

Large mammal burrows in late Miocene calcic paleosols from central Argentina: palaeoenvironment, taphonomy and producers (#25129)

1

First submission

Editor guidance

Please submit by **31 Mar 2018** for the benefit of the authors (and your \$200 publishing discount).



Structure and Criteria

Please read the 'Structure and Criteria' page for general guidance.



Custom checks

Make sure you include the custom checks shown below, in your review.



Author notes

Have you read the author notes on the [guidance page](#)?



Raw data check

Review the raw data. Download from the [materials page](#).



Image check

Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

Privacy reminder: If uploading an annotated PDF, remove identifiable information to remain anonymous.

Files

Download and review all files from the [materials page](#).

13 Figure file(s)
2 Table file(s)
2 Raw data file(s)



Custom checks

Field study



Have you checked the authors [field study permits](#)?



Are the field study permits appropriate?



Structure your review

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

When ready [submit online](#).

Editorial Criteria

Use these criteria points to structure your review. The full detailed editorial criteria is on your [guidance page](#).

BASIC REPORTING

-  Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
-  Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
-  Structure conforms to [PeerJ standards](#), 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 the 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.
-  Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.
-  Speculation is welcome, but should be identified as such.

Standout reviewing tips

3



The best reviewers use these techniques

Tip

Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources

Example

Smith et al (J of Methodology, 2005, V3, pp 123) have shown that the analysis you use in Lines 241-250 is not the most appropriate for this situation. Please explain why you used this method.

Give specific suggestions on how to improve the manuscript

Your introduction needs more detail. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 57- 86 to provide more justification for your study (specifically, you should expand upon the knowledge gap being filled).

Comment on language and grammar issues

The English language should be improved to ensure that an international audience can clearly understand your text. Some examples where the language could be improved include lines 23, 77, 121, 128 – the current phrasing makes comprehension difficult.

Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points

1. Your most important issue
2. The next most important item
3. ...
4. The least important points

Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions

I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifiers to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways: AA, BB, CC

Comment on strengths (as well as weaknesses) of the manuscript

I commend the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed fieldwork. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the statistical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.

Large mammal burrows in late Miocene calcic paleosols from central Argentina: palaeoenvironment, taphonomy and producers

María Cristina Cardonatto ^{Corresp., 1}, Ricardo Néstor Melchor ²

¹ Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales. Dto Geología, Universidad Nacional de La Pampa, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, Argentina

² Instituto de Ciencias de la Tierra y Ambientales de La Pampa, Universidad Nacional de La Pampa- Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, Argentina

Corresponding Author: María Cristina Cardonatto
Email address: mccardonatto@exactas.unlpam.edu.ar

Large cylindrical structures with a dominantly laminated fill occurring in the loess-paleosol sequence of the late Miocene Cerro Azul Formation (central Argentina) are interpreted as mammal burrows. A total of 115 burrow fills from three localities were measured. The fills typically are shallowly dipping, subcylindrical, unbranched structures with a rounded end and lacking enlargements. The horizontal diameter of the burrows range between 0.15 and 1.50 m, with most of the burrows in the interval of 0.39 to 0.98 m. Geometric morphometric analysis of transverse cross-sections support the distinction of subcircular and elliptical (horizontally flattened) fills. Burrows fills are typically laminated in the lower part and massive in the upper part. The laminated intervals reflect pulses of aqueous currents entering the abandoned burrow during moderate rains, whereas massive intervals reflect en masse input of sediment-water mixtures during heavy rains that produced sheet floods. About 1% of the burrow fills contained fragmentary, disarticulated and weathered mammal bones that were introduced in the open burrow by currents along with other sedimentary particles. Analysis of the tetrapod burrow fossil record suggests that Miocene burrows, including those studied herein; reflect a remarkable increase in the average size of the fossorial fauna. We conclude that large late Miocene mammals dug burrows essentially as a shelter against environmental extremes and also to escape predation. Several mammal groups acquired fossorial habits in response to cold and seasonally dry climatic conditions that prevailed during the late Miocene in southern South America. The ample range of horizontal diameters of the studied burrow fills can be attributed to a variety of producers, including dasypodids, the notoungulate *Paedotherium minor*, Glyptodontidae and *Proscelidodon* sp. The simple architecture of the burrows suggests that the producers essentially foraged aboveground.

1 **Large mammal burrows in late Miocene calcic paleosols from central**
 2 **Argentina: palaeoenvironment, taphonomy and producers**

3 María Cristina Cardonatto¹, Ricardo Néstor Melchor^{1,2}

4 *¹Geology Department, National University of La Pampa, Av. Uruguay 151, 6300 Santa Rosa, La*
 5 *Pampa, Argentina. Email: mccardonatto@exactas.unlpam.edu.ar*

6 *²Instituto de Ciencias de La Tierra y Ambientales de La Pampa (Universidad Nacional de La*
 7 *Pampa-Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas), Av. Uruguay 151, 6300*
 8 *Santa Rosa, La Pampa, Argentina.*

9

10 **Corresponding autor:**

11 María Cristina Cardonatto¹

Abstract

Large cylindrical structures with a dominantly laminated fill occurring in the loess-paleosol sequence of the late Miocene Cerro Azul Formation (central Argentina) are interpreted as mammal burrows. A total of 115 burrow fills from three localities were measured. The fills typically are shallowly dipping, subcylindrical, unbranched structures with a rounded end and lacking enlargements. The horizontal diameter of the burrows range between 0.15 and 1.50 m, with most of the burrows in the interval of 0.39 to 0.98 m. Geometric morphometric analysis of transverse cross-sections support the distinction of subcircular and elliptical (horizontally flattened) fills. Burrows fills are typically laminated in the lower part and massive in the upper part. The laminated intervals reflect pulses of aqueous currents entering the abandoned burrow during moderate rains, whereas massive intervals reflect *en masse* input of sediment-water mixtures during heavy rains that produced sheet floods. About 1% of the burrow fills contained fragmentary, disarticulated and weathered mammal bones that were introduced in the open burrow by currents along with other sedimentary particles. Analysis of the tetrapod burrow fossil record suggests that Miocene burrows, including those studied herein; reflect a remarkable increase in the average size of the fossorial fauna. We conclude that large late Miocene mammals dug burrows essentially as a shelter against environmental extremes and also to escape predation. Several mammal groups acquired fossorial habits in response to cold and seasonally dry climatic conditions that prevailed during the late Miocene in southern South America. The ample range of horizontal diameters of the studied burrow fills can be attributed to a variety of producers, including dasypodids, the notoungulate *Paedotherium minor*, Glyptodontidae and *Proscelidodon* sp. The simple architecture of the burrows suggests that the producers essentially foraged aboveground.

Keywords: tetrapod burrow; laminated burrow fill; Xenarthra; taphonomy

Introduction

Fossil vertebrate burrows are relatively common biogenic structures and the oldest convincing evidence of tetrapod burrows are Early Permian (Asselian-Artinskian) lysophorid amphibian burrows from Kansas, USA (Hembree, Martin & Hasiotis, 2004). Most pre-Cretaceous tetrapod

burrows have been attributed to therapsids, in part on the basis of the finding of articulated skeletons in a few Late Permian-Early Triassic burrows (Smith 1987; Groenewald, Welman & MacEachern, 2001; Damiani et al., 2003; Modesto & Botha-Brink 2010). A common architecture for Permian to Jurassic tetrapod burrows is a shallowly inclined ramp with a rounded and not enlarged end, of reduced horizontal diameter (Fig. 1), with discrete scratch marks, always showing a horizontally flattened elliptical cross-section, and commonly with a bilobed bottom (e.g., Damiani et al., 2003; Sidor et al., 2008; Riese, Hasiotis & Odier, 2011; Liu & Li 2013; Melchor & Loope 2016; Krummeck & Bordy, 2017). Most of Jurassic tetrapod burrows occur in eolian sequences including the oldest subhorizontal burrow systems that have been assigned to primitive mammals from the Early Jurassic Navajo Sandstone of USA (Riese, Hasiotis & Odier, 2011) (Fig. 1). In contrast, there is a dearth of reports of Cretaceous tetrapod burrows that can be related with the equable climates that existed for most of this period. The more unusual occurrence for the Late Cretaceous is the unique dinosaur burrow containing an adult and two juvenile remains of ornithopods, further suggesting denning behavior and parental care (Varricchio, Martin & Katsura, 2007).

Most of the Cenozoic tetrapod burrows have been attributed to mammals, mainly to Rodentia and Xenarthra (e.g., Voorhies, 1975; Martin & Bennett 1977; Benton, 1988; Gobetz & Martin 2006), whereas a few examples are related to Carnivora (e.g., Hunt, Xiang-Xu & Kaufman, 1983; Hembree & Hasiotis 2008). The record of Paleogene tetrapod burrows is meager and can also be linked to dominantly benign climate conditions (Fig. 1). The Miocene record of tetrapod burrows is more varied and abundant, with a diversification of the architectural patterns and behavioral strategies that commonly appeared under stressed volcanoclastic and eolian environments. The early Miocene volcanoclastic floodplains of

Nebraska, USA, witnessed the appearance of 1) the celebrated vertical helical burrows ending in a ramp and terminal chamber named *Daimonelix* (e.g., Barbour, 1892; Martin & Bennett, 1977), as well as 2) smaller, complex subhorizontal rodent burrow systems with terminal chambers and subcircular cross-section (Gobetz & Martin, 2006), and 3) the first carnivore den (Hunt, Xiang-Xu & Kaufman, 1983; Hunt 1990). Also in the early Miocene, the coastal dunes of Germany preserved the oldest fossil food cache (Gee et al., 2003). The main tetrapod burrowing innovation during the middle Miocene is represented by cylindrical, subhorizontal, unbranched tunnels with a meniscate backfill interpreted as foraging tunnels of small Dasypodidae from southern South America (Melchor et al., 2012; 2016). Pliocene burrows are small (horizontal diameter less than 250 mm) and those from the Atlantic coast of the Buenos Aires province, Argentina have received a considerable attention, because they are common and a significant amount of the burrows contains bone remains (e.g., Genise, 1989; Quintana, 1992; Fernández, Vassallo & Zárate, 2000; Elissamburu, Dondas & De Santis, 2011). These are subcircular burrows assigned to rodents and notoungulates. The Pleistocene megafauna of South America is also reflected in the burrow trace fossil record in the form of huge tunnels (up to 2 m wide), with horizontally flattened elliptical cross-sections from Argentina and Brazil (e.g., Quintana, 1992; Vizcaíno et al., 2001; Buchmann, Pereira Lopes & Caron, 2009; Genise & Farina 2012; Frank et al., 2012; 2015). These burrows were attributed to Dasypodidae and Pamphathiidae (the small ones) and to ground sloths (intermediate and large ones). It has been suggested that the acquisition or generalization of burrowing behavior by large Pleistocene herbivorous mammals may reflect the arrival of large carnivorans after the Great American Biotic Interchange, just before the Pliocene-Pleistocene boundary (Soibelzon et al., 2009).

A trend towards larger burrows (as suggested by average Dh) is evident from the early Miocene to the late Pleistocene (Fig. 1). Pre-Miocene burrows attain a maximum average horizontal diameter of 420 mm (the examples from the Navajo Sandstone described by Loope, 2006), however, most are in the range of 100-200 mm. From the Miocene on, burrows with an average horizontal diameter in excess of 500 mm are recorded (Fig. 1), including those studied herein. The Neogene record also includes more common and smaller burrows (Dh ~ < 200 mm) that are mostly attributed to rodents and small Dasypodidae (Fig. 1).

In this context, the tetrapod burrows from the late Miocene Cerro Azul Formation are the largest pre-Pleistocene tetrapod burrows and can help to understand the reasons for early acquisition of burrowing habits in large Cenozoic mammals from South America. These structures have been partially and briefly described (Genise et al., 2013), but a detailed description is missing. The purposes of this work are: 1) to infer the likely producers of these late Miocene large burrows and 2) to interpret the taphonomy of the burrows and its paleoecological and paleoenvironmental meaning.

Material & methods

The studied localities with late Miocene burrow fills are distributed in a latitudinal belt of approximately 25 km (Fig. 2): Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo (SG, 37° 12' 55"S, 63° 35' 25"W; 100 masl); Laguna Chillhué (LC, 37°19'15.13"S; 64°14'31.52"W; 145 masl); and Laguna La Paragwaya near Carhué city (LLP, 37° 5'53.57"S; 62°47'34.98"W; 101 m.a.s.l.). The first two localities belong to La Pampa province, whereas the remaining is located in the adjacent Buenos Aires province. The burrow fills appear in outcrop as transverse to oblique, longitudinal, tangential and plan view exposures.

