The scope of traditional and geometric morphometrics for inferences of diet in carnivorous fossil mammals

Sergio Daniel Tarquini, M. Amelia Chemisquy, S. Ladevèze, Francisco J. Prevosti

► To cite this version:

Sergio Daniel Tarquini, M. Amelia Chemisquy, S. Ladevèze, Francisco J. Prevosti. The scope of traditional and geometric morphometrics for inferences of diet in carnivorous fossil mammals. AMEGH-INIANA, 2019, 56 (4), pp.307-318. 10.5710/AMGH.24.07.2019.3255 . hal-03099652

HAL Id: hal-03099652

<https://hal.science/hal-03099652>

Submitted on 6 Jan 2021

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

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

AMEGHINIANA

A GONDWANAN PALEONTOLOGICAL JOURNAL

contained in this volume are to be published in future
issues of the journal.

Please be aware that during the production process
errors may be discovered which could affect the
content.

All legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Submitted: March 25th, 2019 – **Accepted:** July 24th, 2019 – **Published online:** July 27th, 2019

To link and cite this article:

doi: 10.5710/AMGH.24.07.2019.3255

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

**THE SCOPE OF TRADITIONAL AND GEOMETRIC MORPHOMETRICS
FOR INFERENCES OF DIET IN CARNIVOROUS FOSSIL MAMMALS**

SERGIO D. TARQUINI ^{1*}, M. AMELIA CHEMISQUY ^{1,2}, SANDRINE LADEVÈZE
³, AND FRANCISCO J. PREVOSTI ^{1,2}

1- Centro Regional de Investigaciones Científicas y Transferencia Tecnológica de La
Rioja (CRILAR - Provincia de La Rioja, UNLaR, SEGEMAR, UNCa, CONICET).
Entre Ríos y Mendoza s/n (5301), Anillaco, Argentina. starquini92@gmail.com;
amelych80@gmail.com; protocyon@hotmail.com

2- Departamento de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de la
Rioja (UNLaR). Av. Luis M. de la Fuente s/n (5300), La Rioja, Argentina.

3- Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie - Paris (CR2P - CNRS, MNHN, Sorbonne
Université). 8 rue Buffon CP38 (75005), Paris, France. sandrine.ladeveze@mnhn.fr

31 pages (text+references); 2 figures; 4 tables; 4 supplementary online information

Proposed header: TARQUINI *ET AL.*: MORPHOMETRIC METHODS TO INFER
DIET

* Corresponding author: SERGIO D. TARQUINI

ABSTRACT. Molar morphology is one of the most used proxies for paleoecological inferences in mammals. Since the 19th century, several authors associated dental morphological traits with the diet of an animal by means of qualitative and descriptive analyses. More recently, different studies of tooth function have associated various quantitative traits of tooth shape (*i.e.*, morphometric ratios or angles) with the different items consumed by the animal. However, because different inferences of diet for the same species can be found in the literature, it is crucial to study the power of different proxies. In this work, we compared the utility of classic morphometric indices (RGA, AI and angle α) and three-dimensional landmarks configuration to infer diet. Based on a previously published dataset from our working group, we calculated the classic morphometric indices and performed three classification methods: linear discriminant analysis, quadratic discriminant analysis, and weighted random forest. Our results demonstrate that when using the geometric morphometrics approach, the diet of species is better reclassified than when using morphometric indices. Furthermore, intraspecific variation appears fundamental when making paleoecological inferences. In inferring ecological characteristics of extinct animals, studying morphological variation in extant organisms is a safeguard to prevent misinterpretations when reconstructing past ecologies.

KEYWORDS. Diet classification. Carnivora. Morphometric indices. Weighted random forest.

RESUMEN. ALCANCE DE LA MORFOMETRÍA TRADICIONAL Y GEOMÉTRICA A LA HORA DE INFERIR LA DIETA EN LOS MAMÍFEROS FÓSILES CARNÍVOROS. La morfología del molar es uno de los *proxies* más utilizados para las inferencias paleoecológicas en los mamíferos. Desde el siglo XIX,

varios autores asociaron algunos rasgos morfológicos dentales con la dieta del animal mediante análisis cualitativos y descriptivos. Más tarde, a partir del siglo pasado, diferentes estudios sobre la función dental han asociado varios rasgos cuantitativos de la forma del diente (es decir, proporciones o ángulos morfométricos) con el porcentaje de carne de vertebrados que consume el animal. Sin embargo, debido a que en la literatura se pueden encontrar diferentes inferencias de la dieta para la misma especie, es crucial llevar a cabo estudios que comparen la precisión de diferentes *proxies*. En este trabajo, comparamos la utilidad de los índices morfométricos clásicos (RGA, AI y ángulo α) y la configuración de *landmarks* tridimensionales con respecto a las inferencias de la dieta. Sobre la base de un conjunto de datos previamente publicado por nuestro grupo de trabajo, calculamos los índices morfométricos clásicos y realizamos tres métodos de clasificación: análisis discriminante lineal, análisis discriminante cuadrático y análisis de bosques aleatorios ponderados. Nuestros resultados demuestran que al usar la configuración de *landmarks*, la dieta de las especies se reclasifica mejor que cuando se usan índices morfométricos. Además, considerar la variación intraespecífica al hacer inferencias paleoecológicas parece fundamental. Teniendo el propósito de inferir características ecológicas en animales extintos, la consideración de la variación morfológica en los organismos actuales es una garantía para evitar cualquier interpretación errónea en las reconstrucciones de ecologías pasadas.

PALABRAS CLAVES. Clasificación de la dieta. Carnívora. Índices morfométricos. Bosques aleatorios ponderados.

THE analysis of diets is an important component of ecological and paleoecological studies (Price *et al.*, 2012; Kissling *et al.*, 2014; Davis and Pineda Munoz, 2016; Croft *et al.*, 2018a). Many proxies have been used to determine the diet of mammalian species, including direct observations of feeding behavior, stomach and fecal contents, dental microwear and mesowear, isotope analysis of nitrogen and carbon, and craniodental morphology, among others (see review in Davis and Pineda Munoz, 2016). Although often considered to represent the same parameter, these different proxies offer different evidences of the items consumed, have different scopes (*i.e.*, extant and/or fossil species), and are constrained by different methodological aspects (*i.e.*, cost, difficulty and time of study, availability of data) (Evans, 2013; Davis and Pineda Munoz, 2016). In particular, the study of molar morphology combines low cost and low methodological difficulty, thus making it one of the most widely used proxies in paleoecological studies of mammals (*e.g.*, Marshall, 1978; Goin *et al.*, 1992; Van Valkenburgh *et al.*, 2004; Vizcaíno *et al.*, 2006; Prevosti *et al.*, 2013; Croft *et al.*, 2018b; Harper *et al.*, 2018).

The versatility of tribosphenic molars has been shown to be a key innovation in the evolution of mammals, increasing the taxonomic diversity and ecological disparity of this group throughout their evolutionary history (Woodburne *et al.*, 2003; Luo, 2007). Molars are also usually the sole identifiable remains of an extinct mammal, and therefore have been intensively used for taxonomic classifications in addition to dietary reconstructions (*e.g.*, Marshall, 1978; Ungar, 2010; Goin and de los Reyes, 2011). Since the 19th century, several authors have associated certain dental morphological traits with dietary habits by means of qualitative and descriptive analyses (*e.g.*, Lund, 1839; Ryder, 1878; Cope, 1879; Butler, 1946; Marshall, 1978; Reig *et al.*, 1987; Berta, 1989). More recently, different studies of tooth function have correlated several quantitative

traits of tooth shape (*i.e.*, morphometric ratios or angles) with the different items consumed by the animal. These quantitative tools continue to be used today, and while some have used isolated indices (*e.g.*, Crusafont-Pairó and Truyols-Santonja, 1956; Goin *et al.*, 1992; Strait, 1993a, b; Evans *et al.*, 2005; Vizcaíno *et al.*, 2006; Prevosti *et al.*, 2013), others have used several indices to define a morphospace (*e.g.*, Kay, 1975; Van Valkenburgh, 1989; Popowics, 2003; Wesley-Hunt, 2005; Friscia *et al.*, 2007; Asahara *et al.*, 2016; Croft *et al.*, 2018b). Moreover, with the development of new technologies, new dental shape descriptors have been developed to study molar morphology (Evans, 2013). On the one hand, some authors have defined metrics to reflect occlusal surface topography, such as the Dirichlet normal energy, relief index, and orientation patch count (Zuccotti *et al.*, 1998; Ungar and M'Kirera, 2003; Evans *et al.*, 2007; Boyer, 2008; Bunn *et al.*, 2011; Smits and Evans, 2012). On the other hand, other approaches to study tooth morphology have arisen with the development of geometric morphometric techniques, where shape is captured through the use of landmark coordinates (either two- or three-dimensional) and analyzed as a whole, taking into account several shape changes instead of a few measurements (Vizcaíno *et al.*, 2016). For example, some authors have digitized the molars with the aim of assessing the relationships between molar shape and diet: elliptic Fourier analysis has been applied in rodents (Gómez Cano *et al.*, 2013); 2D geometric morphometrics has been used in rodents (Caumul and Polly, 2005), primates (White, 2009), rhinos (Piras *et al.*, 2010), and in didelphid marsupials (Chemisquy *et al.*, 2015; Magnus and Cáceres, 2017); and 3D geometric morphometrics has been used in primates (Cooke, 2011; Singleton *et al.*, 2011) and in carnivorous species (Tarquini *et al.*, 2018).

The strong form-function relationship of the dentition of living mammals has allowed paleontologists to make inferences of diet in fossil species (*e.g.*, Van

Valkenburgh, 1989; Goin *et al.*, 1992; Prevosti *et al.*, 2013; Zimicz, 2014a; Croft *et al.*, 2018b). Within a historical framework, diet reconstructions are crucial for constructing trophic webs, examining evolutionary changes in lineages, and inferring ancient climates and habitats (Pascual and Jaureguizar, 1990; Van Valkenburgh *et al.*, 2004; Dalerum and Angerbjörn, 2005; Prevosti *et al.*, 2013; Echarri *et al.*, 2017). However, in a recent study, we demonstrated the need to take certain precautions before making inferences, because the morphology of the molar not only correlates with diet but also is influenced by the phylogenetic position of each taxa (Tarquini *et al.*, 2018). In any case, the use of different techniques to analyze molar morphology generates the following question: are all methodologies utilized to quantify dental morphology equally reliable?

Usually, inferences of diet in South American predatory mammals are tackled with traditional morphometric analyses, using measurements from the lower molars such as the relative grinding area index or the angle of the paracristid to the tooth row (see Materials and Methods for further details; *e.g.*, Van Valkenburgh, 1991; Goin *et al.*, 1992; Zimicz, 2014b; Prevosti and Forasiepi, 2018). However, morphometric ratios or angles only represent some aspects of the shape, and the geometric and spatial relationships among the measurements are not considered (Bookstein, 1991; Rohlf and Marcus, 1993; Adams *et al.*, 2004; Zelditch *et al.*, 2004; Slice, 2007; Mitteroecker and Gunz, 2009). In other words, shape can be better approximated by landmark coordinates than by linear measurements, as has been demonstrated in numerous different test cases (*e.g.*, Fabre *et al.*, 2014; Schmieder *et al.*, 2015; Lallensack *et al.*, 2016). Subsequently, new approaches using 2D geometric morphometrics have been used to study the mandibles of South American predators (Meloro *et al.*, 2008; Prevosti *et al.*, 2012a; Echarri *et al.*, 2017). However, it is important to note that some problems have arisen with the use of 2D techniques for studying three-dimensional structures, such as the

photographic distortion and the difficulty to capture shape variation as a whole (Álvarez and Perez, 2013; Collins and Gazley, 2017). This led us to hypothesize that 3D geometric morphometrics may turn out to be a more powerful predictive tool than other previously used techniques based on linear measurements, as it represents different aspects of the molar at the same time.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Samples and landmarks

The results of this study are based on the dataset of Tarquini *et al.* (2018), which includes digitalizations of the first lower molar (m1) of 213 specimens corresponding to 67 extant species of Carnivora, and the fourth lower molars (m4) of 14 specimens corresponding to 4 extant species of Marsupialia, including both Didelphimorphia and Dasyuromorphia (Supplementary Online Information 1). The carnivoran m1 and carnivorous marsupial m4 are considered to be functionally analogous teeth following Tarquini *et al.* (2018). The specimens belonging to the insectivore category from the parent dataset were excluded due to small sample size (only three species: *Dasyurus viverrinus*, *Galerella sanguinea*, and *Otocyon megalotis*). The classification of dietary categories in this study follows Tarquini *et al.* (2018): Hypercarnivores —feed primarily on other vertebrates; Mesocarnivores —feed mainly on other vertebrates, but also plants and invertebrates; Omnivores —meat, plants, and invertebrates represent a similar proportion of the diet; Herbivores —feed mostly on plant material; Piscivores —feed mostly on fish.

