the efficiency of the grinding function of teeth, associated with a modified chewing action involving primarily oblique movements, have likely also implied re-arrangements/developments of the masticatory muscles (notably masseter and internal pterygoid muscles). Greaves (1980) showed that maintaining oblique chewing movements of the mandible requires a high position of the articular joint (condyles), above the occlusal plane of the toothrow. Extant hystricognaths (except some cavioids) have indeed mandibular condyles occupying a moderately high position with respect to the occlusal plane of lower molars (Vassalo & Verzi, 2001; Hautier et al., 2011). The posterior part of the dentary is rarely preserved in early hystricognaths for which the mandible is documented, but based on dental morphology, we show that enhanced oblique chewing movements are expected in the early representatives of the infraorder, thereby suggesting a relatively high position of the mandibular condyles in these extinct early forms. The few partially preserved dentary specimens of Acritophiomys bowni, Gaudeamus aslius and G. hylaeus (latest Eocene, Egypt; Sallam et al., 2011, 2012) or Metaphiomys schaubi and Neophiomys paraphyoides (early Oligocene, Egypt; Wood, 1968), indeed displayed condyles situated well above the occlusal tooth plane. In modern hystricognath taxa (except in some cavioids), a moderately high
position of the condyles has been interpreted as enhancing the medial force component of the masseter and pterygoid muscles, acting hence against their lateral force component (Greaves, 1980; Hautier et al., 2010, 2011). From palaeontological and biomechanical perspectives, the decrease of the lateral component of these muscle forces could have been linked to (or could have involved) the lateralization of the angular process of the mandible (Hautier et al., 2011).

The case of some cavioids, which show a very weak lateralization of the angular process (being rather distally positioned) and a lower position of the mandibular condyles with respect to the occlusal tooth plane (compared to other caviomorphs and other hystricognaths [i.e., phiomorphs and hystricids]) indicate examples of evolutionary reversals (see Hautier et al., 2011). Caviids display a very specialized dentition characterized by high crowned teeth (euhypsodonts) with flat occlusal surfaces, and associated with chewing movements not oblique but nearly propalinal (i.e., anteroposterior; Vassalo & Verzi, 2001). Butler (1985) described this derived mode of mastication as “Grade D”, wherein individual relations between upper and lower teeth are lost. These chewing movements are associated with an increase of the antero-posterior component of the masseter and internal pterygoid muscle forces (Vassalo & Verzi, 2001; Hautier et al., 2010). Among Ctenohystrica, anteroposterior masticatory movements (i.e., nearly propalinal mastication) are also observed in extant Ctenodactylidae, which display a sciurognathous mandible with indeed condyles occupying a low position compared to the occlusal tooth plane. They also bear high crowned teeth with flat occlusal surfaces, thereby suggesting loss of the individual relations between upper and lower teeth. Such a specialized dental pattern was already achieved in early Miocene forms, although much lower crowned, such as Prosayimys and Sayimys (e.g., Baskin, 1996; López-Antonanzas et al., 2004, 2016; López-Antonanzas & Knoll, 2011). Early to middle Eocene tamquammyids, which are commonly regarded as the early representatives of the Ctenodactylidae lineage, likely performed a chewing mode with a two-phase movement (see discussion above). In more advanced members of that lineage, notably in Oligocene forms (e.g., Tataromys, Yindirtemys, Karakoromys; Wang, 1997; Schmidt-Kittler et al., 2007; Vianey-Liaud et al., 2006), based on the direction of the attrition facets observed on several specimens, Vianey-Liaud et al. (2006) noted that oblique movements could have been performed in some species (e.g., Tataromys sigmodon, Yindirtemys ulantatalensis). Basically, Oligocene ctenodactylid species were moderately low crowned, still slightly cuspidate (in early stages of wear) and not strongly crested. However, these species never developed a pentalophodont dental pattern, the buccal cusps on upper teeth and lingual cusps on lower
teeth appear mesiodistally compressed and form ridges in continuity with the transverse crests and cristids, and they do not stand out distinctly after wear. In fact, in these fossil taxa, the grinding area occupied nearly the entire occlusal surface of the crowns, a configuration which could then roughly correspond to “Grade B” or even “Grade C” modes of chewing defined by Butler (1985). Although a detailed study of attrition facets should be made on ctenodactylids, it appears that this group of ctenohystricican rodents likely achieved rapidly a “Grade D” mode of chewing with anteroposterior movements. During the Eocene epoch, their dental pattern was rapidly specialized and clearly distinct from that of the early hystricognaths, which would indicate an ancient divergence between these two groups (as estimated by gene-based phylogenies; e.g., Fabre et al., 2012). In that context, it is clear that the “Grade D” mode of mastication observed in extant ctenodactylids and extant caviids resulted from an adaptive convergence.

Finally, among ctenohystricans, diatomyids are particularly interesting for pointing out the difficulty/ambiguity in the recognition of the mandible condition (sciurognathous versus hystricognathous). Laonastes, the only extant representative of that family was initially recognized as a member of the Hystricognathi clade, based on morpho-anatomy and mitochondrial sequences (Laonastidae sensu Jenkins et al., 2005). However, based on fossil evidence, notably dental evidence, Laonastes was subsequently considered as the unique extant relative of the Diatomyidae (Dawson et al., 2006), an Asian “ctenodactyloid” family (formerly believed as extinct), among which the Miocene forms (Diatomys) display a sciurognathous mandible with low condyles (Dawson et al., 2010). Additional nuclear gene-based phylogenetic assessments on Laonastes (Huchon et al., 2007) have corroborated the non-Hystricognathi status of that taxon, and supported a close phylogenetic relationship between the Diatomyidae and the Ctenodactylidae (Ctenodactylomorphi). Interestingly, the mandible of Laonastes, in addition to its own characteristics, exhibits a combination of intermediate features between sciurognathous and hystricognathous morphologies, associated with a strong tendency to anteroposterior masticatory movements (see Hautier et al., 2011: 7-8). The mandible of Laonastes, like that of Diatomys, has indeed low condyles and bears highly crowned cheek teeth with some degree of transverse bilophodonty, without individual occlusal relations between upper and lower teeth (flat occlusal crown; i.e., “Grade D” of Butler, 1985). Such a dental specialization was acquired very early in the diatomyid lineage, as demonstrated by its early representatives documented from the early Oligocene (Fallomus; Flynn et al., 1986; Marivaux & Welcomme, 2003; Marivaux et al., 2004b; Flynn, 2007;
Marković et al., 2018) and possibly from the late middle Eocene (Dawson et al., 2010). These early diatomyids show much lower crowned teeth, bearing bulbous and buccolingually coalescent cusps and cuspids with discreet crests and cristids, forming transverse lobes in early stages of wear. The inclusion of early diatomyids, i.e., the different species of Fallomus, within the matrix for the cladistic analyses, suggests affinities of the group with gobiomyids (not shown here). However, these phylogenetic relationships are unstable and poorly supported given the meagre character scoring related to their simplified dental morphology. Regrettably, these Palaeogene diatomyid fossils are known only by isolated teeth, which does not allow for a detailed analysis of the dentary morphology. As underscored by Hautier et al. (2011), given the peculiar mandibular morphology of the living Laonastes, which exhibits an original combination of features considered as intermediate between sciurognathous and hystricognathous morphologies, mandibles of these early diatomyids would certainly contribute to further our understanding of this morphological transition.

