

The ontogenetic transformation of the mesosaurid tarsus: a contribution to the origin of the primitive amniotic astragalus (#8383)

1

First revision

Please read the **Important notes** below, and the **Review guidance** on the next page.
When ready [submit online](#). The manuscript starts on page 3.

Important notes

Editor and deadline

Virginia Abdala / 2 Apr 2016

Files

1 Tracked changes manuscript(s)

1 Rebuttal letter(s)

12 Figure file(s)

1 Table file(s)

Please visit the overview page to [download and review](#) the files not included in this review pdf.

Declarations

No notable declarations are present



Please in full read before you begin

How to review






When ready [submit your review online](#). The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

- 1. BASIC REPORTING**
- 2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**
- 3. VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS**
4. General comments
5. Confidential notes to the editor





 You can also annotate this **pdf** and upload it as part of your review

To finish, enter your editorial recommendation (accept, revise or reject) and submit.





BASIC REPORTING

-  Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
-  Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
-  Structure conforms to [PeerJ standard](#), discipline norm, or improved for clarity.
-  Figures are relevant, high quality, well labelled & described.
-  Raw data supplied (See [PeerJ policy](#)).

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

-  Original primary research within [Scope of the journal](#).
-  Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how research fills an identified knowledge gap.
-  Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.
-  Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

-  Impact and novelty not assessed. Negative/inconclusive results accepted. *Meaningful* replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.
-  Data is robust, statistically sound, & controlled.
-  Conclusion well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.
-  Speculation is welcome, but should be identified as such.

The above is the editorial criteria summary. To view in full visit <https://peerj.com/about/editorial-criteria/>

The ontogenetic transformation of the mesosaurid tarsus: a contribution to the origin of the primitive amniotic astragalus

Graciela Piñeiro, Pablo Núñez Demarco, Melitta D Meneghel

The hypotheses about the origin of the primitive amniotic tarsus are very speculative. Early studies argued that the origin of the astragalus, one of the largest proximal bones in the tarsus of basal amniotes, was produced by either the fusion of two, three, or even four of the original tarsal bones, the intermedium, the tibiale and the proximal centralia (c4 and c3), or that the intermedium alone transforms into the primitive astragalus. More recent studies have suggested that a fusion of the intermedium, the proximal centrale (c4) and eventually c3 has produced a purportedly multipartite structure of the astragalus in *Captorhinus*. Very well preserved tarsi of the Early Permian aquatic amniote *Mesosaurus tenuidens*, which represent the most complete ontogenetic succession known for a basal amniote (the other exceptional one is provided by the Late Permian diapsid *Hovasaurus boulei* Piveteau, 1926), suggest that there is more than one ossification center for the astragalus and that these fuse during late embryonic stages or maybe early after birth. A non-hatched *Mesosaurus* in an advanced stage of development shows that the tarsus is represented by a single bone, most probably the astragalus, clearly formed by the suturing of three bones, which we interpret as being the intermedium, the tibiale, probably already fused to c4 and the c3. A primitive, amniote-like tarsal structure is also observed in very basal Carboniferous forms, such as *Proterogyrinus*, *Gephyrostegus* and *Westlothiana*, as well as in the diadectids *Diadectes* and *Orobates*, and even in some microsaurids like *Tuditanus* and *Pantylus*, taxa that were all considered as true amniotes in their original descriptions. Therefore, the structure of the amniotic tarsus, including the configuration of the proximal series formed by the astragalus and the calcaneum, typically a pair of enlarged bones, could have been established well before the first recognized amniote walked on Earth. Accordingly, these tarsi are not specialized convergences that appeared in unrelated groups, they might be part of a transformation series that involves taxa closely related to the early amniotes as some hypotheses have suggested.

The ontogenetic transformation of the mesosaurid tarsus: a contribution to the origin of the amniotic astragalus

Graciela Piñeiro, Pablo Núñez Demarco and Melitta Meneghel

The hypotheses about the origin of the primitive amniotic tarsus are very speculative. Early studies argued that the origin of the astragalus, one of the largest proximal bones in the tarsus of basal amniotes, was produced by either the fusion of two, three, or even four of the original tarsal bones, the intermedium, the tibiale and the proximal centralia (c4 and c3), or that the intermedium alone transforms into the primitive astragalus. More recent studies have suggested that a fusion of the intermedium, the proximal centrale (c4) and eventually c3 has produced a purportedly multipartite structure of the astragalus in *Captorhinus*. Very well preserved tarsi of the Early Permian aquatic amniote *Mesosaurus tenuidens*, which represent the most complete ontogenetic succession known for a basal amniote (the other exceptional one is provided by the Late Permian diapsid *Hovasaurus boulei* Piveteau, 1926), suggest that there is more than one ossification center for the astragalus and that these fuse during late embryonic stages or maybe early after birth. A non-hatched *Mesosaurus* in an advanced stage of development shows that the tarsus is represented by a single bone, most probably the astragalus, clearly formed by the suturing of three bones, which we interpret as being the intermedium, the tibiale, probably already fused to c4 and the c3. A primitive, amniote-like tarsal structure is also observed in very basal Carboniferous forms such as *Proterogyrinus*, *Gephyrostegus* and *Westlothiana*, as well as in the diadectids *Diadectes* and *Orobates*, and even in some microsaurids like *Tuditanus* and *Pantylus*, taxa that were all considered as true amniotes in their original descriptions. Therefore, the structure of the amniotic tarsus,

including the configuration of the proximal series formed by the astragalus and the calcaneum, typically a pair of enlarged bones, could have been established well before the first recognized amniote walked on Earth. Accordingly, these tarsi are not specialized convergences that appeared in unrelated groups, they might be part of a transformation series that involves taxa closely related to the early amniotes as some hypotheses have suggested.

The ontogenetic transformation of the mesosaurid tarsus: a contribution to the origin of the amniotic astragalus

Graciela Piñeiro¹, Pablo Núñez Demarco¹ and Melitta Meneghel²

¹Instituto de Ciencias Geológicas, Facultad de Ciencias. Iguá 4225. CP. 11400. Montevideo, Uruguay.

²Laboratorio de Sistemática e Historia Natural de Vertebrados, IECA, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay

Corresponding Author: Graciela Piñeiro, Instituto de Ciencias Geológicas, Facultad de Ciencias. Iguá 4225. CP. 11400. Montevideo, Uruguay. Email: fossil@fcien.edu.uy

26 INTRODUCTION

27

28 The origin of the astragalus and the calcaneum in the ankle of basal amniotes has been
 29 considered as an adaptation to terrestrial locomotion and a key innovation in the origin of
 30 Amniota (Romer, 1956). Considering the elements present in the tarsus of basal tetrapods, it
 31 is clear that there was a strong reduction in the number of bones that form the primitive
 32 amniotic tarsus. This reduction can be explained by the fusion or ~~by the~~ loss of some tarsal
 33 bones in the ancestral amniotes despite the homology of these elements not always being well
 34 established. According to previous contributions, the origin of the astragalus, as well as the
 35 identification of the ancestral bones that give origin to it, are contentious (Peabody, 1951;
 36 Rieppel, 1993; Kissel, Dilkes & Reisz, 2002; Berman & Henrici, 2003; O’Keefe et al., 2006;
 37 Meyer & Anderson, 2013). **However, it is widely acknowledged that the calcaneum is derived**
 38 **from the fibulare, ie. from only one of the precursor bones present in the tarsus of non-**
 39 **amniote tetrapods.** Most authors supported the classic hypothesis of a unitary origin for the
 40 astragalus, from the intermedium or perhaps from the fusion of this bone to the tibiale (e.g.
 41 Holmgren, 1933; Schaeffer, 1941; Peabody, 1951). However, this ~~last~~ author, following
 42 Holmgren (1933), suggested that ~~the origin of~~ the astragalus is produced by the fusion of two
 43 or three bones; mainly the intermedium, one of the proximal centralia (c4) and perhaps, the
 44 tibiale (Peabody, 1951, figure 2). A modification of this proposal, although supporting the
 45 composite origin for the astragalus, was suggested by O’Keefe et al. (2006) by including also
 46 the third centrale as a component of the fused element (four-center hypothesis). Indeed, there
 47 is evidence of a fusion between the tibiale and the proximal centrale (c4) in *Gephyrostegus*
 48 (Schaeffer, 1941; Holmes, 1984) which possesses an amniote-like tarsus, thus, this fusion
 49 may have occurred early in the evolution of the amniotic tarsus. Peabody’s (1951) hypothesis
 50 was subsequently refuted by Rieppel (1993) who stated, based on embryological evidence

from extant reptiles, that the reptilian astragalus, is a neomorph. But Rieppel's (1993) suggestion was not widely accepted and the hypothesis on the multipartite structure of the reptilian astragalus remains plausible. Recent reports of well-preserved tarsi from apparently young individuals of several captorhinid species (Kissel, Dilkes & Reisz, 2002; Berman & Henrici, 2003; O'Keefe et al., 2005, 2006; Meyer & Anderson, 2013), which will be discussed later, prove that the matter is still open.

Embryological studies show only two cartilaginous condensations close to the distal end of the fibula in most extant reptiles, one for the astragalus and the other for the calcaneum (Schaeffer, 1941; Rieppel, 1993), and it remains contentious therefore regarding the presence of additional anlagen for the tibiae. Mainly due to this evidence, the widespread view about the origin of the astragalus before Peabody's (1951) contribution, was in favor of a slightly transformed intermedium as the astragalus precursor.

Another characteristic of the primitive amniotic tarsus is the articulation of the proximal tarsal elements (astragalus and calcaneum) with centralia 1 and 2, which are placed distally and often fuse to each other (Peabody, 1951). The fused element (c1+c2), commonly named the centrale or lateral centrale, has been suggested to form the navicular bone, characteristically present in therapsid-grade synapsids and mammals (Broom, 1915; 1924, Jenkins, 1971). Moreover, five distal tarsals are present, the first and the fourth commonly being the largest.

Here we investigate the origin and evolution of the amniotic astragalus by a thorough study of several almost complete and some incomplete mesosaur skeletons and natural external molds and casts, including well-preserved feet. Moreover, well preserved, isolated astragali and calcanea of individuals in different ontogenetic stages, including the tarsus of one non-hatched *Mesosaurus tenuidens* and newborn individuals, were also analyzed for completing an ontogenetic sequence previously unknown for any other Early Permian

amniote. This amazing record provides useful data for characterizing the tarsal structure in early and late juvenile stages, and helps us to understand the transition towards the acquisition of the adult tarsal morphology. We present a synoptic view of the evidence we found for homologizing the primitive amniotic astragalus to the intermedium plus possibly the tibiale and proximal centralia, and propose that the suturing of these elements occurred during the embryonic stage producing a very specialized single bone in the newborns. We also report the invariable presence of a navicular-like bone (fusion of c1+c2?) in *Mesosaurus tenuidens* (*contra* Modesto, 1996a-b; 1999) and discuss the possibility that this character can be polymorphic for mesosaurs as observed in basal synapsids (Romer & Price, 1940).

Institutional Abbreviations: FC-DP: Fossil Vertebrates of Facultad de Ciencias, Montevideo, Uruguay; GP/2E: Instituto de Geociencias (section Palaeontology), São Paulo University, São Paulo, Brazil; SMF-R: Senckenberg-Institut, Frankfurt, Germany, MN: Museu Nacional de Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; AMNH: American Museum of Natural History, New York, USA.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The specimens used in this study are part of several palaeontological collections and consist of almost complete and well preserved *Mesosaurus tenuidens* individuals and partially preserved skeletons that include the hind limbs, which are the subject of our study. They allow us to address the structure of the mesosaur tarsus and its component bones at different stages of development. All these materials plus isolated complete astragali and calcanea from juvenile and mature individuals were analyzed by using a binocular microscope and different techniques of photography, as well as by digital drawings. Specimens from FC-DPV, GP/2E,

MN and SMF-R were personally analysed by the senior author (GP), while the specimens from the AMNH were studied from photographs kindly provided by personnel of that institution.

Methods

In order to know the structure and ontogenetic variation of the mesosaurid tarsus particularly that of the astragalus, we carried out an anatomical study of 50 mesosaurid specimens assigned to the species *Mesosaurus tenuidens*. We selected 18 individuals with well-preserved tarsi, including a non-hatched individual in a late stage of development to represent an idealized ontogenetic transition (Figs. 1-6).