Another locality of the Cerro Azul Formation, a roadcut in national road 154 (R154, 37° 49' 28.5"S, 64° 4' 8.9"W), has been previously described as having vertebrate burrows (De Elorriaga & Visconti, 2001). However, this locality is not considered herein because the burrow fills probably postdate significantly the deposition of the unit. The reasons for this inference are: 1) burrow fill diameters are considerably larger than those described herein (Dv up to 2.25 m) and more consistent with burrows attributed to a large Pleistocene megafauna (e.g., Vizcaíno et al., 2001; Frank et al., 2012); and 2) the burrow fill cut the carbonate nodules of the capping calcrete. Although absolute dating of the calcrete is not available, it has been suggested that the calcretization process ~~postdate significantly~~ the deposition of the Cerro Azul Formation (Vogt, Carballo & Calmels, 1999; Melchor & Casadio 2000; Visconti et al., 2010). The main argument for this inference is that the calcrete is developed in sedimentary sequences ranging in age from late Miocene to Pleistocene.

Standard measurements in burrow fills were horizontal diameter (Dh), vertical diameter (Dv), preserved length, mean azimuth of burrow fill and inclination of internal laminae. The mean azimuth was measured using a compass and considering the burrow fill boundary and dominant plunge of laminated fill. When changes of dip direction or inclination were observed in a single burrow fill they were recorded separately. Burrow fill diameter (especially Dh) was measured orthogonal to the main axis of the structure. The horizontal diameter was obtained from almost all types of exposures (except for longitudinal ones), whereas the vertical diameter was mostly an apparent value, except for the rare transverse sections, where it can be considered the true vertical diameter. At each location, GPS coordinates were recorded; the burrow fills were photographed and sketched.

The burrow fills exposed in transverse section (n=24) were used for a ~~bidimensional~~ geometric morphometric analysis. From field photographs, the outline of the burrow boundary was sketched in Corel Draw™. These images were used to build a file with the TPSutil software. For each image a total of 16 landmarks were digitised using the TPSdig2 software, arranged with an equidistant pattern on the burrow outline (Fig. 3). Landmarks were aligned using the Procrustes superposition method (McLeod, 2009) and the principal component analyses (PCA) using MorphoJ software. Results are presented by eigenvalue diagrams and PC scores, along with transformation grids.

From scaled sketches of transverse sections of burrow fills, the cross-sectional area of the burrow fill was estimated using ImageJ software. This cross-sectional area was used to estimate the body mass of the producer using the allometric relations ~~by~~ Wu et al. (2015).

At each locality, a detailed sedimentary log was measured and samples ~~from~~ host rock and burrow fill were ~~obtained~~ for petrographic analysis. At selected locations also the burrow fill was logged ~~using standard sedimentologic techniques~~. Mammal bones found *in situ* within burrow fills were recorded and collected for preparation and ~~detailed~~ taxonomic ~~assignation~~. Fossil bones found outside burrow fills were not recorded ~~nor~~ collected. Fossil remains from La Pampa province collected during this study are housed at the Paleontological Collection of the Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de La Pampa, Santa Rosa city, La Pampa, Argentina, under the acronym GHUNLPam. Fossil material collected in burrows from Laguna La Paraguaya locality (Buenos Aires province) are housed at the Museo Histórico Regional de Guaminí “Coronel Marcelino E. Freyre” under the acronym MHG-P. Field work was approved by the Dirección Provincial de Museos y Preservación Patrimonial, under the Project "Vertebrados del Mioceno tardío-Plioceno en el área de las lagunas encadenadas del

oeste de la provincia de Buenos Aires. Aportes a la bioestratigrafía del Cenozoico tardío de la
Región Pampeana", permit nr. 2015-3-P-156-2.

Geological setting

The Cerro Azul Formation outcrops are located in the north-western, central, and eastern part of
La Pampa province and adjacent western Buenos Aires province, Argentina (Linares, Llambías
& Latorre, 1980; Folguera & Zárate 2009; Visconti et al., 2010). The unit is characterized by a
monotonous succession of loess containing moderately developed paleosols (Fig. 4) that has
been assigned to the late Miocene (Huayquerian Land Mammal age) essentially on the basis of
its mammal remains (Montalvo & Casadio, 1988; Verzi, Montalvo & Vucetich, 1999; Verzi,
Montalvo & Visconti, 2003). In particular, the formation is considered as representing the
interval between 10 and 5.7 Ma (Cione et al., 2000; Verzi, Montalvo & Deschamps, 2008). The
maximum exposed thickness in outcrop is 54 m, although the unit reaches about 180 m in the
subsurface (Visconti et al., 2010). The formation is essentially composed of structureless, light
brown (5YR 6/4), pale reddish brown (10R 5/4) or grayish orange pink (5YR 7/2), sandy
siltstones and fine-grained sandstones, showing moderate selection and common carbonate
cementation.

Results

Sedimentology of the burrow fill bearing sections

Macroscopic features of the studied sections are very similar to those of the classical localities of
the Cerro Azul Formation outcrops (e.g., Visconti et al., 2010; Genise et al., 2013; Cardonatto et
al., 2016), especially those of the Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo and Laguna La Paraguaya.
Paleosol profiles are typically composed of two horizons (Fig. 4). The upper horizon is a clayey

siltstone that is distinguished by the presence of subangular blocky, granular or prismatic peds and a darker color (5 YR 6/4) than the underlying horizon. Carbonates are rare except for the local occurrence of carbonate rhizoliths. This upper horizon can be compared with a Bt horizon and its thickness averages 0.60 m (range = 0.35-1.00 m, n = 5), which is very close to the average for the formation (Cardonatto et al., 2016).

The lower horizon is characterized by lighter colored (5 YR 7/2), siltstone to fine-grained sandstone with pervasive carbonate cementation, both in the form of nodules and rhizoliths. Rhizoliths are small to medium sized and commonly 1 -30 mm in diameter. The lower horizon can be up to more than 5 m thick and contain relicts of primary sedimentary structures, like tangential cross-bedding or horizontal bedding, as seen in the Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo section (Fig. 4). Mud intraclasts are common throughout. The remains of primary sedimentary structures and carbonate cementation suggest comparison with a Bk or Bk/C horizon. The trace fossils described in this paper occur in both horizons.

The section at Laguna Chillhué also contains similar paleosols (Fig. 4) and differs from the remaining localities by the presence of a 2 m thick, dark-red, laminated mudstone interval in the lower part of the section (Montalvo et al., 1995). The presence of a mudstone interval in the lower section of the Cerro Azul Formation has been questioned by Lorenzo, Mehl & Zárate (2013), who supposed a younger age for this mudstone interval on the basis of geomorphological inferences. However, at this location the laminated mudstone interval is overlain, through a normal sedimentary contact, by lithologies typical of the Cerro Azul Formation containing mammal remains of Huayquerian (late Miocene) age, with no evidence of reworking. Vertebrate burrow fills were not observed in the laminated mudstone interval.

Description of large burrow fills

A total of 115 burrow fills were measured from three localities: 53 from Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo, 59 from Laguna La Paraguaya, and 3 from Laguna Chillhué (see Supplemental Table S1). The studied burrow fills are distinguished on the basis of the presence of a thinly laminated ~~siltstone to mudstone interval~~ that contrasts with the structureless host rock. When part of the fill is massive and similar to the host rock, the ~~distinction of the~~ burrow boundary is ~~obscured~~. ~~Sedimentary rocks composing the~~ burrow fills exhibit an induration, composition and cementation similar to the hosting rocks, suggesting that they are of late Miocene age. At Laguna La Paraguaya locality, the preferential carbonate cementation of the burrow fills resulted in ~~tridimensional exposures~~ (Fig. 5A). At this locality the density of burrow fills is locally high and may be difficult to find unburrowed intervals. Cross-cutting relationships between two or more burrows are common (Figs. 5B, 5C).

Size and plan view pattern

Observed horizontal diameter ranges from 0.15 to 1.50 m (n= 112) and the frequency distribution suggests a roughly normal distribution where three subpopulations can be distinguished (Fig. 6). The small subpopulation has a Dh from 0.15 to 0.34 m (8 %), the intermediate subpopulation has a Dh from 0.39 to 0.98 m (84 %), and the large subpopulation exhibits a Dh from 1.05 to 1.50 m (8 %).

In plan view exposure, which is found only at SG and LLP localities (n=78), a number of morphologies can be distinguished (Fig. 7). 1) The more common are straight to slightly curved burrow fills (89 % of cases), which exhibits a Dh= 0.15-1.15 m, showing an uniform inclination of internal laminae (ranging from $\approx 0^\circ$ to 27°), the maximum height difference between the proximal and distal portion of a burrow fill is 0.6 m, and the maximum preserved length is 5.18

m (Figs. 7A, 7B). Some burrow fills in this category display a ~~shallowing~~ of internal laminae toward more distal positions (i.e., from 27° to 8°). 2) A sinuous ~~pattern is herein used to refer~~ burrow fills ~~that comprise~~ two opposite curves in plan view, ~~which~~ was recorded in 5% of the cases (Figs. 7C, 7D). The horizontal diameter of sinuous burrow fills ranges from 0.42 to 0.80 m, ~~dip~~ of internal laminae is subhorizontal to slightly inclined (up to 8°), and the maximum observed length is 8 m. 3) The third plan view pattern is a C-shaped ~~closed~~ curve observed in 6% of the burrow fills, with an horizontal diameter ranging from 0.44 to 0.72 m (Figs. 7E, 7F), which commonly appears as a ramp with a height difference of up to 0.55 m, the inclination of internal laminae can be uniform (from 3° to 12°) or show a shallowing toward the distal position (from 14° to subhorizontal).

In a few cases, the distal portion of burrow fill showed an ~~enlargement~~ of up to 23% of the Dh, commonly having a subhorizontal lamination (Figs. 7G, 7H). Other burrow fills exhibit a rounded end with no enlargement that can be accompanied by an upward bending of mudstone laminae ~~at the burrow boundary~~.

Cross-sectional shape and body mass

The analysis of the well defined cross-sectional shape of burrows fills (n= 24 from all localities) suggest a distinction between elliptical (with the major axis subhorizontal) and subcircular cross-sections. Elliptical cross-sections are more common (n=18) and the corresponding Dh ranges from 0.39 to 1.50 m (belonging to the intermediate and large subpopulations, Fig. 6), with an average Dv/Dh ratio of 0.55. The burrows fills with elliptical cross-section include a few cases (n=4) with a flat bottom and convex top. The subcircular cross-sectional shape (n=6) is represented in the intermediate subpopulation with a Dh ranging from 0.39 to 0.56 m, and an average Dv/Dh ratio of 0.88.

Morphometric analyses suggest that 90.13 % of the variation is explained by the first two principal components (Fig. 8B), and deformation grids range from elliptical (score= -0.12) to subcircular (score= 0.17) (Fig. 8A).

Body mass estimates of the producers of the burrow on the basis of the cross-sectional area (using the method by Wu et al., 2015) suggest that there are two ranges (Table S1). Most of the estimates (n= 18) belongs to the intermediate subpopulation with a range from 37 to 439 kg, whereas the remaining estimates comes from the large subpopulation (n= 7) with a range 708 to 1623 kg. Burrows with subcircular cross-section from the intermediate subpopulation, are linked with a producer having body mass from 92.84 to 186.0 kg.

Orientation

Readings of plunge azimuths of burrow fills from all localities are variable but most values are located in the northeast to southeast quadrants (i.e., between N20° and N140°) (Figs. 9A, 9C). The average dip angle of all measured burrow fills with respect to the paleohorizontal is 7.25° and ranges from nearly 0 to 27° (Fig. 9B). Most orientation data comes from the intermediate subpopulation (Dh= 0.39-0.98 m) and especially from LLP locality.

