

# Wolf spider burrows from a modern saline sandflat in central Argentina: morphology, taphonomy and recognition of fossil examples (#25403)

1

First submission

## Editor guidance

Please submit by **2 Apr 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.



### Raw data check

Review the raw data. Download from the location [described by the author](#).



### 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](#).

8 Figure file(s)

9 Other file(s)



## 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.*

# Wolf spider burrows from a modern saline sandflat in central Argentina: morphology, taphonomy and recognition of fossil examples

Fatima Mendoza Belmontes <sup>Corresp., 1</sup>, Ricardo N Melchor <sup>2</sup>, Luis N Piacentini <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> UNLPam, FONCyT doctoral scholar, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, Argentina

<sup>2</sup> INCITAP- UNLPam, CONICET, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, Argentina

<sup>3</sup> Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernardino Rivadavia', CONICET, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Corresponding Author: Fatima Mendoza Belmontes

Email address: famebel@exactas.unlpam.edu.ar

*Pavocosa* sp. (Lycosidae) burrows found in an open sparsely vegetated area on the edge of the saline lake the "Gran Salitral", in central Argentina, are described. Burrows were studied by capturing the occupant and casting them with dental plaster. The hosting sediments and vegetation were also characterized. Inhabited *Pavocosa* sp. burrows display distinctive features as open, cylindrical, nearly vertical, silk lined shafts about 120 mm long, subcircular entrances, a gradual downward widening, and a particularly distinctive surface ornamentation in the form of sets of two linear parallel marks at a high angle to the burrow axis. Instead, casts of vacated *Pavocosa* sp. burrows showed some disturbances caused either by the reoccupation by another organism or by predation of the dweller. Two morphologies are related to reoccupation of burrows: those with a structure in form of an "umbrella" and another with smaller excavations at the bottom of the burrow. Predation by armadillos produces funnel-shaped burrows. Both active and abandoned *Pavocosa* sp. burrow casts are compared with existing ichnogenera and its distinction is discussed. It is argued that key features like the presence of a neck, a downward widening and the surface texture will allow recognition of wolf spider burrows in the fossil record. Fossil wolf spiders are recorded since the Paleogene (possibly Late Cretaceous), so Cenozoic continental rocks can contain wolf spider burrows awaiting recognition. In addition, the particular distribution of *Pavocosa* sp. in saline lakes may imply that this type of burrows are linked to saline environments.

# **Wolf spider burrows from a modern saline sandflat in central Argentina: morphology, taphonomy and recognition of fossil examples**

Fatima Mendoza-Belmontes<sup>1</sup>, Ricardo N. Melchor<sup>2</sup> and Luis Piacentini<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> FONCyT doctoral scholar, UNLPam, Av. Uruguay 151, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, 6300, Argentina

<sup>2</sup> INCITAP (CONICET and Universidad Nacional de La Pampa), Av. Uruguay 151, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, 6300, Argentina

<sup>3</sup> Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernardino Rivadavia'—CONICET, Av. Ángel Gallardo 470, C1405DJR, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Corresponding Author:

Fatima Mendoza-Belmontes<sup>1</sup>

Av. Uruguay 151, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, 6300, Argentina

Email address: fa.mzbelmontes@gmail.com

# ABSTRACT

*Pavocosa* sp. (Lycosidae) burrows found in an open sparsely vegetated area on the edge of the saline lake the “Gran Salitral”, in central Argentina, are described. Burrows were studied by capturing the occupant and casting them with dental plaster. The hosting sediments and vegetation were also characterized. Inhabited *Pavocosa* sp. burrows display distinctive features as open, cylindrical, nearly vertical, silk lined shafts about 120 mm long, subcircular entrances, a gradual downward widening, and a particularly distinctive surface ornamentation in the form of sets of two linear parallel marks at a high angle to the burrow axis. Instead, casts of vacated *Pavocosa* sp. burrows showed some disturbances caused either by the reoccupation by another organism or by predation of the dweller. Two morphologies are related to reoccupation of burrows: those with a structure in form of an "umbrella" and another with smaller excavations at the bottom of the burrow. Predation by armadillos produces funnel-shaped burrows. Both active and abandoned *Pavocosa* sp. burrow casts are compared with existing ichnogenera and its distinction is discussed. It is argued that key features like the presence of a neck, a downward widening and the surface texture will allow recognition of wolf spider burrows in the fossil record. Fossil wolf spiders are recorded since the Paleogene (possibly Late Cretaceous), so Cenozoic continental rocks can contain wolf spider burrows awaiting recognition. In addition, the particular distribution of *Pavocosa* sp. in saline lakes may imply that this type of burrows are linked to saline environments.

Keywords: spider burrow; neoichnology; wolf spiders; predation; burrow reoccupation; saline lake

# INTRODUCTION

Araneae (recorded since the Devonian) is the most diverse order within arachnids with around 47,000 described extant species (World Spider Catalog, 2017). Due to striking adaptations such as silk production and a complex behavior (e.g. construction of hunting webs), Araneae has become a highly successful group that is present in almost all environments (Murphy et al., 2006; Garrison et al., 2016). Burrow construction in spiders is considered a primary adaptation as a retreat from high temperatures and dry air conditions typical of arid environments (e.g., Cloudsley-Thompson, 1983; Punzo, 2000). Important functions as dwelling, nesting, mating, breeding, and foraging are also related to burrows (e.g., Marshall, 1996; Aisenberg, Viera & Costa, 2007; Hils & Hembree, 2015; Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017).

In general, modern spider burrows consist of vertical or oblique, simple or branched vertical forms, sometimes with a terminal chamber, in some cases silk lined, and structures atop as trap doors or a turret can be found (e.g., Ractliffe & Fagerstrom, 1980; Bryson, 1939; Hils & Hembree, 2015; Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017). Among the burrowing spiders, those of the wolf spiders (Lycosidae) tend to produce a nearly vertical burrow with or without a terminal chamber in flat terrain, whereas many trapdoor spider burrows (families Nemesiidae, Ctenizidae, Antrodiaetidae) are at an oblique angle and located on inclined surfaces (Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017). This simple morphology can be comparable to the ichnogenenera *Skolithos* Hadelman, 1840 or *Cylindricum* Linck, 1949 (Smith et al., 2008; Hils & Hembree, 2015;), the Y- shaped forms to *Psilonichnus* Fürsich, 1981 (Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017), and those with a terminal chamber to *Macanopsis* Macsotay, 1967 (Hasiotis, 2006; Mikuš & Uchman, 2012; Hils & Hembree, 2015; Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017).

Significant research related to burrow construction in wolf spiders has been made, but mainly focused on biological and ecological aspects (e.g. Hancock, 1899; Marshall, 1996; Aisenberg,

Viera & Costa, 2007; Carrel, 2008; Suter, Stratton & Miller, 2011; De Simone, Aisenberg & Peretti, 2015; Foelix et al., 2016, 2017; Framenau & Hudson, 2017). In addition to the pioneer contributions by Bryson (1939), Ahlbrandt et al. (1978), and Ractliffe and Fagerstrom (1980), recent neoichnological studies has paid attention to the morphology of spider burrows (Hils & Hembree, 2015; Hembree, 2017; Uchman, Vrenosi & Muceku, 2017). These studies rely essentially on the overall morphology as a clue for recognition of spider burrows in general, including those of Lycosidae.

Similarly, probable spider burrows in the fossil record are scarce and its identification was always based on general morphology. The oldest record is controversial and based on poorly preserved simple vertical hollows from the Eocene of northern France, first considered worm burrows (Polychaeta) and later assigned to trapdoor spiders, in both cases named using biological names for a trace fossil (see details in Dunlop & Braddy, 2011). The same material was latter incorrectly referred to *Oichnus* Bromley, 1981 by Dunlop and Braddy (2011), an ichnogenus reserved for bioerosion structures on calcareous skeletons (Wisshak et al., 2015). *Skolithos* isp. 1 from the Mio-Pliocene fluvial sediments of Brazil was compared with Lycosidae burrows due to its overall morphology (Fernandes, Borghi & Carvalho, 1992). Pleistocene and Holocene carbonate eolianites from Bahamas and Yucatán contains *Skolithos linearis* that were tentatively assigned to arachnids and/or insects (White & Curran, 1988; Curran & White, 1991, 2001).

Finally, a burrow in Pleistocene clastic sediments of the Simpson Desert in Australia (Hasiotis, 2007), was attributed to wolf spiders.

