A quantitative approach to determine the taxonomic identity and ontogeny of the pycnodontiform fish *Pycnodus* (Neopterygii, Actinopterygii) from the Eocene of Bolca Lagerstätte, Italy

John Joseph Cawley [Coresp.,] [1] , Giuseppe Marrama [1] , Giorgio Carnevale [2] , Jürgen Kriwet [1]

[1] Department of Paleontology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria

[2] Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università degli Studi di Torino, Turin, Italy

Corresponding Author: John Joseph Cawley
Email address: john.cawley@univie.ac.at

Background. The pycnodontiform fish *Pycnodus* is one of the representatives of the highly diverse actinopterygian fish fauna from the early Eocene Bolca Lagerstätte, representing one of the youngest and thus last occurrences of this extinct neopterygian clade . This genus has historically been used as a wastebasket taxon in regards to poorly known pycnodontiform fossils. Authors have argued over the specific status of the Bolca Lagerstätte *Pycnodus* in terms of how many species are contained within the genus with some arguing for multiple species and others suggesting lumping all Bolca specimens together into one species.

Methods. Here, we use a quantitative approach performing biometric and geometric morphometric analyses on 52 specimens of *Pycnodus* in order to determine if the morphological variability within the sample might be related to inter- or intraspecific variation.

Results. The analyses revealed that the variations of body shape, morphometric and meristic characters cannot be used to distinguish different morphotypes. On the contrary, our results show a remarkable link between shape and size, related to ontogeny.

Discussion. Differences in body shape of small (juvenile) and large (adult) individuals is probably related to different microhabitats occupation on the Bolca reef with juveniles sheltering within crevices on the reef and adults being more powerful swimmers that swim above the coral. Taxonomically, we suggest that the Bolca *Pycnodus* should be referred to strictly as *Pycnodus apodus* as this was the name given to the holotype. Additionally, an overview of species assigned to *Pycnodus* is given.

1 **A quantitative approach to determine the taxonomic identity**
2 **and ontogeny of the pycnodontiform fish Pycnodus**
3 **(Neopterygii, Actinopterygii) from the Eocene of Bolca**
4 **Lagerstätte, Italy**

5 JOHN JOSEPH CAWLEY[1]*, GIUSEPPE MARRAMÀ[1], GIORGIO CARNEVALE[2] &

6 JÜRGEN KRIWET[1]

7 [1] Department of Paleontology, University of Vienna, Geozentrum, Althanstrasse 14, Vienna, Austria.

8 [2] Dipartimento di Scienze della Terra, Università degli Studi di Torino, Via Valperga Caluso, Turin, Italy

9

10

11 Corresponding Author:

12 John Joseph Cawley

13 Althanstr. 14, Vienna, 1090, Austria

14 Email address: john.cawley@univie.ac.at

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31   **ABSTRACT**

32

33   **Background.** The pycnodontiform fish *Pycnodus* is one of the representatives of the highly

34   diverse actinopterygian fish fauna from the early Eocene Bolca Lagerstätte, representing one of

35   the youngest and thus last occurrences of this extinct neopterygian clade . This genus has

36   historically been used as a wastebasket taxon in regards to poorly known pycnodontiform fossils.

37   Authors have argued over the specific status of the Bolca Lagerstätte *Pycnodus* in terms of how

38   many species are contained within the genus with some arguing for multiple species and others

39   suggesting lumping all Bolca specimens together into one species.

40   **Methods.** Here, we use a quantitative approach performing biometric and geometric

41   morphometric analyses on 52 specimens of *Pycnodus* in order to determine if the morphological

42   variability within the sample might be related to inter- or intraspecific variation.

43   **Results.** The analyses revealed that the variations of body shape, morphometric and meristic

44   characters cannot be used to distinguish different morphotypes. On the contrary, our results show

45   a remarkable link between shape and size, related to ontogeny.

46   **Discussion.** Differences in body shape of small (juvenile) and large (adult) individuals is

47   probably related to different microhabitats occupation on the Bolca reef with juveniles sheltering

48   within crevices on the reef and adults being more powerful swimmers that swim above the

49   corals. Taxonomically, we suggest that the Bolca *Pycnodus* should be referred to strictly as

50   *Pycnodus apodus* as this was the name given to the holotype. Additionally, an overview of

51   species assigned to *Pycnodus* is given.

52

53 **INTRODUCTION**

54 Pycnodontiform fishes were a highly successful group of neopterygian fishes that colonized

55 shallow marine, brackish, and freshwater habitats from the Norian to the middle Eocene during

56 ca. 170 Ma (e.g., Tintori, 1981; Longbottom, 1984; Poyato-Ariza et al., 1998; Kriwet 2005).

57 They were particularly diverse during the Late Cretaceous when they showed the highest degree

58 of morphological diversity (Marramà et al., 2016a; Cawley & Kriwet, 2018). Pycnodonts

59 underwent a severe drop in their diversity and disparity at the end of the Cretaceous, and the last

60 representatives survived in restricted biotopes until the Middle Eocene (Poyato-Ariza, 2005;

61 Marramà et al., 2016a). One of the last Palaeogene representatives is *Pycnodus apodus* (Volta

62 1796), which is represented by several complete and articulated skeletons from the early Eocene

63 (late Ypresian, c. 49 Ma) (Papazzoni et al., 2014; Marramà et al., 2016b) Bolca Koservat-

64 Lagerstätte. This deposit yielded a huge amount of exquisitely preserved fishes, which are

65 housed today in several museums and research institutions around the world, and that are

66 represented by more than 230 bony and cartilaginous fish species (see e.g. Blot, 1987; Blot &

67 Tyler, 1990; Bannikov, 2004, 2006, 2008; Bannikov & Carnevale, 2009, 2010, 2016; Carnevale

68 & Pietsch, 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012; Carnevale et al., 2014, 2017; Marramà & Carnevale, 2015a,

69 b, 2016, 2017; Marramà et al., 2017a, b).

70   *Pycnodus apodus* has a long and complex taxonomic history (see e.g., Blot, 1987;

71 Poyato-Ariza & Wenz, 2002). Volta (1796) originally designated it as *Coryphaena apoda*.

72 Blainville (1818) subsequently redescribed the same specimens without illustrations, and erected

73 for them the taxon *Zeus platessus*. Finally, Agassiz (1833, 1839) created the genus *Pycnodus* for

74 these specimens but kept the specific name of Blainville (1818). Agassiz (1844) noted that the

75 existence of small specimens with a swelling of the forehead to be juveniles of *Pycnodus*

76 *platessus*. Heckel (1856) erected using the same material as Agassiz (but probably also including

77 other specimens) from Bolca a second species of *Pycnodus*, *P. gibbus,* due to differential

78 characters such as the presence of a gibbosity on the forehead, higher vertebrae length to body

79 depth ratio than *P. platessus* and the body depth being one and a half times that of the body

80 length in contrast to *P. platessus* having a body depth half that of the length. Another character

81 not explicitly mentioned in the text but was drawn (Heckel, 1856; Plate 8, Figure 4) is that *P.*

82 *gibbus* has 2 interdigitations between the vertebrae while *P. platessus* has 3-4. More recently,

83 Blot (1987) examined specimens that were labelled *P. platessus* in various institutional

84 collections and compared their anatomy to that of specimens labelled *P. gibbus* and concluded

85 that *P. gibbus* is synonymous with *P. platessus* and variations recorded among specimens were

86 due to intraspecific differences. However, this hypothesis has never been tested employing a

87 robust quantitative approach. Traditional and geometric morphometrics (Zelditch et al., 2004)

88 have been successfully used to interpret the patterns of morphospace occupation, quantifying the

89 morphological diversification, solving taxonomic debates, as well as to test if morphometric

90 variations are due to intra- or interspecific variability (Wretman, Blom & Kear, 2016; Marramà

91 & Carnevale, 2017; Marramà et al., 2017c).

92   In this perspective, this paper aims to analyse if the morphometric variation among

93 *Pycnodus* species of Bolca, can be related to interspecific or intraspecific variability as

94 hypothesized by Blot (1987). For this, we examined abundant *Pycnodus* specimens from various

95 museum collections which were labelled as either *P. apodus*, *P. platessus*, *P. gibbus* or *Pycnodus*

96 sp. to establish whether these species separate substantially from each other in the morphospace

97 and if morphometric and meristic data can be useful to detect significant differences between the

98 labelled taxa. Since the studied sample had a range of specimens of different sizes, we

99 investigated whether different shapes can be related to possible ontogenetic differences of

100 *Pycnodus* representing different growth stages from juvenile to adult.

101

102 **The taxonomic history of *Pycnodus***

103

104 *Pycnodus* has long been used as wastebasket taxon in the study of pycnodontiforms, being used

105 as a default name particularly for many Mesozoic taxa. Later revisions revealed said taxa to have

106 significant morphological differences with *Pycnodus* leading to the creation of new genera.

107 Species of pycnodontiforms previously referred to as *Pycnodus* include *Anomoeodus subclavatus*

108 from the Maastrichtian of the Netherlands (Agassiz, 1833; Davis, 1890; Forir, 1887); other

109 species of *Anomoeodus* referred to as *Pycnodus* include *A. angustus*, *A. muensteri*, *A. phaseolus*,

110 *A. sculptus* (Agassiz, 1844) and *A. distans* (Coquand, 1860; Sauvage, 1880). *Pycnodus liassicus*

111 Egerton, 1855 from the Early Jurassic, of Barrow-on-Soar of Leicestershire, United Kingdom

112 was assigned to the genus *Eomesodon* by Woodward (1918) and *Stemmatodus rhombus*

113 (Agassiz, 1839) from the Early Cretaceous of Capo d'Orlando, close to Naples, Italy was

114 originally named *Pycnodus rhombus* (see Heckel, 1854). *Pycnodus flabellatum* Cope, 1866 from

115   the Cenomanian-Coniacian of Brazil was assigned to *Nursallia flabellatum* by Blot (1987). The

116   pycnodonts *Pycnodus achillis* Costa 1853, *Pycnodus grandis* Costa 1853 and *Pycnodus*

117   *rotundatus* Costa 1864 are all synonymous with *Ocloedus costae* (d'Erasmo, 1914, Poyato-Ariza

118   & Wenz, 2002). Poyato-Ariza (2013) revised *"Pycnodus" laveirensis* Veiga Ferreira 1961 from

119   the Cenomanian of Lavieras, Portugal and found that due to morphological differences in

120   characters such as absence of dermocranial fenestra, number of premaxillary teeth, contact type

121   of arcocentra and median fin morphology, it represents a member of a different genus and

122   consequently erected the new genus *Sylvienodus* as a replacement. An articulated specimen of

123   '*Pycnodus*' was found in the Campanian-Maastrichtian of Nardò, Italy, which certainly

124   represents a different pycnodont (Taverne, 1997). An extremely fragmentary specimen referred

125   to as "*Pycnodus*" *nardoensis* from Apulia (Nardò), Italy is comprised of the anterior part of the

126   body along with some posterior elements of the skull (Taverne, 1997). However, in a later study

127   Taverne (2003) studied new material of this taxon, which revealed that this species does not

128   belong to *Pycnodus* due to the possession of a narrower cleithrum and peculiar morphology of

129   the contour scales. This new data led to the creation of the new genus *Pseudopycnodus* to

130   allocate the Nardò material.