The digitalization comprises nine three-dimensional landmarks (ldk): paraconid (ldk 1), carnassial notch in the paracristid (ldk 2), protoconid (ldk 3), metaconid (ldk 4), hypoconid (ldk 6), entoconid (ldk 7), and the mesial and distal edges of trigonid and

talonid (ldk 5, 8 and 9) (Fig. 1). We also recorded ten semi-landmarks to delimit the base of the crown (Fig. 1). For information regarding landmark and semilandmark treatment, see Tarquini *et al.* (2018).

Morphometric indices

In the literature, several indices have been used to analyze the molar morphology of carnivorous mammals. The indices are relationships between measurements, such as the shear ratio (Strait, 1993a, 1993b; Hogue and Ziashakeri, 2010) and the relative lower grinding area (RGA; Van Valkenburgh, 1989; Prevosti *et al.*, 2013). RGA is measured as the square root of the area of the m1 talonid divided by the relative blade length (BL). The area was estimated as the product of maximum width (WT) and length (LT) of the talonid of m1, and the BL was estimated as the length of the m1 trigonid. We use the index as defined by Prevosti *et al.* (2013), modified from Valkenburgh (1989), which has two advantages: first, it can be applied in fossils that only have the carnassial preserved; and second, the RGA value can be compared in both Carnivora and Metatheria. Other indices include morphometric angles, such as those that describe the relationship between the paracristid and the mesiodistal axis (lower angle, AI; Goin *et al.*, 1992) or the relationship between the height of the protoconid and the length of the talonid (angle α ; Crusafont-Pairó and Truyols-Santonja, 1953, 1956; Wesley-Hunt, 2005; Meloro and Raia, 2010).

Using the configuration of landmarks mentioned above, we calculated the following morphometric indices with Rhinoceros 3D V5.0 software: angle α , AI, and RGA. The angle α was calculated using ldks 3, 8 and 9. For AI, ldk 1, 3, 8 and 9 were used. RGA was calculated using ldks 5, 8 and 9 and the two semilandmarks that define the maximum width of the talonid (Fig. 1).

We also calculated alternative RGAs taking into account a more accurate measurement of the blade length (BL', *i.e.*, distance between the paraconid, ldk 1, and the protoconid, ldk 3) and a more accurate measurement of the area of the m1 talonid (*i.e.*, polygon area (PA) formed by all semilandmarks of talonid) (Fig. 2). However, neither using the BL' nor using the PA led to better discriminating functions; consequently, the detailed results are not reported here.

Statistical analyses

We used the scores of between-group PCA (bg-PCA) conducted in Tarquini *et al.* (2018) for the new analyses (see below). The bg-PCA can be understood as a PCA in two steps: first, we made a PCA with the average shape of each dietary category, and then we plotted the entire dataset on these axes (Mitteroecker and Bookstein, 2011; Seetah *et al.*, 2012). We used the axes of bg-PCA as representatives of shape, which brings about two advantages. First, when the axes of the PCA are constructed, the variance of the whole sample is maximized, while in the bg-PCA, the variance of the dietary categories is maximized but without distorting the geometry of the multivariate space (Klingenberg and Monteiro, 2005; Mitteroecker and Bookstein, 2011). Second, fewer axes are obtained in bg-PCA (the number of categories minus one, in this case four) than in PCA, which avoids problems with the quantity of variables when using PC axes in discriminant analyses (Kovarovic *et al.*, 2011) but without discarding any morphological information.

In order to study the behavior of morphometric indices, we performed three analyses. First, we evaluated the covariation between indices to test independence in the case of using them as variables of the same analysis. We performed a Spearman correlation since the Shapiro-Wilk test demonstrated that the indices are not normally

distributed. The Shapiro-Wilk test, the Spearman correlation and regression analyses were performed using the *stats* package for the software R 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018). Second, we conducted a multivariate regression to quantify how much of the change in the shape (Procrustes coordinates) could be explained by the different indices. Finally, we performed a simple linear regression between the various indices and the axes of the bg-PCA. Following the regressions, a permutation test was performed to evaluate the complete independence between the dependent and independent variables. Regression analysis and the permutation test were performed using the software MorphoJ 1.06b (Klingenberg, 2011).

Although a PCA or bg-PCA would allow us to see the graphical distribution of the diet taking into account the values of the different predictor variables (angle α , AI, RGA, or landmark configuration), it is important to quantify the relative performance of each predictor variable to infer diets. That is the reason why we conducted several linear discriminant analyses (LDA): some with the scores of the bg-PCA (to analyze the scope of geometric morphometrics) and others with the morphometric indices, together and separately (to analyze the scope of traditional morphometrics). Given the known problems of performing a LDA with geometric morphometrics data (Kemsley, 1996; Sheets *et al.*, 2006), and to avoid a bias due to the analysis used, we also carried out two learning methods for classification: quadratic discriminant analyses (QDA) and random forest analyses (RF). The QDA is very similar to the LDA but does not assume identical covariance for each class and produces a quadratic boundary between the classes (Venables and Ripley, 2002; Dixon and Brereton, 2009). The RF is a nonmetric method based on bootstrap resampling techniques of decision trees, which have made it a powerful tool with greater precision than neural networks, classification trees, linear and quadratic DAs, and k-nearest neighbors (Breiman, 2001; Maroco *et al.*, 2011).

However, the regular RF is constructed to minimize the overall error rate, so it tends to be biased toward the majority class (Chen *et al.*, 2004; Zhu and Pierskalla, 2016). Given that our dataset is unbalanced (*i.e.*, there are six herbivores, 105 hypercarnivores, 34 mesocarnivores, 71 omnivores, and 13 piscivores), we proceeded to perform a weighted random forest (WRF), as proposed by Chen *et al.* (2004), which avoids the bias towards the most numerous classes. To evaluate the performance of classification methods based on different predictors, we compared the percentage of correct posterior reclassification (PCPR) and the error rate (% Error) calculated from the confusion matrix. This is obtained in an innate way by the bootstrap resampling in the WRF and from the cross-validation procedure in both LDA and QDA (Breiman, 2001; Venables and Ripley, 2002; Kovarovic *et al.*, 2011). PCPR was calculated globally and for each category; it is understood as the number of animals correctly reclassified in a dietary category divided by the total of animals belonging to that category. % Error was calculated for each category as the number of animals wrongly reclassified in a dietary category divided by the total of animals reclassified in that category. Additionally, as mentioned above, molar morphology has a significant phylogenetic signal, so that within each family, the degree of morphological variation is variable (Tarquini *et al.*, 2018). For that reason, we repeated the classification methods only with the species of the Canidae subgroup, which is also a group where morphometric indices are widely used. LDA, QDA and WRF were performed using the *MASS* and *randomForest* packages (Liaw and Wiener, 2002; Venables and Ripley, 2002) in R 3.5.1 (R Core Team, 2018).

Intraspecific variation

When reviewing previous works, we noted that a few authors have considered intraspecific variation, whereas the majority have not. To compare criteria, we analyzed RGA values calculated from unpublished measurements taken by calipers (Prevosti,

2006) and compared using the average RGA value per species to using RGA values for each specimen separately.

RESULTS

The morphometric indices showed high and significant correlations: RGA vs. angle α ($\rho = -0.87$, $p\text{-value} < 0.0001$), RGA vs. AI ($\rho = 0.88$, $p\text{-value} < 0.0001$) and AI vs. angle α ($\rho = -0.77$, $p\text{-value} < 0.0001$). The regressions against the Procrustes coordinates showed that the indices have a low correlation with shape variation: RGA explained 53.30% of the change in the shape ($p\text{-value} < 0.0001$), AI explained 37.37% ($p\text{-value} < 0.0001$) and angle α explained 49.42% ($p\text{-value} < 0.0001$). By contrast, bg-PC1 (the axis that has the highest proportion of shape change in the bg-PCA) explained the shape variation better than any of the morphometric indices (76.59% percent of variance). Finally, when we analyzed the covariation between the bg-PCs and the morphometric indices, we observed that a large portion of variation explained by bg-PC1 could also be explained by the morphometric indices (percentage of covariance greater than 60%; Tab. 1), whereas there was a low covariation between the morphometric indices and the other axes of bg-PCA (percentage of covariance less than 20%; Tab. 1).

The three classification methods (LDA, QDA and WRF) returned a similar pattern of global PCPR (Tab. 2). The only differences observed were in the performance of the indices when comparing them to each other. However, in all cases when using the scores of the bg-PCA, the diet of a species was better reclassified than when using morphometric indices. Hereafter, we describe the results of WRF to transmit the idea more clearly, which are shown in Table 2 together with the results of the other two analyses. Using all the axes of the bg-PCA, the WRF correctly reclassified 89.96% of

the specimens; using only the first axis, the PCPR was 74.67% (Tab. 2). On the other hand, none of the analyses using individual morphometric indices exceeded 66 PCPR (Tab. 2). Even using all of the indices together, the PCPR was only 75.98% (Tab. 2).

It is interesting to note that the model with the scores of the bg-PCA had an excellent reclassification (higher PCPR and lower % Error) in the hypercarnivorous and piscivorous categories, and a good reclassification (higher PCPR and average % Error) in the mesocarnivorous and omnivorous categories, while it had a bad reclassification (low PCPR and average % Error) in the herbivorous category (Supplementary Online Information 2). Otherwise, the models with the morphometric indices tended to reclassify the different dietary categories with higher % Error (regardless of the value of PCPR) than the model with bg-PCs (Supplementary Online Information 2). Additionally, the indices tend to have a bias to hypercarnivores since it is usually the category with the highest PCPR and the lowest % Error (Supplementary Online Information 2).

When we subdivided the dataset and scrutinized only the Canidae, the results did not change substantially. The scores of the bg-PCA still better reclassified the diet of species than the morphometric indices (Tab. 3 and Supplementary Online Information 3). The discriminant function obtained with the scores of the bg-PCA had a 92.31 PCPR, while that obtained with the indices the PCPR did not exceed 68% (Tab. 3).

Finally, in the intraspecific variation test, we observed that when using the average value of RGA, the separation between dietary categories was clearer than when using all the values of each specimen (Supplementary Online Information 4). Using the average values, under this example, the diets could be classified with a series of logical rules: a taxon can be considered hypercarnivorous when the RGA index is lower than

0.45; mesocarnivorous when the RGA index range from 0.46 to at least 0.47; omnivorous when the RGA index ranges from 0.60 (perhaps lower) to 0.68; and insectivorous when the RGA index is larger than 1. However, when the index is between 0.48 and 0.59, the classification is ambiguous, and the taxon may be omnivorous or mesocarnivorous. On the other hand, if intraspecific variation is considered, the superposition zone is much larger. If the value of RGA is lower than 0.40, the taxon is hypercarnivorous; between 0.40 and 0.42, it may be hypercarnivorous or mesocarnivorous; between 0.43 and 0.48, it may be hypercarnivorous, mesocarnivorous or omnivorous; between 0.48 and 0.69, it may be mesocarnivorous or omnivorous; and larger than 1, it is insectivorous (Supplementary Online Information 4).