The purposes of this work are 1) the identification of ichnological signatures of the burrows produced by *Pavocosa* sp. (Lycosidae) that may facilitate identification of wolf spider burrows in the fossil record, and 2) to discuss its environmental distribution.

88

# 89 **Previous descriptions of modern wolf spider burrows**

90 The first work unequivocally related to burrows of wolf spiders was “The castle – building  
 91 spider” from Illinois (USA) published by Hancock (1899). This paper describes in detail the  
 92 burrows produced by *Geolycosa domifex* (= *Lycosa domifex*), explaining important aspects as  
 93 materials and the methods of construction. *Geolycosa domifex* burrows are described as vertical  
 94 shafts, unless obstacles cause some deviation (Fig. 1A). Ractliffe and Fagerstrom (1980), in his  
 95 widely cited work on traces found in Holocene floodplains, described spider burrows in general  
 96 (assigned to Ctenizidae, Antrodiaetidae, Theraphosidae and Lycosidae) as simple or branched  
 97 tunnels, sometimes with side chambers that are separated of the main tunnel by hinged doors  
 98 (Fig. 1B). Burrows of *Geolycosa xera archboldi* McCrone 1963 and *G. hubbelli* Wallace 1942  
 99 from Florida, USA, are illustrated as vertical shafts showing a gradual transition between the  
 100 shaft and the terminal chamber (Fig. 1C-D) (Carrel, 2008). *Geolycosa missouriensis* Banks, 1895  
 101 burrows from Mississippi, USA, are described as vertical forms, narrower at the surface and  
 102 broader near the bottom, sometimes with a conspicuously enlarged chamber at the bottom (Fig.  
 103 1E) (Suter, Stratton & Miller, 2011). *Geolycosa* sp. burrows from India, exhibited a contrasting  
 104 morphology in comparison with previous records of wolf spiders. These burrows were complex  
 105 with a U-shaped form, two chambers (located one at the entrance and the other at the end of the  
 106 burrow), and shallow hollows described as drainages or prey traps (Fig. 1F) (Chikhale et al.,  
 107 2013). Albin, Simó and Aisenberg (2015), reported different burrows morphologies produced by  
 108 *Allocosa brasiliensis* Petrunkevitch 1910 from Uruguay, linking these variations in the  
 109 morphology to the development stage and sex of the spider that produce them. These authors  
 110 described burrows with a simple vertical shaft and a terminal chamber produced by adults,  
 111 shallow capsules by virgin females, and Y-shaped burrows by male juveniles (Fig. 1G). Hils and

Hembree (2015), through experimental neoichnological studies, recorded four burrow morphologies produced by *Hogna lenta* Hentz, 1844 (Lycosidae): vertical shafts, vertical shafts with a terminal chamber, sub-vertical shafts, and Y-shaped burrows (Fig. 1H). *Geolycosa vultuosa* Koch, 1838 burrows from Albania are characterized as vertical to subvertical, slightly curved or straight shafts with a basal chamber, showing either a gradual transition between the shaft and the basal chamber or a well delineated chamber (Vrenozi & Uchman, 2015). In a taxonomic revision of the halotolerant wolf spider genus *Tetrallycosa* Roewer, 1960 (Framenau & Hudson, 2017); the burrows of three species (*T. alteripa* McKay 1976, *T. williamsi* Framenau & Hudson 2017, and *T. eyrei* Hickman 1944) were described. *Tetrallycosa* burrows are vertical shafts with an offset (a curvature) at mid-depth, which are later modified by backfilling the upper part and creating a new exit oriented in the opposite direction (Fig. 1I) (Framenau & Hudson, 2017). *Allocosa senex* (Mello-Leitão, 1945) burrows from Uruguay are also simple vertical shafts with a downward widening (Fig. 1J) (Foelix et al., 2017). Finally, the burrows of *Trochosa hispanica* Simon, 1870 from Albania (Fig. 1K) were described as simple, vertical shafts with a terminal chamber (Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017).

From the previous account, it is clear that the most common wolf-spider burrow shape are near-vertical cylinders with a rounded end that increase progressively in width downward, vertical shafts with a terminal chamber, and Y shaped burrows. Hasiotis (2006) also suggested that horizontal burrows systems with a pustulose ornamentation are produced by spiders, however, the illustrated burrow system (Hasiotis, 2002, p. 114, figure B) is typical of surface burrows produced by Grilloalpidae (e.g., Chamberlain, 1975). Figure 1 also highlight that the burrows produced under experimental conditions (Fig. 1H) contrast markedly with the remaining ones excavated in natural conditions.

# **MATERIALS AND METHODS**

We studied burrows produced by *Pavocosa* sp. found on the edge of sparsely vegetated sandflat of the Gran Salitral saline lake located in southwest La Pampa province, Argentina (37°24'18.40"S, 67°12'13.57"W) (Fig. 2A-B). This saline lake is placed in the subregion of alluvial plains of the Atuel-Salado rivers, characterized by a flat relief and sandy sediments, under a semiarid climate and with halophyte vegetation (Fig. 2C) (INTA- UNLPam, 1980). The mean monthly temperature ranges between 6.9 °C in July and 24.6 °C in January, and the mean annual precipitation is 340 mm, in both cases for the period 1961-1980 (INTA- UNLPam, 1980). Observations were conducted during three field trips in October-2016 (early spring, mean monthly temperature for 2016: 15.4°C, and the total monthly precipitation was 140 mm), December-2016 (late spring, mean monthly temperature for 2016: 23.1°C, with no precipitations) and February-2017 (summer, mean monthly temperature for 2017: 24.7°C, and precipitation was 22 mm). Rain data from Policía de la Provincia de la Pampa (<http://www.policia.lapampa.gov.ar/contenidos/ver/lluvias>); and temperature from Servicio Meteorológico Nacional ([www.smn.gov.ar](http://www.smn.gov.ar)), in both cases for the nearby 25 de Mayo and Puelén towns.

Sandflat sediments were logged in a shallow pit using standard sedimentological methods, and samples were taken for grain size and carbonate content analysis. Carbonate content of sediment samples was estimated using the Digital Calcimeter "NETTO". Grain size analyses of sediment samples were obtained by a laser particle size counter Malvern Mastersizer 2000®, prior to elimination of organic matter and carbonates, at the Laboratorio de Sedimentología of the Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales, Universidad Nacional de La Pampa.

A total of nine burrows were casted using dental plaster and three spiders found inside the burrows were collected for identification. Measurements on casts taken were the total length (L), neck length (NL), the minimum (mD) and maximum diameter (MD), and the angle of inclination (A); the measures of sets of surface ridges preserved on the cast, that are the length, the width, and the orientation in relation to the principal axis of the burrow (See Fig. 3). We also measured the entrance diameter (ED) from field photographs.

A 3D model of the burrows was generated based on photographs taken with a Lumix DMC-FZ70 camera and processed in the software Agisoft Photoscan Professional v.1.4.6. The resulting models were export in OBJ files to Adobe Photoshop CC 2017 and converted to U3D files (a standard format for 3D), to compose a PDF file for easier visualization.

The casts and spider specimens collected were stored in the “Colección Paleontológica de la Facultad de Ciencias Exactas y Naturales” of the Universidad Nacional de La Pampa (acronym GHUNLPam), and one of the *Pavocosa* sp. specimens in the Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales “Bernardino Rivadavia” (acronym MACN- Ar). The specimens were preserved in EtOH 80%; photographs of preserved specimens were taken with a Leica DFC 290 digital camera mounted on a Leica M165 C stereoscopic microscope. Images taken in different focal planes were combined with Helicon Focus 4.62 Pro ([www.heliconsoft.com](http://www.heliconsoft.com)). The width between the fangs of chelicera in spider specimens was measured for comparison with the marks preserved in the casts.

## RESULTS

### Ocurrence of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows

In early spring (October, 2016), there were frequent rains, and abundant burrow entrances of similar size were observed in the sandflat surface. Spider burrows were found in a sparsely

vegetated sandflat (0 to 10% of plant coverage), with the only presence of a small halophyte shrub *Heterostachys ritteriana* Ungern-Sternberg, 1876 (Fig. 4A). The burrows were simple vertical and silk lined forms (Fig. 4B), either open covered with a thin ring of silk (Fig. 4C) or partially closed with a plug of silk and sediment pellets (Fig. 4D). Surrounding the burrow (in a radius of up to 64 cm) abundant small spherical sediment pellets were observed (with a density of up to 290 pellets/ m<sup>2</sup>) (Fig. 4F), at this time no casts were made. In late spring (December, 2016) burrow density was lower, all restricted to a small area on the edge of the saline lake with sparse vegetation at the boundary with the bare sandflat. A total of eight casts were obtained, five were inhabited burrows, while the remaining were abandoned. The inhabited burrows showed up two sacs of eggs in the lowermost part (Fig.4E). During the field trip conducted in summer (February, 2017), very few burrows were observed, all open and partially filled with some sand, they seem to be uninhabited for a long time. At this time only one uninhabited burrow was casted.