**EARLIEST STEM HYSTRICOGNATHS OR PRE-HYSTRICOGNATHOUS “CTENODACTYLOIDS”**

Thanks to available fossil evidence in a phylogenetic context, we have pointed out the main structural changes in the dental patterns differentiating early “ctenodactyloids” (i.e., Asian chapattimyids, “yuomyids”, tamquammyids/ctenodactylids, or “ctenodactyloids” incertae sedis) from early hystricognaths (see discussion above). Therefore, we focus here on taxa, such as Dianomys (Fig. 5H-I), Anadianomys (Fig. 5G), and eventually Gobiomys (Fig. 5F) and Xueshimys (Fig. 5E), which are very close to the taxa considered as belonging to the Hystricognathi clade (cladistic results; Fig. 2) based on compatible dental pattern (i.e., “baluchimyines”). The case of the late Eocene Dianomys is particularly interesting inasmuch as the dental pattern of its two referred species (D. qujingensis and D. obscuratus; Fig. 5H-I) includes anatomical details (and tendencies) that are otherwise found only in hystricognathous rodents. Indeed, the main cusps and cuspids are not bulbous, notably the protocone and hypocone on upper molars, and the protoconid and hypoconid on lower molars. These cusps and cuspids are rather mesiodistally compressed and obliquely positioned, thereby appearing as oblique ridges in continuity with the transverse crests and cristids. The two latter are particularly well defined and moderately high (i.e., not as high as the apices of the main cusps and cuspids), and form lophs and lophids (upper molars: anteroloph, protoloph, metaloph, and
posteroloph; lower molars: metalophulid I, metalophulid II [or composite cristid; see after], hypolophid, and posterolophid). On upper molars, the anterior arm of the hypocone is well defined and moderately long, appearing elevated (as high as the transverse crests), slightly oblique (not distomesially oriented), and not connected to the distal flank of the protocone (as observed in “ctenodactyloids”). Due to its obliquity, it connects to a short and somewhat relictual lingual metaloph (see below), and in some cases it further connects to the distal extremity of a thin and distobuccally oriented posterior outgrowth of the protocone. The latter is variably developed in length, and often absent on M2 and M3 (especially in \textit{D. qujingensis}; see Wang, 2001: plates I and II). Its absence generates a proverse internal sinus (hypoflexus), the mesial and distal margins of which are formed by the protocone ridge and the hypocone ridge plus its oblique anterior arm (M2 and M3 of \textit{D. qujingensis}; Fig. 5H). \textbf{When the sinus is present, it remains open buccally (transversally open) due to the absence of longitudinal mure.}

In the middle of the occlusal surface, a small, somewhat discreet (faintly visible) metaconule is present, but the latter is still distally positioned as in “ctenodactyloids”, rather than displaced mesiolingually as in hystricognaths. The metaconule is buccally connected to a thin but well-defined and moderately long buccal metaloph, and lingually to the lingual branch of the metaloph. The latter is not directed toward the protocone and connected to it as in “ctenodactyloids”, but (as we already mentioned above) is connected to the mesial extremity of the anterior arm of the hypocone (as observed on the M1 of \textit{Ottomania} or the M1 and M2 of \textit{Baluchimys krabiense}; Fig. 5J-K). Interestingly, in some upper molars referred to \textit{D. qujingensis} (Fig. 5H), the metaconule is rather mesiodistally compressed, and in some specimens (see Wang, 2001: Plate II) it bears a short spur originating from its buccomesial aspect. This spur is buccally directed and corresponds here to an incipient mesolophule. The presence of this neocrest, although discreet, illustrates a first step toward the development of a pentalophodont pattern, as that characterizing subsequent early hystricognaths (Fig. 5J-T).

The configuration of the anterior arm of the hypocone (well-defined, long, and slightly obliquely oriented) and of the protocone (oblique, with the development of a short posterior outgrowth), the presence of a lingual branch of the metaloph linking the mesial extremity of the anterior arm of the hypocone (not the protocone), and the appearance in some specimens of an internal sinus, also illustrate early stages toward the dental pattern characterizing upper molars of hystricognaths. Lower molars also exhibit features compatible with the conditions characterizing early hystricognaths. This is particularly shown in their marked lophate pattern characterized by the development of trenchant and elevated transverse (metalophulid I and II, hypolophid, and posterolophid) and longitudinal (ectolophid) cristids, and more discreet
buccal cuspids (protoconid and hypoconid), which are mesiodistally compressed, appearing as parallel oblique ridges. These two transformed buccal cuspids, together with the complete, centrally displaced and high ectolophid, delimit a large and deep external sinusid (= hypoflexid; Fig. 1). The hypoconulid is also much more discreet, being mesiodistally compressed and virtually entirely subsumed within the posterolophid. The second transverse cristid is particularly well developed and buccolingually complete. The configuration and composition of this cristid are interesting inasmuch as they recall those observed in lower molars of *Ottomania* (Fig. 5J), *Phiomys* (Fig. 5Q), *Acritophiomys* (Fig. 5R), *Gaudeamus* (Fig. 5U), and of the stem caviomorphs *Cachiyacuy* (Fig. 5T) and *Canaanimys* (Fig. 5S), although across these taxa, these conditions were likely achieved iteratively. Similarly in *Dianomys* (Fig. 5H-I), the second transverse cristid is in fact composed of two joint branches, one corresponding to a short posterior arm of the protoconid, the other corresponding to a moderately long neomesolophid (stemming from a mesostylid; Fig. 1). In sum, *Dianomys* exhibits a composite dental pattern combining “ctenodactyloid” features with several characters illustrating early stages of early hystricognaths. Given its transitional dental morphology, which reflects its transitional phylogenetic position, for us *Dianomys* can accordingly be regarded as a stem Hystricognathi, representing an early offshoot of that clade. Although *Dianomys* was originally attributed to the Yuomyidae (Wang, 1984), de Bruijn (1986) suggested possible affinities of this Asian Eocene taxon with the African Phiomyidae (but without a detailed comparison of the few available isolated teeth). In her study of additional fossil material attributed to *Dianomys qujingensis*, Wang (2001: 39, fig. 1) reported a fragment of mandible that she described as sciurognathous. If the observation of Wang is correct, and if our phylogenetic assumption regarding *Dianomys* makes sense (i.e., stem Hystricognathi; Figs 2-4), then *Dianomys* could illustrate a case where the morphology of the mandible is still not sufficiently differentiated for describing a hystricognathous condition. The combination of intermediate dental features characterizing *Dianomys* teeth, probably illustrates a transitional masticatory pattern between the “Grade A” and “Grade B” described by Butler (1980, 1985). This transitional pattern would not yet have involved a marked transformation of the dentary bone (lateralization of the angular process). The distal part of the *Dianomys* mandible is not preserved, which prevents any indication regarding the position of the condyles. However, given the dental pattern including well-developed transverse crests and cristids, and the configuration of the lingual cusps and buccal cuspids (mesiodistally compressed and oblique), it may be expected that the chewing movements included a marked oblique component, thereby suggesting that the mandibular condyles had a rather high
position with respect to the occlusal tooth plane. Therefore, it should be particularly interesting to analyse in detail the attrition facets of the dental material available for the two species of *Dianomys*, to assess if they showed a tendency to increased oblique masticatory movements.