DISCUSSION

Because of the hardness of dental tissues, teeth are the mammalian body parts most likely to be preserved in the fossil record and, consequently, the elements most frequently found and studied (Carlson, 1989; Benton and Harper, 2009; Ungar, 2010). Combined with the importance of the teeth in the acquisition and processing of food, this makes tooth morphology an important source of information for understanding and inferring the ecological habits of fossil species (*e.g.*, Van Valen, 1969; Kay, 1975; Marshall, 1978; Van Valkenburgh, 1989; Prevosti *et al.*, 2013; Solé and Ladevèze, 2017; Tarquini *et al.*, 2018). Bearing that in mind, there have been different inferences of diet for the same species in the literature, making it necessary to carry out studies that include diverse proxies (*e.g.*, Soibelzon *et al.*, 2014; Pineda-Munoz *et al.*, 2017) or to compare the power of different proxies. Our results indicate that 3D geometric morphometrics is a very powerful tool to study molar morphology and is better than traditional morphometrics when it comes to predicting feeding habits. The discriminant

function obtained (regardless of the chosen classification method) displays a greater predictive power than that obtained from the indices (Tabs. 2 and 3). Since the PCPR tends to increase when adding explanatory variables, we performed the classification methods with the first bg-PC to compare against isolated indices, and with the first three bg-PCs against the combined indices. All comparisons showed that geometric morphometric data are better for classifying diets than classical morphometric indices (Tabs. 2 and 3). Although the bg-PC1 explained more shape variation than any of the indices, the variation within this first axis could be explained partially using the indices (*e.g.*, specimens at the positive end of bg-PC1 have a molar with the paracristid parallel to the mesiodistal axis and the talonid is reduced or absent; Tarquini *et al.*, 2018).

It is noteworthy that the bg-PCA, based on geometric data, provided a diffused low degree of separation between diet categories, with different degrees of overlap among them. Nevertheless, as we discussed in a previous work (Tarquini *et al.*, 2018), this might be in part related to the intrinsic definition of diets and the disadvantage of the discretization of a continuous variable such as diet into classes, whose chosen limits are questionable (Van Valkenburgh, 1989; Van Valkenburgh and Koepfli, 1993; Prevosti *et al.*, 2012b; Echarri *et al.*, 2017). This is why this problem is not intrinsically related to geometric morphometric, and in studies that include a broad taxonomic sampling (several species across all Carnivora), it appears difficult to choose a unique value of RGA (or equivalent index) to separate each dietary categories (Van Valkenburgh, 1989; Friscia *et al.*, 2007; Zimicz, 2012; Prevosti *et al.*, 2013). Some authors have chosen to use several indices to define morphospaces that better separate the categories (Van Valkenburgh, 1989; Friscia *et al.*, 2007), although these ratios have high correlation values between them (as also calculated here). This is due to the fact that the indices are calculated with anatomical points or landmarks in common. This

issue is easily circumvented with geometric morphometrics because it avoids any overrepresentation of data by working directly with the landmarks coordinates.

As we mentioned in the introduction, to improve the accuracy of dietary inferences from dental morphology it is necessary to take into account the phylogenetic framework (Tarquini *et al.*, 2018). This is the reason why we restricted our dataset to a less inclusive clade, the Canidae (Tab. 3 and Supplementary Online Information 3). Although there are differences in the performance of the indices when comparing them to each other (*e.g.*, RF and LDA indicated that the AI is the best diet estimator, while QDA indicated that the RGA is the best one), they all agreed that the scores of the bg-PCA better reclassified the diet of species. When examining where the differences in the reclassification were, the confusion matrix showed that, whatever the classification method, the morphometric indices principally struggled to discern correctly hypercarnivores from mesocarnivores. Van Valkenburgh (1991) pointed out that although the molars of hypercarnivorous canids (*Canis lupus*, *Cuon alpinus*, *Lycaon pictus*, and *Speothos venaticus*) are specialized, they do not reach the cat-like extreme condition seen in felids and, to a lesser degree, in hyaenids. For this reason, when we calculated the indices, hypercarnivores and mesocarnivores overlapped and were reclassified erroneously (Tab. 4). This problem was not mentioned by previous authors, since they worked with the average of the indices (see below).

When reviewing previous works, we also noted that another criterion that differs in the methodologies is the use of the average value of the index per species versus the use of the observed variation (*i.e.*, including the value of each specimen separately). In this work, we considered all specimens individually in order to properly account for intraspecific morphological variation. Goin *et al.* (1992) calculated a series of basic

statistics (such as mean, variance, standard deviation, etc.) to evaluate intraspecific morphological variation in the molars of didelphids, whereas in the majority of the other works (Van Valkenburgh, 1989; Prevosti *et al.*, 2013), the authors only used the average value, without specifying exactly how many specimens were measured for each species. To compare criteria, we analyzed the indices calculated from the landmarks and others from unpublished measurements taken by calipers (Prevosti, 2006) and discovered that if the maximum and minimum values of each species are considered, the ranges of overlap between the dietary categories used increases (Supplementary Online Information 4). In fact, it is possible that the use of a central tendency statistic minimizes the real overlap that exists between categories. However, this problem persists when there are few specimens per species (which is commonly the case in fossil taxa), since the average value of the specimens examined is not likely to be representative of the actual average value for the species, which in turn is likely to lead to misinterpretations in the ecology of the fossil species analyzed.

CONCLUSION

This work quantitatively evaluated the power of different proxies to describe the molar morphology of extant carnivore mammals and how it relates to diet. Our results demonstrated that 3D geometric morphometrics is better than traditional morphometrics to predict feeding habits, as using landmarks provides more information than working with isolated measurements or angles of teeth. Moreover, we discussed the importance of considering the intraspecific variation. As the ultimate purpose of these analyses is to infer ecological characteristics in fossils, misinterpretations in the ecology of the fossil specimens can be avoided when the variation of extant organisms is considered.

A better understanding of the methodology used to infer diets in fossils would allow a better comprehension of the ecology of these animals. Having more precise classifications about different ecological traits of the South American carnivorous mammals would allow us to test extinction hypothesis of some carnivore guilds with greater assurance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank D. Flores and P. Teta (MACN-ma) and I. Olivares (MLP-ma) for access to specimens under their care; J. Rajmil, C. Bustamante, W. Bustamante, and M. Mignana for replicas of molars deposited in foreign collections; M. Macchioli Grande for helping with the English version of the manuscript; D. Croft, R. Engelman, A. Friscia, and A. Otero for providing useful comments that helped improve the manuscript. This is a contribution to projects PICT-2015-0966 and PUE 2016-0125.

REFERENCES

- Adams, D.C., Rohlf, F.J. and Slice, D.E. 2004. Geometric morphometrics: ten years of progress following the ‘revolution’. *Italian Journal of Zoology* 71: 5–16.
- Álvarez, A. and Perez, S.I. 2013. Two- versus three-dimensional morphometric approaches in macroevolution: insight from the mandible of Caviomorph Rodents. *Evolutionary Biology* 40: 150–157.
- Asahara, M., Saito, K., Kishida, T., Takahashi, K. and Bessho, K. 2016. Unique pattern of dietary adaptation in the dentition of Carnivora: its advantage and developmental origin. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 283: 20160375.
- Benton, M.J. and Harper, D. a. T. 2009. *Introduction to paleobiology and the fossil record*. Wiley-Blackwell, Chichester, 609 p.

431 Berta, A. 1989. Quaternary evolution and biogeography of the large South American
432 Canidae (Mammalia: Carnivora). *University of California Publication*
433 *Geological. Sciences* 132: 1–149.

434 Bookstein, F.L. 1991. *Morphometric tools for landmark data: geometry and biology*.
435 Cambridge University Press, New York, 357 p.

436 Boyer, D.M. 2008. Relief index of second mandibular molars is a correlate of diet
437 among prosimian primates and other euarchontan mammals. *Journal of Human*
438 *Evolution* 55: 1118–1137.

439 Breiman, L. 2001. Random Forest. *Machine Learning* 45: 5–32.

440 Bunn, J.M., Boyer, D.M., Lipman, Y., St. Clair, E.M., Jernvall, J. and Daubechies, I.
441 2011. Comparing Dirichlet normal surface energy of tooth crowns, a new
442 technique of molar shape quantification for dietary inference, with previous
443 methods in isolation and in combination. *American Journal of Physical*
444 *Anthropology* 145: 247–261.

445 Butler, P.M. 1946. The evolution of carnassial dentitions in the mammalia. *Proceedings*
446 *of the Zoological Society of London* 116: 198–220.

447 Carlson, S.J. 1989. Vertebrate dental structures. In: J.G. Carter (Ed.), *Skeletal*
448 *biomineralization: patterns, processes and evolutionary trends*, American
449 Geophysical Union, Washington D. C., p. 235–260.

450 Caumul, R. and Polly, P.D. 2005. Phylogenetic and environmental components of
451 morphological variation: skull, mandible, and molar shape in marmots
452 (Marmota, Rodentia). *Evolution* 59: 2460–2472.

453 Chemisquy, M.A., Prevosti, F.J., Martin, G. and Flores, D.A. 2015. Evolution of molar
454 shape in didelphid marsupials (Marsupialia: Didelphidae): Analysis of the
455 influence of ecological factors and phylogenetic legacy. *Zoological Journal of*
456 *the Linnean Society* 173: 217–235.

457 Chen, C., Liaw, A. and Breiman, L. 2004. *Using random forest to learn imbalanced*
458 *data*. University of California – Berkeley web: <https://statistics.berkeley.edu>

459 Collins, K.S. and Gazley, M.F. 2017. Does my posterior look big in this? The effect of
460 photographic distortion on morphometric analyses. *Paleobiology* 43: 508–520.

461 Cooke, S.B. 2011. Paleodiet of extinct platyrrhines with emphasis on the Caribbean
462 forms: three-dimensional geometric morphometrics of mandibular second
463 molars. *The Anatomical Record: Advances in Integrative Anatomy and*
464 *Evolutionary Biology* 294: 2073–2091.

465 Cope, E.D. 1879. The origin of the specialized teeth of the Carnivora. *The American*
466 *Naturalist* 13: 171–173.

467 Croft, D.A., Su, D.F. and Simpson, S.W. 2018a. *Methods in paleoecology:*
468 *reconstructing Cenozoic terrestrial environments and ecological communities*.
469 Springer, Cham, 417 p.

470 Croft, D.A., Engelman, R.K., Dolgushina, T. and Wesley, G. 2018b. Diversity and
471 disparity of sparassodonts (Metatheria) reveal non-analogue nature of ancient
472 South American mammalian carnivore guilds. *Proceedings of the Royal Society*
473 *B: Biological Sciences* 285: 20172012.

474 Crusafont-Pairó, M. and Truyols-Santonja, J. 1953. Un ensayo goniométrico sobre la
475 carnífera inferior de los Fisípedos. *Estudios Geológicos* 18: 225–256.

476 Crusafont-Pairó, M. and Truyols-Santonja, J. 1956. A biometric study of the evolution
477 of fissiped carnivores. *Evolution* 10: 314–332.

478 Dalerum, F. and Angerbjörn, A. 2005. Resolving temporal variation in vertebrate diets
479 using naturally occurring stable isotopes. *Oecologia* 144: 647–658.

480 Davis, M. and Pineda Munoz, S. 2016. The temporal scale of diet and dietary proxies.
481 *Ecology and Evolution* 6: 1883–1897.

482 Dixon, S.J. and Brereton, R.G. 2009. Comparison of performance of five common
483 classifiers represented as boundary methods: Euclidean distance to centroids,
484 linear discriminant analysis, quadratic discriminant analysis, learning vector
485 quantization, and support vector machines, as dependent on. *Chemometrics and*
486 *Intelligent Laboratory Systems* 95: 1–17.

487 Echarri, S., Ercoli, M.D., Chemisquy, M.A., Turazzini, G. and Prevosti, F.J. 2017.
488 Mandible morphology and diet of the South American extinct metatherian
489 predators (Mammalia, Metatheria, Sparassodonta). *Earth and Environmental*
490 *Science Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh* 106: 277–288.

491 Evans, A.R. 2013. Shape descriptors as ecometrics in dental ecology. *Hystrix* 24: 133–
492 140.

493 Evans, A.R., Fortelius, M., Jernvall, J. and Eronen, J.T. 2005. Dental ecomorphology of
494 extant European carnivorans. In: E. Żądzińska (Ed.), *Current trends in dental*
495 *morphology research: 13th International symposium on dental morphology*,
496 University of Łódź Press, Łódź, p. 223–232.