131   All other Mesozoic species of *Pycnodus* are based on isolated dentitions or teeth. The

132   earliest records of *Pycnodus* are dentitions found in the limestones from the Upper Jurassic

133   (Kimmeridgian) of Orbagnoux, France (Sauvage, 1893). Isolated teeth and an isolated vomerine

134   dentition were referred to cf. *Pycnodus* sp. (Goodwin et al., 1999) from the Mugher Mudstone

135   formation of the Tithonian. However, its identity is doubted due to the stratigraphic position and

136   could be attributed to *Macromesodon* (Kriwet, 2001b). Pictet, Campiche & Tribolet (1858-60)

137   described remains of the Early Cretaceous fish assemblages from Switzerland where three

138   species of *Macromesodon* (*M. couloni* from the Hauterivian and Barremian, *M. cylindricus* from

139   the Valanginian, Barremian, and Aptian and *M. obliqus* from the Albian) were all originally

140   referred to as *Pycnodus*. Isolated dentitions belonging to '*Pycnodus*' *heterotypus* and '*Pycnodus*'

141   *quadratifer* were reported from the Hauterivian of the Paris basin (Cornuel, 1883, 1886). Several

142   isolated teeth derived from the Cenomanian strata of the Chalk Group of southern England were

143   attributed to *Pycnodus scrobiculatus* Reuss 1845 whose systematic affinity is still uncertain.

144   Other teeth belonging to *P. scrobiculatus* were reported from the Turonian of northern Germany.

145   Roemer (1841) described isolated remains belonging to *Pycnodus harlebeni* from the Late

146 Cretaceous of Hilsconglomerat of Ostenvald, Germany. Another possible Portuguese

147 representative of *Pycnodus* is reported from the Turonian of Bacarena, '*Pycnodus*' sp. aff. '*P.*'

148 *gigas* Jonet 1964. However, the identification of the Portuguese specimens as *Pycnodus* are

149 uncertain and the material most likely pertains to a different pycnodont taxon (Kriwet, 2001b).

150 Isolated dentitions of what were claimed to be *Pycnodus scrobiculatus*, *P. rostratus* and *P.*

151 *semilunaris* from the Turonian of Czechoslovakia (Reuss, 1845) should be regarded as

152 indeterminable pycnodontids due to the lack of characters useful to determine their affinities

153 (Kriwet, 2001b). Isolated teeth attributed to *"Pycnodus" lametae* were reported from the

154 Maastrichtian Lameta Formation of Dongargaon, India (Woodward, 1908). Infratrappean and

155 intertrappean beds of Late Cretaceous and early Palaeocene age respectively, contains "*P*".

156 *lametae* alongside *Pycnodus* sp. in Asifibad, India (Prasad & Sahni, 1987).

157 　　　　*Pycnodus* is the most dominant taxon of the Palaeogene pycnodont assemblages being

158 widely distributed in shallow water contexts worldwide. The earliest record of *Pycnodus* in the

159 Palaeogene is represented by *Pycnodus praecursor* from the Danian of Angola (Dartevelle &

160 Casier, 1949) and *P.* sp. cf. *P. praecursor* from the Thanetian of Niger (Cappetta, 1972).

161 *Pycnodus toliapicus* was reported from the Thanetian of Togo, Thanetian of Nigeria and the

162 upper Palaeocene of Niger (White, 1934; Kogbe & Wozny, 1979; Longbottom, 1984). Several

163 remains of isolated dentitions and teeth from the Eocene have been attributed to *Pycnodus*. These

164 include *Pycnodus bicresta* from the northwestern Himalayan region, India (Kumar & Loyal,

165 1987; Prasad & Singh, 1991); *Pycnodus bowerbanki* from the Ypresian, England, middle Eocene

166 of Mali and Ypresian of Algeria (Longbottom, 1984; Savornin, 1915); *Pycnodus* sp. cf. *P.*

167 *toliapicus* from the Eocene of Katar at the Persian Gulf (Casier, 1971); *Pycnodus toliapicus* from

168 the Ypresian and Lutetian of England and Lutetian of the Paris basin and Belgium (Savornin,

169 1915; Casier, 1950; Taverne & Nolf, 1978); *Pycnodus mokattamensis* from the Lutetian of Egypt

170 (Priem, 1897); *P. mokattamensis* occurs alongside *Pycnodus legrandi*, *Pycnodus lemellefensis*,

171 *Pycnodus thamallulensis*, *Pycnodus vasseuri* and *Pycnodus pellei* from the Ypresian of Algeria

172 (Savornin, 1915); *Pycnodus pachyrhinus* Grey-Egerton 1877 from the Ypresian of Kent,

173 England; *Pycnodus funkianus* Geinitz 1883 from the Ypresian of Brunswick, Germany;

174 *Pycnodus munieri* Priem 1902 and *Pycnodus savini* Priem 1902 from the Ypresian, France and a

175 rather diverse assemblage from the middle Eocene of Mali which includes *Pycnodus jonesae*, *P.*

176 *maliensis*, *P. munieri*, *P. variablis* and *P. zeaformis* (Longbottom, 1984).

177   A nearly complete specimen of *P. lametae* with crushed skull and missing caudal fin was
178   reported from the freshwater Maastrichtian of Bhatali, India close to the Dongargaon area
179   (Mohabey & Udhoji, 1996). However, the assignment of the name *Pycnodus* to this fish is
180   dubious, since it lacks the post-parietal process typical of the Pycnodontidae (personal
181   observation JJC, 2018). A more complete specimen of *Pycnodus* was found in the Palaeocene
182   rocks of Palenque, Mexico (Alvarado-Ortega et al., 2015), which solely differs from the Eocene
183   specimens from Bolca by having a greater number of ventral and post-cloacal ridge scales, less
184   dorsal- and anal-fin pterygiophores and a large or regular-sized posteriormost neural spine.
185   However, due to the inadequacy of the available sample, it is not possible to determine the actual
186   differences between the Palaeocene material from Mexico and that from the Eocene of Bolca,
187   and for this reason this taxon is referred to as *Pycnodus* sp.
188
189
190
191   **MATERIAL AND METHODS**
192   **Specimen sampling**
193   We studied a selection of *Pycnodus* specimens from various museum collections, which were
194   labelled either *P. apodus*, *P. platessus*, *P. gibbus* or *Pycnodus* sp. A total of 52 *Pycnodus*
195   specimens from nine museum collections were used to obtain biometric information with 39
196   specimens from that sample being used for the geometric morphometric analysis as their higher
197   quality preservation provided sufficient morphological information for the aim of this study
198   (BM; Museo dei Fossili di Bolca; NHMUK, Natural History Museum of London; SNSB-BSPG,
199   Staatliche Naturwissenshaftliche Sammlungen Bayerns-Bayerische Staatssammlung für
200   Paläontologie und Geologie, München, Germany; CM, Carnegie Museum, Pittsburgh,
201   Pennsylvania; FMNH, Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago; MGP-PD; Museo di Geologia
202   e Paleontologia dell'Università di Padova; MNHN, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Paris;
203   MCSNV, Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Verona; NHMW; Naturhistorisches Museum
204   Wien) (see Supplementary material). For this analysis,the sample includes 17 specimens
205   identified originally as *Pycnodus* sp., 14 specimens as *P. platessus*, six specimens as *P. gibbus*,
206   and two specimens as *P. apodus*.
207

208 **Geometric morphometric protocol**

209 A total of 18 landmarks and 14 semi landmarks were digitized on photos taken from the studied

210 specimens in the corresponding collections using the software TPSdig (Rohlf, 2005). Landmarks

211 indicating homologous points were selected on the basis of their possible ecological or functional

212 role following the scheme applied in some studies (Claverie & Wainwright, 2014; Tuset et al.,

213 2014; Clarke, Lloyd & Friedman, 2016; Marramà, Garbelli & Carnevale, 2016a, b; Marramà et

214 al., 2016a; Marramà & Carnevale, 2017) about shape variation in modern or extinct fishes

215 (Figure 1). The traits used match 12 out of 17 of the landmarks that was used for 57 species of

216 Pycnodontiformes by Marramà et al (2016a). Additional traits used here are the anterior and

217 posterior margins of the cloaca to see if they shift significantly between morphotypes; using four

218 landmarks around the orbit instead of one in the centre to capture more precisely the variability

219 surrounding the orbit; not using the insertion of the pelvic fin as this character was rarely

220 preserved in our specimens; the posterior tip of the supraoccipital being used as a semilandmark

221 instead of a landmark to function as a fixed anchor for the other semilandmarks; the use of two

222 landmarks for the cleithrum to capture variability in position and size of the pectoral fin instead

223 of using just the one landmark for the insertion of the first pectoral fin ray due to the poor

224 preservation of the pectoral fins in many specimens in contrast to the concave notch in the

225 cleithrum.

226 The landmark coordinates were translated, rotated and scaled at unit centroid size by

227 applying a Generalized Procrustes Analysis (GPA) to minimize the variation caused by size,

228 orientation, location and rotation (Rohlf & Slice, 1990; Zelditch et al., 2004). The GPA was

229 performed using the TPSrelw software package (Rohlf, 2003) and a principal component

230 analysis (PCA) was performed on Procrustes coordinates to obtain the Relative Warp (RW).

231 Shape changes were shown along the axes using deformation grid plots. Missing values are

232 replaced using the algorithm "Mean value imputation" (Hammer, Harper & Ryan, 2001).

233 Two non-parametric tests were performed to analyse the quantitative morphospace

234 occupation of our *Pycnodus* specimens. In order to assess the degree of overlap between

235 morphospaces, an analysis of similarities (ANOSIM, Clarke, 1993) was performed on the entire

236 dataset of standardised morphometric and meristic parameters. PERMANOVA (Anderson, 2001)

237 was used to test similarities of in-group centroid position between the different groups

238 representing a species of *Pycnodus*. Euclidean distances are the distance measure chosen for both

239 tests. All statistical analyses were performed in PAST 3.18 (Hammer, Harper & Ryan, 2001).

240   Since the studied specimens vary greatly in size (smallest being 4.0 cm and largest being

241 30.6 cm) we also investigated whether size could be correlated with shape change in *Pycnodus*

242 and enable us to see whether and how body shape changes throughout ontogeny. To analyse the

243 relationship between size and shape, we performed a Partial Least Square analysis (PLS) using

244 the software TPSpls (Rohlf & Corti, 2000). Alpha (level of significance) was set to 0.05.

245

246 **Biometric analyses**

247 We used ten meristic counts (Number of vertebrae, ribs, scale bars, paired fin rays, median fin

248 rays, median fin pterygiophores and caudal fin rays) and 19 measurements in order to capture

249 morphological variability, to test the homogeneity of the sample, and confirming its assignment

250 to a single morphotype. Histograms were used to illustrate the variation of morphometric and

251 meristic data in order to ascertain if more than one morphotype of *Pycnodus* could be identified.

252 Histograms can be problematic in accurately capturing the distribution of data (Salgado-Ugarte

253 et al., 2000) so we also used Kernel density estimators to determine the presence of a normal

254 (Gaussian) distribution of the meristic data. Least squares regression was used to obtain the

255 relationship between standard length (SL) and all other morphometric variables. Specimens of

256 possible additional taxa were indicated by the presence of statistical outliers from the regression

257 line (Simon et al., 2010) and will require additional scrutiny in order to truly differentiate the

258 outlier from all other specimens. The linear regression results were shown using scatterplots.

259 Log-transformed data were used to perform the least squares regression in order to determine the

260 degree of correlation between the standard length (SL) and all other morphometric variables.

261

262

263 **RESULTS**

264 **Geometric morphometrics**

265 The relative warp analysis produced 38 RWs with the first three axes together explaining about

266 72% of the total variation. Figures 2 and 3 show that there is significant overlap between the

267 morphospaces of the *Pycnodus* taxonomic groups and the thin plate splines show the changes in

268 shape along the axes. Negative values on RW1 (56.1% explained) are related to *Pycnodus*

269   specimens with large orbits and deep bodies while positive scores identify *Pycnodus* with

270   reduced orbits and elongated bodies. Negative values of RW2 (10.4% explained) show

271   specimens having the pectoral fin with a wide base moved higher up the body alongside a long

272   caudal peduncle (Figure 2). Conversely, on positive scores of RW2 lie specimens with pectoral

273   fin with a narrower base located more ventrally on the body alongside a small caudal peduncle.