Distinction of juvenile from adult mesosaurs

The recognition of young, immature individuals from adult, mature ones was not easy to determine in mesosaurs. Modesto (1996a, 1999, 2006, 2010) made a detailed study of the characters that can be used to recognize the three monospecific genera that compose the Family Mesosauridae. He concluded that the main mesosaurid characters (e.g. tooth morphology, head-to-neck ratios, presacral vertebral counts, presence/absence of pachyostotic ribs and hemal arch) used for taxonomic purposes are valid to separate three monospecific mesosaurid taxa. Nevertheless, Piñeiro (2002, 2004, 2008) revised some of the characters that have been previously used as taxonomically diagnostic and found that they could indeed be ontogenetic conditions characterizing immature from mature specimens or could even represent sexual dimorphism. Reliable characters that can be useful to differentiate juvenile (immature) from adult (mature) mesosaurid individuals can be derived from changes in the morphology and structure of the coracoid and the scapula in the shoulder girdle and the pubis at the pelvic girdle (Piñeiro, 2004). These bones, are simple rounded plate-like structures in

very young individuals, only acquiring the stylized shape in adults; the coracoid develops into a roughly rectangular bone with anterior and medial convex margins (Modesto, 1996; Piñeiro, 2004). The coracoid notch pierces the bone medially but it is very poorly developed in young specimens. It becomes a true coracoid foramen in adults, when both bones suture and eventually fuse to form the scapulo-coracoid. These bones can fuse leaving no trace of any suture between them, even in apparently young adults, or the suture remains visible even in large individuals (Piñeiro, 2002), evidencing perhaps intraspecific or sexual variability (Piñeiro, 2004). Similar morphologic changes are seen in the pubis, from small, plate-like rounded bones to more kidney-shaped elements that develop a pubic notch or a true obturator foramen totally enclosed by bone. Other aspects of the skeleton morphology, will be part of a forthcoming paper, and will not, therefore, be discussed here. Even though the characters reviewed above are useful as complementary data to help identify the development stage in mesosaurs, the presence of well ossified carpal and tarsal bones was the most useful feature for considering maturity in mesosaurs. We consider here that an individual is mature when in the tarsus, the astragalus and the calcaneum approach each other and the foramen for the perforating artery appears between them.

Centralia and Navicular Nomenclature

The c1 is often named as the lateral centrale and the c2 as the medial centrale. But, when only one distal tarsal is seen (it could result from the fusion of c1+ c2 or it could be just the c2), it is often identified as the centrale (e.g. Schaeffer, 1941, Currie, 1981, Lewis, 1964, Reisz & Fröbisch, 2014), or as the distal centrale (e.g. Carroll, 1970) or as the lateral centrale (e.g. Peabody, 1952, Modesto, 1999, Reiz & Dilkes, 2003), even though these bones are always placed medially in the tarsus, or even the navicular (Schaeffer, 1941).

Similarly, the c4 is called the proximal centrale (e.g. Kissel, Dilkes & Reisz, 2002; Berman & Henrici, 2003) or posterior centrale (Olson 1964), but there is no stable designation

to the c3; it can be mistaken for the c4 when it is called the proximal centrale (Carroll, 1970; Holmgren, 1933) or even considered a distal centrale (Fröbisch, 2008; Hall, 2007). This lack of consensus in the literature on how to refer to specific centralia increases the confusion about the establishment of evolutionary patterns for the early amniotic tarsus. Therefore, we decided to establish a naming criterion: we refer the bone (or fused bones) placed distally to the astragalus in the mesosaur tarsus as the ‘navicular’, and we used the name "proximal centrale" only when it cannot be determined if it is the c4 or c3.

SYSTEMATIC PALAEONTOLOGY

Amniota Haeckel, 1866

Proganosauria, Baur, 1889

Mesosauridae Baur, 1889

Mesosaurus tenuidens Gervais, 1864—1865; 1865

Figures 1—9

The mesosaurid tarsus (Figs. 1-9) displays a primitive construction regarding the structures observed in other basal amniotes as *Hylonomus lyelli* (Carroll, 1964), *Paleothyris acadiana* (Carroll, 1969) and *Petrolacosaurus kansensis* (Peabody, 1952; Reisz, 1981). It is essentially equivalent to the tarsus of basal synapsids (Romer & Price, 1940; Romer, 1956) and it even mirrors the structure described for some microsaurids (particularly *Tuditanus*, Carroll & Baird, 1968 and *Pantylus*, Carroll, 1968), the embolomere *Proterogyrinus* (Holmes, 1984), *Westlothiana* (Smithson, 1989, although see also Smithson et al., 1994) and *Gephyrostegus* (Carroll, 1970) (Fig. 10).

Description. All specimens from Uruguay were collected either in bituminous or non-bituminous shale of the Early Permian (Artinskian) Mangrullo Formation (Piñeiro, 2004;

176 Piñeiro et al., 2012a, b); all the material coming from Brazil was collected in the correlative
 177 Iratí Formation (Santos et al., 2006). Each of the constituent tarsal elements will be described
 178 for the specimens representing the transition regarding their ontogenetic stage and the
 179 morphological changes detected:

180 1)- FC-DPV 2504 (Figs. 1-2A, 9). An almost complete and well preserved non-hatched
 181 *Mesosaurus tenuidens* from Uruguay, which is curled as if within an egg (Piñeiro et al.,
 182 2012b). It consists of an external mould of a small, still poorly ossified skeleton that suffered
 183 strong dorsoventral compression during diagenesis. This is evidenced by the displacement of
 184 the ribs and feet which are overlapping each other, as well as for the reduced three-
 185 dimensionality (suggesting strong compression) of the delicate skeleton, which represents the
 186 smallest mesosaur yet found (see Figs. 1-2 to better appreciate the small size of the
 187 specimen). While some of the constituent bones of the feet may not be completely ossified
 188 (considering the small size and the poor preservation of the manus), the extraordinary
 189 preservation of the specimen allowed us to reconstruct the structure of the tarsus and to
 190 describe the bones that seem to be present (Fig. 9). Both astragali are preserved, but only one
 191 of them shows the precursor bones articulated (see Fig.9); the other was probably affected by
 192 the lateral compression that the specimen suffered during the early stages of fossilization,
 193 producing the separation of the bones. Neither one is preserved in its original anatomical
 194 position, but they were not too much displaced. Most probably, considering the curled
 195 disposition of the skeleton, the astragali dropped from their original position close to the
 196 zeugopodial, to near the metatarsals, when the soft tissues were weathered. A similar
 197 displacement is observed in very young specimens of *Hovasaurus boulei* as figured by
 198 Caldwell (1994). The composite astragalus is shown as if it has turned itself over before
 199 reaching its final position. This was obviously favored by the presence of the enclosing egg
 200 membrane that avoided long transportation and loss of such tiny bones. Considering this

201 taphonomic explanation, and following the anatomical disposition of the bones we interpreted
 202 the precursor, sutured bones, to be the intermedium, the tibiale (which possibly has fused to
 203 c4) and possibly the c3, confirming Peabody's (1951) and O'Keefe et al. (2006) theory about
 204 the presence of a composite astragalus in the tarsus of early amniotes. The c4 (and maybe also
 205 c3) ~~has proved to ossify~~ early in aquatic and terrestrial reptiles (Shubin & Alberch 1986;
 206 Rieppel, 1992a,b, 1993; Caldwell, 1994, among others), and the former fuses to the tibiale in
 207 *Proterogyrinus scheelei* (Holmes, 1984). On the other hand, c1 and c2 (=‘navicular’) may
 208 ossify very late in mesosaurs, (Figs. 4-6, 8). Thus, taking into account the tarsal structure
 209 shown by early amniotes, and considering that mesosaurids are a very basal group, our
 210 suggested tarsal arrangement for the non-hatched mesosaurid tarsus is plausible.

211 **The distal tarsals could not yet be ossified, but judging from the fact that at least**
 212 **metatarsals II and III were partially, or possibly completely ossified and that metatarsals I and**
 213 **V were apparently absent, we are inclined to suggest that they are not ossified** (see Sheil &
 214 Portik, 2008). Otherwise, due to their very small size, they would not be visible if they were
 215 displaced between the overlapping metatarsals.

216 2)-GP-2E 272 (Figs. 1-3B). This specimen is a well preserved very young individual from
 217 Brazil. The ribs are not as pachyostotic as can be observed in other immature specimens, but
 218 apart from that condition, the specimen does not show relevant anatomical differences to *M.*
 219 *tenuidens*. The silhouette of part of the body can be reconstructed due to the preservation of
 220 the skin. The interdigital membrane that unites the toes to the claws can be delimited as well
 221 as the robustness of the leg musculature, even in such a young individual. What could have
 222 been the plantar aponeurosis covers most of the tarsal bones (Fig. 3B). However, two
 223 elements (maybe mineralized ~~calcified~~ cartilages) placed very close to the fibula are
 224 interpreted here as a possible astragalus (the largest bone) and an incipient, smaller
 225 calcaneum. It is also possible to see shadow-like structures that can be interpreted as some of

the distal tarsals (e.g. dt4), which begin to ossify at very early ontogenetic stages in extant reptiles (Caldwell, 1994; Sheil & Portik, 2008). What appear to be scratch marks (according to Sedor & Costa Da-Silva, 2004) are observed close to the left foot, possibly produced by the individual before its sudden death. But these structures can more possibly be part of the muscle and skin that form the base of the tail, exquisitely preserved. These taphonomic features support the hypothesis that the tarsal elements, even if still cartilaginous, could have been perfectly preserved, but covered by the plantar aponeurosis, which is not frequently observed in fossil tetrapods.

3)-SMF-R 4496 (Figs. 1-3C). This specimen constitutes an external mould of a partially preserved posterior trunk and tail, with associated pelvic girdle and limbs from the Irati Formation. This is the specimen that best shows the structure of the tarsus in immature, juvenile mesosaurids; the preserved bones might be partially ossified. The specimen is comparatively larger than the two described above; its tarsus is formed by two small roughly rounded bones, which can be homologized with the astragalus (the larger one) and the calcaneum (the smaller one), which do not meet, but lie one in front of the other and are positioned as in adult individuals. Despite its apparent general subcircular outline, the astragalus indeed shows a structure similar to that preserved in adults or sub-adult individuals, bearing thickened articulating areas and some suture lines. Although it is difficult to establish with confidence which of the original bones are involved, it is possible to suggest a putative arrangement based on the astragalus of the non-hatched mesosaurid (see Fig. 3C).

4)- AMNH 23795 (Figs. 1-3D) is an articulated, very complete skeleton of a young mesosaur, which bears a tarsus showing the same structure seen in SMF-R 4496 (probably because they are individuals of equivalent age). Both the astragalus and the calcaneum can be seen close to each other. Again, the astragalus shows the same structure as in the small, previously

250 analysed specimens, and what appear to be sutures between component bones can be seen on
 251 the dorsal surface (see Fig. 3D).

252 5)- MN 4741 and SMF-R 4934 (Figs. 1-3E-F respectively) and SMF-R 4513 (Figs. 1-3G)
 253 from Brazil are a little larger than the specimens previously described; we can see for the first
 254 time the morphological differences between both the proximal tarsal bones in the ontogenetic
 255 series, the astragalus being transformed into a more stylized and more easily recognizable
 256 element (see for instance Fig. 3G), although the size of the specimens is still small.

257 Astragalus and calcaneum are preserved close to each other, and the foramen for the
 258 perforating artery is incipient but visible at approximately the midpoint length between these
 259 bones (see SMF-R 4513, Figs. 1-3G). SMF-R 4513 (Figs. 1-3G) is probably an adult or a
 260 subadult individual. There are three bones present; two proximal tarsal elements are visible,
 261 the larger one being the astragalus which features a morphology which is similar to those
 262 observed in more mature individuals (Fig. 3). It is a stout bone tending to reach the L-shaped
 263 outline characteristic of the basalmost amniotes and some other tetrapods (see the distribution
 264 and schematic morphology of the tarsal bones in Fig. 10). The foramen for the perforating
 265 artery is placed at the mid length of the lateral margin, and an intimate area of contact is being
 266 generated between astragalus and calcaneum at this point (Fig 3G). A small bone can be seen
 267 distal to the astragalus-calcaneum contact in SMF-R 4513, which is located proximal to the
 268 distal tarsal elements, including probably the dt4. It could be the ‘navicular’ starting to ossify,
 269 which will be well developed later, in mature *Mesosaurus* specimens.

270 6)- At later stages, these bones develop a short contact through the lateral margin of the
 271 astragalus and the medial margin of the calcaneum (Figs. 4-6H to P), so, the remaining
 272 analysed specimens (FC-DPV 2497, GP-2E 114, GP-2E 5610, SMF-R 4710, SMF-R 44 70,
 273 GP-2E 5816, GP-2E 6576, GP-2E 5740 and FC-DPV 2058 (see figures 4-6H-P) represent
 274 adult individuals. Most of them possess the complete series of tarsal elements: astragalus,

calcaneum and ‘navicular’, as well as five distal tarsals, where the first and the fourth are often the largest, although this can be very variable (Fig.6).