The late middle Eocene *Anadianomys* (*A. declivis*; Fig. 5G; Tong, 1997: plate IX 17-22) from China is clearly much less advanced morphologically than *Dianomys*, in having bulbous cusps and cuspsids (not mesiodistally compressed), very low anterior and posterior crests of upper molars (being still at a cingulum state), a well-defined metaconule, which is slightly mesially displaced, but nearly twinned with the metaconid, thereby making the buccal metaloph virtually indistinct. In contrast, the lingual metaloph, stemming from the metaconule, is short, low but well defined, and not strictly directed toward the protocone apex, but slightly displaced distally toward the distal extremity of a short, gently sloping and buccodistally oriented (slightly oblique) posterior outgrowth of the protocone (Fig. 5G, but also see Tong, 1997: plate IX 18-19, 22). The protoloph is complete, slightly arcuate and relatively elevated (trenchant). The anterior arm of the hypocone is particularly well marked, being long, moderately high and slightly buccally displaced/mesiobuccally oriented (i.e., slightly oblique). The latter reaches the distal extremity of the posterior outgrowth of the protocone, near the lingual extremity of the lingual metaloph. There is no hypoflexus, but the lingual margin of the crown is markedly grooved due to the slightly distobuccal orientation of the posterior outgrowth of the protocone and of the slight obliquity of the anterior arm of the hypocone. The lower molars have also protruding cuspsids. The cristids are present, complete (metalophulid I, hypolophid, posterolophid, and ectolophid), but moderately elevated, and the protoconid and hypoconid are not obliquely positioned. In sum, the dental pattern of *Anadianomys* is far from that of early hystricognathous rodents or even *Dianomys*, but few characters such as the development and orientation of the anterior arm of the hypocone, the orientation of the lingual metaloph, and the position of the metaconule are not “ctenodactyloid” dental features, but rather tendencies toward early stages characterizing teeth of early hystricognaths and *Dianomys*. *Anadianomys* may document a lineage close to the emergence of the Hystricognathi clade. Additional palaeontological data documenting this taxon would be critical for better understanding the morphological transformation and chewing mode involved, illustrating an early step toward the differentiation of hystricognaths.

The Gobiomyidae (*Gobiomys exigus* and *G. neimongolensis*; Fig. 5F) and *Xueshimys dissectus* (Fig. 5E) form a clade in our cladistic phylogenetic results (Fig. 2), appearing as the
closest out-group of the Hystricognathi clade plus *Anadianomys*. In contrast, following the standard Bayesian phylogenetic inferences (Fig. 3), the Gobiomyidae are nested within the “ctenodactyloid” radiation, closely related to the “Yuomyidae” and the Chapattimyidae, whereas *Xueshimys* is sister to *Anadianomys*. From the tip-dating Bayesian inferences (Fig. 4), the Gobiomyidae appear closely related to *Xueshimys*, and together form a clade sister to the clade uniting *Anadianomys* and *Protataromys*. This large clade is rooted by *Stelmomys*, and is nested within the “ctenodactyloid” radiation, appearing hierarchically lower due to the presence of “yuomyids” (*Petrokozlovia* and *Yuomys*) occupying an unexpected and surprising position, sister to the Hystricognathi clade (Fig. 4). Gobiomyidae and *Xueshimys*, as *Anadianomys*, display upper molars with bulbous cusps, with crests (anterior and posterior, protoloph and metaloph) somewhat more elevated, and bear on some specimens a well-marked metaconule (see Wang, 2001: plates I and II; Tong, 1997: plate IX 1-8). However, upper molars do not display a well-defined anterior arm of the hypocone, and the lingual metaloph is often absent. Lower molars display also bulbous cusps, without noticeable mesiodistal compression of the protoconid and hypoconid, and the cristids, notably the hypolophid, are often low and incomplete. On *Gobiomys exigus*, the ectolophid is incomplete (does not reach the protoconid), and a well-defined mesoconid is still present (Fig. 1). *Gobiomys neimongolensis* is documented by a mandible described as sciurognathous (Wang, 2001: plate 12), the distal part of which is preserved but broken at the level of the condyle. Despite this breakage, based on the preserved portion, it can be expected that the condyle was relatively low with respect to the occlusal tooth plane, a position which indicates in turn that oblique chewing movements were probably rather limited in this taxon. The pattern of attrition recalls that of early “ctenodactyloids” (e.g., tamquammyids, yuomyids, and chapattimyids), rather indicating more or less transverse chewing movements. Given their dental morphology and their phylogenetic position (cladistic results; Fig. 2), the Gobiomyidae and *Xueshimys* are therefore considered here as pre-hystricognathous “ctenodactyloids” (Fig. 5E-F).