497 Evans, A.R., Wilson, G.P., Fortelius, M. and Jernvall, J. 2007. High-level similarity of
498 dentitions in carnivorans and rodents. *Nature* 445: 78–81.

499 Fabre, A.-C., Cornette, R., Huyghe, K., Andrade, D. V. and Herrel, A. 2014. Linear
 500 versus geometric morphometric approaches for the analysis of head shape
 501 dimorphism in lizards. *Journal of Morphology* 275: 1016–1026.

502 Friscia, A.R., Van Valkenburgh, B. and Biknevicius, A.R. 2007. An ecomorphological
 503 analysis of extant small carnivorans. *Journal of Zoology* 272: 82–100.

504 Goin, F.J. and de los Reyes, M. 2011. Contribución al conocimiento de los
 505 representantes extintos de *Lutreolina* Thomas, 1910 (Mammalia, Marsupialia,
 506 Didelphidae). *Historia Natural Tercera Serie* 1: 15–25.

507 Goin, F.J., Velázquez, C. and Scaglia, O. 1992. Orientación de las crestas cortantes en
 508 el molar tribosfénico. Sus implicancias funcionales en didelfoideos
 509 (Marsupialia) fósiles y vivientes. *Revista Del Museo de La Plata (Nueva Serie)*
 510 9: 183–198.

511 Gómez Cano, A.R., Hernández Fernández, M. and Álvarez-Sierra, M.Á. 2013. Dietary
 512 ecology of Murinae (Muridae, Rodentia): a geometric morphometric approach.
 513 *PLoS ONE* 8: e79080.

514 Harper, T., Parras, A. and Rougier, G.W. 2018. *Reigitherium* (Meridiolestida,
 515 Mesungulatoidea) an enigmatic Late Cretaceous mammal from Patagonia,
 516 Argentina: morphology, affinities, and dental evolution. *Journal of Mammalian*
 517 *Evolution*. DOI: 10.1007/s10914-018-9437-x

518 Hogue, A.S. and Ziashakeri, S. 2010. Molar crests and body mass as dietary indicators
 519 in marsupials. *Australian Journal of Zoology* 58: 56–68.

520 Kay, R.F. 1975. The functional adaptations of primate molar teeth. *American Journal of*
 521 *Physical Anthropology* 43: 195–216.

522 Kemsley, E.K. 1996. Discriminant analysis of high-dimensional data: a comparison of
523 principal components analysis and partial least squares data reduction methods.
524 *Chemometrics and Intelligent Laboratory Systems* 33: 47–61.

525 Kissling, W.D., Dalby, L., Fløjgaard, C., Lenoir, J., Sandel, B., Sandom, C.,
526 Trøjelsgaard, K. and Svenning, J.C. 2014. Establishing macroecological trait
527 datasets: digitalization, extrapolation, and validation of diet preferences in
528 terrestrial mammals worldwide. *Ecology and Evolution* 4: 2913–2930.

529 Klingenberg, C.P. 2011. MorphoJ: an integrated software package for Geometric
530 Morphometrics. *Molecular Ecology Resources* 11: 353–357.

531 Klingenberg, C.P. and Monteiro, L.R. 2005. Distances and directions in
532 multidimensional shape spaces: implications for morphometric applications.
533 *Systematic Biology* 54: 678–688.

534 Kovarovic, K., Aiello, L.C., Cardini, A. and Lockwood, C.A. 2011. Discriminant
535 function analyses in archaeology: Are classification rates too good to be true?
536 *Journal of Archaeological Science* 38: 3006–3018.

537 Lallensack, J.N., van Heteren, A.H. and Wings, O. 2016. Geometric morphometric
538 analysis of intratrackway variability: a case study on theropod and ornithopod
539 dinosaur trackways from Münchehagen (Lower Cretaceous, Germany). *PeerJ* 4:
540 e2059.

541 Liaw, A. and Wiener, M. 2002. Classification and regression by randomForest. *R News*
542 2: 18–22.

- 543 Lund, P.W. 1839. Cuop-d’oeil sur les espèces éteintes de Mammifères du Brésil; extrait
544 de quelques mémoires présentés à l’Académie royal des Sciences de
545 Copenhague. *Annales Des Sciences Naturelles, Zoologie* 11: 214–234.
- 546 Luo, Z.X. 2007. Transformation and diversification in early mammal evolution. *Nature*
547 450: 1011–1019.
- 548 Magnus, L.Z. and Cáceres, N. 2017. Phylogeny explains better than ecology or body
549 size the variation of the first lower molar in didelphid marsupials. *Mammalia* 81:
550 119–133.
- 551 Maroco, J., Silva, D., Rodrigues, A., Guerreiro, M., Santana, I. and de Mendonça, A.
552 2011. Data mining methods in the prediction of Dementia: a real-data
553 comparison of the accuracy, sensitivity and specificity of linear discriminant
554 analysis, logistic regression, neural networks, support vector machines,
555 classification trees and random forests. *BMC Research Notes* 4: 299.
- 556 Marshall, L.G. 1978. *Evolution of the Borhyaenidae, extinct South American*
557 *predaceous marsupials*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los
558 Angeles, 89 p.
- 559 Meloro, C. and Raia, P. 2010. Cats and dogs down the tree: the tempo and mode of
560 evolution in the lower carnassial of fossil and living Carnivora. *Evolutionary*
561 *Biology* 37: 177–186.
- 562 Meloro, C., Hudson, A. and Rook, L. 2015. Feeding habits of extant and fossil canids as
563 determined by their skull geometry. *Journal of Zoology* 295: 178–188.

564 Meloro, C., Raia, P., Piras, P., Barbera, C. and O'Higgins, P. 2008. The shape of the
565 mandibular corpus in large fissiped carnivores: allometry, function and
566 phylogeny. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 154: 832–845.

567 Mitteroecker, P. and Gunz, P. 2009. Advances in geometric morphometrics.
568 *Evolutionary Biology* 36: 235–247.

569 Mitteroecker, P. and Bookstein, F. 2011. Linear discrimination, ordination, and the
570 visualization of selection gradients in modern morphometrics. *Evolutionary*
571 *Biology* 38: 100–114.

572 Pascual, R. and Jaureguizar, E.O. 1990. Evolving climates and mammal faunas in
573 Cenozoic South America. *Journal of Human Evolution* 19: 23–60.

574 Pineda-Munoz, S., Lazagabaster, I.A., Alroy, J. and Evans, A.R. 2017. Inferring diet
575 from dental morphology in terrestrial mammals. *Methods in Ecology and*
576 *Evolution* 8: 481–491.

577 Piras, P., Maiorino, L., Raia, P., Marcolini, F., Salvi, D., Vignoli, L. and Kotsakis, T.
578 2010. Functional and phylogenetic constraints in Rhinocerotinae craniodental
579 morphology. *Evolutionary Ecology Research* 12: 897–928.

580 Popowics, T.E. 2003. Postcanine dental form in the Mustelidae and Viverridae
581 (Carnivora: Mammalia). *Journal of Morphology* 256: 322–341.

582 Prevosti, F.J. 2006. [*Grandes cánidos (Carnivora, Canidae) del Cuaternario de la*
583 *República Argentina: sistemática, filogenia, bioestratigrafía y paleoecología.*
584 PhD. Thesis, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, La Plata, 501 p. Unpublished.].

585 Prevosti, F.J. and Forasiepi, A.M. 2018. *Evolution of South American mammalian*
586 *predators during the Cenozoic: paleobiogeographic and paleoenvironmental*
587 *contingencies*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 358 p.

588 Prevosti, F.J., Forasiepi, A. and Zimicz, N. 2013. The evolution of the Cenozoic
589 terrestrial mammalian predator guild in South America: competition or
590 replacement? *Journal of Mammalian Evolution* 20: 3–21.

591 Prevosti, F.J., Turazzini, G.F., Ercoli, M.D. and Hingst-Zaher, E. 2012a. Mandible
592 shape in marsupial and placental carnivorous mammals: a morphological
593 comparative study using geometric morphometrics. *Zoological Journal of the*
594 *Linnean Society* 164: 836–855.

595 Prevosti, F.J., Forasiepi, A.M., Ercoli, M.D. and Turazzini, G.F. 2012b. Paleoecology of
596 the mammalian carnivores (Metatheria, Sparassodonta) of the Santa Cruz
597 Formation (late Early Miocene). In: S.F. Vizcaíno, R.F. Kay and M.S. Bargo
598 (Eds.), *Early Miocene paleobiology in Patagonia: High-latitude*
599 *paleocommunities of the Santa Cruz formation*, Cambridge University Press, p.
600 173–193.

601 Price, S.A., Hopkins, S.S.B., Smith, K.K. and Roth, V.L. 2012. Tempo of trophic
602 evolution and its impact on mammalian diversification. *Proceedings of the*
603 *National Academy of Sciences* 109: 7008–7012.

604 R Core Team. 2018. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R
605 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL [http://www.R-](http://www.R-project.org)
606 [project.org](http://www.R-project.org)

607 Reig, O.A., Kirsch, J.A.W. and Marshall, L.G. 1987. Systematic relationships of the
608 living and neocenozoic American ‘opossumlike’ marsupials (suborder

609 Didelphimorphia), with comments on the classification of these and the
 610 Cretaceous and Paleogene New World and European Metatherians. In: M.
 611 Archer (Ed.), *Possums and opossums: studies in evolution*, Surrey Beatty & Son
 612 and the Royal Zoological Society of New South Wales, Sydney, p. 1–89.

613 Rohlf, F.J. and Marcus, L.F. 1993. A revolution in morphometrics. *Trends in Ecology*
 614 *and Evolution* 8: 129–132.

615 Ryder, J.A. 1878. On the mechanical genesis of tooth-forms. *Proceedings of the*
 616 *Academy of Natural Sciences of Philadelphia* 30: 45–80.

617 Schmieder, D.A., Benítez, H.A., Borrissov, I.M. and Fruciano, C. 2015. Bat species
 618 comparisons based on external morphology: a test of traditional versus
 619 geometric morphometric approaches. *PLoS ONE* 10: e0127043.

620 Seetah, T.K., Cardini, A. and Miracle, P.T. 2012. Can morphospace shed light on cave
 621 bear spatial-temporal variation? Population dynamics of *Ursus spelaeus* from
 622 Romualdova pećina and Vindija, (Croatia). *Journal of Archaeological Science*
 623 39: 500–510.

624 Sheets, H.D., Covino, K.M., Panasiewicz, J.M. and Morris, S.R. 2006. Comparison of
 625 geometric morphometric outline methods in the discrimination of age-related
 626 differences in feather shape. *Frontiers in Zoology* 3: 15.

627 Singleton, M., Rosenberger, A.L., Robinson, C. and O'Neill, R. 2011. Allometric and
 628 metameric shape variation in *Pan* mandibular molars: a digital morphometric
 629 analysis. *The Anatomical Record: Advances in Integrative Anatomy and*
 630 *Evolutionary Biology* 294: 322–334.

631 Slice, D.E. 2007. Geometric morphometrics. *Annual Review of Anthropology* 36: 261–
632 281.

633 Smits, P.D. and Evans, A.R. 2012. Functional constraints on tooth morphology in
634 carnivorous mammals. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* 12: 146.

635 Soibelzon, L.H., Grinspan, G.A., Bocherens, H., Acosta, W.G., Jones, W., Blanco, E.R.
636 and Prevosti, F. 2014. South American giant short-faced bear (*Arctotherium*
637 *angustidens*) diet: evidence from pathology, morphology, stable isotopes, and
638 biomechanics. *Journal of Paleontology* 88: 1240–1250.

639 Solé, F. and Ladevèze, S. 2017. Evolution of the hypercarnivorous dentition in
640 mammals (Metatheria, Eutheria) and its bearing on the development of
641 tribosphenic molars. *Evolution and Development* 19: 56–68.

642 Strait, S.G. 1993a. Differences in occlusal morphology and molar size in frugivores and
643 faunivores. *Journal of Human Evolution* 25: 471–484.

644 Strait, S.G. 1993b. Molar morphology and food texture among small-bodied
645 insectivorous mammals. *Journal of Mammalogy* 74: 391–402.