274   The negative values of RW3 (6% explained) show the skull becoming deeper and more

275   elongated with the dermosupraoccipital in particular reaching far back (Figure 3). Body becomes

276   shallower near the caudal peduncle with the cloaca shifting posteriorly, as well as the dorsal

277   apex. Positive scores of RW3 are related to a shorter and shallower skull with the body becoming

278   deeper close to the caudal peduncle and the anterior shift in the cloaca with the body becoming

279   deeper just anterior to the cloaca. The dorsal apex shifts forward in position.

280   ANOSIM performed on the first three axes suggests that there is strong overlap between

281   groups, showing they are barely distinguishable from each other (r-value is 0.10 and $p > 0.05$;

282   see Table 1), except for a single pairwise comparison between *Pycnodus* sp. and *P. platessus* (p

283   < 0.05). The PERMANOVA suggests the same trend (Table 2), showing that group centroids are

284   not significantly different on each pairwise comparison (f-value is 2.83), except between

285   *Pycnodus* sp. and *P. platessus* ($p < 0.05$) which lends significance to the overall p-value (< 0.05).

286   Significant differences detected between *Pycnodus* sp. and *P. platessus* can be explained with the

287   fact that the indeterminate *Pycnodus* specimens show a wide range of morphologies, with the

288   extreme shapes ranging from negative to positive values of all the first three axes.

289   The PLS performed on the entire sample (Figure 4) revealed a strong and significant

290   correlations between size and shape ($r = 0.88$; $p < 0.05$), therefore suggesting that different

291   shapes of the individuals are related to changes in shape of different ontogenetic stages. In fact,

292   small-sized individuals are associated with larger orbits, deeper skull and body shape, long skull,

293   higher position of pectoral fin and a wide, indistinct caudal peduncle that is in distant proximity

294   to both medial fins. Larger individuals, on the other hand, have a reduced orbit, shallower skull

295   and body depth, shorter skull, lower position of pectoral fin and narrow caudal peduncle in close

296   proximity to both medial fins. The PLS analysis therefore suggests that the morphological

297   variations of the orbit, body depth and caudal peduncle are strongly related to ontogeny.

298

299   **Biometric analyses**

300   Morphometrics and meristic counts for all the studied specimens are given in Table 3 and Table

301   4 respectively and mean biometric parameters are given in Table 5. Most of the histograms based

302   on meristic counts (Figure 5) do not show a normal (Gaussian) distribution due to the small

303   sample size being unable to detect significant high frequency of mean values that might have

304   suggested a Gaussian curve (De Baets, Klug & Monnet, 2013), with intermediate states

305   dominating and extreme states being rare. The linear regression performed on morphometric

306   characters (Figure 6) shows that all specimens fit within the cloud of points near the regression

307   line and that no particular specimens of *Pycnodus* deviates from this line. Variation in meristic

308   values and the few outliers in partial least square regression analyses have been interpreted here

309   as measurement errors due to incomplete preservation of some structures due to taphonomy or

310   incomplete mineralization in juvenile individuals. The high values of the coefficient of

311   determination (r^2) ranging from 0.76-0.99 (Table 6) indicate a high degree of positive correlation

312   between standard length and each morphometric character. Linear regression analysis also

313   revealed the highly significant relationship between the standard length and all morphometric

314   characters (p < 0.001). Neither morphometric nor meristic characters are therefore useful in

315   determining two or more different morphologically identifiable species within *Pycnodus*,

316   strongly supporting Blot's (1987) hypothesis that only one species (*P. apodus*; see also below) is

317   present in the Bolca Lagerstätte.

318

319

320   **DISCUSSION**

321   **Intraspecific variation of *Pycnodus apodus***

322   The results demonstrate that all *Pycnodus* species cannot be separated morphologically using the

323   morphometric traits used herein in a quantitative approach, supporting the intraspecific variation

324   hypothesis of Blot (1987). *Pycnodus gibbus* is a problematic taxon to identify due to Heckel

325   (1856) not mentioning exactly which specimen he used to designate the specific name for *P.*

326   *gibbus*. Blot (1987) mentions that Heckel worked on specimens from the NHMW in order to

327   erect *P. gibbus*. However, such specimens could not be found and so the holotype still remains

328   unknown. However, Heckel (1856; plate 8) does illustrate a specimen of *Pycnodus gibbus* and it

329   conforms with what we have found to be the juvenile morphotype in our sample lending

330   credence to the hypothesis by Agassiz (1844) that the specimens he studied were specifically the

331   juvenile of *P. platessus*. One of the characters separating *P. gibbus* from *P. platessus* (Heckel,

332   1856; plate 8, figure 4) is the number of interdigitations between vertebrae (*P. gibbus*: two; *P.*

333   *platessus*: three-four). However, a survey of the vertebral column of all our specimens reveals

334   two to be the predominant number of interdigitations, including specimens labelled *P. platessus*

335   and *P. apodus*. Apart from specimens where the degree of preservation was insufficient to do a

336   count, only one specimen (MGP-PD 8868C) has three interdigitations which we ascertain to be

337   due to intraspecific variation. Blot (1987; table 6) also did not see any difference in the number

338   of interdigitations between *P. gibbus and P. platessus.*

339   As suggested by Grande and Young (2004), ontogenetic variation of morphological

340   characters actually represents a primary source of intraspecific variation; this is confirmed by our

341   analysis, specifically by the morphological changes mostly occurring along RW1 in the

342   morphospace that are related to ontogeny and the very significant results deriving from the PLS

343   analysis. The unimodal (Gaussian) distribution cannot be seen in most of the meristic data, as

344   revealed by the Kernel density estimator on the frequency histograms (Figure 5), due to the fact

345   that the sample is too small to detect high frequency of mean values (De Baets, Klug & Monnet,

346   2013). However, a few meristic characters reveal a domination of intermediate values and

347   comparably rare extremes, which is typical of a homogenous population. Furthermore, the linear

348   regression showed a significant dependence between standard length and all morphometric

349   variables, therefore suggesting that morphometric characters are not useful to distinguish

350   different taxa. Meristic and morphometric data seem to show that all specimens studied belong to

351   a single taxonomic entity (see Dagys, Bucher & Weitschat, 1999; Dagys, 2001; Weitschat, 2008;

352   Marramà & Carnevale, 2015a; Sferco, López-Arbarello & Báez, 2015).

353   Figure 7 shows some notable differences between the juvenile and larger specimens

354   including the degree of ossification, particularly in the skull and caudal fin, being reduced in

355   juvenile in comparison to adults and the notochord not being surrounded by arcocentra in

356   juveniles whereas it is completely enclosed in adults. The so-called gibbosity that Heckel (1856)

357   used to distinguish *P. gibbus* from *P. platessus* is formed by the angle of the anterior profile and

358   the axis of the body. This angle decreases in larger specimens of *Pycnodus* from 70° to 55° (Blot,

359   1987) due to the skull roof moving posteriorly during growth revealing that this character

360   probably does not denote a species but a growth stage within a single species. The high vertebrae

361   length/body depth ratio said to be another indicator of *P. gibbus* is something that also decreases

362   during growth. When Blot plotted all *Pycnodus* specimens onto a growth curve (Blot, 1987;

363   figure 32) *Pycnodus gibbus* fitted into the curve neatly on the lower end of the growth curve.

364   Differences in meristic counts (Table 7) are suggestive of intraspecific variation as seen

365   in other fossil actinopterygians such as Sinamiidae from the Late Jurassic (Su, 1973; Zhang &

366   Zhang, 1980) and Early Cretaceous (Stensiö, 1935); Palaeosconiformes from the Triassic

367   (Lehman, 1952); Parasemionotidae from the Early Triassic (Olsen, 1984) Teleosteomorpha from

368   the Middle to Late Triassic (Tintori, 1990); Bobasatraniiformes from the Middle Triassic

369   (Bürgin, 1992) Paramblypteidae from the Early Permian (Dietze, 1999, 2000) Dapediidae from

370   the Early Jurassic (Thies & Hauff, 2011); stem Actinopteri from the Middle Triassic (Xu, Shen

371   & Zhao, 2014); stem Teleostei from the Middle Triassic (Tintori et al., 2015); Pachycormiformes

372   from the Early Jurassic (Wretman, Blom & Kear, 2016); and the *incertae sedis Teffichthys* from

373   the Early Triassic Marramà et al., 2017c). The analysis of the morphological variability of

374   *Pycnodus*, one of the last representatives of a basal neopterygian lineage that has been around

375   since at least the Late Triassic (Tintori, 1981; Kriwet 2001a; Poyato-Ariza, 2015), indicates that

376   pycnodontiforms also produce substantial intraspecific variation similar to living representatives

377   of other ancient actinopterygian lineages such as amiids (Jain, 1985) and acipenserids (Hilton &

378   Bemis, 1999). Therefore, the identification of different Bolca *Pycnodus* species such as *P. gibbus*

379   (Heckel, 1856), may be the result of species over-splitting and can be on the contrary explained

380   by intraspecific variation in meristic counts and ontogeny.

381

382   **Habitat use during ontogeny**

383   Our morphometric results show that the morphology of the smaller individuals differ

384   significantly from that of the adults and that *Pycnodus*, like extant actinopterygians, would go

385   through morphological changes throughout ontogeny. Large eye size found in the smaller

386   *Pycnodus* specimens is usually a sign of the specimen being in a juvenile stage as can be seen in

387   many extant teleosts (Pankhurst & Montgomery, 1990). Large eye size in pycnodonts has been

388   related to behavioural flexibility and possible nocturnal behaviour (Goatley, Bellwood &

389   Bellwood, 2010). This could also apply for the Bolca *Pycnodus* although the individuals with the

390   largest eyes (juveniles) are not believed to be more nocturnal as larger eye size in smaller fishes

391   is a natural consequence of ontogeny. The deep body shape of the smaller *Pycnodus* specimens

392   can be interpreted as a sign that the juveniles live within the branches of corals and as they get

393   bigger they start to occupy the water column above the reef. Coral reefs composed of

394   scleractinian coral colonies have been reported in-situ (Vescogni et al. 2016) and were probably

395   even more extensive based on abundant remains from the laminated and massive fossiliferous

396   limestone from Pesciara and Monte Postale sites. This change to a benthopelagic lifestyle also is

397   supported by the more fusiform body and the narrower caudal peduncle (Webb, 1982) seen in

398   larger specimens.

399   Ecologically similar extant analogues to *Pycnodus*, fishes of the genus *Lethrinus* undergo

400   ontogenetic changes in head shape as they grow in size but their body depth in relation to length

401   does not change drastically during growth (Wilson, 1998). The sparid species *Diplodus sargus*

402   and *D. puntazzo* also spend their time as juveniles in crevices in the rocks in shallow water 0-2 m

403   deep and move to rocky bottoms and sea grass beds when adult (Macpherson, 1998). However,

404   their ontogenetic trajectory differs from *Pycnodus* as they are more elongate as juveniles and

405   body depth increases with age. Juvenile carangids also have a deeper body than that seen in

406   adults (Leis et al., 2005) and are found within lagoonal patch reefs(Wetherbee et al., 2004) only

407   moving out of this habitat when larger than 40 cm and becoming more pelagic in their habitat

408   preferences (Kuiter, 1993; Myers, 1999). Eurasian perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) go through three

409   different feeding modes during their life span; zooplanktivory, benthic macroinvertebrate feeding

410   and piscivory. The middle stage, benthic feeding results in them shifting to the littoral zone

411   where they have a deeper body and longer fins which aid in maneuverability whereas piscivores

412   and zooplanktivores have a similar body type due to both life stages living in the pelagic realm

413   (Hjelm, Persson & Christensen, 2000).