Finally, we consider a unique specimen (Fig. 6) published by Hussain *et al.* (1978: 100, Plate 6, fig. 9) as M2 of “Saykanomys” *sondaari* (i.e., *Birbalomys sondaari* sensu Kumar *et al.*, 1997). In its original description, this specimen was recognized as “aberrant”, and the authors did not exclude the possibility that it could represent a different taxon. The occlusal pattern of this unique upper molar from the middle Eocene of Pakistan (Kala Chitta Range, Punjab) clearly illustrates for us a distinct genus, and besides, undoubtedly outside of the
Chapattimyidae. In its less cuspidate main cusps, strongly oblique and long anterior arm of the hypocone that is connected to a reduced (not inflated), faintly visible metaconule, and in the long and well-defined metaloph, this tooth can be clearly set apart from chapattimyids (e.g., *Chapattimys*, *Birbalomys*, and *Basalomys*). In contrast, this suite of morphological details is observed in early taxa considered as basal hystricognaths (e.g., *Dianomys*, *Ottomania*, *Confiniummys*, *Baluchimys*, etc.). This tooth preserves a trace of the lingual metaloph, which is thin, very low, and linking the lingual aspect of the metaconule to the median part of the long posterior outgrowth of the protocone (Fig. 6). Although long and extending distally, the posterior outgrowth of the protocone does not reach the hypocone (damping distally), so the lingual margin is open lingually by a narrow and shallow notch. The posterior outgrowth of the protocone plus the oblique and long anterior arm of the hypocone generate an internal sinus (= hypoflexus; Fig. 1). There is no well-differentiated mure (only a small, very short and faintly visible longitudinal spur stemming from the metaconule), and the hypoflexus is open transversally, being only limited lingually by the relic of the lingual metaloph. The mesialmost transverse crest is still at a stage of cingulum (anterocingulum, not anteroloph), which remains not connected to the protocone. There is a narrow but still well-defined protoconule, which is connected to the lingual extremity of a moderately long buccal protoloph. Although the transverse crests are low, the tooth displays a clear tetralophodont pattern, without incipient pentalophodonty. There is, indeed, neither mesolophule nor mesoloph stemming from the metaconule and mesostyle, respectively. Their absence illustrates a dental pattern that appears evolutionarily less advanced compared to that characterizing early hystricognaths (*Dianomys*, *Ottomania*, *Confiniummys*, and *Baluchimys*).

Given the special morphology of this unique tooth (Fig. 6) and the antiquity of this taxon, additional fossil material would be particularly interesting for better appreciating its phylogenetic status. If this taxon is an early stem hystricognath, then its dental pattern and the associated masticatory mechanics could illustrate an early evolutionary stage of the masticatory apparatus differentiation of the group.

QUALITY OF THE ASIAN-AFRICAN FOSSIL RECORD OF EARLY HYSTRICOGNATHS

The strict consensus tree of the cladistic analyses (Fig. 2) was transposed onto a chronostratigraphical context (Fig. 7). First, regardless of the phylogenetic topology, a general
overview (direct reading) of the stratigraphic occurrences or extensions of known hystricognaths highlights a fossil record primarily concentrated over a time interval ranging from the early late Eocene to the late early Oligocene (Priabonian-Rupelian; see also Appendix S1). Only a few hystricognaths are documented in older strata: “Protophiomys” tunisiensis from Central Tunisia (Djebel el Kébar), found in deposits dated at ca. 39.5 Myr (41-38 Myr, late middle Eocene, early Bartonian; Marivaux et al., 2014a,b), and Canaanimys and Cachiyacuy (plus other taxa) from Peruvian Amazonia (Contamana), found in deposits dated ca. 41 Myr (42-40 Myr, early Bartonian, Barrancan South American Land Mammal Age; Antoine et al., 2012, 2016; Boivin et al., 2017a, 2019). These taxa from North Africa and South America are so far the oldest known hystricognaths. The incredible widespread geographic distribution of these taxa suggests a greater antiquity of the Hystricognathi clade, and an early diversification of the group, which would have occurred during a short time interval. This is graphically striking when we apply the phylogeny on the stratigraphic occurrences of known Palaeogene hystricognaths (Fig. 7). Based on the results of the cladistic analyses, the topology of the Hystricognathi clade and both the great antiquity and hierarchically high positions within that clade of “P.” tunisiensis and Canaanimys plus Cachiyacuy, imply numerous extensive ghost lineages, notably for the Asian basal and advanced “baluchimyines”, but also for the African protophiomyines, metaphiomyines, phiomyids, gaudeamurids, and phiocricetomyines. For all of these groups, the ghost lineages extend back to the middle middle Eocene (late Lutetian; Fig. 7), whereas their first known occurrence dates only from the late middle Eocene (early Bartonian; for phiocricetomyines), the early late Eocene (early Priabonian; for protophiomyines), the latest Eocene (latest Priabonian; for “baluchimyines”, phiomyids, and gaudeamurids), and the early Oligocene (early Rupelian; for bugtimyids and metaphiomyines). Gaps in the hystricognath fossil record are also observed when considering the datings of the internal nodes estimated by the Bayesian tip-dating analysis (BTD; Fig. 8) with the fossilized birth-death prior (taking into consideration the ages of related species, the rates of evolution, the phylogenetic relationships, and the patterns of speciation and fossilization). However, the root ages estimated for some hystricognath groups appear somewhat less ancient than those estimated from the cladistic phylogenetic results. Indeed, baluchimyines, protophiomyines and gaudeamurids are estimated to have originated during the early Bartonian (Fig. 8), while bugtimyids, phiocricetomyines as well as phiomorphs (such as taxonomically depicted by the BTD analysis) are estimated to have originated during the late Lutetian (Fig. 8).
Based on our phylogenetic results and dental pattern analyses, the two species of *Dianomys* (*D. obscuratus* and *D. qujingensis*) from China (Caijiachong; Wang, 1984, 2001) are considered here as basal members of the Hystricognathi clade. These two species come from deposits that are middle late Eocene in age (Ergilian Asian Land Mammal Age; Appendix S1). *Dianomys* increases our knowledge of the past diversity of early Asian hystricognaths, but given its age (if valid), it does not fill the gap of the Asian fossil record documenting ancient hystricognathous rodents in Asia. Indeed, given the age of the *Dianomys* clade and its position within the phylogeny, an extensive ghost lineage extending back to the middle middle Eocene is implied (middle Lutetian; Fig. 7). The dating of the origin of the *Dianomys* clade deriving from the BTD analysis provides a similar estimation, dating the root of this clade from the middle Lutetian (Fig. 8), thereby underscoring a nearly 10 Myr ghost lineage for this clade in Asia.

In summary, these results (deriving from cladistic and Bayesian tip-dating analyses) indicate that the origin of the Hystricognathi clade likely occurred ca. 45 Myr (middle Lutetian; Figs 7, 8; consistent with estimates deriving from molecular data; e.g., see Upham & Patterson, 2015), followed by a rapid radiation (high-level taxonomic diversification) of the group during the middle Eocene, and was associated with intercontinental dispersal events during this time window (see discussion after). Colonizations of large continents where strong rodent competitors were seemingly missing, might have involved rapid early diversifications (and morphological changes) associated with filling of open niche space (see Sallam & Seiffert, 2016: 3). However, despite these assumptions and a somewhat new vision regarding the timing of the emergence of hystricognaths and the internal distinct groups, it must be noted that this expected Eocene basal radiation of the group is still undocumented in Asia and scarcely documented in Africa and South America.