In summary, the mesosaur tarsus consists of two proximal bones identified as the astragalus and the calcaneum plus a single navicular-like element and five elements in the distal tarsal series (Fig. 7), resulting in 8 or 9 tarsal bones. The bones that form the ‘navicular’ may be the centralia 1 and 2 considering that c4 and c3 ossify very early in the ontogeny of other fossil and extant sauropsids, while the former are the last to become visible (Caldwell, 1994).

RESULTS

Following the evidence provided by the studied specimens, which notably includes the partially preserved tarsus of a non-hatched mesosaurid in an advanced stage of development, we can see the significant morphological transformation that the mesosaur astragalus experiences during ontogeny. The non-hatched *Mesosaurus tenuidens* found in the Early Permian of Uruguay (see Piñeiro et al., 2012a, b) is so exquisitely preserved that it allows us to describe the morphology of what we interpret to be a composite astragalus that is one millimeter in length! It possibly shows the precursors of the typical amniotic astragalus united by weak sutures (Fig. 9). The following post birth, early stages of mesosaur ontogeny are characterized by the presence of sub-circular to roughly square small bones, mainly representing the astragalus as a single bone (and the one mostly preserved), although some young specimens still show the tripartite structure (Figs. 1-3 C-D) which is not easy to observe directly from photographs because of the very small size of the specimens. The sutures between the precursor bones in the astragalus of larger, adult individuals, can often be

deduced from not always well preserved features (e.g. sutures, rugose surfaces and thickened margins) (Figs. 6 and 8C).

In the early stages of development, both astragalus and calcaneum seem to have been separated, as there is no evidence of contact between them. The foramen for the perforating artery is not visible and we consider these features as useful in identifying juvenile, immature mesosaurids. At the following stage, the astragalus becomes more quadrangular in shape, approaches the calcaneum, and an incipient foramen for the perforating artery develops. At this stage, mesosaurids appear to be young adults and possibly, mature individuals, judging by the further ossification of the overall skeleton. The remaining transformations are crucial for the growth of the individuals for improving their capabilities for capturing prey and for their reproductive traits (see Ramos, 2015; Villamil et al., 2015; Piñeiro et al., 2012a). The proximal border of the astragalus in adult individuals is deep and bears an extended rectangular facet for the fibula, making an almost immobile articulation between these bones, as in basal synapsids (Romer & Price, 1940). The foramen for the perforating artery is well developed in large (mature) individuals where the notches in both bones approach each other to form a conspicuous true foramen (see Figs. 4-6 H to P). The groove for the passage of the perforating artery crosses the bone medially and proximally, where a rugose area is visible (Figs. 4 and 6). Probably it marks the line of suture of both of the larger bones seen in the astragalus of the non-hatched mesosaurid, implicating the intermedium and the c4+tibiale complex. Considering this hypothesis as the most probable, another line of suture located at the medial corner of the astragalus of adult individuals may correspond to the delimitation of the tibiale bone and includes the articular facet for the tibia at the medial margin (Figs. 6, and 8). This suture line is also seen to be continue at the medial margin, where it runs just above the articular facet for the tibia. This facet is wide and teardrop-shaped, which allows for a broad (comparatively motile) articulation with the tibia (Fig. 8 A and C), considering the

oblique angle and the short surface at which the contact is produced. It is interesting to note that the same type of articulations (and very similarly shaped facets) for the fibula and the tibia were described for the ‘pelycosaur’ tarsus, as well as the presence of a medio-ventral extension interpreted as a cartilaginous remnant of the tibiale (Romer & Price, 1940).

Limbs ossification patterns

In *Mesosaurus* a significant delay in mesopodial ossification is noted, following the pattern observed in most aquatic tetrapods (Rieppel, 1992 a-b; Caldwell, 1994) such as *Hovasaurus boulei* (Currie, 1981) from which we also know an almost complete ontogenetic succession in the development of the tarsus (Caldwell, 1994). Thus, long bones (propodials, epipodials and metapodials) become ossified while the mesopodials are still formed of cartilage. However, unlike in *Hovasaurus*, where the astragalus and the calcaneum of very young specimens are of nearly the same size, in *Mesosaurus* the former is clearly larger than the second, thus supporting the hypothesis that the astragalus is the first bone to ossify in the mesosaur tarsus, arising from the suturing and later fusion of at least three bones that are present in the non-hatched mesosaurid. Taking into account this information, along with the evidence proven to occur in Carboniferous tetrapods and the evidence provided by the non-hatched specimen, the mesosaurid tarsal ossification proceeds in the following sequence: intermedium, tibiale+centrale 4 (and c3?, see Fig. 9 and O’Keefe et al. 2006), calcaneum, distal tarsal four, the ‘navicular’ and the remaining bones (distal tarsals 3—1 and 5). The sequence of ossification of these last bones is not clear, however.

Contrary to that seen in extant reptiles, where the calcaneum is the first tarsal element that ossifies (Fröbisch, 2008), it is the fibulare (the calcaneum precursor) which in mesosaurs and aquatic fossil diapsids ossifies much later. In *Hovasaurus boulei* it is suggested that it

appears after the c4 does (after Caldwell, 1994). Thus, it may be possible that it is already present in the tarsus of the non-hatched mesosaurid (Fig. 9), but if so, it ~~should~~ have been very small. Considering the presence of only two bones in juvenile individuals, identified as the astragalus and the calcaneum (Figs. 1-3), it is possible that the intermedium and the tibiale (which possibly is a composite bone if it already fused to c4) fuse early in ontogeny, as some previous workers have suggested (e.g. Gegenbaur & Williston, in Schaeffer, 1941). Indeed, the tibiale fuses to c4 in *Proterogyrinus*, suggesting that these bones also ossify early, and this event was proposed as the first step towards the formation of the amniotic astragalus, as both these bones also fuse later, to the intermedium (Holmes, 1984).

This pattern of ossification is mostly in agreement with recent discoveries in those fields of paleontology and developmental genetics looking for patterns and processes of vertebrate limb evolution (Caldwell, 2002 and references therein). Moreover, it highlights, at least in basal tetrapods, the potential conservatism of the underlying genetic controls of limb development patterns, and exceptions are related to different ecological and functional adaptations (see below).

DISCUSSION

The astragalus during ontogeny

The astragalus is the largest bone in the mesosaurid tarsus, featuring an L-shaped outline in dorsal view in mature specimens (see Figs. 4, 7).

The shape of the astragalus changes dramatically during ontogeny; mature individuals show a stout, roughly squared bone with broad articulating facets for the crus (Fig. 8 A and C). It also possesses a wide, shelf-like latero-distal facet for receiving the centrale or

‘navicular’ (Figs. 6-7), which can be totally separated from the astragalus, or partially fused so that the free, unfused part of the bone can only be seen on the ventral surface (Fig. 8).

However, the astragalus of immature mesosaurids is a delicate, roughly rounded or maybe subquadrangular bone bearing an evident thick dorso-medial border which developed into very well defined articulating areas during growth, producing a slightly excavated central area in the dorsal margin for the fibula and a broad, medially placed almost sub-triangular surface for the tibia. These thickened margins can be seen even in very small newborn individuals (see Fig. 1-3 C-G).

In his 1993 study, Rieppel stated that the mesosaurid astragalus does not show any evidence of being a fusion of the plesiomorphically separated tarsal elements; to him all the suture-like structures (e.g. delicate grooves or thickenings) seen on the ventral surface correspond to attachments of muscles and tendons, and the medial groove delimitates the passage of the perforating artery. Even though the mesosaur astragalus of post-hatching stages does not show the tripartite structure described in *Captorhinus* (Peabody, 1951; Fox & Bowman, 1966; Kissel, Dilkes & Reisz, 2002 and references therein), it seems to have been derived from the junction of at least three bones, as we can deduct from the tarsus of the non-hatched mesosaurid (Fig. 9) where we interpret although with doubts, that the bone forming the tarsus is an astragalus with suturing for the intermedium, the tibiale and maybe the proximal centralia (c4+c3). Indeed, some of the original sutures remained in some specimens, but they show a slightly different pattern from that described by Peabody (1951) because the medio distal Y-shaped suture for intermedium, c4 and c3 is not as evident in the studied specimens (see figures 3, 6, 8).

The mesosaur ‘navicular’

The ‘navicular’ is a bone present in both synapsid and sauropsid amniotes. In the latter, it is observed at least in their basalmost representatives: a ‘navicular’ is found in captorhinids, basal diapsids, some Parareptilia and Mesosauridae and in all pelycosaurs (Figs. 8, and 10). Later, it becomes a bone that is characteristic of ~~only~~ the proto-mammalians and actual mammals, and it is lost in crown diapsids. It ossifies at a late stage (at the same time that the foramen for the perforating artery forms) and is separated from the astragalus in most individuals or abuts against the distal margin of this bone, even fusing partially with it in mature individuals (Figs. 6 and 8). That means that the presence of the ‘navicular’ in mesosaurs is indicative of maturity.

The presence of the ‘navicular’ in *Mesosaurus* is a novel characteristic, as all but one (Modesto, 1996a, b; 1999) of the previous workers did not mention its presence in descriptions of the mesosaurid tarsus. Indeed, Modesto (1996a,b) described the presence of a lateral centrale only in *Stereosternum* and stated that this bone is never present in *Mesosaurus*. We have enough evidence to confirm that a transversely elongated bone is invariably present distal to the astragalus in all the analysed specimens—most frequently representing two sutured bones—identified as the centralia c1 and c2 present in “pelycosaurs” and other basal amniotes. As these bones suture to the astragalus in very mature individuals, as also seems to occur in *Captorhinus aguti* (Peabody, 1951), it becomes difficult to identify its presence in the tarsus of the specimens assigned to *Mesosaurus*. We first become aware of the presence of a ‘navicular’ in *Mesosaurus* from an isolated, relatively large astragalus where the fusion of c1 and c2 has not yet been completed (see Fig. 8 for more detail of this condition). It firstly appears as two sutured (but not fused) bones (Figs. 4 and 6 H-I), and there seems to be a reduction in the size of c1, which becomes a pointed medial tip that is not preserved in most individuals because of the fragility of its suture to c2 (see Fig.

8B-C). As a result, in *Mesosaurus*, the ‘navicular’ strongly abuts to the platform-like facet on the distal margin of the astragalus (Figs. 6P, 8).

This polymorphic condition concerning the fusion of centralia 1 and 2 recalls that observed in ‘pelycosaurs’, in which some species show the centralia 1 and 2 as separate bones (e.g. *Ophiacodon*), while others show them fused (e.g. *Haptodus*) (Romer & Price, 1940) (Fig. 10). It is likely that this is an ontogenetic, perhaps heterochronic condition (D. Marjanović, personal communication), but it needs the analysis of more than one individual of the same species at different stages of development, to be proved. For instance, the morphology of the c1 in mesosaurids is very similar to that of the putative medial centrale of *Sphenacodon ferox* (according to Henrici et al., 2005), and if it is repositioned medially to the lateral central we can obtain a navicular-like bone in *Sphenacodon*. Thus, the small size of the tarsal bones of early amniotes and the possibility that they can move from their original positions, plus to the fact that the recognition of homologous bones seems to be a difficult endeavor, make it likely that the real nature of the tarsus structure in several taxa could remain obscure. Mesosaurs may provide a good opportunity to revisit and gain a better understanding of the processes that are involved in the origin and early evolution of the amniotic tarsus.

Morphological changes supporting an evolutionary transition in the origin of the amniote tarsus

Although most previous workers (e.g. Carroll, 1964; Berman & Henrici, 2003; O’Keefe et al., 2006; Meyer & Anderson, 2013, and references therein) accepted the composite origin of the astragalus following the contribution of Peabody in 1951, the reappraisal of that condition and its significance performed by Rieppel in 1993, introduced controversy. This last author rejected the multipartite origin of the astragalus, arguing that

there was a lack of unequivocal ontogenetic evidence that would show that the bones which will form the composite astragalus are present in at least some stages of development. He rejected the proposed composite origin of the astragalus by Peabody (1951) mainly based on the fact that this bone derives from a single ossification center in extant reptiles and that, according to Sewertzoff (1908), lizards have just a single block of cartilage close to the distal end of fibula and tibia where the astragalus and the calcaneus later ossifies. In *Sphenodon punctatus* the astragalus originates by the condensation of more than one chondrogenic element, but they fuse during the embryonic stage (Rieppel, 1993). Moreover, the presence of more than one cartilage condensation has been recently described to be present during early embryonic stages in the development of six different orders of modern birds (Ossa Fuentes, Mpodozis & Vargas, 2015) and also in chameleons (Diaz & Trainor, 2015). They are apparently homologous with the ancestral tetrapod tarsals, but despite we consider that a comparison with animals that possess an extreme adaptation to flying and perching and that are temporally and phylogenetically so distant from the taxa included in this study, is not appropriate, we will discuss on this subject later.