414   Ontogenetically–related habitat changes also occur in other coral fishes, such as labrids,

415   in which the pectoral fins increase their aspect ratio as these fishes grow in size, enabling them to

416   increase their use of the water column while juveniles stay closer to the bottom (Fulton,

417   Bellwood & Wainwright, 2002). Since both juveniles and adults of *Pycnodus* are found in the

418   Bolca Lagerstätte, we hypothesize that unlike many modern coral reef fishes, which significantly

419   change the habitat during ontogeny (Nagelkerken et al., 2002; Dorenbosch et al., 2005a, b;

420   Adams et al., 2006; Nagelkerken, 2007; Nakamura et al., 2008; Shibuno et al., 2008; Kimirei et

421   al., 2011), there is a shift instead in microhabitat use within the reef, in this case juveniles living

422   within coral crevices to adults roaming over the coral reefs.

423

424

CONCLUSIONS

The quantitative approach here performed supports the hypothesis of Blot (1987) that the various *Pycnodus nominal* species (*P. apodus*, *P. platessus*, *P. gibbus*) from the Eocene Bolca Konservat-Lagerstätte actually belong to a single species. Due to the holotype of *Pycnodus* being given the specific name of *apoda*, all known specimens of *Pycnodus* from Bolca should be referred to as *Pycnodus apodus*. Most of the morphological variation can be explained by the close correlation between morphometric changes and ontogeny, with juveniles and adults occupying different parts of the morphospace. The morphometric differences between juveniles and adults may be due to occupation of different habitats with juveniles sheltering among cover and adults being better adapted to a roaming lifestyle swimming over the benthos to feed. The complex taxonomic history shows that most species typically referred to as *Pycnodus* are different taxa altogether e.g. not valid (all Jurassic and Cretaceous *Pycnodus* specimens being other taxa) and with the majority of Palaeogene *Pycnodus* being represented by isolated dentition it seems that the only definitive articulated skeletal remains attributed to the genus *Pycnodus* are *Pycnodus apodus* from the Bolca Lagerstätte and *Pycnodus* sp. from south-eastern Mexico (Alvarado-Ortega et al., 2015). Future studies should analyse other problematic pycnodontiform taxa such as the widely distributed *Gyrodus* from the Middle Jurassic to the Early Cretaceous (Kriwet & Schmitz, 2005) to investigate if intraspecific variation might partially explain the supposed diversity of species this genus contains.

455 **REFERENCES**

456

457 Adams AJ, Dahlgren CP, Kellison GT, Kendall MS, Layman CA, Ley JA, Nagelkerken I, Serafy

458 JE. 2006. Nursery function of tropical back-reef systems. *Marine Ecology Progress Series*

459 318:287-301. DOI: www.jstor.org/stable/24870766.

460

461 Agassiz L. 1833. Synoptische Übersicht der fossilen Ganoiden. *Neues Jahrbuch für*

462 *Mineralogie, Geologie und Paläontologie* 1833:470-481.

463

464 Agassiz L. 1833-1844. *Recherches sur les Poissons fossiles.* Volume 2. Petitpierre: Neuchâtel.

465

466 Alvarado-Ortega J, Cuevas-García M, del Pilar Melgarejo-Damián M, Cantalice KM, Alaniz-

467 Galvan A, Solano-Templos G, and Than-Marchese BA. 2015. Paleocene fishes from Palenque,

468 Chiapas, southeastern Mexico. *Palaeontologia Electronica* 18:1-22. DOI:

469 https://doi.org/10.26879/536.

470

471 Anderson MJ. 2001. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance. *Austral*

472 *Ecology* 26:32-46. DOI: 10.1111/j.1442-9993.2001.01070.pp.x.

473

474 Bannikov AF. 2004. Fishes from the Eocene of Bolca, northern Italy, previously classified with

475 the Chaetodontidae (Perciformes). *Studie Ricerche sui Giacimenti Terziari di Bolca* 10:55-74.

476

477 Bannikov AF. 2006. Fishes from the Eocene of Bolca, northern Italy, previously classified in the

478 Sparidae, Serranidae and Haemulidae (Perciformes). *Geodiversitas* 28:249-275. DOI: 1280-

479 9659.

480

481 Bannikov AF. 2008. Revision of the atheriniform fish genera *Rhamphognathus* Agassiz and

482 Mesogaster Agassiz (Teleostei) from the Eocene of Bolca, northern Italy. *Studie Ricerche sui*

483 *Giacimenti Terziari di Bolca* 9:65-76.

484

485   Bannikov AF, Carnevale G. 2009. A new percoid fish from the Eocene of Monte Bolca, Italy:

486   *Hendrixella grandei* gen. & sp. nov. *Swiss Journal of Geosciences* 102:481-488. DOI:

487   https://doi.org/10.1007/s00015-009-1331-3.

488

489   Bannikov AF, Carnevale G. 2010. *Bellwoodilabrus landinii*, a new genus and species of labrid

490   fish (Teleostei: Perciformes) from the Eocene of Monte Bolca. *Geodiversitas* 32:201-220. DOI:

491   https://doi.org/10.5252/g2010n2a2.

492

493   Bannikov AF, Carnevale G. 2016. *Carlomonnius quasigobius* gen. et sp. nov.: the first gobioid

494   fish from the Eocene of Monte Bolca, Italy. *Bulletin of Geosciences* 91:13-22. DOI:

495   10.3140/bull.geosci.1577.

496

497   Blainville HD. 1818. Sur les ichthyolithes ou les poissons fossiles. *Nouveau Dictionnaire*

498   *d'Histoire Naturelle, Deterville, Paris* 27:310-95.

499

500   Blot, J. 1987. *L'ordre des Pycnodontiformes. Studi e Ricerche sui Giacimenti Terziari di Bolca*

501   *V. L'ordre des Pycnodontiformes*. Museo civico di storia Naturale: Verona.

502

503   Blot J, Tyler JC. 1990. New genera and species of fossil surgeon fishes and their relatives

504   (Acanthuroidei, Teleostei) from the Eocene of Monte Bolca, Italy, with application of the Blot

505   formula to both fossil and Recent forms. *Studie Ricerche sui Giacimenti Terziari di Bolca* 6:13-

506   92.

507

508   Bürgin T. 1992. Basal ray-finned fishes (Osteichthyes; Actinopterygii) from the Middle Triassic

509   of Monte San Giorgio (Canton Tessin, Switzerland). *Schweizerische Paläontololologische*

510   *Abhandlungen* 114:1-164.

511

512   Cappetta H. 1972. Les poissons Crétacés et Tertiaires du bassin des Iullemmeden (République du

513   Niger). *Palaeovertebrata* 5:179-251.

514

515 Carnevale G, Pietsch TW. 2009. An Eocene frogfish from Monte Bolca, Italy: the earliest
516 skeletal record for the family. *Palaeontology* 52:745-752. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-
517 4983.2009.00874.x.
518
519 Carnevale G, Pietsch TW. 2010. Eocene handfishes from Monte Bolca, with description of a new
520 genus and species, and a phylogeny of the family Brachionichthyidae (Teleostei: Lophiiformes).
521 *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 160:621-647. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1096-
522 3642.2009.00623.x.
523
524 Carnevale G, Pietsch TW. 2011. Batfishes from the Eocene of Monte Bolca. *Geological*
525 *Magazine* 148:461-472. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016756810000907.
526
527 Carnevale G, Pietsch TW. 2012. †*Caruso*, a new genus of anglerfishes from the Eocene of
528 Monte Bolca, Italy, with a comparative osteology and phylogeny of the teleost family Lophiidae.
529 *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 10:47-72. DOI:
530 https://doi.org/10.1080/14772019.2011.565083.
531
532 Carnevale G, Bannikov AF, Marramà G, Tyler JC, Zorzin R. 2014. The Pesciara-Monte Postale
533 Fossil-Lagerstätte: 2. Fishes and other vertebrates. *Rendiconti della Società Paleontologica*
534 *Italiana* 4:37-63.
535
536 Carnevale G, Johnson GD, Marramà G, Bannikov AF. 2017. A reappraisal of the Eocene
537 priacanthid fish *Pristigenys substriata* (De Blainville, 1818) from Monte Bolca, Italy. *Journal of*
538 *Paleontology* 91:554-565. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1017/jpa.2017.19.
539
540 Casier E. 1950. Contributions à l'étude des poissons fossiles de la Belgique. VIII. Les Pristidés
541 éocènes. *Bulletin du Musée Royal d'Histoire Naturelle de Belgique* 25:1-52.
542
543 Casier, E. 1971. Sur un material ichthyologique des "Midra (and Saila) shales" du Qatar (Golfe
544 Persique). *Bulletin de l'Institut royal des Sciences naturelles de Belgique* 47:1-9.
545

546 Cawley JJ, Kriwet J. 2018. A new pycnodont fish, *Scalacurvichthys naishi* gen. et sp. nov., from
547 the Late Cretaceous of Israel. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 16:659-673. DOI:
548 https://doi.org/10.1080/14772019.2017.1330772.

549

550 Clarke KR. 1993. Non-parametric multivariate analysis of changes in community structure.
551 *Austral Ecology* 18:117-143. DOI: 10.1111/j.1442-9993.1993.tb00438.x.

552

553 Clarke, JT, Lloyd GT, Friedman M. 2016. Little evidence for enhanced phenotypic evolution in
554 early teleosts relative to their living fossil sister group. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
555 *Sciences* 113:11531-11536. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1607237113.

556

557 Claverie T, Wainwright PC. 2014. A Morphospace for Reef Fishes: Elongation Is the Dominant
558 Axis of Body Shape Evolution. *PLoS ONE* 9:e112732. DOI:
559 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0112732.

560

561 Cope ED. 1886. A contribution to the vertebrate palaeontology of Brazil. *Proceedings of the*
562 *American Philosophical Society* 23:1-21. www.jstor.org/stable/982910.

563

564 Coquand H. 1860. *Synopsis des animaux et des végétaux fossiles observés dans les formations*
565 *secondaires de la Charente, de la Charente-Inférieure et de la Dordogne.* Barlatier-Feissat et
566 Demonchy: Marseille.

567

568 Cornuel J. 1883. Nouvelle note sur des Pycnodontes portlandiens et néocomiens de l'est du
569 bassin de Paris, et sur des dents binaires de plusieurs d'entre eux. *Bulletin de la Société*
570 *géologique de France* 11:18-27.

571

572 Cornuel, MJ. 1886. Liste des fossiles du terrain crétacé inférieur de la Haute−Marne. *Bulletin de*
573 *la Société géologique de France* 14:312-323.

574

575 Costa OG. 1853. Paleontologia deI regno di Napoli. *Atti della Accademia Pontaniana* 1:1-380.

576

577 Costa OG. 1864. Paleontologia deI regno di Napoli, III. *Atti Accademia*

578 *Pontaniana* 8:1-198.

579

580 Dagys AS. 2001. The ammonoid family Arctohungaritidae from the Boreal Lower-Middle

581 Anisian (Triassic) of Arctic Asia. *Revue de Paléobiologie* 20:543-641.

582

583 Dagys AS, Bucher H, Weitschat W. 1999. Intraspecific variation of *Parasibirites kolymensis*

584 Bychkov (Ammonoidea) from the Lower Triassic (Spathian) of Arctic Asia. *Mitteilungen aus*

585 *dem Geologisch-Paläontologischen der Institut Universität Hamburg* 83:163-178.

586

587 Dartevelle E, Casier, E. 1949. Les poissons fossiles du Bas-Congo et des régions voisines

588 (deuxième partie). *Annales du Musée du Congo Belge* 3:201-256.

589

590 Davis JW. 1890. On the fossil fish of the Cretaceous formations of Scandinavia. *Transactions of*

591 *the Royal Dublin Society* 4:363-434.