646 Tarquini, S.D., Chemisquy, M.A. and Prevosti, F.J. 2018. Evolution of the carnassial in
647 living mammalian carnivores (Carnivora, Didelphimorphia, Dasyuromorphia):
648 diet, phylogeny, and allometry. *Journal of Mammalian Evolution*.
649 doi:10.1007/s10914-018-9448-7

650 Ungar, P.S. 2010. *Mammal teeth: origin, evolution, and diversity*. The Johns Hopkins
651 University Press, Baltimore, 304 p.

652 Ungar, P.S. and M'Kirera, F. 2003. A solution to the worn tooth conundrum in primate
653 functional anatomy. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 100:
654 3874–3877.

655 Van Valen, L. 1969. Evolution of dental growth and adaptation in mammalian
656 carnivores. *Evolution* 23: 96–117.

657 Van Valkenburgh, B. 1989. Carnivore dental adaptations and diet: a study of trophic
658 diversity within guilds. In: J.L. Gittleman (Ed.), *Carnivore behavior, ecology,*
659 *and evolution. Vol. 1*, Springer US, New York, p. 410–436.

660 Van Valkenburgh, B. 1991. Iterative evolution of hypercarnivory in canids (Mammalia:
661 Carnivora): evolutionary interactions among sympatric predators. *Paleobiology*
662 17: 340–362.

663 Van Valkenburgh, B. and Koepfli, K.-P. 1993. Cranial and dental adaptations to
664 predation in canids. *Symposia of the Zoological Society of London* 65: 15–37.

665 Van Valkenburgh, B., Wang, X. and Damuth, J. 2004. Cope's Rule, Hypercarnivory,
666 and extinction in North American canids. *Science* 306: 101–104.

667 Venables, W.N. and Ripley, B.D. 2002. *Modern applied statistics with S*, 4th ed.
668 Springer, New York, 450 p.

669 Vizcaíno, S.F., Bargo, M.S. and Cassini, G.H. 2006. Dental occlusal surface area in
670 relation to body mass, food habits and other biologic features in. *Ameghiniana*
671 43: 11–26.

672 Vizcaíno, S.F., Bargo, M.S., Cassini, G.H. and Toledo, N. 2016. *Forma y función en*
673 *paleobiología de vertebrados*. EDULP, La Plata, 268 p.

674 Wesley-Hunt, G.D. 2005. The morphological diversification of carnivores in North
675 America. *Paleobiology* 31: 35–55.

676 White, J. 2009. Geometric morphometric investigation of molar shape diversity in
677 modern lemurs and lorises. *The Anatomical Record: Advances in Integrative*
678 *Anatomy and Evolutionary Biology* 292: 701–719.

679 Woodburne, M.O., Rich, T.H. and Springer, M.S. 2003. The evolution of tribospheny
680 and the antiquity of mammalian clades. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*
681 28: 360–385.

682 Zelditch, M.L., Swiderski, D.L., Sheets, H.D. and Fink, W.L. 2004. *Geometric*
683 *morphometrics for biologists*. Academic Press, 407 p.

684 Zhu, J. and Pierskalla, W.P. 2016. Applying a weighted random forests method to
685 extract karst sinkholes from LiDAR data. *Journal of Hydrology* 533: 343–352.

686 Zimicz, A.N. 2012. [*Ecomorfología de los marsupiales paleógenos de América del Sur*.
687 PhD. Thesis, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, La Plata, 424p. Unpublished.].

688 Zimicz, N. 2014a. Paleoecología de los Bonapartheroidea (Marsupialia,
689 Polydolopimorphia, Bonapartheroiiformes). *Ameghiniana* 51: 106–128.

690 Zimicz, N. 2014b. Avoiding competition: the ecological history of late Cenozoic
691 metatherian carnivores in South America. *Journal of Mammalian Evolution* 21:
692 383–393.

693 Zuccotti, L.F., Williamson, M.D., Limp, W.F. and Ungar, P.S. 1998. Technical note:
694 Modeling primate occlusal topography using geographic information systems
695 technology. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 107: 137–142.

FIGURE CAPTIONS

Figure 1. Diagram of landmarks and measurements taken on specimens, in labial view

(1) and occlusal view (2). Yellow squares, landmarks; pink circles, semi-landmarks.

Landmarks: 1) paraconid; 2) carnassial notch in the paracristid; 3) protoconid; 4) metaconid; 5) distal edge of trigonid; 6) hypoconid; 7) entoconid; 8) mesial edge of trigonid; 9) distal edge of talonid. Angle α (α) is shown in dark red dashed lines. Lower angle (α) is shown in light blue dash-dotted lines. Measurements used for RGA are green solid lines: **BL**, relative blade length; **WT**, maximum width of the talonid; **LT** length of the talonid;

Figure 2. Alternative measurements taken on specimens to calculate alternative RGAs.

Symbols of landmarks as in Figure 1. Measurements: **BL'**, alternative blade length; **PA**, polygon area of the talonid.

TABLE 1 - Results of the regression analyses between morphometric indices and bgPCs

	RGA		AI		Angle α	
	%	P	%	P	%	P
<i>bgPC1</i>	94.34	< 0.0001	64.97	< 0.0001	84.34	< 0.0001
<i>bgPC2</i>	06.92	< 0.0001	02.85	0.0104	18.29	< 0.0001
<i>bgPC3</i>	12.01	< 0.0001	04.31	0.0017	11.70	< 0.0001
<i>bgPC4</i>	09.21	< 0.0001	00.26	0.4565	10.84	< 0.0001

%, percentage of variance explained; P, probability for each analysis

TABLE 2 - Summary of Confusion matrices of the different Discriminant Analyses displaying the global PCPR (Percentage of Correct Posterior Reclassification)

	<i>Lineal Discriminant Analysis</i>	<i>Quadratic Discriminant Analysis</i>	<i>Weighted Random Forests</i>
<i>All (4) bg-PCs</i>	78.17%	79.91%	89.96%
<i>3 bg-PCs</i>	69.43%	72.49%	85.59%
<i>All (3) indices</i>	50.22%	60.26%	75.98%
<i>bg-PC1</i>	56.33%	57.64%	74.67%
<i>RGA</i>	50.66%	50.66%	62.01%
<i>AI</i>	46.72%	53.28%	65.07%
<i>Angle α</i>	51.09%	47.16%	50.66%

TABLE 3 - Summary of Confusion matrices of the different Discriminant Analyses within Canidae displaying the global PCPR (Percentage of Correct Posterior Reclassification)

	<i>Lineal Discriminant Analysis</i>	<i>Quadratic Discriminant Analysis</i>	<i>Weighted Random Forests</i>
<i>All (2) bg-PCs</i>	90.38%	90.38%	92.31%
<i>All (3) indices</i>	71.15%	65.38%	69.23%
<i>bg-PC1</i>	86.54%	84.62%	75.00%
<i>RGA</i>	50.00%	65.38%	61.54%
<i>AI</i>	57.69%	57.69%	67.31%
<i>Angle α</i>	36.54%	32.69%	42.31%

TABLE 4 - Summary of dietary classification obtained from Weighted Random Forests within hypercarnivorous and mesocarnivorous Canidae

<i>Collection number</i>	<i>Species</i>	<i>Diet</i>	<i>All (3) indices</i>	<i>All (2) bg-PCs</i>
MLP-MA 1035	Canis aureus	Mesocarnivore	Omnivore	Mesocarnivore
MACN-MA 25123	Canis latrans	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MLP-PV S/N	Canis latrans	Mesocarnivore	Omnivore	Mesocarnivore
MLP-MA 1027	Canis latrans	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MACN-MA 23.15	Canis lupus	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore
MACN-MA 4256	Canis lupus	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MLP-MA 30	Canis lupus	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore
AMNH(M) S/N	Cuon alpinus	Hypercarnivore	Hypercarnivore	Hypercarnivore
MACN-MA 15109	Lycalopex culpeus	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MACN-MA 20813	Lycalopex culpeus	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MACN-MA 23719	Lycalopex culpeus	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MACN-MA 23915	Lycalopex culpeus	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MACN-MA 31.59	Lycalopex culpeus	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MACN-MA 38.39	Lycalopex culpeus	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore
AMNH(M) S/N	Lycaon pictus	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore
MACN-MA 38249	Lycaon pictus	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore
AMNH(M) S/N	Speothos venaticus	Hypercarnivore	Hypercarnivore	Hypercarnivore
MACN-MA 16510	Speothos venaticus	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore
MACN-MA 50.67	Speothos venaticus	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore
MACN-MA 35203	Vulpes lagopus	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore
MACN-MA 4.1	Vulpes lagopus	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore
MACN-MA 25149	Vulpes vulpes	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore	Omnivore
MLP-MA 744	Vulpes vulpes	Mesocarnivore	Omnivore	Mesocarnivore
MLP-PV S/N	Vulpes vulpes	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore	Mesocarnivore

The scope of traditional and geometric morphometrics for inferences of diet in carnivorous fossil mammals

Sergio D. Tarquini ^{1*}, M. Amelia Chemisquy ^{1,2}, Sandrine Ladevèze ³, and Francisco J. Prevosti ^{1,2}

1- Centro Regional de Investigaciones Científicas y Transferencia Tecnológica de La Rioja (CRILAR - Provincia de La Rioja, UNLaR, SEGEMAR, UNCa, CONICET). Entre Ríos y Mendoza s/n (5301), Anillaco, Argentina. starquini92@gmail.com; amelych80@gmail.com; protocyon@hotmail.com

2- Departamento de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de la Rioja (UNLaR). Av. Luis M. de la Fuente s/n (5300), La Rioja, Argentina.

3- Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie - Paris (CR2P - CNRS, MNHN, Sorbonne Université). 8 rue Buffon CP38 (75005), Paris, France. sandrine.ladeveze@mnhn.fr

SUPPLEMENTARY ONLINE INFORMATION 1. Studied species and specimens and their dietary classification.