Indeed, there are several known examples of tetrapods, possibly stem amniotes, that allow us to deduce the steps of fusion of the tarsal bones leading to the attainment of the amniote condition. Thus, it is possible that, as the embryology of extant lizards suggests, the fusion of these elements in the development of the amniote ankle is produced in the embryonic stage and so, it is not possible to address their original ossification centers any more (Gauthier et al., 1988). Rieppel (1993) observed that associations of tarsal bones are common in amphibians and that, while centralia 1 and 2 can be fused or separated, c3 and c4 may be fused, or rather, one of them can be lost. Thus, according to Rieppel (1993) the association between the tibiale and c4 may be casual and may not represent a condition of phylogenetic relevance. However, we can see a real transition from closely related,

supposedly non amniote taxa (e.g. *Gephyrostegus*, *Westlothiana*, *Tuditanus*, *Pantylus* (see Ruta, Coates & Quicke, 2003 and Marjanovic & Laurin, 2007, 2008, for ~~us to assert~~ the phylogenetic position of these taxa), to the acquisition of the primitive amniotic tarsal configuration (see figure 10). Thus, if we consider the association of the tibiale and c4 observed in some *Proterogyrinus* specimens (Holmes, 1984), and possible present in the tarsus of the non-hatched mesosaurid (see Fig. 9) as the first step towards the development of the amniotic tarsus (Holmes, 1984), we can reconstruct the succession including *Gephyrostegus* (Carroll, 1970) where the tibiale+c4 (and c3?, see O’Keefe et al., 2006) complex is associated with the intermedium to form the composite amniotic astragalus, a configuration that is also present in some microsaurs (e.g. *Tuditanus punctulatus*, Carroll & Baird, 1972, but see also Carroll & Gaskill, 1978 and *Pantylus cordatus*, Carroll, 1968) and in *Westlothiana* (Smithson, 1989). Within that transformation, the fibulare becomes the calcaneum and c1 and c2 remain as the only centralia present, either as separated bones or fused to form a single element, the ‘navicular’.

Phylogenetic context supporting the evolutionary transition

On a phylogenetic point of view, even considering that there is not complete consensus about the relationships of the taxa involved in the transition, their relationships seem to be supported by the most recent cladistics analyses of basal tetrapods: Ruta, Coates & Quicke, 2003; Vallin & Laurin, 2004; Klembara, 2005; Ruta & Coates, 2007; Marjanovic & Laurin, 2007, 2008, 2015 (see Fig. 11). Most of these phylogenies show *Proterogyrinus* as an embolomere anthrachosaur, although the relationships of this taxon are contentious and were not completely resolved (Ruta, Coates & Quicke, 2003). *Gephyrostegus* is very close to Seymouriamorpha and to microsaurs, a hypothesis supported by the Laurin & Reisz (1997)

tree, but currently also accepted by other researchers (e.g. Marjanovic & Laurin, 2007, 2008, 2015), which argues that lepospondyls are a monophyletic group closely related to amniotes. Otherwise, if microsaurids are paraphyletic and form part of the amniote stem, as other workers suggest (Laurin, 1998; Anderson, 2001; Vallin & Laurin, 2004; Olori, 2015), they could have been the last phylogenetic intermediaries in our evolutionary transformation series.

It is noteworthy that some taxa which are not classified as amniotes have an amniote-like tarsus or at least developed the large proximal tarsal bones that characterize the amniotic tarsus, the astragalus and the calcaneum (Fig. 10). Notable examples of this feature are the diadectids (Romer & Byrne, 1931; Romer, 1944) ~~earlier analysed~~, although adults show a somewhat autapomorphic condition of a fusion between both the proximal bones to produce an astragalocalcaneum bone. Within lepospondyls, the microsaurids *Pantylus* (Carroll, 1968) and *Tuditanus punctulatus* have intriguingly, an amniote-like tarsus (Carroll & Baird, 1972). Moreover, the proterogyrinid *Proterogyrinus scheelei* (Holmes, 1984), *Westlothiana lizziae* (Smithson, 1989, Smithson et al., 1994) and *Gephyrostegus bohemicus* (Carroll, 1970) also have a very amniote-like tarsus. Because mesosaurids are very basal amniotes (Laurin & Reisz, 1995; Piñeiro et al., 2012b) or basal parareptiles (Modesto, 1996 a-b; Modesto, 1999; Piñeiro, 2004;) we explored within these taxa in order to find homologies between putative plesiomorphic, non-amniotic tarsi and their corresponding structure in mesosaurids according to the different ontogenetic stages described for the group.

The status of Westlothiana and microsaurids and its role in the transition

Regarding the condition in *Westlothiana*, Smithson (1989), reconstructed the tarsus as very amniote-like, including within it nine bones (see Smithson, 1989, figure 2d). There were certainly nine bones in the preserved material although they were not preserved in their

original anatomical position. But, later, (Smithson et al., 1994) pointed out that, the tarsus of *Westlothiana* is indeed very plesiomorphic (or amphibian-like) because it included ten, rather than nine bones (see figure 20A in Smithson et al., 1994). We do not find enough evidence to refute the former reconstruction or for validate the latter, thus, a proposal about the tarsus structure in *Westlothiana* would be very speculative at this stage. Moreover, the renaming of the two large, proximally placed bones originally described as the astragalus and the calcaneum as an intermedium and a fibulare, thereby introducing the presence of a putative fibulare bone, is also speculative because this last bone is difficult to identify from the preserved specimen, where the foot bones are mostly disarticulated and obscured by the caudal vertebrae (Smithson et al., 1994). Besides, according to these authors, the putative intermedium is L-shaped, a characteristic very frequently found in the astragalus of early amniotes. Despite *Westlothiana* possessing other advanced conditions that may suggest its relation to the amniote clade, it also retains some plesiomorphic features in the skeleton such as a prefrontal-postfrontal contact, excluding the frontal from the orbital margin (Smithson, 1989). Thus, the reconstruction of the real structure of the tarsus in *Westlothiana* may be crucial to an understanding of the evolutionary transition to the origin of the amniotic astragalus as we have figured it out in this contribution. We hope that our paper will encourage new studies on this taxon.

Concerning microsaur, these ecologically diverse, and small-bodied tetrapods are credible candidates for being part of the stem leading to the emergence of the earliest amniotes. They develop a tarsus with a very amniote-like morphology, and as was recently demonstrated they even show a similar ossification pattern, with the intermedium (?astragalus) and the fibulare (?calcaneum) being the first tarsal bones to ossify (see Olori, 2015). They are also the only proximal elements in the tarsus as in all other amniotes, and naming them as intermedium and fibulare is just arbitrary at this stage, if we have no

embryological information to prove their identity. We have to take into account that in mesosaurids the astragalus and the calcaneum are the only proximal tarsal bones in born individuals, despite the former deriving from the fusion of three or four bones.

Diadectids

Diadectids were recently considered to be amniotes (Berman, 2000), and as such, they would have had an amniote tarsus. Recent discoveries of possible juvenile diadectid tarsi including a putative composite astragalus formed by the intermedium, the tibiale and the proximal centrale (c4, as it was identified) introduced interesting new data to the origin of the amniotic astragalus (Berman & Henrici, 2003). Later, this material was assigned to the species *Orobates pabsti*, a diadectid (Berman et al., 2004). Nevertheless, the holotype specimen of *Orobates* described by Berman & Henrici (2003) and Berman et al. (2004: 29) as having a tripartite astragalus (MNG 10181) was recently subjected to an in-deep study using micro-focus computed tomography scans (Nyakatura et al., 2015), which allowed for a thoughtful anatomical understanding of the specimen. The scanned image and digital reconstruction show that there are seven separated bones in the tarsus of *Orobates*, which morphology suggests could be homologated with immature astragalus and calcaneum plus two centralia (c1+c2) and three small distal tarsals. Indeed, despite the very good preservation of the individual, it was apparently subjected to severe diagenetic distortion and the bones were embedded in a crystalline calcite matrix and there was a significant chemical substitution around their margins (cf. Nyakatura et al., 2015). That taphonomic feature could have produced a configuration that, under direct examination, led to the interpretation of Berman & Henrici (2003) about the presence of a composite astragalus in *Orobates*.

Berman & Henrici (2003) also described two associated, (maybe sutured) tarsal bones which they recognized as the intermedium and the fibulare of a juvenile *Diadectes*. However, the shape of the bones, mostly subcircular, and their relative size and proportions, remind us of the astragalus and calcaneum of a very young individual, taking into account the ontogenetic stages described here for the very basal amniote *Mesosaurus tenuidens*.

This new configuration matches the pattern of the tarsus already known for diadectids: distinct astragalus and calcaneum in young individuals, which fuse later to produce an astragalocalcaneum in very mature adults. Thus, diadectids have a very amniote-like tarsus. ~~Even, some~~ diadectomorphs such as tseajids do not have a well-defined tarsus, but this is due to the not sufficiently good preservation of the specimen feet. Even though, in *Tseajaia campi*, three distinct bones seem to form the proximal line (Moss, 1972), some fusions tending to achieve the amniote-like pattern can be hypothesized: the tibiale fuses to c4 as the evolutionary transition reviewed above suggests, and the intermedium, shown by Moss (1972) as fusing to c4, indeed fuses to c3 (see Figs. 10, 12), supporting the putative incorporation of both centralia into the amniotic astragalus as O’Keefe et al. 2006 have suggested and as it is shown by the tarsus in the non-hatched mesosaurid (Fig.9).

Some groups like diadectids and seymouriamorphs ~~for instance~~, show a high plasticity in producing different patterns often correlated to a different expression of otherwise highly conserved regulatory genes (Shubin, 2002). Therefore, the expression of these genes and the consecutive structure of the tarsus may be regulated by the different ecological pressures to which some taxa have to adapt. Juvenile or young adult *Diadectes* show a conservative tarsus, and distinct astragalus and calcaneum were described as being present (Romer & Byrne, 1931; Romer, 1944; Berman & Henrici, 2003). However, astragalocalcaneum fusion is shown to occur in very large and mature individuals, where it would seem that the movement between these bones becomes very limited or null (Romer, 1944).

598

599 *Hylonomus lyelli*

600

601 Revising the evidence from other basal amniotes such as *Hylonomus lyelli* (Carroll,
602 1964; Meyer & Anderson, 2013) we found some inconsistencies related to the identification
603 of the bones figured, perhaps as an attempt to follow the Peabody's (1951) suggestion of a
604 tripartite origin of the astragalus. Thus, Meyer & Anderson (2013), following Carroll (1964,
605 fig. 1), identified the astragalus and calcaneum from a partially disarticulated specimen where
606 the feet are completely disassociated and considered the calcaneum of *Hylonomus* as two
607 times larger than the astragalus. According to the information found in Carroll (1964, p. 72,
608 fig. 8) and based on the ontogenetic succession that we described here for mesosaurs, the
609 calcaneum can sometimes be equal in size to the astragalus or even a little larger, but never
610 that much larger. Thus, we could deduce both that it is an incomplete astragalus missing the
611 intermedium, as Meyer & Anderson spell out in the text and in figure 3 (but this would
612 suggest that the type specimen of *Hylonomus lyelli* belonged to a very young individual and
613 we know that this does not appear to be the case), or that the bone identified as the calcaneum
614 is the astragalus or that the bone is neither the astragalus nor the calcaneum. We are inclined
615 to accept the last hypothesis because the overall small size of the individual suggests that
616 these bones are much too large to be tarsal bones; they seem to be elements of the pelvic
617 girdle, possibly the pubis (see figure 1 of Carroll, 1964). The well identified astragalus of
618 *Hylonomus lyelli* (see figure 8 of Carroll, 1964) does not show any trace of sutures.

619

620 *Captorhinids*

621

Taking into account the previous evolutionary transition in favor of a composite origin of the amniotic astragalus, which of course may also include other taxa, the interpretation of Peabody (1951) and later workers of the presence of more than one ossification center in the astragalus of *Captorhinus* and other basal amniotes seems sensible. However, other extensive descriptions of *Captorhinus* (e.g. Fox & Bowman, 1966) do not provide ~~more~~ conclusive evidence about the structure of the tarsus and, as Rieppel (1993) claimed, it is necessary to have ontogenetic evidence (e.g. articulated skeletons of very young individuals of *Captorhinus* and/or of related taxa) to prove the homology of the bones composing the tripartite astragalus and their presence in the earliest stages of development. Isolated astragali from the Lower Permian of Oklahoma were described by Kissel, Dilkes & Reisz (2002) as belonging to *Captorhinus magnus*, showing the putative tripartite structure visible only from the dorsal surface of the bones. However, this feature was discussed by Rieppel (1993) who argued that the putative unclosed sutures should be interpreted as areas of muscular attachment, or grooves for blood vessel irrigation, or fractures.