592

593 De Baets K, Klug C, Monnet C. 2013. Intraspecific variability through ontogeny in early

594 ammonoids. *Paleobiology* 39:75-94. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1666/0094-8373-39.1.75.

595

596 Dietze K. 1999. *Paramblypterus duvernoyi* (Actinopterygii): skull morphology and intra-specific

597 variation, and its implications for the systematics of paramblypterid fishes. *Journal of Vertebrate*

598 *Paleontology* 19:247-262. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/02724634.1999.10011139.

599

600 Dietze K. 2000. A revision of paramblypterid and amblypterid actinopterygians from Upper

601 Carboniferous - Lower Permian lacustrine deposits of central Europe. *Palaeontology* 43:927-

602 966. DOI: 10.1111/1475-4983.00156.

603

604 Dorenbosch M, Grol MGG, Christianen MJA, Nagelkerken I, van der Velde G. 2005a. Indo-

605 Pacific seagrass beds and mangroves contribute to fish density coral and diversity on adjacent

606 reefs. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 302:63-76. www.jstor.org/stable/24869791.

607

608   Dorenbosch M, Grol MGG, Nagelkerken I, van der Velde G. 2005b. Distribution of coral reef

609   fishes along a coral reef-seagrass gradient: edge effects and habitat segregation. *Marine Ecology*

610   *Progress Series* 299:277-288. http://www.jstor.org/stable/24869721.

611

612   d'Erasmo G. 1914. La fauna e l'età dei calcari a ittioliti di Pietraroia (Prov. Di Benevento).

613   *Palaeontographica Italica* 20:29-86.

614

615   Egerton P. 1855. *Pycnodus liassicus*. Memoirs of the Geological Survey of the United Kingdom.

616   *British Organic Remains, Decade VIII*:1-3.

617

618   Forir H. 1887. Contributions à l'étude du système Crétacé de la Belgique. 1: Sur quelques

619   poissons et crustacés nouveaux ou mal connus. *Annales de la Société géologique de Belgique*

620   14:25-56.

621

622   Fulton C, Bellwood D, Wainwright, P. 2001. The relationship between swimming ability and

623   habitat use in wrasses (Labridae). *Marine Biology* 139:25-33. DOI:

624   https://doi.org/10.1007/s002270100565.

625

626   Geinitz, HB. 1883. Ueber neue Funde in den Phosphatlagern von Helmstedt, Büddenstedt und

627   Schleweke. *Abhandlungen der Gesellschaft Isis* 5:37-46.

628

629   Goatley HR, Bellwood DR, Bellwood O. 2010. Fishes on coral reefs: changing roles over the

630   past 240 million years. *Paleobiology* 36:415-427. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1666/09035.1.

631

632   Goodwin, M.B, Clemens, WA, Hutchinson JH, Wood CB, Zavada MS, Kemp A, Duffin C,

633   Schaff CR. 1999. Mesozoic continental vertebrates with associated palynostratigraphic datas

634   from the northwestern Ethiopian platform. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 19:728-741. DOI:

635   https://doi.org/10.1080/02724634.1999.10011185.

636

637   Grande T, Young B. 2004. The ontogeny and homology of the Weberian apparatus in the

638   zebrafish *Danio rerio* (Ostariophysi: Cypriniformes). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean*

639   *Society* 140:241-254.DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1096-3642.2003.00097.x.

640

641   Grey-Egerton P. 1877. On some new pycnodonts. *Geological Magazine* 4:49-55. DOI:

642   https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016756800148563.

643

644   Hammer Ø, Harper DAT, Ryan PD. 2001. PAST: paleontological statistics software package for

645   education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica* 4:1-9.

646

647   Heckel J. 1854. Über den Bau und die Eintheilung der Pycnodonten, nebst kurzer Beschreibung

648   einiger neuen Arten derselben. *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften,*

649   *Mathematisch-Naturwissenschafliche Klasse* 12:433-464.

650

651   Heckel J. 1856. Beiträge zur Kenntnis der fossilen Fische erreichs. *Denkschriften der*

652   *kaiserlischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Mathematisch-Naturwissenschaftliche Classe*

653   11:187-274.

654

655   Hilton EJ, Bemis WE. 1999. Skeletal variation in shortnose sturgeon (*Acipenser brevirostrum*)

656   from the Connecticut River: Implications for comparative osteological studies of fossil and living

657   fishes. In: Arratia G, Schultze HP. eds. Mesozoic Fishes 2-Systematics and Fossil Record.

658   Munich: Verlag Dr. F. Pfeil, 69-94.

659

660   Hjelm J, Persson L, Christensen B. 2000. Growth, morphological variation and ontogenetic niche

661   shifts in perch (*Perca fluviatilis*) in relation to resource availability. *Oecologia* 122:190-199.

662   DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/PL00008846.

663

664   Jain SL. 1985. Variability of dermal bones and other parameters in the skull of *Amia calva*.

665   *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 84:385-395. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1096-

666   3642.1985.tb01805.x.

667

668   Jonet S. 1964. Contribution à la connaissance de la faune ichthyologique crétacée. II-Élements

669   de la faune turonnienne. *Boletim da Sociedade Geológica de Portugal* 15:157-174.

670

671   Kimirei IA, Nagelkerken I, Griffioen B, Wagner C, Mgaya YD. 2011. Ontogenetic habitat use by

672   mangrove/seagrass-associated coral reef fishes shows flexibility in time and space. *Estuarine,*

673   *Coastal and Shelf Science* 92:47-58. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecss.2010.12.016.

674

675   Kogbe CA, Wozny E. 1979. Upper Maastrichtian and Paleocene macrofauna from the

676   Iullemmeden Basin (West Afrika) and their paleobiogeographic distribution. *Annals of the*

677   *Geology Survey of Egypt* 9:184-218.

678

679   Kriwet J. 2001a. Palaeobiogeography of pycnodontiform fishes (Actinopterygii, Neopterygii).

680   *Seminario de Paleontología de Zaragoza 5* 1:121-130.

681

682   Kriwet J. 2001b. A comprehensive study of pycnodont fishes (Neopterygii, Pycnodontiformes):

683   Morphology, Taxonomy, Functional Morphology, Phylogeny, and Palaeobiogeography. D. Phil

684   thesis, Humboldt University.

685

686   Kriwet J. 2005. A comprehensive study of the skull and dentition of pycnodont fishes

687   (Neopterygii, Pycnodontiformes). *Zitteliana* 45:135-188.

688

689   Kriwet J, Schmitz L. 2005. New insight into the distribution and palaeobiology of the pycnodont

690   fish *Gyrodus*. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* 50:49-56.

691

692   Kuiter RH. 1993. *Coastal fishes of south-eastern Australia.* Crawford House: Bathurst, New

693   South Wales, Australia.

694

695   Kumar K, Loyal RS. 1987. Eocene ichthyofauna from the Subathu Formation, northwestern

696   Himalaya, India. *Journal of the Palaeontological Society of India* 32:60-84.

697

698 Lehman JP. 1952. Etude complémentaire des poissons de l'Eotrias de Madagascar. *Kungliga*

699 *Svenska Vetenskaps Akademiens Handlingar* 4:1-201.

700

701 Leis JM, Hay AC, Clark DL, Chen, IS, Shao KT. 2006. Behavioral ontogeny in larvae and early

702 juveniles of the giant trevally (*Caranx ignobilis*) (Pisces: Carangidae). *Fishery Bulletin* 104:401-

703 414.

704

705 Longbottom AE. 1984. New Tertiary pycnodonts from the Tilemsi valley, Republic of Mali.

706 *Bulletin of the British Museum of Natural History* 38:1-26.

707

708 Macpherson E. 1998. Ontogenetic shifts in habitat use and aggregation in juvenile sparid fishes.

709 *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology* 220:127-150. DOI:

710 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-0981(97)00086-5.

711

712 Marramà G, Carnevale G. 2015a. The Eocene sardine †*Bolcaichthys catopygopterus*

713 (Woodward, 1901) from Bolca, Italy: osteology, taxonomy and paleobiology. *Journal of*

714 *Vertebrate Paleontology* 35:e1014490, DOI: 10.1080/02724634.2015.1014490.

715

716 Marramà G, Carnevale G. 2015b. Eocene round herring from Monte Bolca, Italy. *Acta*

717 *Palaeontologica Polonica* 60:701-710. DOI: https://doi.org/10.4202/app.00057.2014.

718

719 Marramà G, Carnevale G. 2016. An Eocene anchovy from Monte Bolca, Italy: The earliest

720 known record for the family Engraulidae. *Geological Magazine* 153:84-94. DOI:

721 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0016756815000278.

722

723 Marramà G, Carnevale G. 2017. Morphology, relationships, and paleobiology of the Eocene

724 barracudina †*Holosteus esocinus* (Aulopiformes, Paralepididae) from Monte Bolca, Italy.

725 *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 181:209-228. DOI:

726 https://doi.org/10.1093/zoolinnean/zlw029.

727

728 Marramà G, Garbelli C, Carnevale G. 2016a. A morphospace for the Eocene fish assemblage of

729 Bolca, Italy: a window into the diversification and ecological rise to dominance of modern

730 tropical marine fishes. *Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana* 55:11-21. DOI:

731 10.4435/BSPI.2016.02.

732

733 Marramà G, Garbelli C, Carnevale G. 2016b. A clade-level morphospace for the Eocene fishes

734 of Bolca: patterns and relationships with modern tropical marine fish assemblages. *Bollettino*

735 *della Società Paleontologica Italiana* 55:139-156. DOI: 10.4435/BSPI.2016.13.

736

737 Marramà G, Villier B, Dalla Vecchia FM, Carnevale G. 2016a. A new species of

738 *Gladiopycnodus* (Coccodontoidea, Pycnodontomorpha) from the Cretaceous of Lebanon

739 provides new insights about the morphological diversification of pycnodont fishes through time.

740 *Cretaceous Research* 61:34-43. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cretres.2015.12.022.

741

742 Marramà G, Bannikov AF, Tyler JC, Zorzin R, Carnevale G. 2016b. Controlled excavations in

743 the Eocene Pesciara and Monte Postale deposits reveal new details about the paleoecology and

744 taphonomy of the fish assemblages of Bolca Konservat-Lagerstätte, Italy. *Palaeogeography,*

745 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 454:228-245. DOI:

746 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2016.04.021.

747

748 Marramà G, Claeson KM, Carnevale G, Kriwet J. 2017a. Revision of Eocene electric rays

749 (Torpediniformes, Batomorphii) from the Bolca Konservat-Lagerstätte, Italy, reveals the first

750 fossil embryo in situ in batoids and provides new insights into the origin of trophic novelties in

751 coral reef fishes. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* DOI:10.1080/14772019.2017.1371257.

752

753 Marramà G, Engelbrecht A, Carnevale G, Kriwet J. 2017b. Eocene sand tiger sharks

754 (Lamniformes, Odontaspididae) from the Bolca Konservat-Lagerstätte, Italy: Palaeobiology,

755 palaeobiogeography and evolutionary significance. *Historical Biology* 2017:1-15 DOI:

756 10.1080/08912963.2017.1341503.

757

758   Marramà G, Lombardo C, Tintori A, Carnevale G. 2017c. Redescription of '*Perleidus*'

759   (Osteichthyes, Actinopterygii) from the Early Triassic of northwestern Madagascar. *Rivista*

760   *Italiana di Paleontologia e Stratigrafia* 123:219-242. DOI: https://doi.org/10.13130/2039-

761   4942/8328.

762

763   Mohabey DM, Udhoji SG. 1996. *Pycnodus lametae* (Pycnodontidae), a holostean fish from

764   freshwater Upper Cretaceous Lameta Formation of Maharashtra. *Journal of the Geological*

765   *Society of India* 47:593-598. http://www.geosocindia.org/index.php/jgsi/article/view/68397.