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
Eutheria						
Carnivora						
Feliformia						
Felidae						
Felinae						
	<i>Acinonyx jubatus</i>	MACN-MA 49.36	m1	-	Africa	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 23688	m1	-	-	
	<i>Felis catus</i>	MACN-MA 23700	m1	-	-	
		MACN-MA 23701	m1	-	-	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 23702	m1	-	-	
		MACN-MA 17254	m1	♀	Bolivia	
		MACN-MA 23692	m1	♀	Misiones, Argentina	
	<i>Herpailurus yagouaroundi</i>	MACN-MA 25772	m1	♂	Salta, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 33.4	m1	♂	Mendoza, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 50104	m1	♂	-	
		MACN-MA 50555	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 16489	m1	-	Neuquén, Argentina	
	<i>Leopardus colocolo</i>	MACN-MA 22928	m1	♀	Salta, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 22934	m1	-	Santa Cruz, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 23176	m1	-	La Pampa, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 30103	m1	♂	Neuquén, Argentina	
	<i>Leopardus geoffroyi</i>	MACN-MA 15425	m1	♂	Córdoba, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 22022	m1	-	Bs. As., Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Leopardus geoffroyi</i>	MACN-MA 24214	m1	♂	La Rioja, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 23329	m1	♀	Neuquén, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 34337	m1	♀	La Pampa, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 39209	m1	♀	La Pampa, Argentina	
	<i>Leopardus guigna</i>	MLP-MA 1297	m1	-	Chubut, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
	<i>Leopardus pardalis</i>	MACN-MA 13464	m1	♀	Bolivia	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 13465	m1	♀	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50.98	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50101	m1	♀	Tucumán, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50540	m1	♂	Santa Fé, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 51132	m1	♂	Bolivia	
	<i>Leopardus tigrinus</i>	MACN-MA 23709	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 51121	m1	-	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 52.57	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	
	<i>Leopardus wiedii</i>	MACN-MA 23694	m1	-	Misiones, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 24899	m1	♀	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50.94	m1	♂	Bolivia	
		MACN-MA 50.95	m1	-	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50.97	m1	♂	Bolivia	
		MACN-MA 51137	m1	♂	Bolivia	
		MACN-MA 25.118	m1	♂	Mexico	
	<i>Lynx rufus</i>	MLP-PV S/N	m1	♂	Millbridge, Maine, USA	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Puma concolor</i>	MACN-MA 13339	m1	-	San Luis, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 20629	m1	-	La Pampa, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 30250	m1	♂	Neuquén, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 32.80	m1	♀	San Luis, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 36614	m1	♂	Santa Cruz, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 49295	m1	-	Salta, Argentina	
	Pantherinae					
	<i>Panthera leo</i>	MACN-MA 23.1	m1	-	Africa	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 25158	m1	-	Africa	
		MACN-MA 29904	m1	♀	Africa	
		MACN-MA 4254	m1	-	Africa	
		MACN-MA 4330	m1	-	Africa	
		MACN-MA 4337	m1	-	Africa	
	<i>Panthera onca</i>	MACN-MA 21622	m1	-	Misiones, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 25.66	m1	-	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 25769	m1	♀	Tucumán, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 4301	m1	-	South America	
		MACN-MA 7.8	m1	-	Bolivia	
		MACN-MA 8.43	m1	-	Bolivia	
	<i>Panthera pardus</i>	MLP-MA 1040	m1	-	Africa	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
	<i>Panthera tigris</i>	MACN-MA 25.54	m1	-	Sumatra	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MACN-MA 26.83	m1	-	India	
		MLP-MA 1048	m1	-	-	
		MLP-MA 1051	m1	-	-	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Panthera tigris</i>	MLP-MA 112	m1	-	India	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
		MLP-MA 11-IV-48-1	m1	-	-	
	<i>Panthera uncia</i>	MACN-MA 8.23	m1	-	Asia	Hypercarnivore (Sunquist & Sunquist, 2009)
	Herpestidae					
	Herpestinae					
	<i>Herpestes ichneumon</i>	MLP-MA 1029	m1	-	Africa	Hypercarnivore (Rosalino <i>et al.</i> , 2009)
		MLP-MA 1323	m1	-	Africa	
	Hyaenidae					
	Hyaeninae					
	<i>Crocuta crocuta</i>	MACN-MA 24525	m1	-	Africa	Hypercarnivore (Holekamp & Kolowski, 2009)
		MACN-MA 33277	m1	-	Africa	
	<i>Hyaena hyaena</i>	MACN-MA 15.28	m1	-	Africa	Mesocarnivore (Holekamp & Kolowski, 2009)
		MACN-MA 25103	m1	-	Africa	
		MACN-MA 4.6	m1	-	Africa	
		MLP-MA 1039	m1	-	-	
	Viverridae					
	Genettinae					
	<i>Genetta genetta</i>	MACN-MA 21104	m1	-	Spain	Mesocarnivore (Torre <i>et al.</i> , 2003)
		MACN-MA 21105	m1	-	Spain	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Genetta genetta</i>	MACN-MA 21106	m1	-	Spain	Mesocarnivore (Torre <i>et al.</i> , 2003)
		MACN-MA 21107	m1	-	Spain	
		MACN-MA 23.43	m1	-	Africa	
	Caniformia					
	Canidae					
	<i>Canis aureus</i>	MLP-MA 1035	m1	-	-	Mesocarnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
	<i>Canis latrans</i>	MACN-MA 25123	m1	-	North America	Mesocarnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MLP-MA 1027	m1	-	Africa	
		MLP-PV S/N	m1	-	South Dakota, USA	
	<i>Canis lupus</i>	MACN-MA 23.15	m1	-	Russia	Hypercarnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 4256	m1	-	Europe	
		MLP-MA 30	m1	-	-	
	<i>Cerdocyon thous</i>	MACN-MA 14322	m1	♂	Santa Fe, Argentina	Omnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 14681	m1	♂	Salta, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 16189	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 20456	m1	♀	Salta, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 48.10	m1	♀	Salta, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50.61	m1	♀	Bolivia	
	<i>Chrysocyon brachyurus</i>	MACN-MA 19146	m1	-	-	Omnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 23984	m1	-	Corrientes, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24043	m1	-	Corrientes, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24750	m1	-	Paraguay	
		MACN-MA 3.73	m1	-	-	
		MACN-MA 53.49	m1	-	-	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Cuon alpinus</i>	AMNH(M) S/N	m1	-		Hypercarnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
	<i>Lycalopex culpaeus</i>	MACN-MA 15109	m1	♂	Neuquén, Argentina	Mesocarnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 20813	m1	♂	Neuquén, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 23719	m1	♂	Jujuy, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 23915	m1	♀	Ecuador	
		MACN-MA 31.59	m1	-	-	
		MACN-MA 38.39	m1	-	-	
	<i>Lycalopex griseus</i>	MACN-MA 15186	m1	♂	Neuquén, Argentina	Omnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 20205	m1	♂	Río Negro, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 20207	m1	♂	Río Negro, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 20278	m1	♀	Río Negro, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 20814	m1	♀	Río Negro, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 36480	m1	♀	Salta, Argentina	
	<i>Lycalopex gymnocercus</i>	MACN-MA 14319	m1	♂	La Pampa, Argentina	Omnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 16041	m1	♂	Córdoba, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 16049	m1	♂	La Pampa, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 29.35	m1	♀	La Pampa, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 49134	m1	♀	Salta, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 49148	m1	♀	La Pampa, Argentina	
	<i>Lycalopex vetulus</i>	MLP-PV S/N	m1	-	Brazil	Omnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
	<i>Lycaon pictus</i>	AMNH(M) S/N	m1	-	Africa	Hypercarnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 38249	m1	-	Africa	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Speothos venaticus</i>	AMNH(M) S/N	m1	-	-	Hypercarnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 16510	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50.67	m1	♂	Bolivia	
	<i>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</i>	MACN-MA 6.33	m1	-	USA	Omnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MLP-PV S/N	m1	-	Massachusetts, USA	
	<i>Vulpes lagopus</i>	MACN-MA 35203	m1	-	Russia	Mesocarnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
		MACN-MA 4.1	m1	-	Russia	
	<i>Vulpes vulpes</i>	MACN-MA 25149	m1	-	Germany	Mesocarnivore (Padial <i>et al.</i> , 2002)
		MLP-MA 744	m1	-	Rome, Italy	
		MLP-PV S/N	m1	♂	Massachusetts, USA	
	<i>Vulpes zerda</i>	MACN-MA 9.14	m1	-	Africa	Omnivore (Sillero-Zubiri, 2009)
	Ursidae					
	Ailuropodinae					
	<i>Ailuropoda melanoleuca</i>	MNHN-ZM-AC 1874-273	m1	-	Tibet, China	Herbivore (Garshelis, 2009)
	Tremarctinae					
	<i>Tremarctos ornatus</i>	MACN-MA 17830	m1	♂	Bolivia	Herbivore (Garshelis, 2009)
		MACN-MA 50.87	m1	-	Bolivia	
	Ursinae					
	<i>Helarctos malayanus</i>	MACN-MA 25.49	m1	-	Indonesia	Omnivore (Garshelis, 2009)
	<i>Ursus americanus</i>	MLP-MA 1011	m1	-	-	Omnivore (Garshelis, 2009)
	<i>Ursus arctos</i>	MACN-MA 35208	m1	♂	Russia	Omnivore (Garshelis, 2009)
	<i>Ursus maritimus</i>	MACN-MA 26124	m1	-	Norway	Hypercarnivore (Garshelis, 2009)
		MACN-MA 33.94	m1	-	Norway	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Ursus maritimus</i>	MACN-MA 35204	m1	-	Russia	Hypercarnivore (Garshelis, 2009)
		MLP-MA 1004	m1	-	-	
	Mephitidae					
	Mephitinae					
	<i>Conepatus chinga</i>	MACN-MA 13499	m1	♀	Corrientes, Argentina	Omnivore (Dragoo, 2009)
		MACN-MA 13714	m1	♂	Salta, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 23992	m1	-	Uruguay	
		MACN-MA 24002	m1	-	Río Negro, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24006	m1	-	Río Negro, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24719	m1	-	Río Negro, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 30393	m1	♂	Catán-Lil, Neuquén, Argentina	
	<i>Mephitis mephitis</i>	MACN-MA 23520	m1	♀	USA	Omnivore (Dragoo, 2009)
		MACN-MA 23521	m1	♂	USA	
		MLP-PV S/N	m1	♀	Massachusetts, USA	
	<i>Spilogale gracilis</i>	MACN-MA 34551	m1	♂	USA	Omnivore (Dragoo, 2009)
		MACN-MA 34552	m1	♀	USA	
	Mustelidae					
	Ictonychinae					
	<i>Galictis cuja</i>	MACN-MA 13498	m1	♂	El Bolson, Río Negro, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MACN-MA 13965	m1	♀	Catán-Lil, Neuquén, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 16254	m1	♀	Bs. As., Argentina	
		MACN-MA 16520	m1	♂	Cushamen, Chubut, Argentina	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Galictis cuja</i>	MACN-MA 23291	m1	♂	Bs. As., Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MACN-MA 23793	m1	-	Bs. As., Argentina	
	<i>Galictis vittata</i>	MACN-MA 50.91	m1	♀	Bolivia	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
	<i>Ictonyx libyca</i>	MACN-MA 24.12	m1	-	Africa	Mesocarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
	<i>Lyncodon patagonicus</i>	MACN-MA 31214	m1	♂	Patquía, La Rioja, Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MLP-MA 29-XII-00-17	m1	-	Río Negro, Argentina	
	Lutrinae					
	<i>Lontra felina</i>	MACN-MA 34602	m1	-	Isla de los Estados, Argentina	Piscivore (Kruuk, 2006)
	<i>Lontra longicaudi</i>	MACN-MA 13073	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	Piscivore (Kruuk, 2006)
		MACN-MA 24.13	m1	♀	Paraguay	
		MACN-MA 24662	m1	-	-	
		MACN-MA 24665	m1	-	America	
		MACN-MA 24666	m1	♀	Delta del Paraná, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 25357	m1	♀	Bs. As., Argentina	
		MACN-MA 30234	m1	-	Chaco, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 30246	m1	-	Chaco, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 5.11	m1	-	Santa Fé, Argentina	
	<i>Lontra provocax</i>	MLP-MA 1282	m1	-	Tierra del Fuego, Argentina	Piscivore (Kruuk, 2006)
	<i>Pteronura braziliensis</i>	MACN-MA 25783	m1	-	-	Piscivore (Kruuk, 2006)
		MACN-MA 33155	m1	-	Bolivia	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	Guloninae					
		MACN-MA 20457	m1	♂	Iguazú, Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 31.61	m1	♀	Bolivia	
	<i>Eira barbara</i>	MACN-MA 47202	m1	♀	Bolivia	Omnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MACN-MA 50.90	m1	♀	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50.92	m1	♂	Salta, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 52.38	m1	♂	Ecuador	
	<i>Martes martes</i>	MACN-MA 4.50	m1	-	-	Mesocarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
	Melinae					
		MACN-MA 41227	m1	-	Europe	
	<i>Meles meles</i>	MACN-MA 4250	m1	-	Southern Europe	Omnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MACN-MA 5.36	m1	-	Europe	
	Mustelinae					
	<i>Mustela eversmanni</i>	MACN-MA 35206	m1	-	Russia	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
	<i>Mustela nivalis</i>	MLP-MA 1018	m1	-	Europe	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MACN-MA 20645	m1	-	Spain	
	<i>Mustela putorius</i>	MACN-MA 25148	m1	-	Europe	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MLP-MA 6-111-36-35	m1	-	Spain	
	<i>Mustela sibirica</i>	MACN-MA 35207	m1	♂	Russia	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MACN-MA 16327	m1	♂	Chubut, Argentina	
	<i>Neovison vison</i>	MACN-MA 17825	m1	♂	Bs. As., Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MACN-MA 17826	m1	♂	Chubut, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 19186	m1	♀	Bs. As., Argentina	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
	<i>Neovison vison</i>	MACN-MA 19187	m1	♀	Bs. As., Argentina	Hypercarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
		MACN-MA 19188	m1	♀	Chubut, Argentina	
	Taxidiinae					
	<i>Taxidea taxus</i>	MLP-PV S/N	m1	-	-	Mesocarnivore (Larivière & Jennings, 2009)
	Procyonidae					
	<i>Bassaricyon alleni</i>	MACN-MA 31.68	m1	-	Ecuador	Herbivore (Kays, 2009)
		MACN-MA 50.81	m1	♂	Bolivia	
		MACN-MA 50.82	m1	♂	Bolivia	
	<i>Nasua nasua</i>	MACN-MA 49402	m1	♀	Bolivia	Omnivore (Kays, 2009)
		MACN-MA 49415	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 49457	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50.77	m1	♀	Misiones, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50535	m1	♂	Misiones, Argentina	
	<i>Procyon cancrivorus</i>	MACN-MA 13816	m1	-	Jujuy, Argentina	Omnivore (Kays, 2009)
		MACN-MA 16190	m1	-	Tucumán, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 17116	m1	-	Santa Fe, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 32254	m1	♀	Corrientes, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 33.7	m1	♀	Jujuy, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 41109	m1	♀	San Javier, Santa Fe, Argentina	
	<i>Procyon lotor</i>	MLP-MA 1005	m1	-	-	Omnivore (Kays, 2009)
		MLP-PV S/N	m1	♀	Massachusetts, USA	