Concerning *Captorhinus*, most of the isolated astragali figured by Peabody (1951) clearly belong to mature animals, according to their size and structure (see Fox and Bowman, 1966, for comparison); the smallest one already shows the same morphology seen in the larger ones. If the astragali shown by Peabody (1951) partially represent an ontogenetic transformation series, they cannot confidently demonstrate that the apparent tripartite structure is derived from the fusion of three or four of the plesiomorphic tarsal bones. A feature that could not support the hypothesis of the tripartite structure is that the sutural lines and groove patterns present in *Captorhinus* as described by Peabody (1951) are only visible on the ventral surface of the bone; alternatively, it suggests that the fusion started on the dorsal surface and was not completed in adult individuals. The same condition can be observed in the large captorhinid *Captorhinus magnus* (Kissel, Dilkes & Reisz, 2002).

Fragmentary pes referred to juvenile and adult individuals of the giant, largest known captorhinid *Moradisaurus grandis* from the Upper Permian of Niger, were figured and described by O’Keefe et al. (2005, 2006). Even though the bones were found in association and it was possible to recognize the identity of some of them, they represent isolated and disarticulated pes whose referral to *Moradisaurus* can be possible but not certain, at least no more, than to any other basal tetrapod of the same size. Besides, it is difficult to include that material in an ontogenetic transformation series having one isolated, putatively juvenile pes of the species, where the identity of the bones is highly speculative. The other fragmentary pes, interpreted to pertain to an adult specimen displays the typical amniotic tarsal structure and the astragalus shows no sign of the composite origin.

The presumable “implicit” relationship between mesosaurids and basal synapsids regarding the structure of their skull and tarsus

In 1941, Friedrich von Huene proposed for the first time a phylogenetic relationship between *Mesosaurus* and some basal ‘pelycosaurs’. That suggestion was not generally acknowledged by later authors who developed the currently accepted theory that mesosaurids are the basalmost sauropsids (Laurin & Reisz, 1995) or the basalmost parareptiles (Modesto, 1999). More recently, Piñeiro (2004) found some evidence that she understood gave support to von Huene’s hypothesis (1941) but acknowledged that it should be tested in a phylogenetic context. Moreover, the nature of the mesosaurid skull, long discussed during more than a hundred years, has been recently reassessed to denote the presence of a synapsid-like lower temporal fenestra in *Mesosaurus tenuidens* (Piñeiro et al., 2012c). This contribution gave credit to the observations made by von Huene (1941) several years ago about the morphology of the mesosaur skull. Similarly, the tarsus of mesosaurs has been studied by several authors,

and here we have demonstrated that its structure is almost identical to that described for basal synapsids, but also it is equivalent to that of basal sauropsids, including the basalmost diapsid *Petrolacosaurus kansensis* (Reisz, 1981).

Basal synapsids show a greater development of the calcaneum (Romer & Price, 1940), which in some taxa roughly acquires the size of the astragalus. In contrast to this, the calcaneum of *Mesosaurus* is smaller than the astragalus (although the size differences are less significant in adult individuals), and develops a lateral expansion in the area of the heel, possibly for insertion of extensor tendons including the Achilles tendon (Fig. 7).

Indeed, the tarsus in early amniotes is both structural and morphologically equivalent in the two groups, except that in ‘pelycosaurs’ there is no evidence for the multipartite formation of the astragalus, thus generating doubts about the homology of these bones in synapsid and sauropsid amniotes (Rieppel, 1993). However, the multipartite original structure can be seen just in very young mesosaurs and it disappears before the achievement of the adult stage; but it seems to be evident in captorhinids, being possibly an heterochronic pattern.

Evolutionary paths for the development of amniote tarsus: the mesosaur contribution

The morphological ontogenetic transformation presented here for *Mesosaurus tenuidens* is the most complete known for a basal amniote (cf. Laurin & Reisz, 1995) and as such, it constitutes a relevant database for studies of a different nature. The information provided for this data base on the origin of the amniotic tarsus suggests that, as Peabody (1951) and previous authors (e.g. Holmgren, 1933) have stated, the earliest astragalus originated from **at least three ossification** centers near the tibial and fibular distal margins. More than one ossification center appears to be present at the early embryonic stages of some extant groups (cf. Ossa-Fuentes, Mpodozis & Vargas, 2015; Diaz & Trainor, 2015) but their

homology to the earliest amniote condition is difficult to establish, as the pattern is observed in very specialized groups such as birds and chameleons. Indeed, in the above mentioned papers, (Ossa-Fuentes, Mpodozis & Vargas, 2015; Diaz & Trainor, 2015) it is suggested that the intermedium and the tibiale (although the latter is not pretty much apparent from the figures provided by Diaz & Trainor (2015) appear as independent ossifications at very early stages of the development. On the other hand, Ossa-Fuentes, Mpodozis & Vargas (2015) observed that in the six groups that they studied, in contrast to the most common condition in birds (i+fe), the intermedium forms a separate ossification center that later fuses to the ‘astragalus’ (sic) forming the ascending process characteristic of dinosaurs. Thus, the ‘astragalus’ should be the tibiale?. Moreover, the pattern of ossification that Ossa-Fuentes, Mpodozis & Vargas (2015) suggest, where the fibulare is the first to ossify, followed by the putative intermedium and later by the tibiale, is very different to that currently accepted to occur in basal amniotes.

However, the presence of centralia, bones that are present in outgroup lepidosauria, and which as presumed, are basic components of the structure of the early amniotic astragalus, are not detected in chameleons nor in birds and many of extant diapsids. Therefore, they are not constituents of the modern sauropsid astragalus of the stages of their ontogeny, but they fused sometime in their evolution to produce a different bone, and do not appear any more in the ontogeny of most of the advanced taxa. Selective pressures to reduce the number of tarsal bones in the sense that they are an extension of the epipodials, favouring stability by strengthening the feet to drive the body forward. Thus, the acquisition of unitary, stout structures, are an advantage over several, non-fused delicate bones in order to improve their locomotive capabilities. Therefore, we have to be cautious regarding these findings, considering the high variability shown by the chameleons’ tarsal structure, and the lack of embryological evidence in the fossil taxa for use in comparison. Therefore, as we previously

mentioned, the possibility that neomorph elements are present in such derived groups, cannot be ruled out with the available data.

According to our observations of the non-hatched *Mesosaurus tenuidens* which possesses an astragalus formed by at least three bones, we can say that the mesosaurid astragalus is not a neomorph as Rieppel (1993) has suggested, unless we consider that once united in the earliest stages of the development, these bones form a new element. Even the evidence taken from taxa such as the embolomere *Proterogyrinus scheelei* (Holmes, 1984) can provide support for the multipartite hypothesis and the identification of the bones provided in the present work.

We made several interesting observations that support the already established homologies and possible evolutionary paths towards the origin of the primitive amniotic astragalus. Particularly in *Proterogyrinus* the intermedium has a very similar structure to that of the astragalus of young mature mesosaurs, and the tibiale is clearly sutured against the medial corner formed by c4 and the intermedium. The fibulare is also very similar to the calcaneum of the same stage (see Figs. 1-6), so it is logical to presume that these bones are homologous, as already stated. The main question is what happens to the remaining bones to obtain the mesosaurid (= basal amniote) tarsus consisting of two large proximal elements plus one or two centralia and five distal tarsals?. We find evidence about the presence of c3 early in the ontogeny (Fig. 9), it is possible that it fuses to c4 in the described mesosaur ontogenetic transformation after the latter fuses to the tibiale. Indeed, based on the structure shown by *Proterogyrinus* (Holmes, 1984), where apparently the tibiale fuses to c4, and taking into account that shown by the tarsus in the captorhinomorph *Labidosaurus* (Williston, 1917) where the intermedium and the tibiale also fuse to c4, we hypothesized three possibilities or combinations: A, the astragalus is just formed by the intermedium+tibiale only, and c4 and c3 undergo a reduction in size until they finally disappear (not plausible, given the probable

presence of c4 and c3 in the tarsus of the non-hatched mesosaurid); B, the astragalus is formed by intermedium+tibiale+c4, and c3 is reduced to be lost (not probable given its putative presence in the tarsus of the non-hatched mesosaurid and taking into account the O'Keefe et al., 2006 proposal); C, the astragalus results from the fusion of all bones, i+te+c4+c3 (Figs. 9 and 12A). The last possibility (C) seems to be supported by the materials that we described here, and is consistent to that suggested by O'Keefe et al., 2006, which provided evidence for the inclusion of c3). It does not imply the loss of bones but a re-patterning to produce the amniotic tarsus. Moreover, there are also two possibilities for the formation of the 'navicular': 1, it results from fusion of c1 and c2; 2, it is formed by the c2 after the reduction and loss of c1 (see Fig. 12B). We found probable evidence of some of these fusions (the tibiale+?c4+ intermedium, c1+c2) in early stages of *Mesosaurus tenuidens*'s development, but not in all individuals.

If the hypotheses of the astragalus and the 'navicular' formation are combined, we can have the following six possibilities: A-1; A-2; B-1; B-2; C-1; C-2, but the evidence from mesosaurs might support just C-1.

CONCLUSIONS

The changes produced in the mesosaur tarsus structure during ontogeny were established based on the study of several specimens preserved in different stages of development. This transformation series is the most complete known for a basal amniote as it includes even embryological information. Our results allow for a better recognition of intraspecific (ontogenetic) from interspecific variation in mesosaurs and provides more informative characters that can be used in comparative studies of amniote relationships.

The mesosaur tarsus includes 8 or 9 bones: astragalus and calcaneum plus centralia 1 and 2 (fused to form the mesosaur ‘navicular’) and five distal tarsals. The ‘navicular’ is proved to be present in all mesosaurids, even in *Mesosaurus* where it fuses to the astragalus in mature individuals. The early amniote astragalus is a composite bone as can be evidenced by the presence of at most three sutured bones in the tarsus of a non-hatched mesosaurid in an advanced stage of development. These bones seem to be the intermedium, the tibiale, fused to c4 and the c3. Thus, our study rejects the hypothesis that the amniotic astragalus and calcaneum are neomorphs.

Regarding the analyzed ontogenetic series, we could determine that the attainment of maturity in mesosaurs can be related to a determinate tarsus structure, which can be a good age indicator to extrapolate to other groups of basal amniotes. Moreover, the morphological changes observed in the mesosaur ontogeny could have strong implications in the recognition of until now undocumented, ancestral developmental features of early amniotes.

Current morphological and comparative studies on the mesosaurid skeleton suggest other interesting similarities between mesosaurids and basal synapsids that will be properly described in a forthcoming paper. However, these features are also shared with other basal sauropsids and taxa that are not even amniotes. For instance, mesosaurs share characters with taxa previously known to be closer to Amniota (Panchen & Smithson, 1988 but see also Smithson et al., 1994) but these hypotheses were not phylogenetically evaluated. These taxa are now considered as stem tetrapoda or crown tetrapoda (Olori, 2015; Marjanovic & Laurin, 2015) or their affinities are not yet well defined (e.g. *Westlothiana*), but they still remain close to the earliest amniotes. This commonly shared morphology among apparently unrelated but very basal taxa reflects the primitive nature of mesosaurids, as already noted by Huene (1941) and other paleontologists. The example of the similar tarsal structure observed in mesosaurids, some microsaurids, basal synapsids and non- amniote tetrapods suggests that the

evolution of the astragalus and calcaneum as the most typical bones in the amniotic tarsus could be an acquisition obtained much earlier than when the first ~~recognized~~ amniote appeared and walked on the planet.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Carl Mehling (Fossil Amphibian, Reptile, and Bird Collections, Division of Paleontology of the American Museum of Natural History) who kindly provided the pictures of specimens revised by Olivier Rieppel in his 1993 paper. Prof. Ivone Cardoso Gonzalez and Lics. Alejandro Ramos, Marcelha Páez Landim and Igor Fernando Olivera who assisted us in the revision of the mesosaurid material housed in the Collection of Departamento de Paleontologia do Instituto de Geociencias, Universidade de São Paulo, Brazil. GP wishes to thank Jorge Ferigolo for having allowed her to meet mesosaurs and for the valuable talks together and the outstanding knowledge that he spread to learning and curious people; he made her understand how much we can know from fossils to reconstruct the life during the past. We thank very much Robin Hewison for kindly accepting to revise the English language. We also want to acknowledge Leandro Gaetano and David Marjanović for their insightful comments, helpful criticisms and editorial remarks that highly improved this manuscript.

Funding: This study was funded by ANII-FCE 2011_6450 and NGS Grant 9497_14 (GP).