766

767   Myers RF. 1999. *Mirconesian reef fishes. A comprehensive guide to the coral reef fishes of*

768   *Micronesia.* Coral Graphics: Guam, USA.

769

770   Nagelkerken I. 2007. Are non-estuarine mangroves connected to coral reefs through fish

771   migration? *Bulletin of Marine Science* 80:595-607.

772

773   Nagelkerken I, Roberts CM, van der Velde G, Dorenbosch M, van Riel MC, Cocheret de la

774   Moriniere E, Nienhuis PH. 2002. How important are mangroves and seagrass beds for coral-reef

775   fish? The nursery hypothesis tested on an island scale. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 244:299-

776   305. DOI: doi:10.3354/meps244299.

777

778   Nakamura Y, Horinouchi M, Shibuno T, Tanaka Y, MiyajimaT, Koike I, Kurokura H, Sano M.

779   2008. Evidence of ontogenetic migration from mangroves to coral reefs by black-tail snapper

780   *Lutjanus fulvus*: stable isotope approach. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 355:257-66. DOI:

781   https://doi.org/10.3354/meps07234.

782

783   Olsen PE. 1984. The skull and pectoral girdle of the parasemionotid fish *Watsonulus*

784   *eugnathoides* from the Early Triassic Sakamena Group of Madagascar, with comments on the

785   relationships of the holostean fishes. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 4:481-499. DOI:

786   https://doi.org/10.1080/02724634.1984.10012024.

787

788 Pankhurst NW, Montgomery JC. 1990. Ontogeny of vision in the Antarctic fish *Pagothenia*

789 *borchgrevinki* (Nototheniidae). *Polar biology* 10:419-422. DOI:

790 https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00233689.

791

792 Papazzoni CA, Carnevale G, Fornaciari E, Giusberti, L, Trevisani, E. 2014. The Pesciara-Monte

793 Postale Fossil-Lagerstätte: 1. Biostratigraphy, sedimentology and depositional model. *The Bolca*

794 *Fossil-Lagerstätte: A Window into the Eocene World: Rendiconti della Società Paleontologica*

795 *Italiana*, 4:29-36.

796

797 Patterson C. 1973. Interrelationships of holosteans. In: Greenwood PH, Miles RS, Patterson C.

798 eds. *Interrelationships of Fishes.* Academic Press: London, 233-305.

799

800 Pictet FJ, Campiche G, Tribolet G de. 1858-60. *Description des fossiles du terrain Crétacé des*

801 *environs de Sainte-Croix. Première Partie.* Genève: J. Kessmann & H. Georg.

802

803 Poyato-Ariza FJ. 2005. Pycnodont fishes: morphologic variation, ecomorphologic plasticity, and

804 a new interpretation of their evolutionary history. *Bulletin of the Kitakyushu Museum of Natural*

805 *History and Human History* 3:169-184.

806

807 Poyato-Ariza FJ. 2013. *Sylvienodus*, a new replacement genus for the Cretaceous

808 pycnodontiform fish "*Pycnodus" laveirensis*. *Comptes Rendus Palevol* 12:91-100. DOI:

809 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crpv.2013.01.001.

810

811 Poyato-Ariza FJ. 2015. Studies on pycnodont fishes (I): Evaluation of their phylogenetic position

812 among actinopterygians. *Rivista Italiana di Paleontologia e Stratigrafia*. 121:329-343. DOI:

813 http://dx.doi.org/10.13130/2039-4942/6521.

814

815 Poyato-Ariza FJ, Wenz S. 2002. A new insight into pycnodontiform fishes. *Geodiversitas*

816 24:139-248. http://sciencepress.mnhn.fr/en/periodiques/geodiversitas/24/1/un-nouveau-regard-

817 sur-les-poissons-pycnodontiformes

818

819   Poyato-Ariza, FJ, Talbot, MR, Fregenal-MartInez, MA, Melendez, N, Wenz, S. 1998. First

820   isotopic and multidisciplinary evidence for nonmarine coelacanths and pycnodontiform fishes:

821   palaeoenvironmental implications. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*.

822   144:65-84. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-0182(98)00085-6.

823

824   Prasad, GVR, Sahni, A. 1987. Coastal-plain microvertebrate assemblage from the terminal

825   Cretaceous of Asifabad, Peninsular India. *Journal of the Palaeontological Society of India* 32:5-

826   19.

827

828   Prasad GVR, Singh V. 1991. Microvertebrates from the Infiatrappean Beds of Rangareddi

829   District, Andhra Pradesh and their biostratigraphic significance. *Bulletin of the Indian*

830   *Geologists' Association* 24:1-20.

831

832   Priem F. 1897. Sur les poissons de l'Éocène du Mont Mokattam (Égypte). *Bulletin de la Société*

833   *géologique de France, (Serie 3)* 25:212-227.

834

835   Priem F. 1902. Sur des pycnodontes tertiaires du departement de l'Aude. *Bulletin de la Société*

836   *géologique de France, (Serie 4)* 10:44-49.

837

838   Reuss A. 1845. *Die Versteinerungen der bohmischen Kreideformationen.* Stuttgart:

839   Schweitzerbart.

840

841   Roemer FA. 1841. *Die Versteinerungen des norddeutschen Kreidegebirges.* Hannover:

842   Hahn'sche Hofbuchhandlung.

843

844   Rohlf FJ. 2003. *TpsRelw, relative warps analysis, version 1.36.* State University of New York at

845   Stony Brook: Department of Ecology and Evolution. http://life.bio.sunysb.edu/morph/

846

847   Rohlf FJ. 2005. *TpsDig, Digitize Landmarks and Outlines, version 2.05.* State University of New

848   York at Stony Brook: Department of Ecology and Evolution.

849

850   Rohlf FJ, Slice DE. 1990. Extensions of the Procrustes method for the optimal superimposition
851   of landmarks. *Systematic Biology* 39:40-59. DOI: https://doi.org/10.2307/2992207.

852

853   Rohlf FJ, Corti M. 2000. Use of two-block partial least-squares to study covariation in shape.
854   *Systematic Biology* 49:740-753. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/106351500750049806.

855

856   Salgado-Ugarte, I. H., Shimizu, M., Taniuchi, T., and Matsushita, K., 2000, Size Frequency
857   Analysis by averaged shifted histograms and kernel density estimators. *Asian Fisheries Science*
858   13:1-12.

859

860   Sauvage HE. 1880. Synopsis des poissons et des reptiles des terrains jurassiques de Boulogne-
861   sur-Mer. *Bulletin de la Société géologique de France, (Serie 3)* 8:524-547.

862

863   Sauvage HE. 1893. Note sur quelques poissons du calcaire bitumineux d'Orbagnoux (Ain).
864   *Bulletin de la Société d'Histoire naturelle d' Autun* 6:1-17.

865

866   Savornin MJ. 1915. Les pycnodontes eocenes de i'Algerie. *Comptes Rendus, Association*
867   *Francaise pour I'Avancement de Science* 43:368-377.

868

869   Sferco E, López-Arbarello A, Báez AM. 2015. Anatomical description and taxonomy of
870   †*Luisiella feruglioi* (Bordas), new combination, a freshwater teleost (Actinopterygii, Teleostei)
871   from the Upper Jurassic of Patagonia. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 35:e924958, DOI:
872   10.1080/02724634.2014.924958.

873

874   Shibuno T, Nakamura Y, Horinouchi M, Sano M. 2008. Habitat use patterns of fishes across the
875   mangrove-seagrass-coral reef seascape at Ishigaki Island, southern Japan. *Ichthyological*
876   *Research* 55:218–37. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s10228-007-0022-1.

877

878   Simon KD, Bakar Y, Temple SE, Mazlan AG. 2010. Morphometric and meristic variation in two
879   congeneric archer fishes *Toxotes chatareus* (Hamilton 1822) and *Toxotes jaculatrix* (Pallas 1767)

880   inhabiting Malaysian coastal waters. *Journal of Zhejiang University Science B* 11:871-879. DOI:
881   https://doi.org/10.1631/jzus.B1000054.

883   Stensiö E. 1935. *Sinamia zdanskyi,* a new amiid from the Lower Cretaceous of Shantung, China.
884   *Paleontologia Sinica, Series C* 3:1-148.

886   Su DT. 1973. A new *Sinamia* (*S. huananensis*, sp. nov.) from
887   the Upper Jurassic of Southern Anhui. *Vertebrata PalAsiatica* 11:149-153.

889   Taverne L. 1997. Les poissons crétacés de Nardo 5° *Pycnodus nardoensis* sp. nov. et
890   considérations sur l'ostéologie du genre *Pycnodus* (Actinopterygii, Halecostomi,
891   Pycnodontiformes). *Bolletino del Museo civico di Storia naturale di Verona* 21:437-454.

893   Taverne L. 2003. Les poissons crétacés de Nardò. 15. Etude complémentaire de *Pseudopycnodus*
894   *nardoensis* (Taverne, 1997) nov. gen.(Actinopterygii, Halecostomi, Pycnodontiformes).
895   *Bollettino del Museo Civico di Storia Naturale di Verona, Geologia Paleontologia Preistoria*
896   27:15-28.

898   Taverne L, Nolf D. 1978. Troisième note sur les poissons des Sables de Lede (Eocène belge): les
899   fossiles autres que les otolithes. *Bulletin de la Société Belge de Géologie* 87:125–152.

901   Thies D, Hauff RB. 2011. A new species of *Dapedium* Leach, 1822 (Actinopterygii,
902   Neopterygii, Semionotiformes) from the Early Jurassic of South Germany. *Palaeodiversity*
903   4:185-221.

905   Tintori A. 1981. Two new pycnodonts (Pisces, Actinopterygii) from the Upper Triassic of
906   Lombardy (N. Italy). *Rivista Italiana di Palaeontologia e stratigrafia* 86:795-824.

908   Tintori A. 1990. The actinopterygian fish *Prohalecites* from the Triassic of Northern Italy.
909   *Palaeontology* 33:155-174.
910

911   Tintori A, Zuoyu S, Peigang N, Lombardo C, Dayong J, Motani R. 2015. Oldest stem Teleostei

912   from the Late Ladinian (Middle Triassic) of Southern China. *Rivista Italiana di Paleontologia e*

913   *Stratigrafia* 121:285-296. DOI: https://doi.org/10.13130/2039-4942/6519.

914

915   Tuset, VM, Farré M, Lombarte A, Bordes F, Wienerroither R, Olivar P. 2014. A comparative

916   study of morphospace occupation of mesopelagic fish assemblages from the Canary Islands

917   (North-eastern Atlantic). *Ichthyological research* 61:152-158. DOI:

918   https://doi.org/10.1007/s10228-014-0390-2.

919

920   Veiga Ferreira O. 1961. Fauna ictyologica do Cretacico de Portugal. *Communicaçoes dos*

921   *Serviços Geológicos de Portugal* 45:249-278.

922

923   Vescogni A, Bosellini FR, Papazzoni CA, Giusberti L, Roghi G, Fornaciari E, Dominici S,

924   Zorzin R. 2016. Coralgal buildups associated with the Bolca Fossil-Lagerstätten: new evidence

925   from the Ypresian of Monte Postale (NE Italy). *Facies* 62:1-20. DOI: 10.1007/s10347-016-0472-

926   x.

927

928   Volta GS. 1796. *Ittiolitologia Veronese del Museo Bozziano ora annesso a quello del Conte*

929   *Giovambattista Gazola e di altri gabinetti di fossili Veronesi con la versione latina*. Verona:

930   Stamperia Giuliari.

931

932   Webb PW. 1982. Locomotor patterns in the evolution of actinopterygian fishes. *American*

933   *Zoologist* 22:329-342. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/22.2.329.