Composition of burrow fills

The vertebrate burrows are easily spotted in the field because of ~~its laminated structure~~ that contrasts with the ~~massive aspect of the hosting~~ rock. The filling is composed of an alternation of laminated claystone and siltstone with massive fine-grained sandstone and siltstone ~~having~~ claystone intraclasts. Laminated intervals are a few millimeters to about 50 mm thick, whereas massive intervals tend to be thicker. Most of the burrow fills display a laminated interval in the lowermost part of the fill, ~~whereas~~ the upper part ~~is~~ massive, especially in the

Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo locality (Figs. 10A, 10B, 10C). A few burrows display a poorly defined lamination to massive structure (Fig. 10D). Claystone and siltstone at the bottom of the structure typically ~~overlap on~~ the burrow wall, which is a good criterion to distinguish burrow fills that are mostly eroded. ~~Lamination tends~~ to be horizontal but successive laminated packages resting at low angles were also identified. Individual laminae are normally graded (typically siltstone grading to claystone), and locally disrupted giving a brecciated aspect. Both synsedimentary faulting and deformation were identified (Fig. 10F). ~~Some rare but distinctive feature of the fillings the~~ pseudomeniscate structure, ~~which~~ was identified in two cases (one from Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo and the other from Laguna La Paraguaya). This structure is composed of massive siltstone or fine-grained sandstone arranged in adjacent crescent-shaped bodies with the convex margin pointing downslope that span the full width of the fill (Fig. 10E). Horizontal width of individual pseudomeniscate bodies taken parallel to the burrow axis is 120 mm.

Associated ichnofossils

Only the ichnofossils found within or very close to the burrow fills are considered. We found within the fills abundant rhizoliths and rare smaller vertebrate burrows, vertebrate footprints and ?*Rosellichnus* isp. In the paleosol adjacent to the fills we found *Taenidium barretti*, *Attaichnus kuenzelli* and *Coprinisphaera* isp.

Calcareous rhizoliths, including rhizocretions and root casts, are abundant and were recorded in all studied localities. Commonly, rhizoliths are arranged in vertical, oblique and subhorizontal position (Fig. 10C). Rhizoliths are submillimeter to 45 mm thick and the maximum preserved length is 500 mm. Rhizoliths occurring inside burrow fills are similar in shape and cementation to those of the hosting rock.

A single small burrow fill (Fig. 11A) that cuts the laminated interval of a larger vertebrate burrow fill was identified at Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo (# 638). The 43 mm in diameter structure displays a subcircular outline and a poorly laminated siltstone fill.

A partially eroded burrow fill from Laguna La Paraguaya (# 708) exposed an internal bedding plane of the filling showing elliptical footprints with a noticeable marginal rim (Fig. 11C). ~~At least four footprints are recognized that probably compose a 0.7 m long quadrupedal trackway, with a width of 316 mm. If these footprints do compose a trackway a pace angulation~~ of 112° and a stride length of 600 mm can be inferred. Measurements on individual footprints indicate that average footprint length is 144 mm, average footprint width is 93 mm, and the marginal rim is of uniform thickness and about 50 mm wide.

A group of five subcircular rings in the upper part of a burrow fill (# 659A from SG) is tentatively identified as a cluster of bee cells and compared with the ichnogenus *Rosellichnus* (Fig. 11D). The presence of the ichnogenus at this locality, although at other section, was already documented by Cardonatto et al. (2016).

Adjacent to the burrow fills at Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo, several specimens of *Attaichnus kuenzelii* were identified, in some cases very close, but no cross-cutting relationship were seen. A few specimens of *Taenidium barretti* also occur at this locality, in the form of subcylindrical burrows, 12 mm wide and 80 mm long with an average meniscus thickness of 2.2 mm. At Laguna La Paraguaya we also found two specimens of cemented and compact spherical chambers (diameter 18.7-23.0 mm) with a large emergence hole (10-11 mm) assigned to *Coprinisphaera* isp. (Fig. 11B).

Bone remains found within burrow fills

Mammal bones within the burrow fills are scarce (only 1% of burrows contained fossil remains) and usually appear disarticulated and poorly preserved, in some cases with signs of abrasion (Fig. 12A). The fossil remains from the SG locality are *Proscelidodon* sp. and Glyptodontidae indet., whereas the rest of the fossil material was found at LLP locality, including: *Paedotherium minor* (two specimens), *Doellotatus* sp., *Eosclerocalyptus* sp., Mesotheriinae indet., Glyptodontidae indet. (three specimens), and undeterminate mammals (two specimens). For details about the taxonomy and illustrations of mammal remains, see Supplemental Article S2 and Supplemental Figure S1. The only articulated remains are glyptodont osteoderms found at Laguna La Paraguaya (# 702) that are assigned to *Eosclerocalyptus* sp. (Fig. 12B), and remains of a carapace with several articulated osteoderms from the same locality (# 670) assigned to Glyptodontidae indet. *Proscelidodon* sp. remains (including a hemimandible with teeth and postcranial elements) appeared disarticulated but associated within a single burrow fill. The fossil remains display different degree of weathering and corrosion, as well as biostratigraphic fractures.

Discussion

Producers

The studied fossil burrows are unbranched and display a significant variation in the horizontal diameter, which ranges from 0.15 m to 1.5 m (Fig. 6). The simple, ramp type morphology of the studied burrows suggests that the animals foraged aboveground (e.g., Reichman & Smith, 1990). In order to infer the likely producers of the fossil burrows there are several constraints that need to be considered: 1) the faunal remains found inside the burrow fills; 2) the fossorial mammals that were recorded in the Cerro Azul Formation, especially those from the studied localities; 3)

the size of burrows, as expressed by the Dh; and 4) the overall architecture and cross-section of burrows (including the Dv/Dh ratio) and the extrapolated body mass of its digger. The surface ornamentation of burrows is commonly a very useful clue to the producer (e.g., Seilacher, 2007), however, it is not preserved in the studied cases.

Faunal remains found in burrow fillings

In general, bone remains found inside a burrow can be considered as belonging to its producer or occupant only if they are articulated, nearly complete, commonly ~~are~~ found in a terminal portion and fit ~~in~~ the size (cross-section) of the burrow (e.g., Smith, 1987; Groenewald, Welman & MacEachern, 2001; Damiani et al., 2003). The remains found inside the studied burrows do not fulfill any of these criteria. In most cases, these bone remains have been passively introduced and it is uncertain if they belong to the producers. The remains are essentially fragmentary, disarticulated, with evidence for abrasion and weathering (Fig. 12A, S1); suggesting that they spent some time in the surface and then were introduced into the burrows by currents along with other sedimentary particles. The fragmentary and disarticulated state of *Doellotatus* sp. and one of the specimens of *Paedotherium minor* and the considerably small size of the animals (body mass about 1-2 kg, Table 1) in comparison with the containing burrows; further suggest that these remains were introduced by currents. In the case of *Proscelidodon* sp., the bones are disarticulated but associated, which suggest that they can belong to a single specimen, and the partial horizontal diameter of the burrow match the size of this ground sloth. The only articulated remains are fragments of the dorsal carapace of Glyptodontidae that occur in burrows large enough to hug these animals (Dh= 0.78 to 1.50 m) (Table 1). In consequence, the unique remains that can belong to the producer of the burrows are *Proscelidodon* sp. and those of Glyptodontidae.

Fossorial mammals of the Cerro Azul Formation and size of burrows

The fossorial mammals recorded in the Cerro Azul Formation include xenarthrans, notoungulates and rodents (e.g., Goin, Montalvo & Visconti, 2000; Cerdeño & Montalvo 2001; Urrutia, Montalvo & Scillato-Yané, 2008). Among the Xenarthra, the Glyptodontidae, Dasypodidae and Mylodontidae display fossorial adaptations. The same is true for Mesotheriidae and Hegetotheriidae (Notoungulata); and Caviidae, Octodontidae, and Chinchillidae (Rodentia). We will discuss the potential producers for each size class of the burrow fills (Table 1) as expressed by the horizontal diameter and cross-sectional area of the burrows.

For the small subpopulation ($D_h=0.15-0.34$ m, 8 % of cases), with a body mass ranging from 1 to 13 kg, the likely candidates are the notoungulate *Paedotherium minor*, the dasypodids *Doellotatus*, *Chorobates*, *Proeuphractus*, and *Chasicotatus*; and the rodent *Lagostomus*.

Paedotherium (Hegetotheriidae) is a medium-sized rodent-like ungulate native to South America. This taxon is very common in the Cerro Azul Formation, both in La Pampa and Buenos Aires provinces (e.g., Montalvo, Tomassini & Sostillo, 2016). Articulated remains of this genus have been found within Pliocene fossil burrows (about 0.16-0.22 m wide) from the Atlantic coast of Buenos Aires province (e.g., Genise, 1989; Scognamillo, 1993; Elissamburu, Dondas & De Santis, 2011) and a morphofunctional analysis of its postcranial skeleton suggest a digging capacity (Elissamburu 2004).

The Dasypodidae show a neotropical geographic distribution and were important components of the late Miocene-Pliocene South American fauna (Scillato-Yané, 1982; Ortiz Jaureguizar, 1998). Dasypodids exhibit fossorial habits and were abundant during the late Miocene in the Pampean region of Argentina, suggesting preference for open environments and well drained soils (Scillato-Yané et al., 2013). Most dasypodids recorded in the Cerro Azul Formation were small- to medium-sized, with body mass in the range 1-10 kg for *Doellotatus*, *Chasicotatus*,

380 *Proeuphractus* and *Chorobates* (Table 1). In particular, the holotype of *Chasicotatus ameghinoi*
 381 is a nearly complete carapace about 150 mm wide (Scillato-Yané, Kromptc & Esteban, 2010),
 382 which match the lower size range of the small subpopulation. Modern dasypodid burrows are
 383 usually simple ramps lacking significant enlargements (e.g., González, Soutullo & Altuna, 2001,
 384 Abba, Udrizar & Vizcaíno, 2005), which is similar to the architecture of the fossil burrows.
 385 In the same localities of *Paedotherium*-bearing burrows from the Atlantic coast of the Buenos
 386 Aires province, there are also burrows containing articulated remains of *Lagostomus* that
 387 partially overlap in diameter with those containing *Paedotherium* remains (Genise, 1989;
 388 Elissamburu, Dondas & De Santis, 2011). The extant *Lagostomus maximus* (plains vizcacha) is
 389 well known for its digging adaptations and for living in communal burrow systems (e.g.,
 390 Jackson, Branchi & Villarreal, 1996). Plains vizcacha burrow systems show an average entrance
 391 horizontal diameter of 0.26 m and a range of 0.17-0.37 m (Llanos & Crespo, 1952), which
 392 matches the range of the small subpopulation. However, extant *L. maximus* burrow systems have
 393 several entrance ramps that typically converge into a central chamber or a much more complex
 394 architecture (e.g., Llanos & Crespo, 1952; Rafuse et al., 2017), which contrast with the simple
 395 ramp type morphology of the fossil burrows. The 43 mm in diameter subcircular burrow
 396 identified in the fill of a larger burrow at Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo (# 638) is probably related
 397 to a caviomorph rodent (Caviidae, Octodontidae or Chinchillidae).
 398 For the dominant intermediate subpopulation (Dh= 0.39-0.94 m, 83% of measured burrows),
 399 with an estimated body mass ranging from 37 to 438 kg, the likely candidates are the
 400 Mesotheriinae (Mesotheriidae, Notoungulata); *Eosclerocalyptus*, *Coscinocercus*, and
 401 *Aspidocalyptus* (Xenarthra, Glyptodontidae); *Macrochorobates* and *Macroeuphractus*
 402 (Xenarthra, Dasypodidae); and *Proscelidodon* (Xenarthra, Mylodontidae). The fossil remains

403 found in this size range that are likely candidates are those of Glyptodontidae and *Proscelidodon*
 404 sp. (Table 1). There are two Mesotheriinae species recognized for the late Miocene of central
 405 Argentina: *Pseudotypotherium subinsigne* and *Typotheriopsis silveyrai* (Cerdeño & Montalvo,
 406 2001). These species exhibited a small to medium size (20.88 to 60.13 kg after Croft, Flynn &
 407 Wyss, 2004) (Table 1). The Mesotheriidae shows modifications in the appendicular skeleton that
 408 suggest a scratch-digging habit and fossorial adaptations and are envisaged as having used its
 409 hypsodont teeth to cut roots and break the substrate, to aid digging with claws (Shockey et al.,
 410 2007).

411 Kraglievich (1934) and Quintana (1992) suggested that glyptodonts were not functionally suited
 412 for digging. However, a geometric morphometric study of the limb bones of five glyptodont
 413 species of Miocene and Pleistocene age and comparison with extant armadillos led Vizcaíno et
 414 al. (2011) to conclude that were generalized diggers, as modern Dasypodini and Euphractini.