Remark: As discussed previously, the morphology of the unique tooth (Fig. 6) from the middle Eocene of Pakistan might illustrate an early stage of the dental pattern of hystricognaths. This taxon could then testify to a very ancient record of the groups in South Asia, but to be valid, this assumption requires further morphological support than current data allow. Even if this taxon is among the earliest members of the Hystricognathi clade, we must recognize that the Eocene fossil record of the apparent ancestral homeland (Asia) of hystricognathous rodents remains so far particularly under-documented.
PALAEOBIOGEOGRAPHIC IMPLICATIONS

Palaeontological data are scarce and often limited, but in association with an accurate temporal context, they reveal some aspects of the past evolutionary history of a group, and provide critical evidence and constraints regarding its historical biogeography. But understanding the macroevolutionary events and consequent palaeobiogeographic scenarios requires a phylogenetic context, which within a temporal context provides the baseline for any interpretations. Despite the incompleteness of the fossil record in Asia and Africa for early hystricognathous rodents (Figs 7, 8), the widespread Palaeogene geographic distribution of currently available fossil data from South Asia, North Africa and equatorial South America, testifies to the existence of intercontinental dispersals. However, whatever the phylogenetic inferences considered (deriving from cladistic or Bayesian analyses), the topologies imply a complex early historical biogeography of the group, notably between Asia and Africa. Based on these phylogenetic topologies (Figs 2-4), and using the parsimony optimization for reconstructing ancestral biogeographic states (under Mesquite 2.75; Maddison & Maddison, 2011), several alternative hypothetical scenarios of hystricognathous rodent dispersals between Asia and Africa can be envisaged. Considering an Asian origin of the Hystricognathi clade:

- Three African clades (i. protophiomyines, ii. Phiocricetomyines, and iii. “metaphiomyines-phiomyids-gaudeamurids-caviomorphs”; Figs 2-4) appear patchy nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation. This would imply the existence of multiple (at least three) unidirectional dispersals to Africa from Asia of the Asian ancestors of these three African clades (Fig. 9A and Fig. 10A, C; Appendix S8A, D, F);
- Two African clades (i. protophiomyines and ii. “phiocricetomyines-metaphiomyines-phiomyids-gaudeamurids-caviomorphs”) appear patchy nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation. In this case, at least two colonisations of Africa from Asia could be expected (Fig. 9B; Appendix S8B). However, in this context, one dispersal event occurred to Asia from Africa (considering here an African [taxon [ancestor of the Asian Lophibaluchia] colonizing Asia; interpretation deriving only from the results of the cladistic analyses);
- The African clades (plus some Asian clades*) form a monophyletic group, nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation. This view would imply only one dispersal event
to Africa from Asia of the Asian common ancestor of all African taxa (Fig. 9C and Fig. 10B, D; Appendix S8C, E, G). But in this context, the Asian clades* nested within the monophyletic African radiation (* i.e., bugtimyids and *Lophibaluchia* from the cladistic results [Fig. 9C; Appendix S8C]; bugtimyids and “baluchimyines-dianomyids” from the standard Bayesian results [Fig. 10B; Appendix S8E]; bugtimyids and baluchimyines from the Bayesian tip-dating results [Fig. 10D; Appendix S8G]) would have an African origin, thereby indicating at least two dispersal return events to Asia from Africa (see also Sallam & Seiffert, 2016).

Whatever the scenario considered, these dispersals between Asia and Africa seem to have occurred during the initial adaptive radiation of the group, i.e., during the middle middle Eocene and the late middle Eocene (late Lutetian – early Bartonian; see Figs 7, 8). Given that all Asian and African hystricognath taxonomic units seem to have emerged during this time interval, we would be then rather in favour of the hypothesis of multiple unidirectional dispersals from Asia to Africa of the Asian ancestors of at least three African clades (Fig. 9A and Fig. 10A, C; Appendix S8A, D, F). Indeed, it is hard to consider the possibility of several “round-trips” between Asia and Africa during this estimated time window (i.e., Asian origin of the African clades and African origin of some Asian clades [= quick back to Asia]; Fig. 9C and Fig. 10B, D; Appendix S8C, E, G). Dispersals from Africa toward South Asia at that time were, however, not impossible inasmuch as such a dispersal scenario (direction) is suggested for interpreting the Afro-Asian distribution of the late middle-early late Eocene anomaluroid rodents, based on the hypothesis of their ancient African antiquity (see Marivaux et al., 2005a, 2011, 2015, 2017b; Sallam et al., 2010; but see Coster et al., 2015b). As surprising as it might seem, it is worth noting that if ancestral Asian hystricognaths dispersed across the Tethys Sea to invade Africa sometime during the middle Eocene (Figs 7, 8), they were also able to continue their pattern of intercontinental dispersal across the Atlantic Ocean to colonize South America, perhaps only shortly before their first appearance in the fossil record there (i.e., *ca.* 41 Myr, late middle Eocene; Antoine et al., 2012; Antoine et al., 2016; Boivin et al., 2017a, 2019). The results of the Bayesian tip-dating analysis would suggest that the dispersal from Africa to South America of the ancestor of caviomorphs (including Gaudeamuridae) most likely occurred *ca.* 42-43 Myr (the Phiomorpha-Caviomorpha split would have occurred *ca.* 43-44 Myr; Fig. 8; consistent with estimates deriving from molecular data; e.g., see Upham & Patterson, 2015). However, although the time window during which
the Asio-African and Afro-South-American dispersals occurred seems to be better bracketed, the modalities and pathways of these dispersals remain unresolved. Interestingly, the historical biogeography of hystricognaths is strikingly similar and can be put in parallel with that of anthropoid primates, for which an Asian origin is also demonstrated (e.g., Beard et al., 1996; Jaeger et al., 1999; Beard, 2004, 2006, 2016; Beard & Wang, 2004; Marivaux et al., 2003, 2005b; Jaeger & Marivaux, 2005; Seiffert, 2012), associated with (several) dispersal(s) to Africa sometime during the middle Eocene (e.g., Jaeger et al., 2010b; Chaimanee et al., 2012; Marivaux et al., 2014b; Beard, 2016), then to South America (e.g., Bond et al., 2015; Marivaux et al., 2016). Today, many questions remain as to whether the colonization of Africa and South America by hystricognathous rodents and anthropoid primates took place synchronously or in a temporally staggered fashion (e.g., Chaimanee et al., 2012; Beard, 2016; Upham & Patterson, 2015 and references cited). The extensive marine barriers that separated Asia from Africa (e.g., Barrier et al., 2018), and Africa from South America (e.g., de Oliviera et al., 2009) at that time, and the absence of ecological continuity (land corridor) between each landmass as a result, have likely required “extraordinary” overwater dispersals (sweepstakes dispersal on natural rafts; e.g., Houle, 1998, 1999). Regardless of the modalities of these dispersals (that remain speculative), the success of the African and South American colonizations of anthropoid primates and hystricognathous rodents suggests that the three landmasses had very similar and favourable tropical palaeoenvironmental conditions at that time (at least South Asia, North Africa, and equatorial South America). Another critical question also remains as to whether the middle Eocene Climate Optimum (MECO; e.g., Zachos et al., 2008) recorded at ca. 40-41 Myr, might have played a role in these dispersals and/or in early diversifications in both Africa and South America of these two mammal groups (e.g., Antoine et al., 2012; Chaimanee et al., 2012; Marivaux et al., 2014a,b; Beard, 2016; Boivin et al., 2019). Many critical issues remain on the early evolution and historical biogeography of both groups, which should be highlighted by additional palaeontological and neontological evidence, and a better knowledge of the palaeoenvironmental constraints. Palaeontological field efforts must then be strongly sustained in the tropical regions of South Asia, Africa and South America in order to substantially document and further our understanding of the early evolutionary history and palaeodiversity of hystricognathous rodents, anthropoid primates and other groups.
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Figure legends