References

- 819 Anderson JS. 2001. The phylogenetic trunk: maximal inclusion of taxa with missing data in
820 an analysis of the Lepospondyli (Vertebrata, Tetrapoda). *Systematic Biology* **50**:170–
821 193.
- 822 Baur G. 1889. Palaeohatteria Credner and the Proganosauria. *American Journal of Science*
823 **27**:310–313.
- 824 Berman, D. S. 2000. Origin and early evolution of the amniote occiput. *Journal of*
825 *Paleontology* **74**:938–956.
- 826 Berman DS & Henrici AC. 2003. Homology of the astragalus and structure and function of
827 the tarsus of Diadectidae. *Journal of Paleontology* **77**:172–188.
- 828 Berman DS, Henrici AC, Sumida SS & Martens T. 2000. Redescription of *Seymouria*
829 *sanjuanensis* (Seymouriamorpha) from the Lower Permian of Germany based on
830 complete mature specimens with a discussion of paleoecology of the Bromacker
831 locality assemblage. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **20**(2):253–268.
- 832 Berman DS, Henrici AC, Kissel RA, Sumida SS, Martens T. 2004. A new diadectid
833 (Diadectomorpha), *Orobates pabsti*, from the Early Permian of central Germany.
834 *Bulletin of Carnegie Museum of Natural History* **35**:1–36. doi: 10.2992/0145-
835 9058(2004)35[1:anddop]2.0.co;2
- 836 Broom R. 1915. On the origin of mammals. *Phylosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*
837 *of London, Series B* **206**:1–48.
- 838 Broom R. 1924. Further evidence on the structure of the Eosuchian. *Bulletin of the American*
839 *Museum of Natural History* **51**:67–76.
- 840 Caldwell MW. 1994. Developmental constraints and limb evolution in Permian and modern
841 lepidosauromorph diapsids. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **14**:459–471
- 842 Caldwell MW. 2002. From fins to limbs to fins: Limb evolution in fossil marine reptiles.
843 *American Journal of Medical Genetics* **112**: 236–249. doi: 10.1002/ajmg.10773

- 844 Carroll RL. 1964. The earliest reptiles. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* **45**:61–83.
- 845 Carroll RL. 1968. The postcranial skeleton of the Permian microsauro *Pantylus*. *Canadian*
- 846 *Journal of Zoology* **46**:1175–1192. doi: 10.1139/z68-168
- 847 Carroll RL. 1969. A Middle Pennsylvanian captorhinomorph, and the interrelationships of
- 848 primitive reptiles. *Journal of Paleontology* **43**:151–170.
- 849 Carroll RL. 1970. The ancestry of reptiles. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*
- 850 *of London B* **257**:267–308.
- 851 Carroll RL & Baird D. 1968. The Carboniferous Amphibian *Tuditanus* [*Eosauravus*] and the
- 852 Distinction Between Microsaurs and Reptiles. *American Museum Novitates* **2337**: 1–
- 853 50.
- 854 Carroll RL & Baird D. 1972. Carboniferous stem-reptiles of the Family Romeriidae.
- 855 *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology* **143**:321–364.
- 856 Carroll RL & Gaskill P. 1978. The Order Microsauria. *Memoirs of the American*
- 857 *Philosophical Society* **126**, 211 pp.
- 858 Carroll RL. 1995. Problems of the phylogenetic analysis of Paleozoic choanates. In Studies on
- 859 Early Vertebrates: VIIth International Symposium, Parc de Miguasha, Quebec (M.
- 860 Arsenault, H. Lelièvre and P. Janvier (eds.), pp. 389–445. *Bulletin du Muséum*
- 861 *National d 'Histoire Naturelle*, Paris (Séries 4) 17 (C).
- 862 Currie 1981. *Hovasaurus boulei*, an aquatic eosuchian from the upper Permian of
- 863 Madagascar. *Palaeontographica Africana* **24**:99–168.
- 864 Diaz R E & Trainor P A. 2015. Hand/Foot splitting and the re-evolution of mesopodial
- 865 skeleton elements during the evolution and radiation of chameleons. *Evolutionary*
- 866 *Biology* **15**: 1–25.
- 867 Dilkes D. 2015. Carpus and tarsus of Temnospondyli. *Vertebrate Anatomy Morphology*
- 868 *Palaeontology* **1**:51–87.

- 869 Fox RC & Bowman MC. 1966. Osteology and relationships of *Captorhinus aguti* (Cope)
- 870 (Reptilia: Captorhinomorpha). *University of Kansas Paleontological Contributions,*
- 871 *Vertebrata* **11**:1–79.
- 872 Fröbisch N. 2008. Ossification patterns in the tetrapod limb—conservation and divergence
- 873 from morphogenetic events. *Biological Reviews* **83**:571–600.
- 874 Gauthier JA, Kluge AG & Rowe T. 1988. The early evolution of the Amniota; n Benton M J
- 875 ed. *The Phylogeny and Classification of the Tetrapods*, Vol. 1. Clarendon Press,
- 876 Oxford. 103–155.
- 877 Gervais P. 1864-1865. Description du *Mesosaurus tenuidens* reptile fossile de l’Afrique
- 878 australe. *In Académie des Sciences et Lettres de Montpellier, Mémoires de la Section*
- 879 *des Sciences*, Tome Sixième. Boehm et Fils, Montpellier, 169–175.
- 880 Gervais P. 1865. Du *Mesosaurus tenuidens*, reptile fossile de l’Afrique australe. *Comptes*
- 881 *Rendus de l’Académie des Sciences* **60**:950–955.
- 882 Godfrey S J. 1989. The postcranial skeletal anatomy of the Carboniferous
- 883 tetrapod *Greererpeton burkemorani* Romer, 1969. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
- 884 *Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **323**(1213):75-133.
- 885 Hall BK. 2007. Fins into limbs: Evolution, Development and Transformation. Chicago:
- 886 University of Chicago Press. 433 p.
- 887 Haeckel, E., 1866. *Generelle Morphologie Der Organismen*. Reimer, Berlin.
- 888 Henrici A, Berman D, Lucas SG, Heckert AB, Rinehart LF & Zeigler KE. 2005. The carpus
- 889 and tarsus of the Early Permian synapsid *Sphenacodon ferox* (Eupelycosauria:
- 890 *Sphenacodontidae*). In Lucas, S.G. and Zeigler, K.E., eds. *The Nonmarine Permian,*
- 891 *New Mexico. Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin No.* **30**:106–110.

- 892 Holmes R. 1984. The Carboniferous amphibian *Proterogyrinus scheelei* Romer, and the early
893 evolution of tetrapods. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London*, B
894 **306**:431–524.
- 895 Holmgren N. 1933. On the origin of the tetrapod limb. *Acta Zoologica* **14**:185–295.
- 896 Huene F v. 1941. Osteologie und systematische Stellung von *Mesosaurus*.
897 *Palaeontographica, Abteilung A* **92**:45–58.
- 898 Jenkins Jr. FA. 1971. The postcranial skeleton of African Cynodonts. Peabody Museum of
899 Natural History. Bulletin **36**:1–216.
- 900 Kissel RA, Dilkes DW & Reisz RR. 2002. *Captorhinus magnus*, a new captorhinid (Amniota:
901 Eureptilia) from the Lower Permian of Oklahoma, with new evidence on the
902 homology of the astragalus. *Canadian Journal of Earth Science* **39**:1363–1372.
- 903 Klembara, J. 2005. A new discosauriscid seymouriamorph tetrapod from the Lower Permian
904 of Moravia, Czech Republic. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* **50**(1):25–48.
- 905 Laurin M. 1998. The importance of global parsimony and historical bias in understanding
906 tetrapod evolution. Part I. Systematics, middle ear evolution, and jaw suspension.
907 *Annals des Sciences Naturelles, Zoologie* **19**:1–42.
- 908 Laurin M & Reisz R R. 1995. A reevaluation of early amniote phylogeny. *Zoological*
909 *Journal of the Linnean Society* **113**:165–223.
- 910 Laurin M & Reisz RR. 1997. A new perspective on tetrapod phylogeny. In: Sumida S, Martin
911 K eds. *Amniote Origins– Completing the Transition to Land*. San Diego: Academic
912 Press, 9–59.
- 913 Laurin M, Reisz RR. 1999. A new study of *Solenodonsaurus janenschi*, and a 728
914 reconsideration of amniote origins and stegocephalian evolution. *Canadian Journal of*
915 *Earth Sciences / Revue canadienne des Sciences de la Terre* **36**:1239–1255.

- 916 Lewis O J. 1964. The homologies of the mammalian tarsal bones. *Journal of anatomy* **98**: (Pt
917 2):195.
- 918 Marjanović D & Laurin M. 2007. Fossils, molecules, divergence times, and the origin of
919 lissamphibians. *Systematic Biology* **56**:369–388.
- 920 Marjanović D & Laurin M. 2008. A reevaluation of the evidence supporting an unorthodox
921 hypothesis on the origin of extant amphibians. *Contributions to Zoology* **77**:149–199.
- 922 Marjanović D & Laurin M. 2015. Reevaluation of the largest morphologic data matrix for
923 phylogenetic analysis of Paleozoic limbed vertebrates. *PeerJ PrePrints* |
924 <https://doi.org/10.7287/peerj.preprints.1596v1> | CC-BY 4.0 Open Access | rec: 18 Dec
925 2015, publ: 18 Dec 2015.
- 926 Meyer TE & Anderson JS 2013. Tarsal fusion and the formation of the astragalus in
927 *Hylonomus lyelli*, the earliest amniote, and other early tetrapods, *Journal of Vertebrate*
928 *Paleontology* **33**:488–492.
- 929 Modesto SP. 1996a. The anatomy, relationships, and palaeoecology of *Mesosaurus tenuidens*
930 and *Stereosternum tumidum* (Amniota: Mesosauridae) from the Lower Permian of
931 Gondwana. [Ph.D. Thesis]. Toronto: University of Toronto, p. 279.
- 932 Modesto SP. 1996b. *Noteosaurus africanus* Broom is a nomen dubium. *Journal of*
933 *Vertebrate Paleontology* **16**:172–174.
- 934 Modesto SP. 1999. Observations on the structure of the Early Permian reptile *Stereosternum*
935 *tumidum* Cope. *Palaeontologia Africana* **35**:7–19.
- 936 Modesto, S.P., 2006. The cranial skeleton of the Early Permian aquatic reptile *Mesosaurus*
937 *tenuidens*: implications for relationships and palaeobiology. *Zoological Journal of the*
938 *Linnean Society* **146**:345–368.
- 939 Modesto SP. 2010. The postcranial skeleton of the aquatic parareptile *Mesosaurus tenuidens*
940 from the Gondwanan Permian. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **30**(5):1378–1395.