415 Generalized diggers are species that dig short burrows for protection or in search of food and that
 416 feed on the surface or just below it by making ‘food probes’ (Abba, Udrizar & Vizcaíno, 2005).

417 In order to assess if glyptodonts were likely producers of the fossil burrows we compared the
 418 width of the dorsal carapace and the dorsal carapace height / width ratio with comparable values
 419 of the fossil burrows. Dorsal carapace width of Miocene-Pliocene glyptodonts range between
 420 0.40 and 0.77 m (Perea, 2005; Vizcaíno et al., 2011; Zurita et al., 2011), well in the range of
 421 horizontal diameter of the fossil burrows. Information on the ratio between carapace height and
 422 width for Miocene-Pliocene glyptodonts is incomplete, and similar data for Pleistocene South
 423 American glyptodonts (Duarte, 1997; Zurita et al., 2010) average 0.87 (range= 0.78-0.91; n=4).

424 In our case study, glyptodonts are considered good candidates for constructing the subcircular
 425 burrows of the intermediate subpopulation, which are 0.39-0.56 m wide and display an average

Dv/Dh ratio of 0.88. Regarding the large dasypodids *Macrochorobates* and *Macroeuphractus*, the available body mass estimates suggest a range of 10 to 100 kg (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) and little is known about their paleoecology.

Among the mylodontids, the Scelidotherinae, endemic to South America (McDonald, 1987; Taglioretti et al., 2014); are only represented for the Huayquerian – Chapadmalian SALMAs (late Miocene to early Pliocene) by *Proscelidodon*, a ground sloth related to open environments with grasslands, under temperate and warm climate (Miño Boilini et al., 2011; Pujos et al., 2012; McDonald & Perea 2002). A digging habit was inferred for *Proscelidodon* after a morphofunctional study of a Montehermosian (latest Miocene-early Pliocene) forelimb (Aramayo, 1988). Body mass estimates are only available for Pleistocene scelidotherines (Table 1), and range from 584 to 1057 kg (De Esteban-Trivigno, Mendoza & De Renzi, 2008; Bargo et al., 2000; Fariña, Vizcaíno & Bargo, 1998). These would be maximum estimates for late Miocene scelidotherines because the primitive Mylodontidae were smaller and there seems to be a trend toward progressively larger sizes in the Pleistocene (e.g., McDonald & Perea 2002).

Large Pliocene-Pleistocene fossil burrows near Mar del Plata city (Buenos Aires province) have been attributed to mylodonts on the basis of the finding of bone remains inside the fill (Frenguelli 1955) and using the surface ornamentation of the burrows (Zárate et al., 1998; Dondas, Isla & Carballido, 2009).

For the large subpopulation, with a Dh ranging from 1.05 and 1.50 m (9 % of cases) and an extrapolated body mass of 700-1600 kg, the more likely producer is *Proscelidodon* sp. and, secondarily, the Glyptodontidae.

To summarize, the studied fossil burrows can be attributed to several producers, according to their horizontal diameter. The more likely producers of the studied fossil burrows are: 1) for the

small subpopulation, the smaller dasypodids (*Doellotatus*, *Chasicotatus*, *Proeuphractus* and *Chorobates*) on the basis of body mass, the fossorial habit and architecture of modern dasypodid burrows; and, secondarily *Paedotherium minor*. 2) For the intermediate and large subpopulations, the Glyptodontidae and Mylodontidae (*Proscelidodon* sp.) are good candidates as these were the largest representatives of the late Miocene burrowing fauna of the Cerro Azul Formation. The Glyptodontidae were generalized diggers, like modern dasypodids, and exhibited a carapace fitting especially the subcircular burrows. *Proscelidodon* sp. is also a likely candidate of the elliptical and larger burrows. For the intermediate subpopulation, probably the large dasypodids (*Macrochorobates* and *Macroeuphractus*) and Mesotheriinae should be considered.

Taphonomy of burrow fills

The horizontally laminated and massive fill of the burrows suggest that the material entered the excavation ~~without the participation of its producer~~. The burrows ~~were abandoned and~~ received sediments ~~both~~ in successive small pulses and large catastrophic ~~ones~~. Although we cannot discard some secondary input of dust by wind, most of the filling of the burrows is related to water transport as ~~suggested~~ by the well laminated and ~~direct~~ graded siltstone to mudstone laminae (Figs. 10A-C, 10F). Laminated intervals are linked to successive pulses of sediment-laden water that eventually ponded in the terminal tracts of the burrows. This is in agreement with the theoretical ~~interpretation~~ by Imbellone, Teruggi & Mormeneo (1990) of similar Quaternary burrows and experimental results by Woodruff & Varricchio (2011). Experiments by Woodruff & Varricchio (2011) indicate that well laminated fills were obtained by adding small amounts of sediment-water mixtures entering at a low angle (5°) into the burrow. In contrast, *en masse* pouring of the sediment-water mixture at high angle (30°) produced a massive and poorly sorted sediment fill, whereas *en masse* pouring at a low angle (5°) produced thicker graded beds

(Woodruff & Varricchio 2011). *En masse* filling experiments also produced “arcuate structures” (Woodruff & Varricchio 2011) that are very similar to the pseudomeniscate structures described herein. Both features are comparable to “arcuate surface ridges” produced in experimental debris flows that reflect the pulsatory nature of experimental and natural debris flows (Major 1997). The experiments by Woodruff & Varricchio (2011) lend further support to the interpretation of the massive intervals as result of catastrophic input of large volume of unsorted sediment. As the burrows are related to an essentially flat landscape and no fluvial channels deposits were observed in any of the studied localities, the sediment pulses should be related with rains. We speculate that one or more laminae may result from moderate to heavy rains. In contrast, massive intervals can be related to heavy rains producing sheet flooding, which can generate hyperconcentrated flows (e.g., Smith & Lowe 1991) capable of transporting enough material to fill, at least, the terminal portion of a burrow in a single event. High-energy sheet floods can also saturate burrow walls and produce roof collapse.

Our studies also support the generalization that well laminated burrow fills will not contain remains of the producer and that massive fills of the whole burrow or most of the lower part have a greater chance of containing remains of the tetrapod that dug the burrow, as proposed by Scognamillo (1993) and Groenewald, Welman & MacEachern (2001). For the laminated burrow fills, the most likely scenario is that the burrow was vacated or, if the animal died inside, it may result scavenged and/or weathered, which produces incomplete and disarticulated remains. In the case of a massive fill, both live entombing (Scognamillo, 1993; Groenewald, Welman & MacEachern, 2001) and fast burial after death (Woodruff & Varricchio 2011) are required to produce an nearly articulated and complete skeleton. Massive fills in the upper half of the burrow will not preserve remains of its producer.

The episodic nature of the filling processes is evidenced by the laminated fill and further supported by the presence of footprints in the surface of some laminae and the cluster of bee cells (*Rosellichnus* isp.) found inside the fill. These trace fossils suggest that partially filled burrows with a surface communication were explored or reoccupied by other tetrapods and used by bees to nest. Alternatively, the bee cells may be constructed after the complete filling of the burrow in the soil profile. Among the presumed producers of burrows of intermediate size, the outline and size of the footprints match those of Pleistocene glyptodonts, but are quite different from those of ground sloths (compare Aramayo et al., 2015). Disruption of laminae composing the fill of the burrows is explained by drying and cracking of mud after a flood event, whereas synsedimentary faulting can be related to trampling by tetrapods.

Attaichnus kuenzelli occur profusely in the SG locality, in some cases very close, but never were cut by a large mammal burrow. These relationships suggest that the producers of the burrows were apparently not foraging on *A. kuenzelli*, considered a nest chamber of leaf-cutting ants (Genise et al., 2013).

Paleoecological and paleoenvironmental meaning

Detailed inferences about the paleoecological and paleoenvironmental meaning of the studied large mammal burrows can be gained through sedimentological study of the hosting rocks, analysis of orientation of burrows fills and considering the associated trace fossils. This information, along with the potential producers will help to understand the reason for acquisition of burrowing habits in large late Miocene mammals.

515 *Sedimentology*

516 Thick, monotonous, massive continental successions of siltstone showing moderate to good
 517 sorting with associated paleosols, as those described for the Cerro Azul Formation, are typical of
 518 loess deposits, whose dominantly eolian origin is well established (e.g., Johnson, 1989; Pye,
 519 1995). The presence of pedogenic calcite is indicative of well-drained soil profiles in sub-humid,
 520 semi-arid, and arid climates with low rainfall (less than 800 mm/yr) and high evapotranspiration
 521 (see review in Sheldon & Tabor 2009). Previous estimation of mean annual precipitation for the
 522 development of the paleosols of the Cerro Azul Formation is 449 ± 147 mm (Cardonatto et al.,
 523 2016). Paleosols showing a Bt horizon and blocky or prismatic peds can be compared with
 524 mollisols (Cardonatto et al., 2016). Some paleoenvironmental constraints can also be derived
 525 from the composition of the mammal fauna, and the stable isotopic composition of enamel teeth.
 526 Vertebrate remains of the Cerro Azul Formation, mainly notoungulates and rodents, suggest that
 527 these sediments were deposited in open landscapes like steppes or herbaceous plains (Montalvo
 528 et al., 2008). Carbon isotope composition from late Miocene herbivorous enamel teeth from
 529 Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo and nearby localities indicates a dominance of C3 plants in lowland
 530 areas (MacFadden, Cerling & Prado, 1996), which are favoured in climates with cool growing
 531 season (Ehleringer, Cerling & Helliker, 1997)

532 *Orientation of burrow fills*

533 Comparison with orientation data from modern Dasypodidae burrows can help to interpret the
 534 orientation pattern of fossil burrow fills. As xenarthrans are imperfect homeotherms, their body
 535 temperatures do change with the environment (e.g., McNab, 1980; 1985). It has been suggested
 536 that the burrow entrance orientation of armadillos avoid prevailing winds and both uniform and
 537 preferential orientation has been documented (e.g., McDonough & Loughry, 2008). The cases of

no preferential orientation are related to the invasive armadillo *Dasypus novemcinctus* from southern USA (Texas, Alabama, Oklahoma) and Belize (Clark, 1951; Zimmerman, 1990; Platt et al., 2004; Sawyer et al., 2012). All these cases are mostly related to forested areas. Studies documenting a preferred orientation of Dasypodidae burrows are from Argentina, Uruguay and Brazil, involving open environments and several species (Crespo, 1944; Carter & Encarnaçao, 1983; González, Soutullo & Altuna, 2001; Abba, Udrizar & Vizcaíno, 2005; Ceresoli & Fernandez Duque, 2012). The pioneer study by Crespo (1944) included three localities from western Argentina, ranging from 27° 37' S to 34° 13' S and including annual precipitation ranging from less than 200 mm to 500 mm. The vegetation ranges from low bushes, to shrubland and psammophilous grassland with sparse trees. These localities belong to the Monte and Espinal biogeographic provinces (e.g., Roig, Roig-Juñent & Corbalán, 2009) and the included armadillo species are: *Chaetophractus vellerosus*, *C. villosus* and *Zaedyus pichy*. A compilation of the entrance orientation data from the three localities of Crespo (1944) suggests a dominant entrance orientation toward the west (Fig. 9D). This distribution is remarkably similar to the fossil burrows if we assume that entrance orientation was at 180° of dipping azimuth (Fig. 9C). Dominant surface wind patterns in northern Argentina are humid and sometimes hot winds from the east and north (e.g., Barros et al., 2015), whereas cold winds are from the south. In consequence, the orientation pattern described by Crespo (1944) from open environments of the semiarid region of Argentina can be interpreted as preferential orientation of entrances avoiding dominant hot and cold winds. Similar patterns of armadillo burrow entrance orientation avoiding prevailing winds were documented by Carter & Encarnaçao (1983) in Minas Gerais, Brazil; González, Soutullo & Altuna (2001) in Uruguay (Fig. 9E); Abba, Udrizar & Vizcaíno (2005) in Buenos Aires province of Argentina (Fig. 9F); and Ceresoli & Fernández Duque (2012) in

Formosa province, northern Argentina. Alternative explanations for this preferential orientation are that, as the armadillos seek food following an odour in the wind, they tend to approach a site from downwind and dig in the lee side (Carter & Encarnaçao, 1983) and to maximize sun exposure during cold winters (Ceresoli & Fernández Duque, 2012). In particular, the most adequate example to evaluate the orientation of the fossil burrows is the data from dasypodid burrows by Crespo (1944), which were collected in open semiarid settings similar to those of the late Miocene of central Argentina. In consequence, it is possible to propose that the late Miocene wind pattern of central Argentina was similar to the present one with hot winds from the east and north and cold winds from the south.