# **Sandflat sediments**

The pit dug in the saline sandflat where the burrows occur was 60 cm deep (Fig. 5A). The uppermost bed (# 1) is 13 cm thick and mainly composed of poorly-sorted pale yellowish brown (10 YR 6/2) silty sand containing 0.9 % CO<sub>3</sub><sup>-2</sup> (Figs. 5B, 5C). The lower 5 cm of bed 1 exhibits thin diffuse evaporite laminae and a mud lamina. This bed contained the studied *Pavocosa* sp. burrows. Bed 2 (7 cm thick) is poorly-sorted moderate yellowish brown (10 YR 5/4) silty sand, with massive structure and 0.8% CO<sub>3</sub><sup>-2</sup>. Bed 3 (5 cm thick) is very poorly-sorted, dark yellowish brown (10 YR 4/2), silty sand with massive structure, containing 1.4% CO<sub>3</sub><sup>-2</sup> and small (2 mm) gastropod shells comparable with *Heleobia* Stimpson, 1865. The 27 cm thick bed 4 is very

poorly-sorted, massive, moderate brown (5 YR 4/4), sandy silt containing 0.6% CO<sub>3</sub><sup>-2</sup>. The 6 cm thick lowermost bed (# 5), is mainly composed of fine-grained, pale yellowish brown (10 YR 6/2) sand with abundant carbonate cement that matches with the water table. Field work was conducted in rainy days, however, the water table was well below the bottom of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows (about 40—45 cm below).

# **Producer of the burrows: *Pavocosa* sp.**

Although the genus *Pavocosa* Roewer, 1960 was never reviewed, and its composition was recently questioned (Toscano-Gadea & Costa, 2016), the inclusion of the material studied as an undescribed species of *Pavocosa* was possible thought the comparison of the males and females of *Pavocosa gallopavo* (Mello-Leitão, 1941) (Figs. 6A, 6C), the type species of the genus. The male holotype of *P. gallopavo* (MLP-15065) and females from MACN collection were examined and shares with *Pavocosa* sp. (Figs. 6B, 6D) the presence of deep furrows on the atrium, parallel to the median septum of the female epigyne and the coloration pattern (Figs. 6A, 6B), characters probably diagnostic of the genus (Piacentini et al. unpublished data). The enlarged posterior eyes in *Pavocosa* sp. and the shape of the genitalia are clearly distinctive from *P. gallopavo*. The fangs of specimens captured inside the burrows (n=3) are separated about 3.9 mm—4.6 mm (Fig. 7H).

Additional material from Córdoba (Salinas Grandes, 29°50'39" S, 64°40'16" W), Santiago del Estero and San Luis (Pampa de las Salinas; 32°12'19" S, 64°39'13" W) were recorded from MACN-Ar collection (23503, 23505 to 23513, 24096, and 38710), all from saline environments. The burrows of representatives from Córdoba (A. Peretti, C. Mattoni and M. Izquierdo, personal communication, 2008) and San Luis (M. Ramírez pers communication, 2016) are very similar to

228 those described on this work.

229 

230 **Pavocosa** sp. burrows

231 The inhabited burrow (n=5) (Figs. 7A-E) are simple, vertical and circular shafts with an  
 232 inclination of the main axis of 72°—88° (average: 80°), the length ranges from 115 to 130 mm  
 233 (average: 120 mm). The diameter gradually increases from an upper narrow neck that is 12 to 15  
 234 mm wide (average 14 mm) and 5—8 mm long (average 6 mm), to a maximum diameter in the  
 235 lower half ranging from 18 to 28 mm (average 23 mm). The outline of the entrance and cross-  
 236 section of the maximum diameter of the burrows are subcircular. In average, the widest part of  
 237 the burrow is 64% larger than the neck. The burrow cast surface exhibits sparse ornamentation  
 238 in the form sets of two linear parallel ridges (Fig. 7F-G) about 2.8—4.4 mm long (average 3.4  
 239 mm, n=16) and 2.2—4.5 mm wide (average: 3.4 mm, n= 14) aligned almost perpendicular  
 240 (range: 42°—89°, average: 64°, n=14) to the main axis of the burrow. The supplementary  
 241 material contains interactive PDF files of each *Pavocosa* sp. burrow casts.

242 

243 **Modified** *Pavocosa* sp. burrows

244 Uninhabited *Pavocosa* sp. burrows (n=4) (Fig. 8) display some kind of modification in its overall  
 245 form (Fig. 6A-D) (see Supplementary Material for interactive 3D models of each cast). All are  
 246 composed of a highly inclined shaft (range: 78°—87°; average: 84.5°), with an upper  
 247 constriction and an average maximum diameter ranging from 15 to 22 mm (average 19 mm).  
 248 Three types of modifications were identified. 1) Subcylindrical burrows (108 —116 mm long by  
 249 15—22 mm wide) with a subhorizontal expansion in the middle part forming an "umbrella"  
 250 (Figs. 8A-B). The shaft **walls** exhibit scarce ornamentation in the form sets of two linear parallel

ridges similar to those of inhabited *Pavocosa* sp. burrows. The “umbrella” structure shows an oval to lobed shape in plan view (Figs. 8C-D), with minimum diameter of 47—54 mm and a maximum diameter of 59—66 mm. The “umbrella” surface exhibits an ornamentation in form of small (1.4 mm in diameter) rounded knobs (Fig. E). The burrow bottom is rounded or partially filled with sediments. 2) Subcylindrical burrow about 116 mm long and 21 mm wide with two smaller burrows (8 mm of diameter) arising at the bottom of the larger burrow (Fig. 8 F). 3) A third form is a 143 mm high and 101 mm wide funnel that ends in a 24 mm wide cylindrical shaft with an oblique bottom (Fig. 8 G). The surface of the funnel exhibits sets of two parallel ridges (about 21 mm long and 9.2 mm wide) running oblique to the major axis (Fig. 8H).

## DISCUSSION

### Identification of wolf-spider burrows in the fossil record

*Pavocosa* sp. produce open burrows with distinctive features as cylindrical, nearly vertical, silk lined shaft showing a gradual downward widening, a neck in the top and a rounded end, the entrance sometimes plugged with a cap of silk and sediment pellets, and a particularly distinctive surface ornamentation on the burrow walls. Most of these features are shared with other wolf spider burrows documented in the literature (Fig. 1) (Hancock, 1899; Ractliffe & Fagerstrom, 1980; Carrel, 2008; Suter, Stratton & Miller, 2011; Albín, Simó & Aisenberg, 2015; Hils & Hembree, 2015; Vrenozi & Uchman, 2015; Foelix et al., 2017; Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017). In particular, the presence of a neck and downward widening seem to be a common feature in wolf spider burrows found in natural settings. For *Pavocosa* sp. burrows this widening is about 64%, whereas it is 52% for *Trochosa hispanica* (Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017). Another highly distinctive feature of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows is its surface ornamentation in the form of two short parallel ridges that appear in the burrow casts (Figs. 7F-G). This feature was

not identified in previous studies of wolf spider burrows and is potentially related to the burrowing technique used by *Pavocosa* sp. Spiders uses two main mechanisms of excavation: 1) By pushing and compressing sediment using the pedipalps (Hils & Hembree, 2015) and 2) by scraping the soil with help of fangs from chelicerae (Stokes, 1884; Suter, Stratton & Miller, 2011; Hils & Hembree, 2015; Foelix et al., 2016). Although we have not observed *Pavocosa* sp. during digging, the sets of two linear parallel ridges observed on the burrow cast surface are similar in form and shape with the arrangement of fangs of collected specimens. The distance between fangs (3.9–4.6 mm) overlaps with distance between ridges within a set (2.2–4.5 mm). Thus we propose that excavation in *Pavocosa* sp. involves the use of fangs, as in type 2 excavation mechanism mentioned above.