- 941 Moss JL. 1972. The morphology and phylogenetic relationships of the Lower Permian
- 942 tetrapod *Tseajaia campi* Vaughn (Amphibia: Seymouriamorpha). *University of*
- 943 *California Publications in Geological Sciences*, **98**:1–72.
- 944 Nyakatura JA, Allen VR, Laströer J, Andikfar A, Danczak M, Ullrich H-J, Werner
- 945 Hufenbach W, Martens T, and Fischer MS. 2015. A three-dimensional skeletal
- 946 reconstruction of the stem amniote *Orobates pabsti* (Diadectidae): analyzes of body
- 947 mass, centre of mass position, and joint mobility. *PLoS ONE* 10(9):
- 948 0137284.doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0137284
- 949 O’Keefe FR, Sidor CA, Larsson HCE, Maga A & Ide O. 2005. The vertebrate fauna of the
- 950 Upper Permian of Niger. III. Morphology and ontogeny of the hindlimb of
- 951 *Moradisaurus grandis* (Reptilia: Captorhinidae). *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*
- 952 **25**:309–319.
- 953 O’Keefe FR, Sidor CA, Larsson HCE, Maga A & Ide O. 2006. Evolution and homology of
- 954 the astragalus in early amniotes: new fossils, new perspectives. *Journal of Morphology*
- 955 **267**:415–425.
- 956 Olori J. 2015. Skeletal morphogenesis of *Microbrachis* and *Hyloplesion* (Tetrapoda:
- 957 Lepospondyli) and implications for the developmental patterns of extinct, early
- 958 tetrapods. *PLoS ONE* **10**(6): e0128333. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0128333
- 959 Olson, EC. 1968. The family Caseidae. *Fieldiana, Geology* **17**:225–349.
- 960 Ossa-Fuentes L, Mpodozis J & Vargas AO. 2015. Bird embryos uncover homology and
- 961 evolution of the dinosaur ankle. *Nature communications* 6:8902 | DOI:
- 962 10.1038/ncomms9902 |www.nature.com/naturecommunications.
- 963 Panchen AL & Smithson TR. 1988. The relationship of the earliest tetrapods. In: Benton MJ
- 964 ed. *The phylogeny and classification of the tetrapods. Vol. 1. Amphibians, Reptiles,*
- 965 *Birds*, 1–32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- 966 Peabody FE. 1951. The origin of the astragalus of reptiles. *Evolution* **5**: 339–344.
- 967 Peabody FE. 1952. *Petrolacosaurus kansensis* Lane, a Pennsylvanian reptile from Kansas.
- 968 *University of Kansas Paleontological Contributions, Vertebrata*, art. **1**:1–41.
- 969 Piñeiro G. 2002. Paleofaunas del Pérmico-Eotriásico de Uruguay. MSc Thesis. PEDECIBA,
- 970 Universidad de la República, Montevideo, Uruguay, 208 p. +28 Figs.
- 971 Piñeiro G, 2004. Paleofaunas del Pérmico y Permo-Triásico de Uruguay. Bioestratigrafía,
- 972 Paleobiogeografía y sistemática. Universidad de la República Montevideo, Uruguay,
- 973 206 p.
- 974 Piñeiro, G. 2008. Los mesosaurios y otros fósiles de fines del Paleozoico. In: Perea D, ed.,
- 975 *Fósiles de Uruguay*. DIRAC. Facultad de Ciencias, 179–205.
- 976 Piñeiro G, Ramos A, Goso C, Scarabino F, & Laurin M. 2012a. Unusual environmental
- 977 conditions preserve a Permian mesosaur-bearing Konservat- Lagerstätte from
- 978 Uruguay. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* **57** (2): 299–318.
- 979 doi.org/10.4202/app.2010.0113
- 980 Piñeiro G, Ferigolo J, Meneghel M & Laurin M. 2012b. The oldest known amniotic embryos
- 981 suggest viviparity in mesosaurs. *Historical Biology* **24** (6):630–640.
- 982 Piñeiro G, Ferigolo J, Ramos A & Laurin M. 2012c. Cranial morphology of the Early
- 983 Permian mesosaurid *Mesosaurus tenuidens* and the evolution of the lower temporal
- 984 fenestration reassessed. *Comptes Rendus Palevol* **11**(5):379–391.
- 985 Piveteau J. 1926. Paleontologie de Madagascar, XIII. Amphibiens et reptiles permien.
- 986 *Annales de Paleontologic* **15**:53–180.
- 987 Ramos, A. La dieta de los reptiles Mesosauridae (Reptilia: Proganosauria) del Pérmico
- 988 Temprano de Uruguay. 2015. MSc. Thesis. Universidad de la República, Montevideo,
- 989 Uruguay. 33 pp.

- 990 Reisz RR. 1981. A diapsid reptile from the Pennsylvanian of Kansas. *Special Publication of*
991 *the Museum of Natural History, University of Kansas* **7**:1–74.
- 992 Reisz RR & Dilkes DW. 2003. *Archaeovenator hamiltonensis*, a new varanopid (Synapsida:
993 Eupelycosauria) from the Upper Carboniferous of Kansas. *Canadian Journal of Earth*
994 *Sciences* **40**(4), 667–678.
- 995 Reisz R R & Fröbisch J. 2014. The oldest caseid synapsid from the Late Pennsylvanian of
996 Kansas, and the evolution of herbivory in terrestrial vertebrates. *PLoS ONE* **9**(4):
997 e94518.
- 998 Rieppel O. 1992a. Studies on skeleton formation in reptiles: I, the postembryonic
999 development of the skeleton in *Cyrtodactylus pubisulcus* (Reptilia, Gekkonidae).
1000 *Journal of Zoology of London* **227**:87–100.
- 1001 Rieppel O. 1992b. Studies on skeleton formation in reptiles.III. Patterns of ossification in the
1002 skeleton of *Lacerta vivipara* Jacquin (Reptilia, Squamata). *Fieldiana Zoology N. Ser.*
1003 **68**:1–25.
- 1004 Rieppel O. 1993. Studies on skeleton formation in reptiles. IV. The homology of the reptilian
1005 (amniote) astragalus revisited. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **13**:31–47.
- 1006 Romer AS. 1944. The Permian cotylosaur *Diadectes tenuitectus*. *American Journal of Science*
1007 **242**:139–144.
- 1008 Romer AS. 1956. The Osteology of the Reptiles. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago,
1009 772 pp
- 1010 Romer AS & Byrne F. 1931. The pes of *Diadectes*: notes on the primitive tetrapod limb.
1011 *Palaeobiologica* **4**:25–48.
- 1012 Romer AS & Price IL. 1940. Review of the Pelycosauria. *Geological Society of America*
1013 *Special Paper* **28**:1–538. doi: 10.1130/spe28-p1

- 1014 Ruta M, Coates MI & Quicke DLJ. 2003. Early tetrapod relationships revisited. *Biological*
- 1015 *Reviews* **78**:251–345.
- 1016 Ruta M & Coates MI. 2007. Dates, nodes and character conflict: addressing the lissamphibian
- 1017 6049 origin problem. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 5:69–122. DOI 6050
- 1018 10.1017/S1477201906002008
- 1019 Santos RV, Souza PA, Alvarenga CJS, Dantas EL, Pimentel EL, Oliveira CG & Araújo LM.
- 1020 2006. Shrimp U–Pb Zircon Dating and Palynology of Bentonitic Layers from the
- 1021 Permian Irati Formation, Parana Basin, Brazil. *Gondwana Research* **9**:456–463.
- 1022 Schaeffer B. 1941. The morphological and functional evolution of the tarsus in amphibians
- 1023 and reptiles. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* **78**:395–472.
- 1024 Sedor FA & Costa Da-Silva R. 2004. Primeiro registro de pegadas de Mesosauridae
- 1025 (Amniota, Sauropsida) na Formação Irati (Permiano Superior da Bacia do Paraná) do
- 1026 Estado de Goiás, Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Paleontologia* **7**(2):269–274.
- 1027 Sewertzoff AN. 1908. Studien über die Entwicklung der Muskeln, Nerven und des Skeletts
- 1028 der Extremitäten der niederen Tetrapoda. *Bulletin de la Societe Imperiale des*
- 1029 *Naturalistes de Moscou*, N.S. **21**:1–430.
- 1030 Sheil A & Portik D. 2008. Formation and ossification of limb elements in *Trachemys scripta*
- 1031 and a discussion of autopodial elements in turtles. *Zoological Sciences* 25:622–641.
- 1032 Shubin NH. 2002. Origin of evolutionary novelty: examples from limbs. *Journal of*
- 1033 *Morphology* **252**:15–28.
- 1034 Shubin NH & Alberch P. 1986. A morphogenetic approach to the origin and basic
- 1035 organization of the tetrapod limb. *Evolutionary Biology* **20**:319–387.
- 1036 Smithson TR. 1989. The earliest known reptile. *Nature* **342**:676–677.
- 1037 Smithson RT, Carroll RL, Panchen AL & Andrews SM. 1994. *Westlothiana lizziae* from the
- 1038 Viséan of East Kirkton, West Lothian, Scotland, and the amniote stem. *Transactions*

of the Royal Society of the Edinburgh, Earth Sciences **84**:383–412.

doi:10.1017/S0263593300006192

Vallin G, Laurin M. 2004. Cranial morphology and affinities of *Microbrachis*, and a reappraisal of the phylogeny and lifestyle of the first amphibians. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **24**:56–72.

Villamil J, Meneghel M, Blanco RE, Jones W, Núñez Demarco P, Rinderknecht A, Laurin M & Piñeiro, G. 2015. Optimal swimming speed estimates in the Early Permian mesosaurid *Mesosaurus tenuidens* (Gervais, 1865) from Uruguay. *Historical Biology*. Published online: 14 August, 2015. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08912963.2015.1075018>

Williston S W. 1917. *Labidosaurus*' Cope, a Lower Permian cotylosaur reptile from Texas. *Journal of Geology* **25**:309–321.

Figure captions

Figure 1. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation. Photographs of the selected specimens preserving epipodial, mesopodial and metapodial elements. The images focussed particularly on the tarsal elements preserved in each of the specimens. This figure includes the earliest stages of the ontogenetic series. A. FC-DPV 2504, close-up view of the limbs preserved in a non-hatched mesosaurid. The very small composite tarsus can be seen slightly distally displaced from its natural position close to the zeugopodium. See interpretive drawings in figure 2A, Fig. 7 and text, for further description. B. GP-2E 272, tarsus of a very young mesosaur; the constituent elements should have already started ossification, but they are covered by the plantar aponeurosis and just shadows of astragalus and distal tarsals can be seen. See interpretive drawings in figure 2B for

details, C. SMF-R 4496, well preserved tarsus of a young individual, both astragalus and calcaneum can be observed close to the crus. See interpretive drawing in Fig. 2C for a more detailed anatomical description of the specimen. D. AMNH 23795, tarsus of a very young mesosaur showing the astragalus and a tiny calcaneum a little laterally displaced. The calcaneum still preserves part of the suturing of the precursor bones over its visible (probably ventral) surface. Toe number one is not completely ossified yet, suggesting the very juvenile stage of this specimen. See interpretive drawings in Fig. 2D for more detailed anatomical description of the specimen. E-G. MN 4741, SMF-R 4934, and SMF-R 4513, show the progressive growing of the individuals in the ontogenetic series and the concomitant dramatic changes in the morphology of the astragalus. According to the tarsus morphology and the further ossification of the limbs and overall skeleton, the specimen in G is considered to be a young adult or a sub-adult. See text for further descriptions and interpretive drawing in Fig. 2 E-G.

Figure 2. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation. Interpretive drawings of the specimens in Fig. 1. See text for further descriptions of each the included specimens. Scale bar: 5 mm.

Figure 3. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation. Detailed interpretive drawings to show the morphology of the tarsus in after-hatched and juvenile mesosaurid shown in figure 1 (B-G; A, is detailed in Fig.9). Putative ancestral bones that formed the mesosaur astragalus are shown as we interpreted them based on the morphology and relationships of the tarsal bones preserved in FC-DPV 2504, the non-hatched mesosaurid (see Fig. 9 and text for further descriptions of each the included specimens). Anatomical Abbreviations: ?ac3, putative ancestral centrale three; ?ai, putative ancestral intermediate; as, astragalus; ?ate+ac4, putative ancestral

1088 tibiale plus ancestral centrale four; ca, calcaneum; ?dt, putative distal tarsals; ?dt4,
1089 putative distal tarsal four; ?na, putative navicular; pa, plantar aponeurosis .

1090 Figure 4. Photographs of the selected specimens preserving epipodial, mesopodial and
1091 metapodial elements. From H to P. GP-2E 5610, FC-DPV 2497, GP-2E 114, SMF-R
1092 4710, SMF-R 4470, GP-2E 5816, GP-2E 6576, GP-2E 5740, FC-DPV 2058. All the
1093 specimens are considered as adults; they have well ossified tarsi. The preserved bones
1094 and their morphology fit into the typical pattern for basal amniotes: 2 large proximal
1095 bones (astragalus and calcaneum), a ‘navicular’ (often preserving the suture between
1096 c1 and c2) and 5 distal tarsals. See Figs. 5 and 6 for interpretive drawings of the
1097 preserved bones and their main characteristic features.

1098 Figure 5. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation.
1099 Interpretive drawings of the specimens in Fig.2 (H-P) showing the adult stages in the
1100 ontogenetic sequence. See text for further descriptions of each the included specimens.

1101 Figure 6. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation.
1102 Detailed interpretive drawings of the specimens in Fig. 2 showing the morphology of
1103 the tarsus in adult individuals. The formation of the ‘navicular’ by the fusion of c1 and
1104 c2 is shown through the series, as well as the formation and development of the
1105 foramen for the perforating artery. Notable is the variation in size and shape of the
1106 distal tarsals observed in the analysed specimens. Anatomical abbreviations: as,
1107 astragalus; c1: centrale 1; c2, centrale 2; ca, calcaneum; na: ‘navicular’; paf, foramen
1108 for the perforating artery; I,II,III,IV,V, distal tarsals.

1109 Figure 7. Photograph (A) and anatomical reconstruction (B) of the crus in an adult
1110 *Mesosaurus tenuidens*. Colours indicate the identity of the different elements that form
1111 the tarsus and the crus. Scale bar: 10 mm.