Associated trace fossils

The trace fossil assemblage of the Cerro Azul Formation is of low diversity and abundance and dominated by insect trace fossils (*Celliforma*, *Rosellichnus*, *Fictovichnus*, *Rebuffoichnus* and *Teisseirei*), and was compared with the *Celliforma* ichnofacies (Cardonatto et al., 2016). The *Celliforma* ichnofacies is typical of well-drained calcareous paleosols developed under low vegetation coverage (Genise et al., 2010, 2016). The reduced size of associated rhizoliths suggests that the vegetation was dominated by scrubs with minor participation of herbaceous plants.

The local occurrence of cemented *Coprinisphaera* at LLP and additional occurrences of fossil dung-beetle brood balls (*Quirogaichnus coniunctus* Laza, 2006) from the formation in a nearby locality (Laza, 2006) is indicative of the presence of the *Coprinisphaera* ichnofacies, suggesting herbaceous communities and wetter climatic conditions (Genise et al., 2016) for the easternmost locations of the formation.

Burrowing habits in large late Miocene mammals

Mammals burrows are typically constructed as shelters from environmental extremes and predators, and also for food storage, foraging and reproduction (e.g., Reichman & Smith, 1990; Kinlaw, 1999). From these common uses of burrows, protection from environmental extremes and predators are more likely for the studied fossil burrows and no evidence supporting the remaining functions is available. Top predators during deposition of the Cerro Azul Formation are the Phorusrhacidae (Cenizo, Tambussi & Montalvo, 2012; Vezzosi, 2012) that occupied the role of large carnivorans, as well as the Sparassodonta (Goin, Montalvo & Visconti, 2000). However, the main factor controlling the occurrence of large mammal burrows during the late Miocene (Fig. 1) is herein related to environmental changes. It has been suggested that different mammal groups acquired fossorial habits during the Cenozoic as a response to the expansion of open, savanna-like environments under cold, dry and seasonal climates (Nevo, 1979; 1995; 2011). During the late Miocene (the Huayquerian SALMA), southern South America experienced a global cooling as response to the increase in the Antarctic ice sheet (Zachos et al., 2001) and the uplift of the Andes (e.g., Amidon et al., 2017), which favored cold and seasonally dry climatic conditions. This regional framework is confirmed by the inferences on the sedimentology, faunal remains and invertebrate ichnology of the studied succession. This evidence suggests open environments, with well-drained soils and low vegetation coverage, and a semiarid and seasonal climate. Considering that the more likely candidates for the largest burrows are xenarthrans (Glyptodontidae and Mylodontidae), which are imperfect homeotherms (e.g., McNab, 1980; 1985), the necessity and convenience for excavating an underground refuge is clear. In addition to escape from predation, these animals used burrows to avoid extremely cold or warm climatic conditions in order to conserve energy and water, and to breed because of the particular physiology of xenarthrans (Vizcaíno et al., 2001).

Conclusions

Subcylindrical structures with a laminated fill occurring in a late Miocene loess-paleosol sequence from central Argentina are interpreted as the burrow fills of fossorial mammals. The burrows occur associated with calcareous paleosols developed under a semiarid climate in a flat landscape. A detailed analysis of more than one hundred structures permitted to conclude that:

1. The more common geometry is a shallow ramp with a rounded end, lacking bifurcations.
2. The ample variation of the horizontal diameter of the burrow fills, along with cross-sectional shape and inferred body masses suggest that several producers were involved.
3. The smaller burrows ($D_h = 0.15\text{-}0.34$ m, 8 % of cases, body mass ranging from 1 to 13 kg) were produced by small dasypodids and, secondarily, by the notoungulate *Paedotherium minor*.
3. For the dominant burrow fills exhibiting an intermediate ($D_h = 0.39\text{-}0.94$ m, 83% of measured burrows, producer body mass of 37 to 438 kg), and large horizontal diameter ($D_h = 1.05\text{-}1.50$ m, 9 % of measured burrows, producer body mass of 700-1600 kg), the Glyptodontidae and Mylodontidae (*Proscelidodon* sp.) are the best candidates. The Glyptodontidae are related to the subcircular burrows of intermediate size and *Proscelidodon* sp. would be the producer of the elliptical and largest burrows.
4. About 10% of the burrow fills contained fragmentary, disarticulated, abraded and weathered bone remains that were introduced into the burrows by aqueous currents and do not belong to the excavator of the burrow.
5. After abandonment, the burrows received sediments from the surface that progressively filled the structure. The filling process was produced dominantly by several pulses of sediment laden currents related to moderate rains (well laminated fill) and *en masse* input of dense sediment-laden currents related to heavy rains producing sheet flooding (massive fill). During filling, the abandoned burrows were visited or reoccupied by other tetrapods and used by bees to nest,

6. It is not ~~expected that~~ well laminated burrow fills will ~~not~~ contain remains of the producer, whereas massive fills have a greater chance of containing remains of the tetrapod that dug the burrow. 

7. The main factor explaining the appearance of large mammal burrows in the late Miocene are environmental changes, including open environments with low vegetation and semiarid and seasonal climate.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to Fátima Mendoza Belmontes for help during field work, Claudia Montalvo for guidance with the taxonomy of vertebrate remains and for appropriate comments on an earlier version of the manuscript; Marcelo Zárate for noticing about the burrow fills of the LLP locality; and María F. Vera Candiotti for his help in morphometric analysis.

References

- Abba AM, Udrizar DE, Vizcaíno, SF. 2005. Distribution and use of burrows and tunnels of *ChaetophRACTUS villosus* (Mammalia, Xenarthra) in the eastern Argentinean pampas. *Acta Theriologica*, 50: 115-124.
- Amidon WH, Fisher GB, Burbank DW, Ciccioli PL, Alonso RN, Gorin AL, Silverhart PH, Kylander-Clark ARC, Christoffersen MS. 2017. Mio-Pliocene aridity in the south-central Andes associated with Southern Hemisphere cold periods. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114: 6474-6479.
- Aramayo SA. 1988. Nuevos restos de *Proscelidodon* sp. (Edentata, Mylodontidae) del Yacimiento Monte Hermoso (Plioceno inferior a medio) provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina. *Estudio morfológico funcional. Actas Segundas Jornadas Geológicas Bonaerenses*: 99-107.
- Barbour EH. 1892. Notice of new gigantic fossils. *Science N.S.* 19: 99-100.
- Bargo MS, Vizcaíno SF, Archuby FM, Blanco, RE. 2000. Limb bone proportions, strength and digging in some Lujanian (Late Pleistocene-Early Holocene) mylodontid ground sloths (Mammalia, Xenarthra). *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, 20: 601-610.

- 660 Barros VR, Boninsegna JA, Camilloni IA, Chidiak M, Magrín GO, Rusticucci M. 2015. Climate
661 change in Argentina: trends, projections, impacts and adaptation. Wiley Interdisciplinary
662 Reviews: Climate Change, 6: 151-169.
- 663 Benton MJ. 1988. Burrowing by vertebrates. Nature, 331: 17-18.
- 664 Bown TM. 1982. Ichnofossils and rhizoliths of the nearshore fluvial Jebel Qatrani Formation
665 (Oligocene), Fayum Province, Egypt. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 40:
666 255-309.
- 667 Bown TM, Kraus MJ. 1983. Ichnofossils of the alluvial Willwood Formation (lower Eocene),
668 Bighorn Basin, northwest Wyoming, U.S.A. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,
669 Palaeoecology, 43: 95-128.
- 670 Buchmann FS, Pereira Lopez R, Caron F. 2009. Icnofósseis (paleotocas e crotovinas) atribuídos a
671 mamíferos extintos no sudeste e sul do Brasil. Revista brasileira paleontological, 12: 247-256.
- 672 Cabrera A. 1939. Sobre vertebrados fósiles del Plioceno de Adolfo Alsina. Rev. Mus. de La Plata
673 (Nueva Serie), 2: 3-35.
- 674 Cardonatto MC, Sostillo R, Visconti G, Melchor RN. 2016. The *Celliforma* ichnofacies in
675 calcareous paleosols: An example from the late Miocene Cerro Azul Formation, La Pampa,
676 Argentina. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 443: 203-215.
- 677 Carter TS, Encarnação CD. 1983. Characteristics and Use of Burrows by Four Species of
678 Armadillos in Brazil. Journal of Mammalogy, 64: 103-108.
- 679 Cenizo MM, Tambussi CP, Montalvo CI. 2012. Late Miocene continental birds from the Cerro
680 Azul Formation in the Pampean region (central-southern Argentina). Alcheringa, 36: 47-68.
- 681 Cerdeño E, Montalvo CI. 2001. Los Mesotheriinae (Mesotheriidae, Notoungulata) del Mioceno
682 superior de La Pampa, Argentina. Revista Española de Paleontología, 16: 63-75.
- 683 Ceresoli N, Fernandez-Duque E. 2012. Size and orientation of giant armadillo burrow entrances
684 (*Prionodontes maximus*) in western Formosa Province, Argentina. Edentata, 13: 66-68.
- 685 Cione AL, Azpelicueta, MM, Bond M, Carlini AA, Casciotta JR, Cozzuol MA, de la Fuente M,
686 Gasparini Z, Goin FJ, Noriega J, Scillato-Yané GJ, Soibelzon L, Tonni EP, Verzi D, Vucetich
687 MG. 2000. Miocene vertebrates from Entre Ríos province, eastern Argentina. En: F.G.
688 Aceñolaza y R. Herbst (Eds.), El Neógeno de Argentina. Serie Correlación Geológica, 14: 191–
689 237.
- 690 Clark WK. 1951. Ecological life history of the armadillo in the eastern Edwards Plateau region.
691 American Midland Naturalist, 46: 337–58.
- 692 Crespo J. 1944. Contribución al conocimiento de la ecología de algunos dasipódidos (Edentata)
693 Argentinos. Revista Argentina de Zoogeografía, Buenos Aires, 4: 7-39.
- 694 Croft DA, Flynn JJ, Wyss, A. 2004. Notoungulata and Litopterna of the early Miocene Chucal
695 Fauna, northern Chile. Fieldiana, Geology, n.s. 50, 1-52.
- 696 Damiani R, Modesto S, Yates A, Neveling J. 2003. Earliest evidence of cynodont burrowing.
697 Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences, 270: 1747-1751.

698 De Esteban-Trivigno S, Mendoza M, De Renzi M . 2008. Body mass estimation in Xenarthra: A
699 predictive equation suitable for all quadrupedal terrestrial placentals? Journal of Morphology,
700 269: 1276-1293.

701 De Elorriaga EE, Visconti G. 2002. Crotovinas atribuibles a grandes mamíferos del Cenozoico
702 en el sureste de la Provincia de La Pampa. 9° Reunión Argentina de Sedimentología, Resúmenes,
703 Asociación Argentina de Sedimentología, Córdoba: 63.

704 Delsuc F, Superina M, Tilak M, Douzery EJP, Hassanin A. 2012. Molecular phylogenetics
705 unveils the ancient evolutionary origins of the enigmatic fairy armadillos. Molecular
706 Phylogenetics and Evolution, 62: 673-80

707 Dondas, A., Isla, F.I. y Carballido, J.L., 2009. Paleocaves exhumed from the Miramar Formation
708 (Ensenadan Stage-age, Pleistocene), Mar del Plata, Argentina. Quaternary International, 210: 44-
709 50.

710 Duarte RG. 1997. Gliptodontes del Pleistoceno tardío de Agua de las Palomas, Campo del
711 Pucará, Catamarca, Argentina. Variaciones morfológicas del caparazón de *Glyptodon reticulatus*
712 Owen, 1845. Ameghiniana, 34: 345-355.

713 Ehleringer JR, Cerling TE, Helliker BR. 1997. C4 photosynthesis, atmospheric CO2, and
714 climate. Oecologia, 112: 285–299.