	Species	Collection number	Digitized molar	Sex	Provenance	Diet (reference)
Metatheria						
	Dasyuromorphia					
	Dasyuridae					
	Dasyurinae					
	<i>Dasyurus geoffroii</i>	FMNH 35329	m4	♀	Australia	Mesocarnivore (Baker, 2015)
	Thylacinidae					
	<i>Thylacinus cynocephalus</i>	FMNH 81522	m4	-	Tasmania	Hypercarnivore (Helgen & Veatch, 2015)
	Didelphimorphia					
	Didelphidae					
	Didelphinae					
	<i>Didelphis albiventris</i>	MACN-MA 13139	m4	♀	Concordia, Entre Ríos, Argentina	Omnivore (Vieira & Astúa de Moraes, 2003)
		MACN-MA 24149	m4	♂	Bs. As., Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24150	m4	-	Corrientes, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24169	m4	♂	Concordia, Entre Ríos, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 49.49	m4	-	Corrientes, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 49.51	m4	♂	Corrientes, Argentina	
	<i>Lutreolina crassicaudata</i>	MACN-MA 13265	m4	♂	Bs. As., Argentina	Mesocarnivore (Vieira & Astúa de Moraes, 2003)
		MACN-MA 24110	m4	♂	Formosa, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24111	m4	-	Corrientes, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24112	m4	♂	Corrientes, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 24780	m4	-	Corrientes, Argentina	
		MACN-MA 50477	m4	♂	Bs. As., Argentina	

Institutional abbreviations

AMNH, American Museum of Natural History, New York; FMNH, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago; MLP, Museo de La Plata, La Plata; MACN, Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales “Bernardino Rivadavia”, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires; MNHN, Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle, Paris.

References

- Baker, A.M. 2015. Family Dasyuridae (Carnivorous marsupials). In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 5. Monotremes and Marsupials*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 232–348.
- Dragoo, J.W. 2009. Family Mephitidae (Skunks). In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 1. Carnivores*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 532–563.
- Garshelis, D.L. 2009. Family Ursidae (Bears). In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 1. Carnivores*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 448–497.
- Helgen, K.M. and Veatch, E.G. 2015. Recent extinct australian marsupials and monotremes. In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 5. Monotremes and Marsupials*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 17–31.
- Holekamp, K.E. and Kolowski, J.M. 2009. Family Hyaenidae (Hyenas). In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 1. Carnivores*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 234–261.
- Kays, R. 2009. Family Procyonidae (Raccons). In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 1. Carnivores*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 504–531.
- Kruuk, H. 2006. *Otters: Ecology Behaviour and Conservation*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Larivière, S. and Jennings, A.P. 2009. Family Mustelidae (Weasels and relatives). In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 1. Carnivores*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 564–656.
- Padial, J.M., Avila, E. and Sanchez, J.M. 2002. Feeding habits and overlap among red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*) and stone marten (*Martes foina*) in two Mediterranean mountain habitats. *Mammalian Biology* 67: 137–146.
- Rosalino, L.M. and Santos-Reis, M. 2009. Fruit consumption by carnivores in Mediterranean Europe. *Mammal Review* 39: 67–78.

- Sillero-Zubiri, C. 2009. Family Canidae (Dogs). In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 1. Carnivores*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 352–447.
- Sunquist, M.E. and Sunquist, F.C. 2009. Family Felidae (Cats). In: Wilson, D.E. and R.A. Mittermeier (Eds.), *Handbook of the Mammals of the World. Vol. 1. Carnivores*, Lynx Edicions, Barcelona, pp. 54–169.
- Torre, I., Ballesteros, T. and Degollada, A. 2003. Changes in the diet of the genet (*Genetta genetta* Linnaeus, 1758) in relation to small mammal-prey availability: possible choice of the bank vole? *Galemys* 15: 25–36.
- Vieira, E.M. and Astúa de Moraes, D. 2003. Carnivory and insectivory in Neotropical marsupials. In: Jones, M.E., C.R. Dickman and M. Archer (Eds.), *Predators with pouches*, CSIRO Publishing, Collingwood, pp. 271–284.

The scope of traditional and geometric morphometrics for inferences of diet in carnivorous fossil mammals

Sergio D. Tarquini ^{1*}, M. Amelia Chemisquy ^{1,2}, Sandrine Ladevèze ³, and Francisco J. Prevosti ^{1,2}

1- Centro Regional de Investigaciones Científicas y Transferencia Tecnológica de La Rioja (CRILAR - Provincia de La Rioja, UNLaR, SEGEMAR, UNCa, CONICET).

Entre Ríos y Mendoza s/n (5301), Anillaco, Argentina. starquini92@gmail.com; amelych80@gmail.com; protocyon@hotmail.com

2- Departamento de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de la Rioja (UNLaR). Av. Luis M. de la Fuente s/n (5300), La Rioja, Argentina.

3- Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie - Paris (CR2P - CNRS, MNHN, Sorbonne Université). 8 rue Buffon CP38 (75005), Paris, France. sandrine.ladeveze@mnhn.fr

SUPPLEMENTARY ONLINE INFORMATION 2. Confusion matrices of the different Discriminant Analyses using the scores of the classic indices and the bg-PCs. PCPR = Percentage of Correct Posterior Reclassification (global percentage shown in bold).

Linear Discriminant Analysis						
All (3) indices						
	<i>Herbivore</i>	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>Piscivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	0	0	2	1	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	70	33	1	1	66.67
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	1	23	6	4	67.65
<i>Omnivore</i>	17	0	26	13	15	18.31
<i>Piscivore</i>	1	0	1	5	6	46.15
<i>%Error</i>	85.71	1.41	72.29	51.85	77.78	50.22

RGA						
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	0	0	1	2	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	72	31	2	0	68.57
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	1	26	6	1	76.47
<i>Omnivore</i>	21	0	31	12	7	16.90
<i>Piscivore</i>	1	0	1	8	3	23.08
<i>%Error</i>	88.00	1.37	70.79	58.62	76.92	50.66

AI						
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	2	0	1	0	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	1	90	12	2	0	85.71
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	7	14	8	0	5	23.53
<i>Omnivore</i>	22	9	28	3	9	4.23
<i>Piscivore</i>	4	0	4	2	3	23.08
<i>%Error</i>	91.89	21.74	84.62	62.50	82.35	46.72

Angle α						
<i>Herbivore</i>	4	0	0	0	2	66.67
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	4	70	20	9	2	66.67
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	1	3	24	5	1	70.59
<i>Omnivore</i>	21	0	30	15	5	21.13
<i>Piscivore</i>	4	0	0	5	4	30.77
<i>%Error</i>	88.24	4.11	67.57	55.88	71.43	51.09

<i>Linear Discriminant Analysis</i>						
<i>All (4) bg-PCs</i>						
	<i>Herbivore</i>	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>Piscivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Herbivore</i>	5	0	0	1	0	83.33
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	93	6	5	1	88.57
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	0	28	3	3	82.35
<i>Omnivore</i>	17	0	8	40	6	56.34
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	0	0	13	100.00
<i>%Error</i>	77.27	0.00	33.33	18.37	43.48	78.17
<i>3 bg-PCs</i>						
<i>Herbivore</i>	5	0	0	1	0	83.33
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	91	7	5	2	86.67
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	4	23	6	1	67.65
<i>Omnivore</i>	20	0	17	27	7	38.03
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	0	0	13	100.00
<i>%Error</i>	80.00	4.21	51.06	30.77	43.48	69.43
<i>bg-PC1</i>						
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	0	0	3	0	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	80	21	4	0	76.19
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	2	27	0	5	79.41
<i>Omnivore</i>	24	0	13	8	26	11.27
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	0	2	11	84.62
<i>%Error</i>	88.89	2.44	55.74	52.94	73.81	56.33

Quadratic Discriminant Analysis						
All (3) indices						
	<i>Herbivore</i>	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>Piscivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	0	0	3	0	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	1	77	25	0	2	73.33
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	3	28	2	1	82.36
<i>Omnivore</i>	10	0	34	20	7	28.17
<i>Piscivore</i>	1	0	0	2	10	76.92
<i>%Error</i>	80.00	3.75	67.82	25.93	50.00	60.26

RGA						
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	0	0	1	2	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	73	30	0	2	69.52
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	2	26	0	6	76.47
<i>Omnivore</i>	19	0	33	3	16	4.23
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	1	1	11	84.62
<i>%Error</i>	86.36	2.67	71.11	40.00	70.27	50.66

AI						
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	2	0	0	1	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	92	10	0	3	87.62
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	16	6	1	11	17.65
<i>Omnivore</i>	9	10	23	10	19	14.08
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	2	0	11	84.62
<i>%Error</i>	75.00	23.33	85.37	9.09	75.56	53.28

Angle α						
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	0	0	1	2	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	4	70	25	1	5	66.67
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	1	3	26	2	2	76.47
<i>Omnivore</i>	21	0	32	4	14	5.63
<i>Piscivore</i>	5	0	1	2	5	38.46
<i>%Error</i>	91.18	4.11	69.05	60.00	82.14	47.16

<i>Quadratic Discriminant Analysis</i>						
<i>All (4) bg-PCs</i>						
	<i>Herbivore</i>	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>Piscivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Herbivore</i>	2	0	0	4	0	33.33
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	93	8	4	0	88.57
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	0	28	6	0	82.35
<i>Omnivore</i>	9	1	14	47	0	66.20
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	0	0	13	100.00
<i>%Error</i>	81.81	1.06	44.00	22.95	0.00	79.91
<i>3 bg-PCs</i>						
<i>Herbivore</i>	4	0	0	2	0	66.67
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	88	13	4	0	83.81
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	4	25	5	0	73.53
<i>Omnivore</i>	13	0	22	36	0	50.70
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	0	0	13	100.00
<i>%Error</i>	76.47	4.35	58.33	23.40	0.00	72.49
<i>bg-PC1</i>						
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	0	0	3	0	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	88	13	4	0	83.81
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	3	26	0	5	76.47
<i>Omnivore</i>	25	0	16	5	25	7.04
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	1	2	10	76.92
<i>%Error</i>	89.29	3.30	53.57	64.29	75.00	57.64

Weighted Random Forests						
<i>All (3) indices</i>						
	<i>Herbivore</i>	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>Piscivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Herbivore</i>	1	1	1	3	0	16.67
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	93	9	3	0	88.57
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	12	14	8	0	41.18
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	2	3	62	4	87.32
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	0	9	4	30.77
<i>%Error</i>	0.00	13.89	48.15	27.06	50.00	75.98

<i>RGA</i>						
<i>Herbivore</i>	2	0	0	3	1	33.33
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	85	11	8	1	80.95
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	1	12	8	12	1	23.53
<i>Omnivore</i>	1	9	9	44	8	61.97
<i>Piscivore</i>	1	2	1	6	3	23.08
<i>%Error</i>	60.00	21.30	62.07	39.73	78.57	62.01

<i>AI</i>						
<i>Herbivore</i>	0	2	1	3	0	0.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	2	87	10	4	2	82.86
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	12	10	11	1	29.41
<i>Omnivore</i>	2	3	11	49	6	69.01
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	1	1	8	3	23.08
<i>%Error</i>	100.00	17.14	69.70	34.67	75.00	65.07