Figure 8. Ontogenetic transition of the ‘navicular’ in *Mesosaurus tenuidens*. A, FC-DPV 1502, from left to right, photographs and interpretive drawings of isolated astragalus from a young individual, in dorsal, ventral and medial views respectively. The bone shows the typical square outline of immature individuals and the remains of sutures between the original anlagen more visible on its ventral surface, which appears to display a different morphology with respect to the dorsal one. Note that there are no traces of the ‘navicular’ preserved along the distal surface of the astragalus, which bears a concave margin. B, GP-2E 5203, photograph and interpretive drawing of astragalus, calcaneum and incipient ‘navicular’ of a young individual in dorsal view. Recall on that the ‘navicular’ is already united to the astragalus by c2, being formed by c1 and c2 and the suture between them is still well visible. C, FC-DPV 1479, photographs and interpretive drawings of an isolated astragalus from an adult individual in dorsal, ventral and medial view. Observe that the ‘navicular’ is now a single bone almost completely fused to the astragalus to produce the finally resultant adult outline. C1 has transformed into a tip-like bone and remains separated from the astragalus, but it can just be seen from the ventral view, which still features different from the dorsal one. The wide and triangular facet for articulation with the tibia can be seen from the medial view. Anatomical abbreviations: a, astragalus; ca, calcaneum; c1, centrale one; c2, centrale two; ac3, ancestral centrale three; ft, facet for the articulation of the tibia; ai, ancestral intermedium; ate+ac4, ancestral tibiale plus ancestral central four. Scale bar: 5 mm.

Figure 9. Preserved tarsus in a *Mesosaurus tenuidens* non-hatched individual. A, FC.DPV 2504, a non-hatched mesosaurid in the egg, showing the two feet overlapping each other by compression. B, SEM image of the foot of FC-DPV 2504 focusing on the tarsal area. The astragali can be seen in the center of the figure, mixed between the


metatarsals. The astragalus seems to be not preserved. C, Interpretive drawing of the tarsus including a possible identification of the preserved bones by regarding previous hypotheses about the origin of the amniotic astragalus. The composing elements of the astragalus were colored to favour identification of the isolated bones of the left foot. Anatomical abbreviations: ?i, possible intermedium; ?c4, possible central four; fi, fibula; mc, metacarpals; ?te, possible tibiale; t, tibia. Scale bar: 1mm.

Figure 10. Tarsus structure in basal tetrapods, including amniote and non-amniote taxa.

Schematic diagram for comparing the tarsus structure in the basal tetrapods *Acheloma* and *Greererpeton* (amphibian-like tarsus) with regard to that of embolomeres and microsaur (amniote-like tarsus) and actually primitive amniotes. Note the similar structure and construction of the microsauro tarsus with respect to the early amniote *Hylonomus*. See text for more details of the evolutive significance of the selected taxa. Abbreviations: as, astragalus; i, intermedium; te, tibiale; 1,2,3,4, centralia; i,ii,iii,iv,v, distal tarsals. Taxa were redrawn from the following sources: *Acheloma* (Dilkes, 2015); *Greererpeton* (Godfrey, 1989); *Proterogyrinus* (Holmes, 1984); *Gephyrostegus* (Carroll, 1970); *Seymouria* (Berman et al., 2000); *Weslotiana* (Smithson 1989, Smithson et al.,1994); *Pantylus* (Carroll, 1968); *Tuditanus* (Carroll, 1968); Diadectomorphs (Moss, 1972; Berman & Henrici 2003;); *Ophiacodon* and *Haptodus* (Romer & Price, 1940); *Hylonomus* (Carroll, 1964); *Captorhinus* (Fox & Bowman, 1966); *Petrolacosaurus* (Peabody, 1952; Reisz, 1981).

Figure 11. Schematic representation of recent phylogenetic hypotheses of early tetrapod relationships showing the position of the taxa involved in the evolutionary transition to the formation of the early amniotic astragalus (see text for the figure context). A. Ruta & Coates, 2007; B. Carroll, 1995; C. Laurin & Reisz, 1999; D. Marjanovic & Laurin, 2015.

1162 Figure 12. Hypotheses about the astragalus and the navicular formation. The schematic
1163 diagram shows the steps that lead to the formation of the amniotic tarsus, regarding the
1164 series of possible transformations that could have produced the primitive astragalus
1165 (A) as well as those that prevailed into the evolution of the 'navicular' bone (B).



1166
1167 Figure 1. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation.
1168 Photographs of the selected specimens preserving epipodial, mesopodial and
1169 metapodial elements. The images focussed particularly on the tarsal elements

preserved in each of the specimens. This figure includes the earliest stages of the ontogenetic series. A. FC-DPV 2504, close-up view of the limbs preserved in a non-hatched mesosaurid. The very small composite tarsus can be seen slightly distally displaced from its natural position close to the zeugopodium. See interpretive drawings in figure 2A, Fig. 7 and text, for further description. B. GP-2E 272, tarsus of a very young mesosaur; the constituent elements should have already started ossification, but they are covered by the plantar aponeurosis and just shadows of astragalus and distal tarsals can be seen. See interpretive drawings in figure 2B for details, C. SMF-R 4496, well preserved tarsus of a young individual, both astragalus and calcaneum can be observed close to the crus. See interpretive drawing in Fig. 2C for a more detailed anatomical description of the specimen. D. AMNH 23795, tarsus of a very young mesosaur showing the astragalus and a tiny calcaneum a little laterally displaced. The calcaneum still preserves part of the suturing of the precursor bones over its visible (probably ventral) surface. Toe number one is not completely ossified yet, suggesting the very juvenile stage of this specimen. See interpretive drawings in Fig. 2D for more detailed anatomical description of the specimen. E-G. MN 4741, SMF-R 4934, and SMF-R 4513, show the progressive growing of the individuals in the ontogenetic series and the concomitant dramatic changes in the morphology of the astragalus. According to the tarsus morphology and the further ossification of the limbs and overall skeleton, the specimen in G is considered to be a young adult or a sub-adult. See text for further descriptions and interpretive drawing in Fig. 2 E-G.




Figure 2. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation.

Interpretive drawings of the specimens in Fig. 1. See text for further descriptions of each the included specimens. Scale bar: 5 mm.




Figure 3. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation.

Detailed interpretive drawings to show the morphology of the tarsus in after-hatched and juvenile mesosaurid shown in figure 1 (B-G; A, is detailed in Fig.9). Putative ancestral bones that formed the mesosaur astragalus are shown as we interpreted them based on the morphology and relationships of the tarsal bones preserved in FC-DPV 2504, the non-hatched mesosaurid (see Fig. 9 and text for further descriptions of each the included specimens). Anatomical Abbreviations: ?ac3, putative ancestral centrale three; ?ai, putative ancestral intermediate; as, astragalus; ?ate+ac4, putative ancestral tibiale plus ancestral centrale four; ca, calcaneum; ?dt, putative distal tarsals; ?dt4, putative distal tarsal four; ?na, putative navicular; pa, plantar aponeurosis .




Figure 4. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation.

Photographs of the selected specimens preserving epipodial, mesopodial and metapodial elements. From H to P. GP-2E 5610, FC-DPV 2497, GP-2E 114, SMF-R 4710, SMF-R 4470, GP-2E 5816, GP-2E 6576, GP-2E 5740, FC-DPV 2058. All the specimens are considered as adults; they have well ossified tarsi. The preserved bones and their morphology fit into the typical pattern for basal amniotes: 2 large proximal bones (astragalus and calcaneum), 'a navicular' (often preserving the suture between c1 and c2) and 5 distal tarsals. See Figs. 5 and 6 for interpretive drawings of the preserved bones and their main characteristic features.




Figure 5. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation. Interpretive drawings of the specimens in Fig.2 (H-P) showing the adult stages in the ontogenetic sequence. See text for further descriptions of each the included specimens.





Figure 6. *Mesosaurus tenuidens* ontogenetic transformation transition in the tarsus formation.

Detailed interpretive drawings of the specimens in Fig. 2 showing the morphology of the tarsus in adult individuals. The formation of the ‘navicular’ by the fusion of c1 and c2 is shown through the series, as well as the formation and development of the foramen for the perforating artery. Notable is the variation in size and shape of the distal tarsals observed in the analysed specimens. Anatomical abbreviations: as, astragalus; c1: centrale 1; c2, centrale 2; ca, calcaneum; na: ‘navicular’; paf, foramen for the perforating artery; I,II,III,IV,V, distal tarsals.




1231

1232 Figure 7. Photograph (A) and anatomical reconstruction (B) of the crus in an adult

1233 *Mesosaurus tenuidens*. Colours indicate the identity of the different elements that form

1234 the tarsus and the crus. Scale bar: 10 mm.



1236

1237 Figure 8. Ontogenetic transition of the ‘navicular’ in *Mesosaurus tenuidens*. A, FC-DPV
 1238 1502, from left to right, photographs and interpretive drawings of isolated astragalus
 1239 from a young individual, in dorsal, ventral and medial views respectively. The bone
 1240 shows the typical square outline of immature individuals and the remains of sutures
 1241 between the original anlagen more visible on its ventral surface, which appears to
 1242 display a different morphology with respect to the dorsal one. Note that there are no
 1243 traces of the ‘navicular’ preserved along the distal surface of the astragalus, which
 1244 bears a concave margin. B, GP-2E 5203, photograph and interpretive drawing of
 1245 astragalus, calcaneum and incipient ‘navicular’ of a young individual in dorsal view.
 1246 Recall on that the ‘navicular’ is already united to the astragalus by c2, being formed by
 1247 c1 and c2 and the suture between them is still well visible. C, FC-DPV 1479,
 1248 photographs and interpretive drawings of an isolated astragalus from an adult
 1249 individual in dorsal, ventral and medial view. Observe that the ‘navicular’ is now a
 1250 single bone almost completely fused to the astragalus to produce the finally resultant
 1251 adult outline. C1 has transformed into a tip-like bone and remains separated from the
 1252 astragalus, but it can just be seen from the ventral view, which still features different
 1253 from the dorsal one. The wide and triangular facet for articulation with the tibia can be
 1254 seen from the medial view. Anatomical abbreviations: a, astragalus; ca, calcaneum; c1,
 1255 centrale one; c2, centrale two; ac3, ancestral centrale three; ft, facet for the articulation
 1256 of the tibia; ai, ancestral intermedium; ate+ac4, ancestral tibiale plus ancestral central
 1257 four. Scale bar: 5 mm.




Figure 9. Preserved tarsus in a *Mesosaurus tenuidens* non-hatched individual. A, FC.DPV

2504, a non-hatched mesosaurid in the egg, showing the two feet overlapping each

other by compression. B, SEM image of the foot of FC-DPV 2504 focusing on the

tarsal area. The astragali can be seen in the center of the figure, mixed between the

metatarsals. The astragalus seems to be not preserved. C, Interpretive drawing of the

tarsus including a possible identification of the preserved bones by regarding previous


hypotheses about the origin of the amniotic astragalus. The composing elements of the

astragalus were colored to favour identification of the isolated bones of the left foot.

Anatomical abbreviations: ?i, possible intermedium; ?c3, possible central three; fi,

fibula; mc, metacarpals; ?te+c4, possible tibiale plus possible central four; t, tibia.

Scale bar: 1mm.



1271 Figure 10. Tarsus structure in basal tetrapods, including amniote and non-amniote taxa.

1272 Schematic diagram for comparing the tarsus structure in the basal tetrapods *Acheloma*

1273 and *Greererpeton* (amphibian-like tarsus) with regard to that of embolomeres and

1274 microsaurs (amniote-like tarsus) and actually primitive amniotes. Note the similar

1275 structure and construction of the microsaurs tarsus with respect to the early amniote

1276 *Hylonomus*. See text for more details of the evolutive significance of the selected taxa.

1277 Abbreviations: as, astragalus; i, intermedium; te, tibiale; 1,2,3,4, centralia; i,ii,iii,iv,v,

1278 distal tarsals. Taxa were redrawn from the following sources: *Acheloma* (Dilkes,

1279 2015); *Greererpeton* (Godfrey, 1989); *Proterogyrinus* (Holmes, 1984); *Gephyrostegus*

1280 (Carroll, 1970); *Seymouria* (Berman et al., 2000); *Weslotiana* (Smithson 1989,


1281 Smithson et al.,1994); *Pantylus* (Carroll, 1968); *Tuditanus* (Carroll, 1968);

1282 Diadectomorphs (Moss, 1972; Berman & Henrici 2003;); *Ophiacodon* and *Haptodus*

1283 (Romer & Price, 1940); *Hylonomus* (Carroll, 1964); *Captorhinus* (Fox & Bowman,

1284 1966); *Petrolacosaurus* (Peabody, 1952; Reisz, 1981).

1285



1286
 1287 Figure 11. Schematic representation of recent phylogenetic hypotheses of early tetrapod
 1288 relationships showing the position of the taxa involved in the evolutionary transition to
 1289 the formation of the early amniotic astragalus (see text for the figure context). A. Ruta
 1290 & Coates, 2007; B. Carroll, 1995; C. Laurin & Reisz, 1999; D. Marjanovic & Laurin,
 1291 2015.




Figure 12. Hypotheses about the astragalus and the navicular formation. The schematic diagram shows the steps that lead to the formation of the amniotic tarsus, regarding the series of possible transformations that could have produced the primitive astragalus (A) as well as those that prevailed into the evolution of the ‘navicular’ bone (B).