Silk lined burrows are unique in spiders and essentially impart stability in soft substrates to prevent collapse (Ractliffe & Fagerstrom, 1980; Foelix et al. 2017; Hils & Hembree, 2015). The presence of organic matter in the form of a silk lining increase the potential of preservation of wolf spider burrows (Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017), well above those of all others arthropods that habit in the same environment.

Spider burrows may result modified by reoccupation or predation. Reoccupation of abandoned lycosid and mygalomorph burrows by lizards, centipedes, moths, wasps, beetles and ants have been documented (e.g., Fellows, Fenner & Bullet, 2009). Ants have been also observed invading occupied wolf spider burrows with the purpose of prey piracy (Marshall, 1995). However, it has not been documented if the reoccupation results in any change in the morphology of the burrow. Common spider burrow disturbances caused by predation includes those produced by pompilid wasps that preys the spider and digs a tunnel perpendicular to the spider burrow (Gwynne, 1979), and excavation of the upper part of the burrows by armadillos (Suter, Stratton & Miller, 2011).

Most of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows are susceptible to go through a large amount of disturbances, including those caused by the reoccupation by another organism (Fig. A-B and F) and predation of the dweller (Fig. 8G). Two kinds of burrow modifications observed during this study are tentatively related to reoccupation of burrows: those with an expansion in the middle part as a kind of "umbrella" (Fig. 8A-B) and that with smaller excavations at the bottom of the burrow (Fig. 8F). The "umbrella" seen in some casts is highly reminiscent of oval to lobed ant nest chambers (Tschinkel, 2003), although no ants were recorded when making the casts. The producer of the smaller burrows at the bottom of *Pavocosa* sp. burrow is unknown. Funnel shaped burrows (Fig. 8G) are related to predation by armadillos and are similar to structures described in the literature including Sarzetti and Genise (2011) from northern Argentina, Suter, Stratton and Miller (2011: fig. 2), and Platt (2014), the two latter from Mississippi, USA. Assignment to a small armadillo is suggested by the size of the funnel and the presence of sets of two large ridges in the cast surface (compare Platt, 2014), interpreted as scratch marks (Fig. 8H). In particular, *Zaedyus pichiy* Desmarest, 1804 is the only small armadillo species recorded in the area (Siegenthaler et al., 2004). Both the original *Pavocosa* sp. burrows and those modified by reoccupation or predation can be compared with known ichnogenera. The simple vertical forms are grossly comparable with *Skolithos* (see Alpert, 1974 and Schlirf, 2000); some significant differences are the presence of a constriction or neck, the downward widening and the surface texture. These features are potentially significant ichnotaxonomically (Schlirf & Uchman, 2005), although no proposed ichnotaxon match them. Slight variations in burrow diameter are allowed in *Skolithos* (Alpert, 1974; Schlirf, 2000), although the observed differences in *Pavocosa* sp. burrow diameter are significant and systematic. There are a few examples of ornamented *Skolithos*, all of them from



continental settings and tentatively assigned to insects or spiders (Bromley and Asgaard, 1979; Schlirf et al. 2001; Netto, 2007). Modified *Pavocosa* sp. burrows with an “umbrella” if fossilized can be confused with *Daimoniobarax* Smith et al., 2011; in particular, the umbrella is comparable with chambers and the vertical burrow of the spider is comparable with the shaft connecting the chambers in *Daimoniobarax*. A potential difference is the considerably larger diameter of the burrow connecting the chambers that averages 40% of chamber diameter in the modified *Pavocosa* sp. burrow and 10% in *Daimoniobarax* (Smith et al., 2011). The modified *Pavocosa* sp. burrow with smaller burrows arising from the bottom can be confused with a downward bifurcation as seen in rhizoliths (Klappa, 1980), a roughly similar rhizolith was figured by Melchor et al. (2002, fig. 3B). Finally, funnel shaped burrows can be compared with several ichnogenera including *Monocraterion* Torell, 1870; *Conostichnus* Lesquereux, 1876; *Rosselia* Dahmer, 1937; *Conichnus* Männil, 1966; and *Cornulatichnus* Carroll and Trewin, 1995 (see also Platt, 2014). A fundamental difference with these ichnogenera is the lack of paired surface ridges, as seen in the predated *Pavocosa* sp. burrow. Further differences are: 1) *Monocraterion* shows smaller radial burrows arising from the central funnel (Jensen, 1997); 2) *Conostichnus* exhibits a duodecimal symmetry and transverse and longitudinal ridges and furrows (Pemberton et al. 1988); 3) *Rosselia* is a bulbous structure with a concentrically laminated fill (Schlirf et al. 2002); 4) *Conichnus* exhibits a rounded apex and common chevron-like fill (Pemberton et al. 1988); and 5) *Cornulatichnus* has a well-developed lining (Carroll and Trewin, 1995). Conical sedimentary structures of inorganic origin can also resemble *Pavocosa* sp. burrows modified by predation. Buck and Goldring (2003) identified two main inorganic processes that can produce conical sedimentary structures: collapse and dewatering. The former is distinguished by V or U shaped downwarping of lamination and the latter by deformed

lamination and massive zone at the base of the cone (Buck & Goldring, 2003). These features allow distinction from the predated (i.e., funnel-shaped) *Pavocosa* sp. burrow, that would have a massive fill.

Burrowing spiders belong to Mesothelae and Opisthothelae (Coddington, 2005). Although Mesothelae dates back to the Late Carboniferous, the only known burrowing group (Liphistiidae) has no fossil record (Dunlop, Penney & Jekel, 2017). Within Opisthothelae, burrowing spiders are found in the Middle Triassic to Recent Mygalomorphae that includes the tarantulas and trapdoor spiders and in the ?Cretaceous to Recent Lycosoidea (included in Araneomorphae) that comprises the wolf spiders (Dunlop, 2010; Dunlop, Penney & Jekel, 2017). The oldest putative example of Lycosoidea comes from Turonian beds of Botswana, ~~Africa~~ (Selden, Anderson & Anderson, 2009); which is close to the age of the superfamily suggested by phylogenetic studies (70 Ma, after Garrison et al., 2016); although most fossil records are from the Paleogene to Recent (Dunlop, Penney & Jekel, 2017). In addition, phylogenetic studies on web type suggest that the spider common ancestor likely foraged from a subterranean burrow,  sometimes sealed by a trapdoor (Garrison et al. 2016). In consequence, the record of spider burrows can be traced back, at least. to the Middle Triassic (and probably to the Late Carboniferous) and lycosid burrows in Cenozoic or Late Cretaceous rocks.

The use of fossil to calibrate molecular phylogenies is an uprising topic in spider biology (Planas et al, 2013; Wood et al, 2013; Moradmand et al, 2014). The absence of reliable fossil record, such as in Lycosidae (Penney, 2001), is an important impediment and the potential identification of wolf spider burrows on the fossil record, with the clues provided herein, can be a useful alternative source of data.

# **Environmental distribution of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows**

The sediments of the sandflat containing the *Pavocosa* sp. burrows reflect the interaction between the nearby eolian and lacustrine settings. The two upper beds are essentially sandy deposits with a mixture of dominant fine sand and silt (samples S1 and S2; Fig. 5). The dominance of the coarse fraction (fine sand), poor sorting and the frequency distribution is comparable with those of modern interdune deposits (e.g., Ahlbrandt, 1979). Poorly defined laminae with evaporites in bed 1 are interpreted as result of capillary rise and precipitation from brines. The sandy nature of the material where *Pavocosa* sp. excavated the burrows and the depth to the water table suggests preference for well-drained substrates. In contrast, the lowermost silty beds (samples S3 and S4; Fig. 5) are interpreted as dominantly lacustrine deposits, on the basis of the fine grain size and the presence of gastropods shells. *Heleobia* is a very common extant gastropod in South America recorded in estuarine and continental settings, including saline lakes (see review in Cazzaniga, 2011). In consequence, the logged section reflects the migration of the parabolic dune towards the northeast over the Gran Salitral lacustrine sediments (for a more detailed interpretation of dune deposits see Melchor et al., 2012).