934

935   Weitschat W. 2008. Intraspecific variation of *Svalbardiceras spitzbergensis* (Frebold) from the

936   Early Triassic (Spathian) of Spitsbergen. *Polar Research* 27:292-297. DOI: 10.1111/j.1751-

937   8369.2008.00041.x.

938

939   Wetherbee BM, Holland KN, Meyer CG, Lowe CG. 2004. Use of a marine reserve in Kaneohe

940   Bay, Hawaii by the giant trevally, *Caranx ignobilis. Fisheries Research* 67:253-263. DOI:

941   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.fishres.2003.11.004.

942

943 White EI. 1934. Fossil fishes from Sokoto province. *Bulletin of the Geological Survey of Nigeria*

944 14:1-78.

945

946 Wilson GG. 1998. A description of the early juvenile colour patterns of eleven *Lethrinus* species

947 (Pisces: Lethrinidae) from the Great Barrier Reef, Australia. *Records of the Australian Museum*

948 50:55-83. DOI:10.3853/j.0067-1975.50.1998.1274.

949

950 Woodward AS 1908. On some fish-remains from the Lameta beds at Dangargaon, Central

951 Provinces. *Palaeontologia Indica* 3:1-6.

952

953 Woodward AS. 1918. The fossil fishes of the English Wealden and Purbeck Formations. Part 2.

954 *Monographs of the Palaeontographical Society* 70:49-104.

955

956 Wretman L, Blom H, Kear BP. 2016. Resolution of the Early Jurassic actinopterygian fish

957 *Pachycormus* and a dispersal hypothesis for Pachycormiformes. *Journal of Vertebrate*

958 *Paleontology* 36:e1206022, DOI:10.1080/02724634.2016.1206022.

959

960 Xu GH, Shen CC, Zhao LJ. 2014. *Pteronisculus nielseni* sp. nov., a new stem-actinopteran fish

961 from the Middle Triassic of Luoping, Yunnan Province, China. *Vertebrata PalAsiatica* 52:364-

962 380.

963

964 Zelditch M, Swiderski D, Sheets, DH, Fink, W. 2004. *Geometric Morphometrics for Biologists:*

965 *A primer.* Waltham: Elsevier Academic Press.

966

967 Zhang MM, Zhang H. 1980. Discovery of *Ikechaoamia* from South China. *Vertebrata*

968 *PalAsiatica* 18:89-93.

969
970

971 **Figure captions**

972

973 Figure 1: Landmarks represented by red circles, which were used on *Pycnodus* (MCSNV T.998)
974 for the geometric morphometric analysis. These are 1) tip of premaxilla; 2) ventralmost margin
975 of orbit; 3) posteriormost margin of orbit; 4) anteriormost margin of orbit; 5) dorsalmost margin
976 of orbit; 6) first dorsal pterygiophore; 7) last dorsal pterygiophore; 8) tip of dorsal lobe of caudal
977 fin; 9) medial convex margin of caudal fin; 10) tip of ventral lobe of caudal fin; 11) final anal
978 pterygiophore; 12) first anal pterygiophore; 13) posterior cloacal scale; 14) anterior cloacal scale;
979 15) joint between quadrate and prearticular; 16) ventral most concave margin of cleithrum
980 accommodating pectoral fin; 17) dorsal most concave margin of cleithrum accommodating
981 pectoral fin; 18) Point of contact between neurocranium and vertebral column. The
982 semilandmarks are reperesented by small white circles and are split into two sets; the first set
983 consists of seven semilandmarks between the tip of the dermosupraoccipital and the base of the
984 first principal caudal fin ray; the second set has an additional seven semilandmarks between the
985 base of the ventral most principal caudal fin ray and the antero-ventral corner of the cleithrum.
986 Photo credit: Jürgen Kriwet.
987
988 Figure 2: Morphospace of *Pycnodus* on the first two RW axes together accounting for about 66%
989 of the overall shape variation. Deformation grids illustrate the shapes lying at extreme values
990 along each axis.
991
992 Figure 3: Morphospace of *Pycnodus* showing RW 1 on the x-axis and RW 3 on y-axis the latter
993 accounting for 6% of the overall shape variation. Deformation grids illustrate the shapes lying at
994 extreme values along each axis.
995
996 Figure 4: PLS analysis showing a correlation of morphometric variation with size. Smallest,
997 medium sized and largest specimens are used to represent the juvenile, small adult and large
998 adult stages respectively. Significance of this correlation is shown by the r and p-values.
999 Smallest specimen is 4.02 cm,medium sized specimen is 10.6 cm, largest specimen is 30.6 cm.
1000
1001 Figure 5: Histograms showing the distributions of meristic characters of *Pycnodus*. The x-axis
1002 represents the number of elements and the y-axis the relative frequency. Red curved line is the
1003 Kernel density estimator which measures the normality of each sample which reveals that there
1004 is a non-Gaussian distribution among all the samples. (A) Vertebrae. (B) Rib pairs. (C) Scale
1005 bars. (D) Dorsal fin rays. (E) Anal fin rays. (F) Pectoral fin rays. (G) Pelvic fin rays. (H) Dorsal
1006 fin pterygiophores. (I) Anal fin pterygiophores. (J) Caudal fin rays. (K) Arcocentra
1007 interdigitations.
1008
1009 Figure 6: Scatterplots and regression lines with 95% confidence bands of the relationships
1010 between each morphometric character and the standard length of *Pycnodus*. (A) Head length. (B)
1011 Head depth. (C) Maximum body depth. (D) Pectoral fin base. (E) Dorsal fin base. (F) Anal fin
1012 base. (G) Caudal peduncle length. (H) Caudal peduncle depth. (I) Caudal fin span.   (J)

1013   Prepectoral distance. (K) Predorsal distance. (L) Prepelvic distance. (M) Preanal distance. (N)
1014   Preorbital length. (O) Postorbital length. (P) Orbit diameter. (Q) Lower jaw length.
1015
1016   Figure 7: Ontogenetic series of *Pycnodus*. (A) juvenile 4.02 cm (MCSNV T.309). (B) small adult
1017   13.25 cm (BSPG AS I 1208). (C) large adult 30.61 cm (BSPG AS I 1209). Scale bar for all
1018   specimens equals 1 cm. Photo credit: Jürgen Kriwet.
1019
1020   **Table captions**
1021
1022   Table 1: ANOSIM results. R-value is 0.10 and P-value is 0.06.
1023
1024   Table 2: PERMANOVA results. F-value is 2.83 and P-value is 0.03.
1025
1026   Table 3: Measurements as percentage of SL (mean values in parentheses) used for identifying
1027   *Pycnodus apodus*. Range of measurements are represented by the 25th and 75th percentile.
1028
1029   Table 4: Mean meristic values used for identifying *Pycnodus apodus*. Range of meristic counts
1030   are represented by the 25th and 75th percentile.
1031
1032   Table 5: Mean morphometric and meristic data for the examined specimens of *Pycnodus*.
1033
1034   Table 6: Relationships between morphometric characters and standard length using least squares
1035   regression for *Pycnodus*.
1036
1037   Table 7: Meristic counts of *Pycnodus*. Museum abbreviations are mentioned in main text.

Figure 1

Landmarks represented by red circles, which were used on *Pycnodus* (MCSNV T.998) for the geometric morphometric analysis.

These are 1) tip of premaxilla; 2) ventralmost margin of orbit; 3) posteriormost margin of orbit; 4) anteriormost margin of orbit; 5) dorsalmost margin of orbit; 6) first dorsal pterygiophore; 7) last dorsal pterygiophore; 8) tip of dorsal lobe of caudal fin; 9) medial convex margin of caudal fin; 10) tip of ventral lobe of caudal fin; 11) final anal pterygiophore; 12) first anal pterygiophore; 13) posterior cloacal scale; 14) anterior cloacal scale; 15) joint between quadrate and prearticular; 16) ventral most concave margin of cleithrum accommodating pectoral fin; 17) dorsal most concave margin of cleithrum accommodating pectoral fin; 18) Point of contact between neurocranium and vertebral column. The semilandmarks are reperesented by small white circles and are split into two sets; the first set consists of seven semilandmarks between the tip of the dermosupraoccipital and the base of the first principal caudal fin ray; the second set has an additional seven semilandmarks between the base of the ventral most principal caudal fin ray and the antero-ventral corner of the cleithrum. Photo credit: Jürgen Kriwet.

Figure 2

Morphospace of *Pycnodus* on the first two RW axes together accounting for about 66% of the overall shape variation.

Deformation grids illustrate the shapes lying at extreme values along each axis.

Figure 3

Morphospace of *Pycnodus* showing RW 1 on the x-axis and RW 3 on y-axis the latter accounting for 6% of the overall shape variation.

Deformation grids illustrate the shapes lying at extreme values along each axis.

Figure 4

PLS analysis showing a correlation of morphometric variation with size.

Smallest, medium sized and largest specimens are used to represent the juvenile, small adult and large adult stages respectively. Significance of this correlation is shown by the r and p-values. Smallest specimen is 4.02 cm, medium sized specimen is 10.6 cm, largest specimen is 30.6 cm.

r= 0.88
p < 0.05

Figure 5

Histograms showing the distributions of meristic characters of *Pycnodus*.

The x-axis represents the number of elements and the y-axis the relative frequency. Red curved line is the Kernel density estimator which measures the normality of each sample which reveals that there is a non-Gaussian distribution among all the samples. (A) Vertebrae. (B) Rib pairs. (C) Scale bars. (D) Dorsal fin rays. (E) Anal fin rays. (F) Pectoral fin rays. (G) Pelvic fin rays. (H) Dorsal fin pterygiophores. (I) Anal fin pterygiophores. (J) Caudal fin rays. (K) Arcocentra interdigitations.

PeerJ

Figure 6

Scatterplots and regression lines with 95% confidence bands of the relationships between each morphometric character and the standard length of *Pycnodus*.

(A) Head length. (B) Head depth. (C) Maximum body depth. (D) Pectoral fin base. (E) Dorsal fin base. (F) Anal fin base. (G) Caudal peduncle length. (H) Caudal peduncle depth. (I) Caudal fin span. (J) Prepectoral distance. (K) Predorsal distance. (L) Prepelvic distance. (M) Preanal distance. (N) Preorbital length. (O) Postorbital length. (P) Orbit diameter. (Q) Lower jaw length.

Figure 7

Ontogenetic series of *Pycnodus.*

(A) juvenile 4.02 cm (MCSNV T.309). (B) small adult 13.25 cm (BSPG AS I 1208). (C) large adult 30.61 cm (BSPG AS I 1209). Scale bar for all specimens equals 1 cm. Photo credit: Jürgen Kriwet.

Table 1 (on next page)

ANOSIM results.

R-value is 0.10 and P-value is 0.06.

1

ANOSIM	*P. apodus*	*P. gibbus*	*P. platessus*	*Pycnodus* sp.
P. apodus	0	0.3583	0.7879	0.1717
P. gibbus	0.3583	0	0.3411	0.4755
P. platessus	0.7879	0.3411	0	0.0389
Pycnodus sp.	0.1717	0.4755	0.0389	0

2

Table 2(on next page)

PERMANOVA results.

F-value is 2.83 and P-value is 0.03.

PERMANOVA	*P. apodus*	*P. gibbus*	*P. platessus*	*Pycnodus* sp.
P. apodus	0	0.3228	0.5671	0.1586
P. gibbus	0.3228	0	0.2358	0.2876
P. platessus	0.5671	0.2358	0	0.0048
Pycnodus sp.	0.1586	0.2876	0.0048	0

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

Table 3(on next page)

Measurements as percentage of SL (mean values in parentheses) used for identifying *Pycnodus apodus*.

Range of measurements are represented by the 25th and 75th percentile.