<i>Angle α</i>						
<i>Herbivore</i>	0	1	0	2	3	0.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	2	75	14	13	1	71.43
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	12	9	12	1	26.47
<i>Omnivore</i>	3	16	11	32	9	45.07
<i>Piscivore</i>	2	3	1	7	0	0.00
<i>%Error</i>	100.00	29.91	74.29	51.52	100.00	50.66

Weighted Random Forests						
All (4) bg-PCs						
	<i>Herbivore</i>	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>Piscivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Herbivore</i>	3	0	0	3	0	50.00
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	97	2	6	0	92.38
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	1	29	4	0	85.29
<i>Omnivore</i>	1	1	5	64	0	90.14
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	0	0	13	100.00
<i>%Error</i>	25.00	2.02	19.44	27.66	0.00	89.96
3 bg-PCs						
<i>Herbivore</i>	1	0	0	5	0	16.67
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	99	3	3	0	94.29
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	4	21	9	0	61.76
<i>Omnivore</i>	1	2	6	62	0	87.32
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	0	0	0	13	100.00
<i>%Error</i>	50.00	5.71	30.00	21.52	0.00	85.59
bg-PCI						
<i>Herbivore</i>	5	0	0	1	0	83.33
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	92	10	2	1	87.62
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	9	17	5	3	50.00
<i>Omnivore</i>	2	3	7	52	7	73.24
<i>Piscivore</i>	0	1	2	5	5	38.46
<i>%Error</i>	28.57	12.38	52.78	20.00	68.75	74.67

The scope of traditional and geometric morphometrics for inferences of diet in carnivorous fossil mammals

Sergio D. Tarquini ^{1*}, M. Amelia Chemisquy ^{1,2}, Sandrine Ladevèze ³, and Francisco J. Prevosti ^{1,2}

1- Centro Regional de Investigaciones Científicas y Transferencia Tecnológica de La Rioja (CRILAR - Provincia de La Rioja, UNLaR, SEGEMAR, UNCa, CONICET).

Entre Ríos y Mendoza s/n (5301), Anillaco, Argentina. starquini92@gmail.com; amelych80@gmail.com; protocyon@hotmail.com

2- Departamento de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de la Rioja (UNLaR). Av. Luis M. de la Fuente s/n (5300), La Rioja, Argentina.

3- Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie - Paris (CR2P - CNRS, MNHN, Sorbonne Université). 8 rue Buffon CP38 (75005), Paris, France. sandrine.ladeveze@mnhn.fr

SUPPLEMENTARY ONLINE INFORMATION 3. Confusion matrices of the Discriminant Analyses using the scores of the classic indices and the bg-PCs within Canidae. PCPR = Percentage of Correct Posterior Reclassification (global percentage shown in bold).

Linear Discriminant Analysis				
All (2) bg-PCs				
	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	8	1	0	88.89
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	15	0	100.00
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	4	24	85.71
<i>%Error</i>	0.00	25.00	0.00	90.38
All (3) índices				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	5	4	0	55.56
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	6	9	0	55.56
<i>Omnivore</i>	3	2	23	82.14
<i>%Error</i>	64.29	40.00	0.00	71.15
Bg-PCI				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	8	1	0	88.89
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	14	1	93.33
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	5	23	82.14
<i>%Error</i>	0.00	30.00	4.17	86.54
RGA				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	9	0	0.00
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	11	2	2	13.33
<i>Omnivore</i>	4	0	24	85.71
<i>%Error</i>	100.00	81.82	7.69	50.00
AI				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	5	4	0	55.56
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	6	5	4	33.33
<i>Omnivore</i>	1	7	20	71.43
<i>%Error</i>	58.33	68.75	16.67	57.69
Angle α				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	0	4	5	0.00
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	3	8	4	53.33
<i>Omnivore</i>	3	14	11	39.29
<i>%Error</i>	100.00	77.78	45.00	36.54

Quadratic Discriminant Analysis				
All (2) bg-PCs				
	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	8	1	0	88.89
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	1	14	0	93.33
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	3	25	89.29
<i>%Error</i>	11.11	22.22	0.00	90.38
All (3) indices				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	4	5	0	44.44
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	4	9	2	60.00
<i>Omnivore</i>	1	6	21	75.00
<i>%Error</i>	55.56	55.00	8.70	65.38
Bg-PCI				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	8	1	0	88.89
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	1	13	1	86.67
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	5	23	82.14
<i>%Error</i>	11.11	33.33	4.17	84.62
RGA				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	7	2	0	77.78
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	10	3	2	20.00
<i>Omnivore</i>	2	2	24	85.71
<i>%Error</i>	63.16	57.14	7.69	65.38
AI				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	5	4	0	55.56
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	6	5	4	33.33
<i>Omnivore</i>	1	7	20	71.43
<i>%Error</i>	58.33	68.75	83.33	57.69
Angle α				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	2	3	4	22.22
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	2	7	6	46.67
<i>Omnivore</i>	3	17	8	28.57
<i>%Error</i>	71.43	74.07	55.56	32.69

Weighted Random Forests				
All (2) bg-PCs				
	<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	<i>Omnivore</i>	<i>PCPR</i>
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	8	1	0	88.89
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	0	14	1	93.33
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	2	26	92.86
<i>%Error</i>	0.00	17.65	3.70	92.31
All (3) indices				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	2	7	0	22.22
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	4	8	3	53.33
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	2	26	92.86
<i>%Error</i>	66.67	52.94	10.34	69.23
Bg-PCI				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	8	1	0	88.89
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	1	9	5	60.00
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	6	22	78.57
<i>%Error</i>	11.11	43.75	18.52	75.00
RGA				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	1	7	1	11.11
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	6	6	3	40.00
<i>Omnivore</i>	0	3	25	89.29
<i>%Error</i>	85.71	62.50	13.79	61.54
AI				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	6	2	1	66.67
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	4	6	5	40.00
<i>Omnivore</i>	1	4	23	82.14
<i>%Error</i>	45.45	50.00	20.69	67.31
Angle α				
<i>Hypercarnivore</i>	1	2	6	11.11
<i>Mesocarnivore</i>	2	4	9	26.67
<i>Omnivore</i>	6	5	17	60.71
<i>%Error</i>	88.89	63.64	46.88	42.31

The scope of traditional and geometric morphometrics for inferences of diet in carnivorous fossil mammals

Sergio D. Tarquini ^{1*}, M. Amelia Chemisquy ^{1,2}, Sandrine Ladevèze ³, and Francisco J. Prevosti ^{1,2}

1- Centro Regional de Investigaciones Científicas y Transferencia Tecnológica de La Rioja (CRILAR - Provincia de La Rioja, UNLaR, SEGEMAR, UNCa, CONICET).

Entre Ríos y Mendoza s/n (5301), Anillaco, Argentina. starquini92@gmail.com; amelych80@gmail.com; protocyon@hotmail.com

2- Departamento de Ciencias Exactas, Físicas y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de la Rioja (UNLaR). Av. Luis M. de la Fuente s/n (5300), La Rioja, Argentina.

3- Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie - Paris (CR2P - CNRS, MNHN, Sorbonne Université). 8 rue Buffon CP38 (75005), Paris, France. sandrine.ladeveze@mnhn.fr

SUPPLEMENTARY ONLINE INFORMATION 4. Differences in classifications if the RGA is averaged by species or not.

The RGA values used in this study correspond to measurements taken by calliper (Prevosti, 2006). We compared the use of the average value of the RGA per species, versus the use of the observed variation (*i.e.*, including the value of each specimen separately). In the first case, we averaged the RGA per species, obtaining a single value per species. Under this example, the diets could be classified with a series of logical rules: *e.g.*, a taxon can be considered hypercarnivorous when the RGA index is lower than 0.45; insectivore when the RGA index is larger than 1. Although the limit between omnivores and mesocarnivores is ambiguous and it is usually determined arbitrarily.

RGA AVERAGED

Species	RGA	Diet	Classification based on the limits established by the RGA
<i>Cuos alpinus</i>	0.396	Hypercarnivore	Hypercarnivore
<i>Lycaon pictus</i>	0.427	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Canis lupus</i>	0.440	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Speothos venaticus</i>	0.447	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Canis latrans</i>	0.468	Mesocarnivore	Mesocarnivore
<i>Vulpes lagopus</i>	0.472	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Cerdocyon thous</i>	0.483	Omnivore	Omnivore / Mesocarnivore
<i>Lycalopex culpeus</i>	0.501	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Chrysocyon brachyurus</i>	0.510	Omnivore	
<i>Vulpes vulpes</i>	0.537	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Lycalopex gymnocercus</i>	0.540	Omnivore	
<i>Canis aureus</i>	0.570	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Lycalopex griseus</i>	0.573	Omnivore	
<i>Vulpes zerda</i>	0.596	Omnivore	Omnivore
<i>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</i>	0.630	Omnivore	
<i>Lycalopex vetus</i>	0.676	Omnivore	
<i>Otocyon megalotis</i>	1.092	Insectivore	Insectivore

In the second case, we used the intraspecific variation including the maximum and minimum values for each species. Considering these values, the overlap between the diet categories is much greater. The limits between hypercarnivores and mesocarnivores, hypercarnivores and omnivores, and omnivores and mesocarnivores, are ambiguous.

MAXIMUM AND MINIMUM RGA FOR EACH SPECIES

Species	RGA	Diet	Classification based on the limits established by the RGA
<i>Cuon alpinus</i> (max)	0.38315075	Hypercarnivore	Hypercarnivore
<i>Speothos venaticus</i> (max)	0.38899377	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Canis lupus</i> (max)	0.39954606	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Vulpes lagopus</i> (max)	0.40203548	Mesocarnivore	Hypercarnivore / Mesocarnivore
<i>Lycaon pictus</i> (max)	0.41193274	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Lycalopex culpeus</i> (max)	0.41656346	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Cuon alpinus</i> (min)	0.42707933	Hypercarnivore	Hypercarnivore / Mesocarnivore / Omnivore
<i>Lycalopex gymnocercus</i> (max)	0.43352668	Omnivore	
<i>Canis latrans</i> (max)	0.43876609	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Lycaon pictus</i> (min)	0.4401231	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Chrysocyon brachyurus</i> (max)	0.47260203	Omnivore	
<i>Canis lupus</i> (min)	0.47866607	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Canis aureus</i> (max)	0.48129375	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Vulpes vulpes</i> (max)	0.48323788	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Speothos venaticus</i> (min)	0.48422978	Hypercarnivore	
<i>Canis latrans</i> (min)	0.48460054	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Lycalopex griseus</i> (max)	0.50013523	Omnivore	Omnivore / Mesocarnivore
<i>Cerdocyon thous</i> (max)	0.50764504	Omnivore	
<i>Vulpes lagopus</i> (min)	0.53516599	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</i> (max)	0.53516937	Omnivore	
<i>Lycalopex culpeus</i> (min)	0.55065397	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Chrysocyon brachyurus</i> (min)	0.55356594	Omnivore	
<i>Vulpes vulpes</i> (min)	0.56869599	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Vulpes zerda</i> (max)	0.59363335	Omnivore	
<i>Vulpes zerda</i> (min)	0.5982215	Omnivore	
<i>Lycalopex griseus</i> (min)	0.62284374	Omnivore	
<i>Lycalopex gymnocercus</i> (min)	0.62465886	Omnivore	
<i>Cerdocyon thous</i> (min)	0.65690314	Omnivore	
<i>Lycalopex vetus</i> (max)	0.66255223	Omnivore	
<i>Lycalopex vetus</i> (min)	0.69023133	Omnivore	
<i>Urocyon cinereoargenteus</i> (min)	0.69226584	Omnivore	
<i>Canis aureus</i> (min)	0.69539824	Mesocarnivore	
<i>Otocyon megalotis</i> (max)	1.05831893	Insectivore	Insectivore
<i>Otocyon megalotis</i> (min)	1.12532476	Insectivore	

References

Prevosti, F.J. 2006. [*Grandes cánidos (Carnivora, Canidae) del Cuaternario de la República Argentina: sistemática, filogenia, bioestratigrafía y paleoecología*. PhD. Thesis, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, La Plata, 501 p. Unpublished.].