Wolf spiders (Lycosidae) is one of the most successful spider families distributed in most of the habitats around the World (World Spider Catalog, 2017). Lycosids display a wide range of prey-capture strategies from web builders to burrow-dwellers or vagant species. The use of burrows in wolf spiders can be in some cases obligatory, temporary in male juveniles, and as brood care in females (Logunov, 2011), or merely facultative in absence of objects as a rock that serves as a retreat. In general, burrows in wolf spiders are related to open areas of xerothermic habitats with sparse or no vegetation (e.g. sandy seashores, dune heaths, limestone areas and desert

nanophanerophyte steppe) (Logunov, 2011). Some wolf spider species have specific habit preferences, as is the case of halotolerant species that inhabit the surface of salt lakes, most of them included in *Tetrallycosa* and other species as *Lycosa salifodina* McKay, 1976 from Australia (Framenau & Leung, 2013), and two other Argentinian species including *Pavocosa* sp. In particular, *Pavocosa* sp. has been documented in saline lakes of Cordoba, Santiago del Estero, San Luis and La Pampa. In consequence, it is likely that the described burrows are typical of saline environments.

## CONCLUSIONS

Observations on the burrows of the wolf spider *Pavocosa* sp. in the coast of a saline lake in central Argentina suggest that:

1) *Pavocosa* sp. produce burrows with recognizable features as open, cylindrical, nearly vertical, silk lined shafts, showing a gradual downward widening, with a neck and the entrance and a rounded end, and a particularly distinctive surface ornamentation on the burrow walls.

2) Burrows are susceptible to go through a large amount of disturbances, including reoccupation by another organism or by predation of the dweller. Two types of modified *Pavocosa* sp. are related to reoccupation of burrows: those with an expansion in the middle part as a kind of "umbrella" and another with smaller excavations at the bottom of the burrow. Predation by armadillos results in funnel-shaped burrows.

3) *Pavocosa* sp. burrows have significant differences with those found in the ichnogenus *Skolithos*. Features as the presence of a neck, a downward widening and the surface texture make them identifiable in the fossil record. In the same way, the modified *Pavocosa* sp. burrows can

be confused with *Daimoniobarax*, rhizoliths, and several conical sedimentary structures, although some key aspects allows their distinction.

4) *Pavocosa* sp. colonized well drained sandy substrates of eolian origin on the margin of a saline lake. Known occurrences of this species suggest that it is a halotolerant wolf spider that inhabit the surface of saline lakes.

5) The potential record of wolf spider burrows dates back to the Paleogene (possibly Late Cretaceous). The presence of silk lining increases its potential of preservation and the typical morphology and the surface texture render them recognizable in the fossil record.

Acknowledgements. Silverio Feola, Mauricio Fernández, Sofía Mulatero, Luis Torres and Angélica Tamame helped during field work. This research was funded by projects PICT 2013-1129 (from Agencia Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Tecnológicas); PIP 2014-2016 11220130100005CO (from CONICET), and project PI09G (from Universidad Nacional de La Pampa) to RNM.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahlbrandt, T.S., Andrews, S., and Gwynne, D.T. 1978. Bioturbation in eolian deposits. *Journal of Sedimentary Petrology*, 48:839-848.

Ahlbrandt TS. 1979. Textural parameters of eolian sands. In: Mckee, E.D., A study of global sand seas. *Geological Survey Professional Paper*, 1052: 21-52.

Aisenberg A., Viera C., Costa FG. 2007. Daring females, devoted males, and reversed sexual size dimorphism in the sand-dwelling spider *Allocosa brasiliensis* (Araneae, Lycosidae).

- 435 *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 62: 29-35. Doi: 10.1007/s00265-007-0435-x
- 436 Albín A., Simó M., Aisenberg A. 2015. Characterisation of burrow architecture under natural  
437 conditions in the sand-dwelling wolf spider *Allocosa brasiliensis*. *Journal of Natural History*.  
438 50:201–209. Doi: 10.1080/00222933.2015.1068395
- 439 Alpert SP. 1974. Systematic Review of the Genus *Skorinios*. *Journal of Paleontology*, 48(4),  
440 661-669. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1303217>
- 441 Banks N. 1895. Some Missouri spiders. *Entomological News* 6: 204-207.
- 442 Bromley RG., 1981. Concepts in ichnology illustrated by small round holes in shells. *Acta*  
443 *Geológica Hispánica*, 16: 55–64.
- 444 Bromley RG., Asgaard U. 1979: Triassic freshwater ichnocoenoses from Carlsberg Fjord.  
445 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 28, 39-80
- 446 Bryson HR. 1939. Identification of soil insects by their burrow characteristics. *Trans Kansas*  
447 *Acad Sci* 42:245–253
- 448 Buck SG., Goldring R. 2003. Conical Sedimentary Structures, Trace Fossils or Not?  
449 Observations, Experiments, and Review. *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, 73: 338-353.
- 450 Carrel JE. 2008. Differential survival of *Geolycosa xera archboldi* and *G. hubbelli* (Araneae,  
451 Lycosidae) after fire in Florida scrub. *J Arachnol*, 36:595–599.
- 452 Carroll S., Trewin NH. 1995. *Cornulatichnus*: a new trace fossil from the Old Red Sandstone of  
453 Orkney. *Scottish Journal of Geology*, 31: 37–41.

- 454 Cazzaniga N. 2011. El género *Heleobia* (Caenogastropoda: Cochliopidae) en América del Sur.  
455 *Amici Molluscarum*, special number: 1-79.
- 456 Chikhale MP., Santape GB., Bodkhe AK. 2013. Some Observations on Burrow Architecture of  
457 Burrowing Spider *Geolycosa* Montgomery, 1904 (Araneae, Lycosidae) At Vairat, Melghat Tiger  
458 Reserve, Maharashtra, India. *Indian Journal of Arachnology*, 2: 34-38.
- 459 Cloudsley-Thompson JL. 1983. Desert adaptation in spiders. *Journal of Arid Environments*, 4:  
460 307-317.
- 461 Coddington JA. 2005. Phylogeny and classification of spiders. In: Ubick, D., Paquin, P.,  
462 Cushing, P.E., Roth, V. (Eds.), Spiders of North America: an Identification Manual. *American*  
463 *Arachnological Society*, pp. 18–24.
- 464 Curran AH., White B. 1991. Trace fossils of shallow subtidal to dunal ichnofacies in Bahamian  
465 Quaternary carbonates. *Palaios*, 6:498–510
- 466 Curran HA., White B. 2001. Ichnology of Holocene carbonate eolianites of the Bahamas. *Society*  
467 *of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralogists*, Special Publication 71, 47–55.
- 468 Dahmer G. 1937. Lebensspuren aus dem Taunusquarzit und den Siegener Schichten  
469 (Unterdevon). Preussischen Geologischen Landesanstalt zu Berlin Jahrbuch 1936 vol. 57:p. 523–  
470 539
- 471 De Simone GA., Aisenberg A., Peretti AV. 2015. Female and juvenile burrow digging in  
472 *Allocosa brasiliensis*, a South American sand-dwelling wolf spider. *Arachnology*, 16:8 276-  
473 280.doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.13156/arac.2015.16.8.276>

- 474 Desmarest AG. 1804. Tableau methodique des mammiferes. Pp. 5-58 in Nouveau dictionnaire  
475 d'histoire naturelle, appliquee aux arts, principalement it l'agriculture et it l'economie rurale et  
476 domestique: par une societe de naturalistes et d'agriculteurs: avec des figures tirees des trois  
477 regnes de la nature. Chez Deterville, Paris, France.
- 478 Dunlop JA. 2010. Geological history and phylogeny of Chelicerata. *Arthropod Structure and*  
479 *Development*, 39: 124–142. doi: 10.1016/j.asd.2010.01.003
- 480 Dunlop JA., Braddy SJ. 2011. *Cteniza bavincourti* and the nomenclature of arachnid-related  
481 trace fossils. *The Journal of Arachnology*, 39:250–257.
- 482 Dunlop JA., Penney D., Jekel D. 2017. A summary list of fossil spiders and their relatives. In  
483 World Spider Catalog. Natural History Museum Bern, Retrieved from <http://wsc.nmbe.ch>,  
484 version 18.5, accessed on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017.
- 485 Fellows HL., Fenner AL., Bull CM. 2009. Spiders provide important resources for an  
486 endangered lizard. *Journal of Zoology*, 279:2 156–163. Doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.2009.00600.x
- 487 Fernandes ACS., Borghi L., Carvalho IS. 1992. Icnofósseis de Artropodes na Formação Resende  
488 (Bacia de Resende, RJ). *Anais Acad Brasil Ciên*, 64: 269–275
- 489 Foelix R., Rechenberg I., Erb B., Joel AC. 2016. Über den Bau der Wohnröhren bei  
490 wüstenlebenden Spinnen. *Arachne*, 21: 4-17.
- 491 Foelix R., Rechenberg I., Erb B., Albín A., Aisenberg A. 2017. Sand transport and burrow  
492 construction in sparassid and lycosid spiders. *Journal of Arachnology* 45:255–264
- 493 Framenau VW., Leung AE. 2013. *Costacosa*, a new genus of wolf spider (Araneae, Lycosidae)