715 Elissamburu A. 2004. Análisis morfométrico y morfofuncional del esqueleto apendicular de
716 *Paedotherium* (Mammalia, Notoungulata). Ameghiniana, 41: 363-380.

717 Elissamburu A, Dondas A, De Santis L. 2011. Morfometría de las paleocuevas de la “Fm.”
718 Chapadmalal y su asignación a *Actenomys* (Rodentia), *Paedotherium* (Notoungulata) y otros
719 mamíferos fósiles hospedantes. Mastozoología Neotropical, 18: 227-238.

720 Fariña RA, Vizcaíno SF, Bargo MS. 1998. Body mass estimations in Lujanian (late Pleistocene–
721 early Holocene of South America) mammal megafauna. Mastozoología Neotropical, 5: 87–108.

722 Fernández ME, Vassallo AI, Zárate M. 2000. Functional morphology and paleobiology of the
723 Pliocene rodent *Actenomys* (Caviomorpha: Octodontidae): the evolution to a subterranean mode
724 of life. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society, 71:71–90.

725 Frank HT, Buchmann FS, Gonçalves de Lima L, Fornari M, Caron F. 2012. Cenozoic vertebrate
726 tunnels in southern Brazil. In: Netto RG, Carmona NB, Tognoli, FM (Eds.), Ichnology of Latin
727 America: selected papers, Monografías da Sociedade Brasileira de Paleontología, 2: 141-158.

728 Frank HT, Althaus CE, Dario EM, Tramontina FR, Adriano RM, Almeida ML, Ferreira GF,
729 Nogueira R, Breier R. 2015. Underground chamber systems excavated by Cenozoic ground
730 sloths in the state of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil. Revista Brasileira de Paleontologia, 18: 273-284.

731 Frenguelli, J. 1955. Loess y limos pampeanos. Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Facultad de
732 Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Serie técnica y didáctica, 7:1-88.

733 Folguera A, Zárate M. 2009. La sedimentación neógena continental en el sector extrandino de
734 Argentina central. Revista de la Asociación Geológica Argentina, 64: 692-712.

735 Gee CT, Sander PM, Petzelberger BEM. 2003. A Miocene rodent nut cache in coastal dunes of
736 the Lower Rhine Embayment, Germany. Palaeontology, 46: 1133-1149.

- 737 Genise J. 1989. Las cuevas de *Actenomys* (Rodentia: Octodontidae) de la Formación
738 Chapadmalal (Plioceno superior) de Mar del Plata y Miramar (Provincia de Buenos Aires).
739 Ameghiniana, 26: 33-42.
- 740 Genise JF, Farina JL. 2012. Ants and xenarthrans involved in a Quaternary food web from
741 Argentina as reflected by their fossil nests and palaeocaves. Lethaia, 45: 411-422.
- 742 Genise JF, Melchor RN, Bellosi ES, Verde M. 2010. Invertebrate and vertebrate trace fossils
743 from continental carbonates. In: AM Alonso-Zarza, Tanner L, Carbonates in continental settings:
744 facies, environments and processes, Developments in Sedimentology, 61: 319-369.
- 745 Genise JF, Melchor RN, Sánchez MV, González MG. 2013. *Attaichnus kuenzelii* revisited: A
746 Miocene record of fungus-growing ants from Argentina. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,
747 Palaeoecology, 386: 349-363.
- 748 Genise JF, Bedatou E, Bellosi E, Sarzetti LC, Sánchez MV, Krause JM. 2016. The Phanerozoic
749 four revolutions and evolution of paleosol ichnofacies. In: LA Buatois, Mángano MG, The trace-
750 fossil record of major evolutionary events. p. 301-370.
- 751 Gobetz KE, Martin LD. 2006. Burrows of a gopher-like rodent, possibly *Gregorymys*
752 (Geomyoidea: Geomyidae: Entoptychtinae), from the early Miocene Harrison Formation,
753 Nebraska. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 237: 305-314.
- 754 Goin FJ, Montalvo CI, Visconti G. 2000. Los marsupiales (Mammalia) del Mioceno Superior de
755 la Formación Cerro Azul (Provincia de La Pampa, Argentina). Estudios Geológicos, 56: 101-
756 126.
- 757 González EM, Soutullo A, Altuna CA. 2001. The burrow of *Dasypus hybridus* (Cingulata:
758 Dasypodidae). Acta Theriologica, 46: 53-59.
- 759 Groenewald GH, Welman J, MacEachern JA. 2001. Vertebrate burrow complexes from the Early
760 Triassic *Cynognathus* Zone (Driekoppen Formation, Beaufort Group) of the Karoo Basin, South
761 Africa. Palaios, 16: 148-160.
- 762 Hembree DI, Martin LD, Hasiotis ST. 2004. Amphibian burrows and ephemeral ponds of the
763 Lower Permian Speiser Shale, Kansas: evidence for seasonality in the midcontinent.
764 Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 203: 127-152.
- 765 Hembree DI, Hasiotis ST. 2008. Miocene vertebrate and invertebrate burrows defining
766 compound paleosols in the Pawnee Creek Formation, Colorado, U.S.A. Palaeogeography,
767 Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 270: 349-365.
- 768 Hunt RM. 1990. Taphonomy and sedimentology of Arikaree (lower Miocene) fluvial, eolian, and
769 lacustrine paleoenvironments, Nebraska and Wyoming: A paleobiota entombed in fine-grained
770 volcanoclastic rocks. In: Lockley MG, Rice A, Volcanism and fossil biotas. Geological Society
771 of America, Special Paper, 244: 69-111.
- 772 Hunt RMJ, Xiang-Xu XUE, Kaufman J. 1983. Miocene burrows of extinct bear dogs: Indication
773 of early denning behavior of large mammalian carnivores. Science, 221: 364-366.
- 774 Imbellone, P., Teruggi, M., Mormeneo, L. 1990. Crotovinas en sedimentos cuaternarios del
775 partido de la Plata. In: Zárate, M. (Ed.) Simposio Internacional sobre Loess, pp. 166-172. Mar
776 del Plata.

777 Jackson JE, Branch LC, Villarreal D. 1996. *Lagostomus maximus*. Mammalian Species, 543: 1-
778 6.

779 Johnson SY. 1989. Significance of loessite in the Maroon Formation (Middle Pennsylvanian to
780 Lower Permian), Eagle Basin, Northwest Colorado. Journal of Sedimentary Research, 59: 782-
781 791.

782 Kinlaw A. 1999. A review of burrowing by semi-fossorial vertebrates in arid environments.
783 Journal of Arid Environments, 41: 127-145.

784 Kraglievich L. 1934. La antigüedad pliocena de las faunas de Monte Hermoso y Chapadmalal,
785 deducidas de su comparación con las que le precedieron y sucedieron. Imprenta "El Siglo
786 Ilustrado", 136 p.

787 Krummeck WD, Bordy EM. 2017. *Reniformichnus katikatii* (new ichnogenus and ichnospecies):
788 Continental vertebrate burrows from the Lower Triassic, Main Karoo Basin, South Africa.
789 Ichnos, 24: 1-12 (in press)

790 Laza, JH. 2006. Dung-beetle fossil brood balls: The ichnogenera *Coprinisphaera* Sauer and
791 *Quirogaichnus* (Coprinisphaeridae). Ichnos, 13: 217-235.

792 Linares E, Llambías E, Latorre C. 1980. Geología de la Provincia de La Pampa, República
793 Argentina y Geocronología de sus rocas metamórficas y eruptivas. Revista de la Asociación
794 Geológica Argentina, 35: 87-146.

795 Liu J, Li L. 2013. Large Tetrapod Burrows from the Permian Naobaogou Formation of the
796 Daqingshan Area, Nei Mongol, China. Acta Geologica Sinica - English Edition, 87: 1501-1507.

797 Llanos AC, Crespo JA. 1952. Ecología de la vizcacha (*Lagostomus maximus maximus* Blainv.)
798 en el nordeste de la provincia de Entre Ríos. Revista de Investigaciones Agrícolas, 6:289-378.

799 Loope DB. 2006. Burrows dug by large vertebrates into rain-moistened Middle Jurassic sand
800 dunes. Journal of Geology. 114: 753-762.

801 Loope DB. 2008. Life beneath the surfaces of active Jurassic dunes: Burrows from the Entrada
802 Sandstone of south-central Utah. Palaios, 23: 411-419.

803 Lorenzo FR, Mehl AE, Zárate MA. 2013. Sedimentología y estratigrafía de depósitos del
804 Mioceno tardío de los valles transversales de la provincia de La Pampa, Argentina. Latin
805 American Journal of Sedimentology and Basin Analysis, 20: 67-84.

806 Lucas SG, Gobetz KE, Odier GP, McCormick T, Egan C. 2006. Tetrapod burrows from the
807 Lower Jurassic Navajo Sandstones, southeastern Utah. In: JD Harris, Lucas SG, Spielmann JA,
808 Lockley MG, Milner ARC, Kirkland JI (Eds), The Triassic-Jurassic Terrestrial Transition New
809 Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin, 37: 147-154.

810 MacFadden BJ, Cerling TE, Prado J. 1996. Cenozoic terrestrial ecosystem evolution in
811 Argentina: Evidence from carbon isotopes of fossil mammal teeth. Palaios, 11: 319-327.

812 Major, JJ. 1997. Depositional processes in large-scale debris-flow experiments. Journal of
813 Geology, 106: 345-366.

814 Martin LD, Bennett DK. 1977. The burrows of the Miocene beaver *Palaeocastor*, Western
815 Nebraska, U.S.A. Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology, 22: 173-193.

- 816 McDonald HG. 1987. A systematic review of the Plio-Pleistocene Scelidotherinae Ground Sloth
817 (Mammalia: Xenarthra: Mylodontidae). PhD Tesis, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada, 478
818 p. Unpublished.
- 819 McDonald HG, Perea D. 2002. The large Scelidothera *Catonyx tarijensis* (Xenarthra,
820 Mylodontidae) from the Pleistocene of Uruguay. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, 22: 677-
821 683.
- 822 McDonough CM, Loughry WJ. 2008. Behavioral ecology of armadillos. In: SF Vizcaino,
823 Loughry WJ (Eds), *The Biology of Xenarthra*, p. 281-293. Gainesville.
- 824 Macleod N .2009. Who is Procrustes and what has he done with my data. *Palaeontological*
825 *Association Newsletter*, 70: 21-36.
- 826 McNab BK. 1980. Energetics and the limits to a temperate distribution in armadillos. *Journal of*
827 *Mammalogy*, 61: 606-27.
- 828 McNab BK.1985. Energetics, population biology, and distribution of xenarthrans, living and
829 extinct. In G G Montgomery (Ed), *The evolution and ecology of armadillos, sloths and*
830 *vermilinguas*, p. 219-232. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.
- 831 Melchor RN, Casadío S. 2000. Descripción Geológica de la Hoja 3766-III “La Reforma”
832 (1:250.000), Provincia de la Pampa. Servicio Geológico Minero Argentino, Boletín, 295: 1-56.
- 833 Melchor RN, Bedatou E, de Valais S, Genise JF. 2006. Lithofacies distribution of invertebrate
834 and vertebrate trace-fossil assemblages in an Early Mesozoic ephemeral fluvio-lacustrine system
835 from Argentina: Implications for the *Scoyenia* ichnofacies. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
836 *Palaeoecology*, 239: 253-285.
- 837 Melchor RN, Genise JF, Umazano AM, Superina M. 2012. Pink fairy armadillo meniscate
838 burrows and ichnofabrics from Miocene and Holocene interdune deposits of Argentina:
839 Palaeoenvironmental and palaeoecological significance. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
840 *Palaeoecology*, 350-352: 149-170.
- 841 Melchor RN, Loope D. 2016. Communal therapsid burrows from interdune facies of the Lower
842 Jurassic Navajo Sandstone, southern Utah, USA. *Abstract book Ichnia*: 174.
- 843 Miño Boilini AR, Tomassini RL, Oliva C, Manera de Bianco T. 2011. Adiciones al
844 conocimiento de *Proscelidodon* Bordas, 1935 (Mammalia, Xenarthra, Scelidotheriinae). *Revista*
845 *Brasileira de Paleontologia*, 14: 269-278.
- 846 Montalvo CI, Casadío S. 1988. Presencia del género *Palaeoctodon* (Rodentia, Octodontidae) en
847 el Huayqueriense (Mioceno tardío) de la Provincia de La Pampa. *Ameghiniana*, 25: 111-114.
- 848 Montalvo CI, Visconti G, Púgener L, Cardonatto MC. 1995. Mamíferos de Edad Huayqueriense
849 (Mioceno tardío), Laguna Chillhué, provincia de La Pampa. 4° Jornadas Geológicas y Geofísicas
850 Bonaerenses (Junín), *Actas* 1: 73-79.
- 851 Montalvo CI, Melchor RN, Visconti G, Cerdeño E. 2008. Vertebrate taphonomy in loess-
852 palaeosol deposits: A case study from the late Miocene of central Argentina. *Geobios*, 41: 133–
853 143.
- 854 Montalvo CI, Tomassini RL, Sostillo R. 2016. Leftover prey remains: a new taphonomic mode
855 from the late Miocene (Cerro Azul Formation) in central Argentina. *Lethaia*, 49: 219-230.