**Figure 1.** Dental terminology (updated and modified after Marivaux et al., 2004, 2014a, 2017a; Boivin & Marivaux, 2018). Abbreviations for upper teeth: Aah, anterior arm of the hypocone; Aam, anterior arm of the metacone; Al, anteroloph (or anterocingulum); Ay, anterostyle; H, hypocone; Hfx, hypoflexus; Lac, lingual anterocingulum; Lmel, lingual metaloph (= enterocrest); M, metacone; Mcu, metaconule; Mel, buccal metaloph; Mel (+), buccal metaloph and its possible lingual connections (+); Msfx, mesoflexus; Ms, mesostyle; Msl, Mesoloph; Msul, mesolophule; Mr, mure; P, protocone; Pa, paracone; Pafx, paraflexus; Pap, posterior arm of the paracone; Pcu, protoconule; Pop, posterior outgrowth of the protocone (Pop + longitudinal Aah = endoloph); Prl, protoloph; Psfx, posteroflexus; Psl, posteroloph; Py, paraastyle. Abbreviations for lower teeth: Aahd, anterior arm of hypoconid; Acd, anterocingulid; Ad, anteroconid, Afxd, anteroflexid (= paraflexid); Ecd, ectolophid (Ecd mesial + Ecd distal); Et, entoconid; Hd, hypoconid; Hfxd, hypoflexid; Hld, hypolophid (= entolophid); Hud, hypoconulid; Med, mesoconid; Md, metaconid; Med. I, metalophulid I (= ancestral paralophid); Med. II, metalophulid II (= protolophid or long posterior arm of the protoconid); Msd, mesolophid; Msfxd, mesoflexid; Mstd, mesostylid; Mtfxd, metaflexid; Nmsd, neo-mesolophid; Pamd, posterior arm of the metaconid; Prd, protoconid; Psd, posterolophid. Arrowheads point mesiolingually to indicate the orientation of the teeth on the jaws (mesiolingual).

**Figure 2.** Results of the cladistic phylogenetic analyses. Strict consensus tree of two equally most parsimonious trees of 1042.46 steps each (CI= 0.373; RI= 0.637). Bootstrap (BP) and Bremer (B) values are indicated by the numbers labelled above and under internal branches, respectively (BP > 15; B ≥ 0.5). The solid line arrow indicates the Hystricognathi clade (including taxa formerly considered as such, plus Dianomys as proposed and discussed here). The dashed arrows indicate the possibilities of taxonomic enlargements regarding the basal content of the Hystricognathi clade (considering Anadianomys and gobiomyids; but see discussion in the main text). Quotation marks mean paraphyletic taxonomic unit.
Figure 3. Results of the Bayesian phylogenetic analysis. Allcompat consensus tree (majority-rule plus compatible groups) of 25,000 post-burn-in trees retained by the Bayesian analysis. Numbers at nodes represent posterior probabilities (PP; in percent). The solid line arrow indicates the Hystricognathi clade (including taxa formerly considered as such, plus Diommys, which is nested here within the Hystricognathi clade). Bal, baluchimyines (-ids); Bug, bugtimyids; Cav, stem caviomorphs; Chp, chapattimyids; Coc, cocomyids; Dia, dianomyids; Gau, gaudeamurids; Gob, gobiomyids; Met, metaphiomyines (-ids); Phc, phiocricetomyines (-ids); Phi, phiomyids; Pro, protophiomyines (-ids); Taq, tamquammyids; Yuo, yuomyids. Quotation marks mean paraphyletic taxonomic unit.

Figure 4. Results of the Bayesian phylogenetic tip-dating analysis with the fossilized birth-death prior. Allcompat consensus tree (majority-rule plus compatible groups) of 50,000 post-burn-in trees retained by the tip-dating analysis. Numbers at nodes represent posterior probabilities (PP; in percent). The solid line arrow indicates the Hystricognathi clade (including taxa formerly considered as such, plus Diommys as proposed and discussed here). Bal, baluchimyines (-ids); Bug, bugtimyids; Cav, stem caviomorphs; Chp, chapattimyids; Coc, cocomyids; Dia, dianomyids; Gau, gaudeamurids; Gob, gobiomyids; Met, metaphiomyines (-ids); Phc, phiocricetomyines (-ids); Phi, phiomyids; Pro, protophiomyines (-ids); Taq, tamquammyids; Yuo, yuomyids. Quotation marks mean paraphyletic taxonomic unit.

Figure 5. Phylogeny and dental patterns. The circular tree corresponds to the strict consensus tree topology of the cladistic analyses (Fig. 2). The computerized schematic line drawings of upper and lower teeth illustrate the dental patterns of selected ctenohystrican taxa of the main subclades. All the line drawings illustrate left upper and lower molars (some drawings were reversed from the corresponding original fossil specimens), and primarily represent M2 and m2, respectively. The upper molars (and the lower molars associated) are scaled to have equal buccolingual width. For some taxa recognized here as members of the Hystricognathi clade (e.g., Diommys and Ottomania), we have illustrated additional upper and lower specimens (Diommys obscuratus and D. qujingensis: M1-3 and m1-3; Ottomania proavita).
Figure 6. Schematic line drawing of the unique upper molar (M2) documenting a taxon from the middle Eocene of Pakistan (Kala Chitta Range, Punjab). This molar was figured in Hussain et al. (1978: 100, Plate 6, fig. 9), and recognized as an “aberrant specimen” among the dental material attributed to “Saykanomys” sondaari (i.e., *Birbalomys sondaari* sensu Kumar et al., 1997).