- 494 from coastal north-west Western Australia. Records of the Western Australian Museum, 83:  
495 173–184. doi: 10.18195/issn.0313-122x.83.2013.173-184
- 496 Framenau VW., Hudson P. 2017. Taxonomy, systematics and biology of the Australian  
497 halotolerant wolf spider genus *Tetrallycosa* (Araneae: Lycosidae: Artoriinae). *European Journal*  
498 *of Taxonomy*, 335: 1–72. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5852/ejt.2017.335>
- 499 Fursich FT. 1981. Invertebrate trace fossils from the upper Jurassic of Portugal. **Comunicacoes**  
500 **Servicos Geologicos de Portugal**, 67, 153-168
- 501 Garrison NL., Rodriguez J., Agnarsson I., Coddington JA., Griswold C E., Hamilton CA., Hedin  
502 M., Kocot KM., Ledford JM., Bond JE. 2016. Spider phylogenomics: untangling the Spider Tree  
503 of Life. *PeerJ*, 4: e1719. doi: 10.7717/peerj.1719
- 504 Gwynne DT. 1979. Nesting biology of the spider wasps (Hymenoptera: Pompilidae) which prey  
505 on burrowing wolf spiders (Araneae: Lycosidae, *Geolycosa*). *J Nat Hist*, 13:681– 692
- 506 Haldeman SS. 1840. Supplement to number one of ‘A monograph of the Limniades, and other  
507 freshwater bivalve shells of the apparently new animals in different classes, and names and  
508 characters of the subgenera in Paludina and Anculosa.’ J. Dobson, Philadelphia. 3 pp.
- 509 Hancock JL. 1899. The castle-building spider. *Ent News*, 10:23–29.
- 510 Hasiotis ST. 2002. Continental Trace Fossils. Short Course Notes, SEPM, Tulsa, 134 p.
- 511 Hasiotis ST. 2007. Continental ichnology: fundamental processes and controls on trace fossil  
512 distribution. The continental realm. In: Miller W III (ed) Trace Fossils: Concepts, Problems,  
513 Prospects. Elsevier Sci, Amsterdam, pp. 268–284.



- 514 Hasiotis ST., Bourke MC. 2006. Continental trace fossils and museum exhibits: displaying  
515 burrows as organism behaviour frozen in time. *The Geological Curator*, 8 (5): 211-226.
- 516 Hembree DI. 2017. Neoichnology of tarantulas (Araneae: Theraphosidae): Criteria for  
517 recognizing spider burrows in the fossil record. *Palaeontologia Electronica*, 20.3.45A: 1-30.  
518 Retrieved from [palaeo-electronica.org/content/2017/2003-neoichnology-of-tarantulas](http://palaeo-electronica.org/content/2017/2003-neoichnology-of-tarantulas)
- 519 Hentz NM. 1844. Descriptions and figures of the araneides of the United States. *Boston Journal*  
520 *of Natural History* 4: 386-396
- 521 Hickman VV.1944. Scorpions and spiders. In: The Simpson desert expedition, 1939-Scientific  
522 reports No. 1, Biology. Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia 68, 18-48.
- 523 Hils JM., Hembree DI. 2015. Neoichnology of the burrowing spiders *Gorgyrella inermis*  
524 (Mygalomorphae: Idiopidae) and *Hogna lenta* (Araneomorphae: Lycosidae). *Palaeontologia*  
525 *Electronica*, 18.1.7A: 1-62. Retrieved from [palaeo-electronica.org/content/2015/1057-](http://palaeo-electronica.org/content/2015/1057-neoichnology-of-spiders)  
526 [neoichnology-of-spiders](http://palaeo-electronica.org/content/2015/1057-neoichnology-of-spiders)
- 527 INTA, UNLPam. 1980. Inventario Integrado de los Recursos Naturales de la Provincia de la  
528 Pampa. Buenos Aires. ISAG
- 529 Jensen S. 1997. Trace fossils from the Lower Cambrian Mickwitzia sandstone, south-central  
530 Sweden: Fossils and Strata, v. 42, 111 p.
- 531 Klappa CF. (1980) Rhizoliths in terrestrial carbonates: classification, recognition, genesis and  
532 significance. *Sedimentology* 27:613–629
- 533 Koch CL. 1838. Die Arachniden. Nürnberg, Vierter Band, pp. 109-144, Funfter Band, pp. 1-124

- 534 Lesquereux L. 1876. Species of fossil marine plants from the Carboniferous Measures.  
535 *Geological Survey of Indiana, Annual Report 7*, pp. 134- 145.
- 536 Linck O. 1949. Lebens-Spuren aus dem Schilfsandstein (Mittl. Keuper, km 2) NW-  
537 Württembergs und ihre Bedeutung für die Bildungsgeschichte der Stufe. - Jahreshefte des  
538 Vereins für vaterländische Naturkunde in Württemberg 97–101: 1–100+ 8 pls.
- 539 Logunov DV. 2011. Sexual size dimorphism in burrowing wolf spiders (Araneae: Lycosidae).  
540 *Proceedings of the Zoological Institute RAS*, 315: 274–288.
- 541 Macsotay O. 1967. Huellas problemáticas y su valor paleoecológico en Venezuela. *Geos*, 16: 1-  
542 87.
- 543 Männil R. 1966. O vertikalnykh norkakh zaryvaniya v Ordovikskikh izvestnyakakh Pribaltiki. In  
544 Hecker RF. (ed.), *Organizm i sreda v geologicheskome proshlom*. Akademiya Nauk SSSR.  
545 *Paleontologicheskij Institut*, p. 200-207.
- 546 Marshall SD. 1995. Natural history, activity patterns, and relocation rates of a burrowing wolf  
547 spider: *Geolycosa xera archboldi* (Araneae, Lycosidae). *Journal of Arachnology*, 23: 65-70.
- 548 Marshall SD. 1996. Evidence for territorial behavior in a burrowing wolf spider. *Ethology*, 102:  
549 32-39.
- 550 McCrone JD. 1963. Taxonomic status and evolutionary history of the *Geolycosa pikei* complex  
551 in the Southeastern United States (Araneae, Lycosidae). *Am. Mid. Nat.* 70, 47-73.
- 552 McKay RJ. 1976. The wolf spiders of Australia (Araneae: Lycosidae): 8. Two new species  
553 inhabiting salt lakes of Western Australia. *Memoirs of the Queensland Museum*, 17: 417-423

554 Melchor RN, Genise JF, Miquel SE. 2002. Ichnology, sedimentology and paleontology of  
555 Eocene calcareous paleosols from a palustrine sequence, Argentina. *Palaios*, 17:16–35.

556 Melchor RN., Genise JF., Umazano AM., Superina M., 2012. Pink fairy armadillo meniscate  
557 burrows and ichnofabrics from Miocene and Holocene interdune deposits of Argentina:  
558 palaeoenvironmental and palaeoecological significance. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*  
559 *Palaeoecology*, 350–352:149–170.

560 Mello-Leitão CF de. 1941. Las arañas de la provincia de Santa Fe colectadas por el Profesor  
561 Birabén. *Revista del Museo de La Plata, N.S. Zoología*, 2: 199-225.

562 Mello-Leitão CF de. 1945. Arañas de Misiones, Corrientes y Entre Ríos. *Revista del Museo de*  
563 *La Plata (N.S., Zool.)* 4: 213-302.

564 Mikuš P., Uchman A. 2012. Beetle burrows with a terminal chamber: a contribution to the  
565 knowledge of the trace fossil *Macanopsis* in continental sediments. *Palaios*, 28: 403–413.

566 Murphy NP., Framenau VW., Donnellan SC., Harvey M.S., Park YC., Austin AD. 2006.  
567 Phylogenetic reconstruction of the wolf spiders (Araneae: Lycosidae) using sequences from the  
568 12S rRNA, 28S rRNA, and NADH1 genes: Implications for classification, biogeography, and the  
569 evolution of web building behavior. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 38: 583–602.

570 Moradmand M., Schönhöfer A., Jäger P. 2014. Molecular phylogeny of the spider family  
571 Sparassidae with focus on the genus *Eusparassus* and notes on the RTA-clade and ‘Laterigradae’.  
572 *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*. 74:48–65.