Modesto SP, Botha Brink J. 2010. A burrow cast with *Lystrosaurus* skeletal remains from the Lower Triassic of South Africa. *Palaaios*, 25: 274-281.

Nevo E. 1979. Adaptive convergence and divergence of subterranean mammals. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 10: 269-308.

Nevo E. 1995. Mammalian evolution underground. The ecological-genetic-fenetic interfaces. *Acta Theriologica*, 3: 9-31.

Nevo E. 2011. Evolution under environmental stress at macro- and micro-scales. *Genome Biology and Evolution*, 3: 1039-1052.

Ortiz Jaureguizar, E. 1998. Paleoeología y evolución de la fauna de mamíferos de América del Sur durante la "Edad de las Planicies Australes" (Mioceno superior-Plioceno superior). *Estudios Geológicos*, 54: 161-169.

Perea D. 2005. *Pseudoplohophorus absolutus* n. sp. (Xenarthra, Glyptodontidae), variabilidad en Sclerocalyptinae y redefinición de una biozona del Mioceno Superior de Uruguay. *Ameghiniana*, 42: 175-190.

Perea, D. Scillato-Yané, G.J. 1995. *Proeuphractus limpidus* Ameghino, 1886 (Xenarthra, Dasypodidae, Euphractini): Osteología comparada del cráneo y elementos de la coraza asociados (Neógeno del Uruguay). *Boletín de la Real Sociedad Española de Historia Natural*, 90: 125–130.

Platt SG, Rainwater TR, Brewer SW. 2004. Aspects of the burrowing ecology of nine-banded armadillos in northern Belize. *Mammalian Biology*, 69: 217-224.

Pujos F, Candela A, Galli CI, Coira BL, Reguero MA, de los Reyes M, Abello MA. 2012. The Scelidotheriine *Proscelidodon* (Xenarthra: Mylodontidae) from the Late Miocene of Maimará (Northwestern Argentina, Jujuy Province). *Ameghiniana*, 49: 668-674.

Pye K. 1995. The nature, origin and accumulation of loess. *Quaternary Science Reviews*, 14: 653–667.

Quintana CA. 1992. Estructura interna de una paleocueva, posiblemente de un Dasypodidae (Mammalia, Edentata) del Pleistoceno de Mar del Plata (Provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina). *Ameghiniana*, 29: 87-91.

Rafuse DJ, Kaufmann CA, Gutiérrez MA, González ME, Scheifler NA, Álvarez MC, Massigoge A. 2017. Taphonomy of modern communal burrow systems of the Plains vizcacha (*Lagostomus maximus*, Chinchillidae) in the Pampas region of Argentina: implications for the fossil record. *Historical Biology*:1-17 (in press).

Reichman OJ, Smith SC. 1990. Burrows and burrowing behavior by mammals. *Current Mammalogy*, 2: 197–244.

Riese DJ, Hasiotis ST, Odier GP. 2011. Synapsid burrows and associated trace fossils in the lower Jurassic Navajo Sandstone, Southeastern Utah, U.S.A., indicates a diverse community living in a wet desert ecosystem. *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, 81: 299-325.

Roig FA, Roig-Juñent S, Corbalán V. 2009. Biogeography of the Monte Desert. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 73: 164-172.

Rovereto C. 1914. Los estratos araucanos y sus fósiles. *Anales del Museo Nacional de Historia Natural de Buenos Aires*, 25: 1-247.

- 896 Sawyer CF, Brinkman DC, Walker VD, Covington TD, Stienstraw EA. 2012. The
897 zoogeomorphic characteristics of burrows and burrowing by nine-banded armadillos (*Dasypus*
898 *novemcinctus*). *Geomorphology*, 157: 122-130.
- 899 Scognamillo DG. 1993. Estructura de las cuevas de *Actenomys* (Rodentia: Octodontidae) de la
900 Aloformación Playa San Carlos, Plioceno tardío (Barranca de los Lobos, Pdo. Gral. Pueyrredón):
901 significado paleoecológico y estratigráfico. Unpublished Licenciata thesis, National University
902 of Mar del Plata, Argentina, 32 pp.
- 903 Scillato-Yané GJ. 1982. Los Dasypodidae (Mammalia-Edentata) del Plioceno y Pleistoceno de
904 Argentina. Tesis Doctoral. Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Universidad Nacional de La
905 Plata, 159 pp. Inédita.
- 906 Scillato-Yané GJ, Krmpotic CM, Esteban GI. 2010. The species of genus *Chasicotatus* Scillato-
907 Yané (Eutatini, Dasypodidae). *Revista Mexicana de Ciencias Geológicas*, 27: 43-55.
- 908 Scillato -Yané G, Góis F, Zurita AE, Carlini A, González Ruiz L, Krmpotic C, Oliva C,
909 Zamorano M. 2013. Los Cingulata (Mammalia, Xenarthra) del “Conglomerado osífero”
910 (Mioceno Tardío) de la Formación Ituzaingó de Entre Ríos, Argentina. *Asociación*
911 *Paleontológica Argentina, Publicación Especial*, 14: 118-134.
- 912 Seilacher A. 2007. *Trace Fossil Analysis*. Berlin: Springer, 226 p.
- 913 Sheldon ND, Tabor NJ. 2009. Quantitative paleoenvironmental and paleoclimatic reconstruction
914 using paleosols. *Earth-Science Reviews*, 95: 1-52.
- 915 Shockey BJ, Croft DA, Anaya F. 2007. Analysis of function in the absence of extant functional
916 homologues: a case study using mesotheriid notoungulates (Mammalia). *Paleobiology*, 33: 227-
917 247.
- 918 Sidor CA, Miller MF, Isbell JL. 2008. Tetrapod burrows from the Triassic of Antarctica. *Journal*
919 *Vertebrate Paleontology*, 28: 277-284.
- 920 Smith R. 1987. Helical burrow casts of therapsid origin from the Beaufort Group (Permian) of
921 South Africa. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 60: 155-170.
- 922 Soibelzon LH, Pomi LH, Tonni EP, Rodriguez S, Dondas A. 2009. First report of a South
923 American short-faced bears' den (*Arctotherium angustidens*): palaeobiological and
924 palaeoecological implications. *Alcheringa*, 33: 211-222.
- 925 Taglioretti M, Miño-Boilini AR, Scaglia F, Dondas A. 2014. Presencia de *Proscelidodon patrius*
926 (Xenarthra, Scelidotheriinae) en la Formación Chapadmalal (Plioceno superior), Mar del Plata,
927 Buenos Aires, Argentina: Implicancias bioestratigráficas. *Ameghiniana*, 51: 420-427.
- 928 Torres MR, Borghi CE, Giannoni SM, Pattini, A. 2003. Portal orientation and architecture of
929 burrows in *Tympanoctomys barrerae* (Rodentia, Octodontidae). *Journal of Mammalogy*, 84:
930 541-546.
- 931 Urrutia JJ, Montalvo CI, Scillato-Yané GJ. 2008. Dasypodidae (Xenarthra, Cingulata) de la
932 Formación Cerro Azul (Mioceno tardío) de la provincia de La Pampa, Argentina. *Ameghiniana*,
933 45: 289-302.
- 934 Varricchio DJ, Martin AJ, Katsura Y. 2007. First trace and body fossil evidence of a burrowing,
935 denning dinosaur. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 274: 1361–1368.

- 936 Verzi DH, Montalvo CI, Vucetich MG. 1999. Afinidades y significado evolutivo de
937 *Neophanomys biplicatus* (Rodentia, Octodontidae) del Mioceno tardío-Plioceno temprano de
938 Argentina. *Ameghiniana*, 36: 83-90.
- 939 Verzi DH, Montalvo CI, Tiranti SI. 2003. Un nuevo *Xenodontomys* (Rodentia, Octodontidae) del
940 Mioceno tardío de La Pampa, Argentina. *Patrón evolutivo y bioestratigrafía*. *Ameghiniana*, 40:
941 229-238.
- 942 Verzi DH, Montalvo CI, Deschamps C. 2008. Biostratigraphy and biochronology of the Late
943 Miocene of central Argentina: evidence from rodents and taphonomy. *Geobios*, 41: 145-155.
- 944 Vezzosi RI. 2012. First record of *Procarriama simplex* Rovereto, 1914 (Phorusrhacidae,
945 Psilopterinae) in the Cerro Azul Formation (upper Miocene) of La Pampa Province; remarks on
946 its anatomy, palaeogeography and chronological range. *Alcheringa*, 36: 157-169.
- 947 Visconti G. 2007. Sedimentología de la Formación Cerro Azul (Mioceno superior) de la
948 provincia de La Pampa. Tesis doctoral inédita. Biblioteca de la Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y
949 Naturales de la UBA “Luis Federico Leloir”. 203 p.
- 950 Visconti G, Melchor RN, Montalvo CI, Umazano AM, de Elorriaga EE. 2010. Análisis
951 litoestratigráfico de la Formación Cerro Azul (Mioceno superior) en la provincia de La Pampa.
952 *Revista de la Asociación Geológica Argentina*, 67: 257-265.
- 953 Vizcaíno SF, Fariña RA. 1999. On the flight capabilities and distribution of the giant Miocene
954 bird *Argentavis magnificens* (Teratornithidae). *Lethaia*, 32: 271-278.
- 955 Vizcaíno SF, Zárate M, Bargo MS, Dondas A. 2001. Pleistocene burrows in the Mar del Plata
956 area (Argentina) and their probable builders. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica*, 46 (2): 289-301.
- 957 Vizcaíno SF, Blanco RE, Bender JB, Milne N. 2011. Proportions and function of the limbs of
958 glyptodonts. *Lethaia*, 44: 93-101.
- 959 Vogt T, Carballo OC, Calmels AP. 1999. Un esbozo de explicación de la génesis de las toscas de
960 la meseta de La Pampa. 1° Congreso Argentino de Cuaternario y Geomorfología, *Actas*: 195-
961 205.
- 962 Voorhies MR. 1975. Vertebrate burrows. In: RW Frey, *The study of trace fossils*. p. 325-350.
963 New York.
- 964 Woodruff DC, Varricchio DJ. 2011. Experimental modeling of a possible *Oryctodromeus*
965 *cubicularis* (Dinosauria) burrow. *Palaaios*, 26: 140-151.
- 966 Wu NC, Alton LA, Clemente CJ, Kearney MR, White CR. 2015. Morphology and burrowing
967 energetics of semi-fossorial skinks (*Liopholis* spp.). *The Journal of Experimental Biology*, 218:
968 2416-2426.
- 969 Zachos J, Pagani M, Sloan L, Thomas E, Billups K. 2001. Trends, Rhythms, and Aberrations in
970 Global Climate 65 Ma to Present. *Science*, 292: 686-693..
- 971 Zárate, M.A., Bargo, M.S., Vizcaíno, S.F., Dondas, A. y Scaglia, O., 1998. Estructuras
972 biogénicas en el Cenozoico tardío de Mar del Plata (Argentina) atribuibles a grandes mamíferos.
973 *Revista Asociación Argentina de Sedimentología*, 5: 95-103.
- 974 Zimmerman JW. 1990. Burrow characteristics of the nine-banded armadillo, *Dasypus*
975 *novemcinctus*. *Southwestern Naturalist*, 35: 226-27.

Zurita AE, Soibelzon LH, Soibelzon E, Gasparini GM, Cenizo MM, Arzani H. 2010. Accessory protection structures in *Glyptodon* Owen (Xenarthra, Cingulata, Glyptodontidae). *Annales de Paléontologie*, 96: 1-11.