Figure 7. Strict consensus tree of the cladistic phylogenetic analyses (Fig. 2), transposed onto a chronostratigraphical context. The solid bars of different lengths indicate the stratigraphic occurrences (or extensions) of the ctenohystrican taxa sampled. Note the numerous Eocene gaps (long branches = phylogenetically implied ghost lineages) in the Asian and African fossil records of hystricognathous rodents. The rectangular area with a gradient of grey (left to right) indicates the temporal window for which the fossil record of hystricognathous rodents is virtually non-existent in Asia and Africa. The black star indicates the unique tooth from the middle Eocene of Pakistan, which could illustrate one of the oldest/earliest representatives of the Hystricognathi clade. Taxon names (and stratigraphic extensions) are coloured according to their continental geographic location.

Figure 8. Allcompat consensus tree of the Bayesian tip-dating analysis (Fig. 4). The rectangular area with a gradient of grey (left to right) indicates the temporal window for which the fossil record of hystricognathous rodents is virtually non-existent in Asia and Africa. Taxon names are coloured according to their continental geographic location.

Figure 9. Tentative hypothetical scenarios of hystricognathous rodent dispersals between Asia, Africa and South America during the Eocene, based on the results of the cladistic analyses. The color-coded and highly simplified phylogenetic tree derives from the strict consensus topology of the parsimony analyses (Fig. 2), and it is superimposed on a simplified late middle Eocene global palaeogeographic reconstruction (simplified after a palaeogeographic map of R. Blakey). These three scenarios (A-C) illustrate the evolutionary and biogeographic patterns discussed in the text. The Asian clades are depicted in blue, the African ones are in red, and the South American ones are in green. A, African clades are patchy nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, implying then multiple (a least three)
unidirectional dispersals to Africa from Asia; B, African clades are patchy nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, implying in this case at least two colonisations of Africa from Asia, and one dispersal return event to Asia from Africa (considering here an African taxon colonizing Asia); C, African clades form a monophyletic group, nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, thereby implying only one dispersal event to Africa from Asia of the common ancestor of the African taxa. In this context, the Asian clades nested within the monophyletic African radiation indicate at least two dispersal return events to Asia of African taxa. For each scenario, we provide a color-coded non-simplified tree as Supplemental Material online (Appendix S8A-C). Bal, baluchimyines (-ids); Bug, bugtimyids; Cav, stem caviomorphs; Chp, chapattimyids; Coc, cocomyids; Dia, dianomyids; Gau, gaudeamurids; Gob, gobiomyids; Met, metaphiomyines (-ids); Phc, phiocricetomyines (-ids); Phi, phiomyids; Pro, protophiomyines (-ids); Taq, tamquammyids; Yuo, yuomyids.

Figure 10. Tentative hypothetical scenarios of hystricognathous rodent dispersals between Asia, Africa and South America during the Eocene, based on the results of the Bayesian analyses (standard and tip-dating). The color-coded and highly simplified phylogenetic trees derive from the Allcompat consensus trees of the standard Bayesian (A-B; Fig. 3) and Bayesian tip-dating (C-D; Fig. 4) analyses, and they are superimposed on a simplified late middle Eocene global palaeogeographic reconstruction (simplified after a palaeogeographic map of R. Blakey). For each scenario, we provide a color-coded non-simplified tree as Supplemental Material online (Appendix S8D-G). A and C: African clades are patchy nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, implying then multiple (at least three) unidirectional dispersals to Africa from Asia; B and D, African clades form a monophyletic group, nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, thereby implying only one dispersal event to Africa from Asia of the common ancestor of the African taxa (+ some Asian). In this context, the Asian clades nested within the monophyletic African radiation indicate at least two dispersal return events to Asia of African taxa. Bal, baluchimyines (-ids); Bug, bugtimyids; Cav, stem caviomorphs; Chp, chapattimyids; Coc, cocomyids; Dia, dianomyids; Gau, gaudeamurids; Gob, gobiomyids; Met, metaphiomyines (-ids); Phc, phiocricetomyines (-ids); Phi, phiomyids; Pro, protophiomyines (-ids); Taq, tamquammyids; Yuo, yuomyids.
Figure 1. Dental terminology (updated and modified after Marivaux et al., 2004, 2014a, 2017a; Boivin & Marivaux, 2018). Abbreviations for upper teeth: Aah, anterior arm of the hypocone; Aam, anterior arm of the metacone; Al, anteroloph (or anterocingulum); Ay, anterostyle; H, hypocone; Hfx, hypoflexus; Lac, lingual anterocingulum; Lmel, lingual metaloph (= enterocrest); M, metacone; Mcu, metaconule; Mel, buccal metaloph; Mel (+), buccal metaloph and its possible lingual connections (+); Msfx, mesoflexus; Ms, mesostyle; Msl, Mesoloph; Msul, mesolophule; Mr, mure; P, protocone; Pa, paracone; Pafx, paraflexus; Pap, posterior arm of the paracone; Pcu, protoconule; Pop, posterior outgrowth of the protocone (Pop + longitudinal Aah = endoloph); Prl, protoloph; Psfx, posteroflexus; Psl, posteroloph; Py, parastyle. Abbreviations for lower teeth: Aahd, anterior arm of hypoconid; Acd, anterocingulid; Ad, anteroconid; Afxd, anteroflexid (= paraflexid); Ecd, ectolophid (Ecd mesial + Ecd distal); Et, entoconid; Hd, hypoconulid; Hfdx, hypoflexid; Hld, hypolophid (= entolophid); Hud, hypoconulid; Mcd, mesoconid; Md, metaconid; Med. I, metalophulid I (= ancestral paralophid); Med. II, metalophulid II (= protolophid or long posterior arm of the protoconid); Msd, mesolophid; Msfxd, mesoflexid; Mtd, mesostylid; Mtfxd, metaflexid; Nmsd, neo-mesolophid; Pamd, posterior arm of the metaconid; Prd, protoconid; Psd, posterolophid. Arrowheads point mesiolingually to indicate the orientation of the teeth on the jaws (mesiolingual).
Figure 2. Results of the cladistic phylogenetic analyses. Strict consensus tree of two equally most
parsimonious trees of 1042.46 steps each (CI= 0.373; RI= 0.637). Bootstrap (BP) and Bremer (B) values
are indicated by the numbers labelled above and under internal branches, respectively (BP > 15; B ≥ 0.5).
The solid line arrow indicates the Hystricognathi clade (including taxa formerly considered as such, plus
Dianomys as proposed and discussed here). The dashed arrows indicate the possibilities of taxonomic
enlargements regarding the basal content of the Hystricognathi clade (considering Anadianomys and
gobiomyids; but see discussion in the main text). Quotation marks mean paraphyletic taxonomic unit.
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Figure 3. Results of the Bayesian phylogenetic analysis. Allcompat consensus tree (majority-rule plus compatible groups) of 25,000 post-burn-in trees retained by the Bayesian analysis. Numbers at nodes represent posterior probabilities (PP; in percent). The solid line arrow indicates the Hystricognathi clade (including taxa formerly considered as such, plus Dianomys, which is nested here within the Hystricognathi clade). Bal, baluchimyines (-ids); Bug, bugtimyids; Cav, stem caviomorphs; Chp, chappattimyids; Coc, cocomyids; Dia, dianomyids; Gau, gaudeamurids; Gob, gobiomyids; Met, metaphiomyines (-ids); Phc, phiocricetomyines (-ids); Phi, phiomyids; Pro, protophiomyines (-ids); Taq, tamquammyids; Yuo, yuomyids.