573 Netto RG. 2007. Skolithos-dominated piperock in non-marine environments: an example from

574 the Triassic Caturrita Formation, southern Brazil. In: Bromley RG, Buatois LA, Mángano MG,  
575 Genise JF, Melchor RN (eds.), *Sediment- Organism Interactions: a Multifaceted Ichnology*.  
576 SEPM Special Publication, 88.

577 Pemberton SG., Frey RW., Bromley RG. 1988. The ichnotaxonomy of *Conostichus* and other  
578 plug-shaped ichnofossils. *Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences* 25, 886 – 892.

579 Penney D. 2001. Advances in the taxonomy of spiders in Miocene amber from the Dominican  
580 Republic (Arthropoda: Araneae). *Palaeontology*. 44:987–1009.

581 Petrunkevitch A. 1910. Some new or little known American Spiders. *Annals of the New York*  
582 *Academy of Science*, 19: 205-224.

583 Planas E., Fernández-Montraveta C., Ribera C. 2013. Molecular systematics of the wolf spider  
584 genus *Lycosa* (Araneae: Lycosidae) in the Western Mediterranean Basin. *Molecular*  
585 *Phylogenetics and Evolution*. 67:414–428.

586 Platt BF. 2014. The foraging pits of the nine-banded armadillo, *Dasypus novemcinctus*  
587 (Mammalia: Xenarthra: Dasypodidae), and implications for interpreting conical trace fossils.  
588 *Palaeontologia Electronica* 17.3.46A: 1–17.

589 Policía de la Provincia de la Pampa. Registros Pluviales para el Departamento Puelén  
590 (<http://www.policia.lapampa.gov.ar/contenidos/ver/lluvias>).

591 Punzo F. (2000). Desert arthropods: life history variations. Berlin, Springer – Verlag, 230 p.

592 Ratcliffe BC., Fagerstrom JA. 1980. Invertebrate lebensspuren of Holocene floodplains: Their  
593 morphology, origin and paleoecological significance. *Journal of Paleontology*, 54: 614-630.

594 Roewer CF. 1960. Araneae Lycosaeformia II (Lycosidae) (Fortsetzung und Schluss).  
 595 Exploration du Parc National de l'Upemba, Mission G. F. de Witte, 55: 519-1040.

596 Sarzetti LC., Genise JF. 2011. Predation of Soil-Nesting *Centris muralis* (Insecta: Apidae) by  
 597 *Armadillos* (*Zaedyus pichiy*) (Mammalia: Cingulata) in La Rioja Province, Northwestern  
 598 Argentina. *Journal of the Kansas Entomological Society*.84: 179-183.

599 Schlirf M. 2000. Upper Jurassic trace fossils from the Boulonnais (northern France). *Geologica*  
 600 *et Palaeontologica*, 34:145–213.

601 Schlirf M., Uchman A., Kümmel M. 2001. Upper Triassic (Keuper) non-marine trace fossils  
 602 from the Haßberge area (Franconia, south-eastern Germany). *Paläontologische Zeitschrift*, 75,  
 603 71-96.

604 Schlirf M., Nara M., Uchman A. 2002. Invertebraten-Spurenfossilien aus dem *aunusquarzit*  
 605 (Siegen, Unterdevon) von der 'Rossel' nahe Rudesheim. *Jahrbucher des Nassauischen Vereins*  
 606 *für Naturkunde* 123: 43-63.

607 Schlirf M., Uchman A., 2005. Revision of the ichnogenus *Sabellarifex* Richter, 1921 and its  
 608 relationship to *Skolithos* Haldeman, 1840 and *Polykladichnus* Fürsich, 1981. *Journal of*  
 609 *Systematic Palaeontology*, 3, 115–131.

610 Selden PA., Anderson HM., Anderson JM. 2009. A review of the fossil record of spiders  
 611 (Araneae) with special reference to Africa, and description of a new specimen from the Triassic  
 612 Molteno Formation of South Africa. *African Invertebrates* 50, 105–116.

613 Servicio Meteorológico Nacional. Meteorological station Neuquén Aero, Period 2016- 2017

614 (<http://www.smn.gov.ar/>)

615 Shepard FP. 1954. Nomenclature based on sand-silt-clay ratios. *Journal of Sedimentary*

616 *Research* 24, 151-158.

617 Siegenthaler GB., Tiranti SI., Fiorucci EA. 2004. Relevamiento de los Vertebrados de la

618 Provincia de La Pampa, first edition. Gobierno de La Pampa, Santa Rosa

619 (<https://recursosnaturales.lapampa.edu.ar//index2.html>).

620 Simon E.1870. Aranéides nouveaux ou peu connus du midi de l'Europe. *Mémoires de la Société*

621 *Royale des Sciences de Liège* (2) 3: 271-358.

622 Smith JJ, Hasiotis ST, Kraus MJ, Woody DT. 2008. Relationship of Floodplain Ichnocoenoses to

623 Paleopedology, Paleohydrology, and Paleoclimate in the Willwood Formation, Wyoming,

624 During the Paleocene-eocene Thermal Maximum. *Palaaios*, 23: 683–699.

625 Smith JJ., Platt BF., Ludvigson GA., Thomasson JR. 2011. Ant-nest ichnofossils in honeycomb

626 calcretes, Neogene Ogallala formation, high Plains region of western Kansas, U.S.A.

627 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoecology, Palaeoclimatology*, 308: 383-394

628 Stimpson W. 1865. Researches upon the Hydrobiinae and allied forms; chiefly made upon

629 materials in the Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*,

630 201: 1–59.

631 Stokes AC. 1884. A Burrowing Spider. *Science*, 4: 114-116.

632 Suter RB., Stratton GE., Miller PR. 2011. Mechanics and energetics of excavation by burrowing

633 wolf spiders, *Geolycosa* spp. *Journal of Insect Science*, 11:22.

- 634 Torell O. 1870. Petrificata Suecana Formationis Cambricae. *Lunds Universitet Årsskrift*, 6: 1-14.
- 635 Toscano-Gadea CA., Costa FG. 2016. Description of the sexual behavior of the Neotropical wolf  
636 spider *Pavocosa gallopavo* (Araneae: Lycosidae), with comments on sexual cannibalism.  
637 *Journal of Arachnology*, 44: 412–416.
- 638 Tschinkel WR. 2003. Subterranean ant nests: Trace fossils past and future? *Palaeogeography*,  
639 *Palaeoecology, Palaeoclimatology*, 192: 321–333.
- 640 Uchman A., Vrenozi B., Muceku B. 2017. Spider burrows in ichnological context: A review of  
641 literature data and burrows of the wolf spider *Trochosa hispanica* Simon, 1870 from Albania. **B.**  
642 **Rend. Fis. Acc. Lincei.** Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12210-017-0662-7>
- 643 Ungern-Sternberg F. 1876. Salicorniearum Synopsis. Atti del congresso internazionale botanico  
644 tenuto in Firenze nel mese di maggio 1874. 1: 8, Firenze, pp. 259-343.
- 645 Vrenozi B., Uchman A. 2015. Data on the burrows of the wolf spider *Geolycosa vultuosa* (C. L.  
646 Koch, 1838), the first record for Albania. *First International Congress on Continental Ichnology*  
647 *Abstracts*, 69- 70.
- 648 Wallace HK. 1942. A revision of the burrowing spiders of the genus *Geolycosa* (Araneae,  
649 Lycosidae). *Am. Mid. Nat.* 27, 1-62.
- 650 White B., Curran HA. 1988. Mesoscale physical sedimentary structures and trace fossils in  
651 Holocene carbonate eolianites from San Salvador Island, Bahamas. *Sedimentary Geology*, 55:  
652 163-184. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0037-0738\(88\)90095-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/0037-0738(88)90095-4)
- 653 Wisshak M., Kroh A., Bertling M., Knaust D., Nielsen JK., Jagt JWM., Neumann C., Nielsen

654 KSS. 2015. In defence of an iconic ichnogenus – *Oichnus* Bromley, 1981. *Annales Societatis*  
655 *Geologorum Poloniae*, 85: 445–451.