Zurita AE, Oliva C, Dondas A, Soibelzon E, Isla FI. 2011. El registro más completo de un Hoplophorini (Xenarthra: Glyptodontidae) para los Pisos/Edades Chapadmalalense-Marplatense (Plioceno tardío-Pleistoceno temprano). *Revista del Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales*, 13: 69-75.

Legend of figures

Figure 1. Plot of the average horizontal diameter (Dh) of tetrapod burrows against the age of the hosting rock, distinguishing between burrows with remains of the  lucer, those lacking bone remains and the present study. Note that the age axis contains two gaps in the Cretaceous and Paleocene. Source of information on Supplemental Article S1.

Figure 2. Study area in central Argentina (inset) and localities in La Pampa and Buenos Aires provinces. LC: Laguna Chillhué, SG: Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo, LLP: Laguna La Paraguaya.

Figure 3. Location of landmarks (red points) on burrow fills preserved in cross section.

Figure 4. Detailed sedimentary logs of the measured sections.

Figure 5. Abundance and cross-cutting relationships of burrow fills, from LLP locality. A) General view of the outcrop showing several burrow fills (yellow arrows). B-C) Field view and diagram of cross-cutting relationships between different burrow fills (distinguished in C with different shades of gray).

1002

1003 Figure 6. Histogram showing the frequency distribution of horizontal diameter (Dh) for the
1004 studied burrow fills. Three subpopulations can be distinguished.

1005

1006 Figure 7. Burrow fill morphology in plan view. A-B) Field photograph and diagram of slightly
1007 curved fill. C-D) Field photograph and diagram of sinuous fill. E-F) Field photograph and
1008 diagram of “C” shaped fill. G-H) Field photograph and diagram of burrow fill with slightly
1009 enlarged and rounded end. Curved lines in the diagrams represent weathered laminae.

1010

1011 Figure 8. Results of geometric morphometric analysis of burrow fills preserved in cross section.
1012 A) Plot of principal components 1 and 2, distinguishing by study locality, and deformation grids
1013 for elliptical (PC1 score -0.12) and subcircular (PC1 score 0.17) fills. B) Histogram of variance
1014 of principal components.

1015

1016 Figure 9. Orientation of fossil burrow fills compared with modern data from dasypodid burrows.
1017 A) Rose diagram showing the dip azimuth of fossil burrow fills. B) Equal area projection of dip
1018 azimuth and dip angle of fossil burrow fills. C) Entrance orientation of fossil burrows, assuming
1019 that it is located at 180° of measured dip azimuth. The data in A-C is from SG and LLP
1020 localities, those from the remaining locality are preserved only in cross-section. D) Entrance
1021 orientation of several species of dasypodid burrows from semiarid settings of northern-central
1022 Argentina by Crespo (1944). E) Entrance orientation of *Dasypus hybridus* burrows from a
1023 grassland setting in Uruguay by González, Soutullo & Altuna (2001). F) Entrance orientation of

1024 *Chaetophractus villosus* burrows from cultivated land in Buenos Aires province, Argentina by
1025 Abba, Udrizar & Vizcaíno (2005).

1026

1027 Figure 10. Features of fossil burrow fills. A-B) Detailed sedimentary logs of the fill of selected
1028 burrows (see Table S1 for information on these burrow fills). References as for Fig. 4. C) Cross-
1029 section of laminated to massive burrow fill # 648 from SG, represented in (B). Elliptical outline
1030 of fill indicated by yellow arrows, black arrow point to subvertical rhizolith cutting the laminated
1031 fill. D) Cross-section of burrow fill # 714 from LLP. Subcircular outline of poorly laminated to
1032 massive burrow fill indicated by yellow arrows. E) Pseudomeniscate structure in burrow fill #
1033 704 from LLP seen in plan view. Yellow arrows point the outline of the burrow fill and black
1034 arrows to individual pseudomenisci. F) Detail of laminated burrow fill (# 632 from SG) showing
1035 direct grading in siltstone to claystone laminae (yellow arrows), syndimentary fault (white
1036 arrows) and onlap of clay laminae on burrow wall (black arrow).

1037

1038 Figure 11. Ichnofossils associated with burrow fills. A) Small burrow fill (black arrows) cutting
1039 the laminated fill of a larger mammal burrow (SG locality). B) *Coprinisphaera* isp. from LLP
1040 locality. C) Tetrapod footprints on the top of laminated fill of a burrow from LLP locality.
1041 Numbers refers to individual footprints. D) ?*Rosellichnus* isp. (arrowed) inside a burrow fill from
1042 SG.

1043

1044 Figure 12. Bone remains inside burrow fills. A) Isolated, weathered and fragmentary
1045 glyptodontid osteoderms from a burrow fill of SG locality. B) Partly articulated osteoderms of
1046 *Eosclerocalyptus* sp. found inside a burrow fill from LLP locality.

1047

1048 **Legend of table**

1049 Table 1. Relationship between cross-sections and body mass of the putative producers, estimated
 1050 body mass according to Wu et al. (2015).

Table 1(on next page)

Table 1. Body mass estimate of producers.

Relationship between cross-sections and body mass of the putative producers, estimated body mass according to Wu et al. (2015).

1 Table 1. Relationship between cross-sections and body mass of the putative producers, estimated
2 body mass according to Wu et al. (2015). Dh: horizontal diameter.

Range of burrow Dh (m)	Estimated body mass (kg)	Fossil remains inside burrow fill	Potential burrow producer	Body mass of potential producer (kg)
0.15 – 0.34	1 - 13	<i>Paedotherium minor</i>	<i>Paedotherium</i> <i>Doellotatus</i> <i>Chasicotatus</i> <i>Proeuphractus</i> <i>Chorobates</i> <i>Lagostomus</i>	1.86 (Elissamburu, 2004) Less than 1 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) Less than 1 (Scillato–Yané et al., 2010) 2–3 (Perea & Scillato–Yané, 1995) 1 – 10 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) 1 – 10 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999);
0.39 – 0.94	37 - 439	Mesotheriinae indet. <i>Eosclerocalyptus</i> sp. Glyptodontidae indet. Glyptodontidae indet. <i>Proscelidodon</i> sp. <i>Paedotherium minor</i> <i>Doellotatus</i> sp.	Mesotheriinae <i>Eosclerocalyptus</i> <i>Coscinocercus</i> <i>Aspidocalyptus</i> <i>Macrochorobates</i> <i>Macroeuphractus</i> <i>Proscelidodon</i> <i>Doellotatus</i>	20.88 – 60.13 (Croft, Flynn & Wyss, 2004) More than 100 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) More than 100 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) More than 100 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) 10 – 100 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) 10 – 100 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) 581.8 (De Esteban-Trivigno, Mendoza & De Renzi, 2008); 850 (Bargo et al., 2000); 1057 (Fariña, Vizcaíno & Bargo, 1998). Body mass of <i>S. leptcephalum</i>
1.05 – 1.5	708 - 1623	Glyptodontidae indet.	Glyptodontidae <i>Proscelidodon</i>	More than 100 (Vizcaíno & Fariña, 1999) 581.8 (De Esteban-Trivigno, Mendoza & De Renzi, 2008); 850 (Bargo et al., 2000); 1057 (Fariña, Vizcaíno & Bargo, 1998). Body mass of <i>S. leptcephalum</i> .

Figure 1

Plot of horizontal diameter vs age

Plot of the average horizontal diameter (Dh) of tetrapod burrows against the age of the hosting rock, distinguishing between burrows with remains of the producer, those lacking bone remains and the present study. Note that the age axis contains two gaps in the Cretaceous and Paleocene. Source of data on Supplemental Information.




Figure 2

Study area.

Study area in central Argentina (inset) and localities in La Pampa and Buenos Aires provinces. LC: Laguna Chillhué, SG: Salinas Grandes de Hidalgo, LLP: Laguna La Paraguaya.

Image credit: María Cristina Cardonatto.




Figure 3

Example of location of landmarks.

Location of landmarks (red points) on burrow fills preserved in cross section. Photo credit: Ricardo Néstor Melchor.




Figure 4

Sedimentary logs.

Detailed sedimentary logs of the measured sections from the study localities. Image credit: Ricardo Néstor Melchor.




Figure 5

Abundance and cross-cutting relationships of burrow fills, from LLP locality.

(A) General view of the outcrop showing several burrow fills (yellow arrows). (B-C) Field view and diagram of cross-cutting relationships between different burrow fills (distinguished in C with different shades of gray). Photo and image credit: Ricardo Néstor Melchor.






Figure 6

Histogram of horizontal diameter.

Histogram showing the frequency distribution of horizontal diameter (Dh) for the studied burrow fills. Three subpopulations can be distinguished. Image credit: María Cristina Cardonatto.




Figure 7

Burrow fill morphology in plan view.

(A-B) Field photograph and diagram of slightly curved fill. (C-D) Field photograph and diagram of sinuous fill. (E-F) Field photograph and diagram of “C” shaped fill. (G-H) Field photograph and diagram of burrow fill with slightly enlarged and rounded end. Curved lines in the diagrams represent weathered laminae. Photo credit: Ricardo Néstor Melchor. Image credit: María Cristina Cardonatto.










Figure 8

Results of geometric morphometric analysis of burrow fills preserved in cross section.

(A) Plot of principal components 1 and 2, distinguishing by study locality, and deformation grids for elliptical (PC1 score -0.12) and subcircular (PC1 score 0.17) fills. (B) Histogram of variance of principal components. Image credit: María Cristina Cardonatto.



B



Principal component analysis

	Eigenvalues	% Variance	Cumulative %
1.	0.00643525	83.225	83.225
2.	0.00053407	6.907	90.132
3.	0.00036765	4.755	94.887
4.	0.00016002	3.069	96.956
5.	0.00009245	1.196	98.152
6.	0.00004173	0.540	98.692

Figure 9

Orientation of fossil burrow fills compared with modern data from dasypodid burrows.

(A) Rose diagram showing the dip azimuth of fossil burrow fills. (B) Equal area projection of dip azimuth and dip angle of fossil burrow fills. (C) Entrance orientation of fossil burrows, assuming that it is located at 180° of measured dip azimuth. The data in A-C is from SG and LLP localities, those from the remaining locality are preserved only in cross-section. (D) Entrance orientation of several species of dasypodid burrows from semiarid settings of northern-central Argentina build from data by Crespo (1944). (E) Entrance orientation of *Dasypus hybridus* burrows from a grassland setting in Uruguay build from data by González et al. (2001). (F) Entrance orientation of *Chaetophractus villosus* burrows from cultivated land in Buenos Aires province, Argentina build from data by Abba et al. (2005). Image credit: Ricardo Néstor Melchor.





Figure 10

Features of fossil burrow fills.

(A-B) Detailed sedimentary logs of the fill of selected burrows (see Table S1 for information on these burrow fills). References as for Fig. 4. (C) Cross-section of laminated to massive burrow fill # 648 from SG, represented in (B). Elliptical outline of fill indicated by yellow arrows, black arrow point to subvertical rhizolith cutting the laminated fill. (D) Cross-section of burrow fill # 714 from LLP. Subcircular outline of poorly laminated to massive burrow fill indicated by yellow arrows. (E) Pseudomeniscate structure in burrow fill # 704 from LLP seen in plan view. Yellow arrows point the outline of the burrow fill and black arrows to individual pseudomenisci. (F) Detail of laminated burrow fill (# 632 from SG) showing direct grading in siltstone to claystone laminae (yellow arrows), syndimentary fault (white arrows) and onlap of clay laminae on burrow wall (black arrow). Image credit: Ricardo Néstor Melchor.

A # 636



B # 648






Figure 11

Ichnofossils associated with burrow fills.

(A) Small burrow fill (black arrows) cutting the laminated fill of a larger mammal burrow from SG locality. (B) *Coprinisphaera* isp. from LLP locality. (C) Tetrapod footprints on the top of laminated fill of a burrow from LLP locality. Numbers refers to individual footprints. (D) ?*Rosellichnus* isp. (arrowed) inside a burrow fill from SG. Photo credit: Ricardo Néstor Melchor.




Figure 12

Bone remains inside burrow fills.

(A) Isolated, weathered and fragmentary glyptodontid osteoderms from a burrow fill of SG locality. (B) Partly articulated osteoderms of *Eosclerocalyptus* sp. found inside a burrow fill from LLP locality. Photo credit: Ricardo Néstor Melchor.