Quotation marks mean paraphyletic taxonomic unit.
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Figure 4. Results of the Bayesian phylogenetic tip-dating analysis with the fossilized birth-death prior. Allcompat consensus tree (majority-rule plus compatible groups) of 50,000 post-burn-in trees retained by the tip-dating analysis. Numbers at nodes represent posterior probabilities (PP; in percent). The solid line arrow indicates the Hystricognathi clade (including taxa formerly considered as such, plus Dianomys as proposed and discussed here). Bal, baluchimyines (-ids); Bug, bugtimyids; Cav, stem caviomorphs; Chp, chapattimyids; Coc, cocomyids; Dia, dianomyids; Gau, gaudeamurids; Gob, gobiomyids; Met, metaphiomyines (-ids); Phc, phiocricetomyines (-ids); Phi, phiomyids; Pro, protophiomyines (-ids); Taq, tamquammyids; Yuo, yuomyids. Quotation marks mean paraphyletic taxonomic unit.
Figure 5. Phylogeny and dental patterns. The circular tree corresponds to the strict consensus tree topology of the cladistic analyses (Fig. 2). The computerized schematic line drawings of upper and lower teeth illustrate the dental patterns of selected ctenohystrican taxa of the main subclades. All the line drawings illustrate left upper and lower molars (some drawings were reversed from the corresponding original fossil specimens), and primarily represent M2 and m2, respectively. The upper molars (and the lower molars associated) are scaled to have equal buccolingual width. For some taxa recognized here as members of the Hystricognathi clade (e.g., Dianomys and Ottomania), we have illustrated additional upper and lower specimens (Dianomys obscuratus and D. qujingensis: M1-3 and m1-3; Ottomania proavita).
Figure 6. Schematic line drawing of the unique upper molar (M2) documenting a taxon from the middle Eocene of Pakistan (Kala Chitta Range, Punjab). This molar was figured in Hussain et al. (1978: 100, Plate 6, fig. 9), and recognized as an “aberrant specimen” among the dental material attributed to “Saykanomys” sondaari (i.e., Birbalomys sondaari sensu Kumar et al., 1997).
Figure 7. Strict consensus tree of the cladistic phylogenetic analyses (Fig. 2), transposed onto a chronostratigraphical context. The solid bars of different lengths indicate the stratigraphic occurrences (or extensions) of the ctenohystrican taxa sampled. Note the numerous Eocene gaps (long branches = phylogenetically implied ghost lineages) in the Asian and African fossil records of hystricognathous rodents. The rectangular area with a gradient of grey (left to right) indicates the temporal window for which the fossil record of hystricognathous rodents is virtually non-existent in Asia and Africa. The black star indicates the unique tooth from the middle Eocene of Pakistan, which could illustrate one of the oldest/earliest representatives of the Hystricognathi clade. Taxon names (and stratigraphic extensions) are coloured according to their continental geographic location.
Figure 8. Allcompat consensus tree of the Bayesian tip-dating analysis (Fig. 4). The rectangular area with a gradient of grey (left to right) indicates the temporal window for which the fossil record of hystricognathous rodents is virtually non-existent in Asia and Africa. Taxon names are coloured according to their continental geographic location.
Figure 9. Tentative hypothetical scenarios of hystricognathous rodent dispersals between Asia, Africa and South America during the Eocene, based on the results of the cladistic analyses. The color-coded and highly simplified phylogenetic tree derives from the strict consensus topology of the parsimony analyses (Fig. 2), and it is superimposed on a simplified late middle Eocene global palaeogeographic reconstruction (simplified after a palaeogeographic map of R. Blakey). These three scenarios (A-C) illustrate the evolutionary and biogeographic patterns discussed in the text. The Asian clades are depicted in blue, the African ones are in red, and the South American ones are in green. A, African clades are patchy nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, implying then multiple (at least three) but unidirectional dispersals to Africa from Asia; B, African clades are patchy nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, implying in this case at least two colonisations of Africa from Asia, and one dispersal return event to Asia from Africa (considering here an African taxa colonizing Asia); C, African clades form a monophyletic group, nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, thereby implying only one dispersal event to Africa from Asia of the common ancestor of the African taxa. In this context, the Asian clades nested within the monophyletic African radiation indicate at least two dispersal return events to Asia of African taxa. For each scenario, we provide a color-coded non-
simplified tree as Supplemental Material online (Appendix S8A-C). Bal, baluchimyines (-ids); Bug, bugtimyids; Cav, stem caviomorphs; Chp, chapattimyids; Coc, cocomyids; Dia, diemyids; Gau, gaudeamurids; Gob, gobiomyids; Met, metapliomyines (-ids); Phc, phiocricetomyines (-ids); Phi, phiomyids; Pro, protophiomyines (-ids); Taq, tamquammyids; Yuo, yuomyids.
Figure 10. Tentative hypothetical scenarios of hystricognathous rodent dispersals between Asia, Africa and South America during the Eocene, based on the results of the Bayesian analyses (standard and tip-dating). The color-coded and highly simplified phylogenetic trees derive from the Allcompat consensus trees of the standard Bayesian (A-B; Fig. 3) and Bayesian tip-dating (C-D; Fig. 4) analyses, and they are superimposed on a simplified late middle Eocene global palaeogeographic reconstruction (simplified after a palaeogeographic map of R. Blakey). For each scenario, we provide a color-coded non-simplified tree as Supplemental Material online (Appendix S8D-G). A and C: African clades are patchy nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, implying then multiple (at least three) but unidirectional dispersals to Africa from Asia; B and D, African clades form a monophyletic group, nested within the paraphyletic Asian radiation, thereby implying only one dispersal event to Africa from Asia of the common ancestor of the African taxa (+ some Asian). In this context, the Asian clades nested within the monophyletic African radiation indicate at least two dispersal return events to Asia of African taxa. Bal, baluchimyines (-ids); Bug, bugtimyids; Cav, stem caviomorphs; Chp, chapattimyids; Coc, cocomyids; Dia, dianomyids; Gau, gaudeamurids; Gob, gobiomyids; Met, metaphiomyines (-ids); Phc, phiocricetomyines (-ids); Phi, phiomyids; Pro, protophiomyines (-ids); Taq, tamquammyids; Yuo, yuomyids.