656 World Spider Catalog 2017. World Spider Catalog. Natural History Museum Bern. Retrieved  
657 from <http://wsc.nmbe.ch>, version 18.5, accessed on September 11<sup>th</sup>, 2017. doi: 10.24436/2

658

659

# Figure captions

Figure 1. Compilation of previous descriptions of wolf spider burrows: (A) *Geolycosa domifex* (Hancock, 1899; fig. Pl II). (B) Generalized shape of spider burrows (Ctenizidae, Antrodiaetidae, Theraphosidae and Lycosidae. Ractliffe and Fagerstrom (1980, fig. 1B). Not to scale. (C) *Geolycosa xera archboldi* and (D) *G. hubbelli* burrows by Carrel (2008, fig. 1). (E) *Geolycosa missouriensis* burrow (Suter et al., 2011, fig. 1). (F) *Geolycosa* sp. (Chikhale et al., 2013, fig. 7); (G) *Allocosa brasiliensis*: Produced by: a. Females, b. Males, and c. Juveniles (Albín et al. 2015, fig. 1). (H) *Hogna lenta*: a. vertical shaft (fig. 12-2), b. vertical shaft with a terminal chamber (14-4), c. subvertical shaft (fig. 13-4), and d. Y-shaped burrow (fig. 15-1) (Hils and Hembree ,2015) (I) *Tetrallycosa* (a) offset burrow (b) with original burrow backfilled (Framenau and Hudson, 2017, fig. 3); (J) *Allocosa senex* (Foelix et al., 2017; fig. 16); (K) *Trochosa hispanica* (Uchman et al., 2017; fig. 6A).

Figure 2. Location map of the study area. (A-B) Site of study in the “Gran Salitral” in La Pampa Province, Argentina; (C) Geomorphologic map of the Gran Salitral area and location of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows (GS). Modified from Melchor et al. (2012)

Figure 3. Measures taken on burrows. Length (L), neck length (NL), minimum (mD) and maximum diameter (MD), angle of inclination (A).

Figure 4. View of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows in the field. (A) Site of observation of burrows in an open area with sparse vegetation (*Heterostachys ritteriana*). (B) Longitudinal section of an inhabited burrow with silk lining. Scale divisions in centimeters. (C) Entrance covered with a thin layer of silk. (D) Burrow partially closed with a cap of silk and sediment pellets; (E) Sac of

eggs found inside the burrow. Scale divisions in millimetres. (F) Partially plugged entrance and sediment pellets dispersed on the surface of the sandflat.

Figure 5. Sediments of the sandflat. (A) Detailed section of the sediments observed at the pit. (B) Representative grain size distribution of sediment samples. (C) Classification of sediment samples after Shepard (1954).

Figure 6. Comparison between type material of *Pavocosa gallopavo* and *Pavocosa* sp. (A) Female epigyne of *Pavocosa gallopavo* (MACN-Ar 13208). (B) Female epigyne of *Pavocosa* sp. (MACN-Ar 38582). (C) Dorsal view of *Pavocosa gallopavo* (MACN-Ar 13208). (D) Dorsal view of *Pavocosa* sp. (MACN-Ar 38582). Scale divisions in millimetres.

Figure 7. Plaster casts of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows. (A) GHUNLPam-4771. Dweller captured *Pavocosa* sp. (GHUNLPam -4780). (B) GHUNLPam -4772 (C) GHUNLPam -4773. Dweller captured *Pavocosa* sp and an egg sac found at the bottom (GHUNLPam -4770). (D) GHUNLPam -4774. Egg sac found at the bottom (E) GHUNLPam -4775. (F- G) Surface texture of burrow casts in the form of sets of two linear parallel ridges (arrows) (H) View of cheliceral fangs of *Pavocosa* sp. (specimen GHUNLPam -4780).

Figure 8. Plaster casts of modified *Pavocosa* sp. burrows. (A-B) Burrows with umbrella-like structures in the middle part, probably produced by reoccupation by ants (GHUNLPam-4776 and 4777). (C-D) Plan view showing umbrella shape from burrow casts GHUNLPam-4776 and 4777. (E) Detail of the knobby surface texture of the umbrella-like structure. (F) Cast showing two smaller burrows arising from the bottom of the wolf spider burrow (GHUNLPam -4778). (G) Funnel-shaped burrow cast as result of predation by a small armadillo (GHUNLPam -4779). Arrows point to set of two parallel ridges. (H) Detail of the set of two linear parallel ridges


703 (arrows). (I) Field view of burrow modified by predation by armadillos (cast figured in G). Note  
 704 brecciated fragments produced during excavation by the armadillo.

705

# Figure 1

Compilation of previous descriptions of wolf spider burrows


(A) *Geolycosa domifex* (Hancock, 1899; fig. Pl II). (B) Generalized shape of spider burrows (Ctenizidae, Antrodiaetidae, Theraphosidae and Lycosidae. Ractliffe and Fagerstrom (1980, fig. 1B). Not to scale. (C) *Geolycosa xera archboldi* and (D) *G. hubbelli* burrows by Carrel (2008, fig. 1). (E) *Geolycosa missouriensis* burrow (Suter et al., 2011, fig. 1). (F) *Geolycosa* sp. (Chikhale et al., 2013, fig. 7); (G) *Allocosa brasiliensis*: Produced by: a. Females, b. Males, and c. Juveniles (Albín et al. 2015, fig. 1). (H) *Hogna lenta*: a. vertical shaft (fig. 12-2), b. vertical shaft with a terminal chamber (14-4), c. subvertical shaft (fig. 13-4), and d. Y-shaped burrow (fig. 15-1) (Hils and Hembree ,2015) (I) *Tetrallycosa* (a) offset burrow (b) with original burrow backfilled (Framenau and Hudson, 2017, fig. 3); (J) *Allocosa senex* (Foelix et al., 2017; fig. 16); (K) *Trochosa hispanica* (Uchman et al., 2017; fig. 6A).



# Figure 2

Location map of the study area


(A-B) Site of study in the “Gran Salitral” in La Pampa Province, Argentina; (C)  
 Geomorphologic map of the Gran Salitral area and location of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows (GS).  
 Modified from Melchor et al. (2012).



# Figure 3

Measures taken on burrows


Length (L), neck length (NL), minimum (mD) and maximum diameter (MD), angle of inclination (A).



# Figure 4

View of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows in the field and location.


(A) Site of observation of burrows in an open area with sparse vegetation (*Heterostachys ritteriana*). (B) Longitudinal section of an inhabited burrow with silk lining. Scale divisions in centimeters. (C) Entrance covered with a thin layer of silk. (D) Burrow partially closed with a cap of silk and sediment pellets; (E) Sac of eggs found inside the burrow. Scale divisions in millimetres. (F) Partially plugged entrance and sediment pellets dispersed on the surface of the sandflat.



# Figure 5

Sediments of the sandflat.

(A) Detailed section of the sediments observed at the pit. (B) Representative grain size distribution of sediment samples. (C) Classification of sediment samples after Shepard (1954).



# Figure 6

Comparison between type material of *Pavocosa gallopavo* and *Pavocosa* sp.


. (A) Female epigyne of *Pavocosa gallopavo* (MACN-Ar 13208). (B) Female epigyne of *Pavocosa* sp. (MACN-Ar 38582). (C) Dorsal view of *Pavocosa gallopavo* (MACN-Ar 13208). (D) Dorsal view of *Pavocosa* sp. (MACN-Ar 38582). Scale divisions in millimetres.



# Figure 7

Plaster casts of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows.

(A) GHUNLPam-4771. Dweller captured *Pavocosa* sp. (GHUNLPam -4780). (B) GHUNLPam -4772 (C) GHUNLPam -4773. Dweller captured *Pavocosa* sp and an egg sac found at the bottom (GHUNLPam -4770). (D) GHUNLPam -4774. Egg sac found at the bottom (E) GHUNLPam -4775. (F- G) Surface texture of burrow casts in the form of sets of two linear parallel ridges (arrows) (H) View of cheliceral fangs of *Pavocosa* sp. (specimen GHUNLPam -4780).



# Figure 8

Plaster casts of modified *Pavocosa* sp. burrows.

(A-B) Burrows with umbrella-like structures in the middle part, probably produced by reoccupation by ants (GHUNLPam-4776 and 4777). (C-D) Plan view showing umbrella shape from burrow casts GHUNLPam-4776 and 4777. (E) Detail of the knobby surface texture of the umbrella-like structure. (F) Cast showing two smaller burrows arising from the bottom of the wolf spider burrow (GHUNLPam -4778). (G) Funnel-shaped burrow cast as result of predation by a small armadillo (GHUNLPam -4779). Arrows point to set of two parallel ridges. (H) Detail of the set of two linear parallel ridges (arrows). (I) Field view of burrow modified by predation by armadillos (cast figured in G). Note brecciated fragments produced during excavation by the armadillo.