1
2

Morphometric character	Measurements in % of SL
Head length	27.9-32.9 (30.4)
Head depth	48.5-57.7 (53.1)
Maximum body depth	55.6-65.1 (60.8)
Pectoral fin base	6.5-9.2 (8.1)
Dorsal fin base	37.4-44.3 (40.9)
Anal fin base	25.3-29.4 (27.8)
Caudal peduncle depth	3.8-5.1 (4.6)
Caudal peduncle length	13.6-15.7 (14.7)
Caudal fin span	32.9-38.6 (35.9)
Prepectoral distance	28.1-30.7 (29.6)
Predorsal distance	41.9-48.3 (45.2)
Prepelvic distance	48.6-52.7 (50.4)
Preanal distance	56.9-60.3 (58.6)
Preorbital distance	9.9-14.4 (12.3)
Postorbital length	5.4-8.3 (7.1)
Orbit diameter	9.3-12.5 (11.0)
Lower jaw	12.5-16.5 (14.7)

3
4
5
6
7
8
9

Table 4(on next page)

Mean meristic values used for identifying *Pycnodus apodus*.

Range of meristic counts are represented by the 25th and 75th percentile.

1

Meristic Character	Mean meristic value
Vertebrae	24-26 (25)
Rib pairs	10-12 (11)
Scale bars	8-10 (9)
Dorsal fin rays	54-60 (56)
Anal fin rays	42-48 (45)
Pectoral fin rays	30-40 (35)
Dorsal fin pterygiophores	53-60 (56)
Anal fin pterygiophores	41-41 (45)
Caudal fin rays	25-34 (30)

2

Table 5(on next page)

Mean morphometric and meristic data for the examined specimens of *Pycnodus*.

Morphometric/meristic data	Min	Max	Mean	Median	Variance	Standard deviation	25th percentile	75th percentile
Standard length	2.9	27.7	11.1	8.8	46.7	6.8	5.9	16.4
Head length	1.1	7.1	3.3	2.8	2.9	1.7	2.0	4.6
Head depth	2.0	11.6	5.6	4.4	7.7	2.8	3.5	7.8
Maximum body depth	2.1	13.4	5.8	4.9	8.4	2.9	3.8	7.4
Pectoral fin base	0.2	1.8	0.8	0.7	0.2	0.4	0.5	1.1
Dorsal fin base	1.1	12.5	4.9	3.7	10.5	3.2	2.4	6.3
Anal fin base	0.7	9.6	3.4	2.5	5.6	2.4	1.6	5.0
Caudal peduncle depth	0.2	1.2	0.5	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.3	0.6
Caudal peduncle length	0.6	3.7	1.6	1.3	0.8	0.9	1.0	2.4
Caudal fin span	0.9	10.7	4.1	3.0	6.7	2.6	2.2	6.9
Prepectoral distance	1.1	7.2	3.1	2.8	2.5	1.6	1.9	4.0
Predorsal distance	1.6	11.0	5.0	4.2	7.4	2.7	2.9	7.6
Prepelvic distance	1.7	12.4	5.3	4.3	8.9	3.0	3.2	6.4
Preanal distance	2.2	14.2	6.6	5.4	12.8	3.6	3.7	9.3
Preorbital distance	0.3	4.1	1.4	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.8	1.9
Postorbital length	0.3	1.7	0.7	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.5	0.8
Orbit diameter	0.4	2.2	1.1	1.0	0.2	0.4	0.8	1.3
Lower jaw	0.5	4.6	1.7	1.3	1.1	1.0	0.9	2.4
Vertebrae	23	27	25.1	25	1.4	1.2	24	26
Rib pairs	9	13	11.1	11	1.1	1.1	10	12
Scale bars	7	11	8.7	8	0-9	1.0	8	10
Dorsal fin rays	46	66	56.4	56	18.2	4.3	54	60
Anal fin rays	37	52	45.0	45	14.5	3.8	42	47.8
Pectoral fin rays	24	47	35.2	35.5	43.9	6.6	30.3	39.8
Pelvic fin rays	3	5	4.3	4	0.6	0.8	4	5
Dorsal fin pterygiophores	38	65	55.8	57	30.5	5.5	52.8	60
Anal fin pterygiophores	39	58	44.8	45	16.3	4.0	41	47
Caudal fin rays	22	43	29.5	29	35.8	6.0	24.5	33.5
Arcocentra interdigitations	2	3	2	2	0	0.2	2	2

1
2
3

Table 6(on next page)

Relationships between morphometric characters and standard length using least squares regression for *Pycnodus*.

Variable character log (y)	Slope (a)	Intercept (b)	Coefficient of determination (r^2)	95% CI on a		95% CI on b	
Head length	0.86	-0.38	0.97	0.80	0.90	-0.42	-0.33
Head depth	0.80	-0.09	0.98	0.77	0.83	-0.11	-0.06
Maximum body depth	0.83	-0.06	0.99	0.81	0.85	-0.08	-0.04
Pectoral fin base	0.89	-1.00	0.76	0.77	0.99	-1.11	-0.88
Dorsal fin base	1.12	-0.51	0.97	1.07	1.17	-0.56	-0.46
Anal fin base	1.16	-0.71	0.97	1.09	1.22	-0.78	-0.64
Caudal peduncle depth	0.77	-1.13	0.89	0.68	0.87	-1.23	-1.05
Caudal peduncle length	0.91	-0.75	0.97	0.85	0.97	-0.81	-0.69
Caudal fin span	1.04	-0.49	0.98	1.00	1.09	-0.54	-0.45
Prepectoral distance	0.87	-0.40	0.98	0.83	0.90	-0.43	-0.36
Predorsal distance	0.91	-0.26	0.98	0.86	0.95	-0.30	-0.21
Prepelvic distance	0.92	-0.22	0.99	0.89	0.94	-0.24	-0.19
Preanal distance	0.93	-0.17	0.99	0.91	0.95	-0.19	-0.14
Preorbital distance	1.09	-1.01	0.89	0.99	1.20	-1.12	-0.90
Postorbital length	0.66	-0.83	0.78	0.56	0.76	-0.93	-0.74
Orbit diameter	0.64	-0.63	0.89	0.57	0.71	-0.69	-0.56
Lower jaw	0.94	-0.78	0.92	0.87	1.02	-0.86	-0.70

1
2

Table 7(on next page)

Meristic counts of *Pycnodus*.

Museum abbreviations are mentioned in main text.

Species name on museum label	Specimen no.	No. of vertebrae	Rib pairs	No. of scale bars	Dorsal fin rays	Anal fin rays	Pectoral fin rays	Pelvic fin rays	Dorsal fin pterygiophores	Anal fin pterygiophores	Caudal fin rays	Arcocentra interdigitations	Museum
Pycnodus sp.	12058	26	13	8	60	?	39	?	57	?	32	2	MGP-PD
Pycnodus sp.	12059	25	?	9	52	?	44	?	53	?	29	2	MGP-PD
Pycnodus sp.	12808	24	12	8	?	?	44	?	?	40	26	2	MGP-PD
Pycnodus sp.	12809	25	?	8	56	42	28	?	56	44	30	2	MGP-PD
Pycnodus sp.	26968	?	12	8	?	43	33	?	?	40	?	2	MGP-PD
Pycnodus sp.	26969	25	11	10	55	46	25	?	58	44	30	2	MGP-PD
Pycnodus platessus	1853.XXVI.i.a/b	25	10	9	61	46	47	5	?	47	?	2	NHMW
Pycnodus platessus	1855.VI.75	23	10	8	54	42	38	3	54	40	24	2	NHMW
Pycnodus platessus	6880Z	25	13	10	?	?	36	?	48	?	22	2	MGP-PD
Pycnodus gibbus	7433C	25	11	9	?	?	?	4	52	?	25	2	MGP-PD
Pycnodus platessus	8867C	26	11	8	56	?	?	?	57	46	23	?	MGP-PD
Pycnodus platessus	8868C	?	13	7	54	49	?	?	60	46	25	3	MGP-PD
Pycnodus platessus	A.III.a.S.48	24	11	8	56	45	?	?	59	46	28	2	NHMW
Pycnodus platessus	BMNH 38000	26	10	8	66	?	?	5	65	48	24	?	BMNH
Pycnodus gibbus	BMNH P.11992	27	11	10	55	?	?	3	60	46	26	2	BMNH
Pycnodus gibbus	BMNH P.1632/P.3760	27	11	11	49	?	?	3	53	?	31	2	BMNH
Pycnodus platessus	BMNH P.1633	25	11	9	59	47	31	5	62	45	29	2	BMNH
Pycnodus gibbus	BMNH P.17025	24	10	10	52	41	30	?	49	39	27	2	BMNH
Pycnodus gibbus	BMNH P.4386	?	12	10	?	?	46	5	?	?	43	2	BMNH
Pycnodus gibbus	BMNH P.44519	26	12	8	61	50	35	3	63	44	36	2	BMNH
Pycnodus gibbus	BMNH P.44520	26	10	9	62	39	?	?	60	?	37	2	BMNH
Pycnodus platessus	BMNH P.7459	?	10	8	63	45	36	5	59	51	34	2	BMNH
Pycnodus apodus	Bol 126/127	26	11	10	52	?	40	5	?	?	33	2	MNHN
Pycnodus apodus	Bol 130/131	?	10	9	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	2	MNHN
Pycnodus apodus	Bol 134/135	25	11	10	59	52	?	5	61	48	37	?	MNHN
Pycnodus apodus	Bol 94/95	26	11	8	62	52	?	?	59	45	43	2	MNHN
Pycnodus platessus	BSPG AS I 1208	24	9	8	53	42	40	4	56	44	42	2	BSPG
Pycnodus platessus	BSPG AS I 1209	26	12	8	60	47	?	?	58	48	22	2	BSPG
Pycnodus platessus	CM 4479	?	12	8	?	?	?	5	?	?	?	?	CM
Pycnodus platessus	CM 4479a	?	12	8	?	?	?	?	52	41	?	?	CM
Pycnodus gibbus	CM 4480	24	?	8	60	49	45	4	61	50	34	2	CM

Pycnodus gibbus	CM 4480.1	26	11	7	59	48	?	?	60	48	39	2	CM
Pycnodus gibbus	CM 4481	24	11	8	59	46	35	4	58	46	40	2	CM
Pycnodus sp.	Coll Baja Pesciara 4 (T.998)	25	13	8	56	44	28	?	56	43	30	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	Coll Baja Pesciara 5 (T.999)	23	?	9	55	43	25	?	58	41	24	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	I.G.135608	23	9	8	58	46	?	4	59	58	31	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	I.G.135609	23	10	10	59	44	24	5	59	41	?	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	I.G.135664	26	12	8	49	37	?	?	46	?	30	?	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	II D 167	27	11	8	51	47	33	?	51	46	25	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	II D 168	25	?	9	54	44	?	?	55	40	25	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	II D 170	27	?	7	59	51	?	?	60	47	28	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	II D 171	27	11	8	56	42	?	?	53	41	24	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	II D 180	25	11	9	60	49	32	4	62	50	33	?	MCSNV
Pycnodus gibbus	PF 3234	25	13	10	54	?	38	5	56	?	25	2	FMNH
Pycnodus sp.	(I.G.23???)	25	11	9	54	43	?	4	55	42	23	?	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	(I.G.186666)	26	10	10	46	39	?	?	50	42	23	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	(I.G.186667)	25	11	10	?	?	?	?	43	?	27	2	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	(I.G.24497)	24	11	9	?	?	?	?	38	?	22	?	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	unknown	23	10	8	54	41	?	?	51	40	30	?	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	(I.G.135680)	?	9	10	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	I.G.37581	?	12	?	?	?	?	?	?	?	23	?	MCSNV
Pycnodus sp.	T.309	24	11	8	?	?	?	?	?	?	34	?	MCSNV

1
2
3