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

Fatima Mendoza-Belmontes[1], Ricardo N. Melchor[2] and Luis N Piacentini[3]

[1] FONCyT doctoral scholar, UNLPam, Av. Uruguay 151, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, 6300, Argentina

[2] INCITAP (CONICET and Universidad Nacional de La Pampa), Av. Uruguay 151, Santa Rosa, La Pampa, 6300, Argentina

[3] Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernardino Rivadavia'-CONICET, Av. Ángel Gallardo 470, C1405DJR, Buenos Aires, Argentina

Corresponding Author:

Fatima Mendoza-Belmontes[1]

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

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

Con formato: Español (España, internacional)

ABSTRACT

Pavocosa sp. (Lycosidae) burrows found in an open sparsely vegetated area on the edge of the Gran Salitral saline lake, 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 small mammals produces funnel-shaped burrows. Both active and abandoned *Pavocosa* sp. burrow casts are compared with existing ichnogenera and inorganic sedimentary structures, highlighting its distinction. It is argued that key features like the presence of a neck, a downward widening and the described surface texture will allow recognition of wolf spider burrows in the fossil record. However, the putative spider burrows described in the literature either lack the necessary preservational quality or does not show ornamentation similar to the modern wolf spider burrows. Fossil wolf spiders are recorded since the Paleogene (possibly Late Cretaceous), therefore 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 is linked to saline environments.

Eliminado: an ornamentation

Eliminado: are

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 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., Ratcliffe & 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; Mikuś & 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 Ratcliffe & Fagerstrom (1980), recent neoichnological studies has paid attention to the morphology of spider burrows (Hils & Hembree, 2015; Hembree, 2017; Uchman, Vrenozi & 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 later incorrectly referred to *Oichnus* Bromley, 1981 by Dunlop & 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* Haldeman, 1840 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.

Previous descriptions of modern wolf spider burrows

Eliminado: pionner

Eliminado: t

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

Eliminado:

Eliminado:

MATERIALS AND METHODS

We studied burrows produced by *Pavocosa* sp. found on the edge of sparsely vegetated sandflat

144 of the Gran Salitral saline lake located in southwest La Pampa Province, Argentina
145 (37°24'18.40"S, 67°12'13.57"W) (Fig. 2A-B). This saline lake is placed in the subregion of
146 alluvial plains of the Atuel-Salado rivers, characterized by a flat relief and sandy sediments,
147 under a semiarid climate and with halophyte vegetation (Fig. 2C) (INTA-UNLPam, 1980). The
148 Gran Salitral saline lake is the terminal part of an endorheic drainage system that occasionally
149 receives waters from the Atuel- Salado rivers. Modern brines exhibit a concentration ranging
150 from 213 to 252 g/l and the near-surface sediments of the saline lake attest for hydrological
151 variations during the Holocene, including fluctuations in brine salinity and lake level (Melchor &
152 Casadío, 2000). The mean monthly temperature ranges between 6.9 °C in July and 24.6 °C in
153 January, and the mean annual precipitation is 340 mm, in both cases for the period 1961-1980
154 (INTA-UNLPam, 1980).
155 Observations were conducted during three field trips in October-2016 (early spring, mean
156 monthly temperature for 2016: 15.4 ° C, and the total monthly precipitation was 140 mm),
157 December-2016 (late spring, mean monthly temperature for 2016: 23.1 °C, with no
158 precipitations) and February-2017 (summer, mean monthly temperature for 2017: 24.7 °C, and
159 precipitation was 22 mm). Rain data was obtained from Policía de la Provincia de la Pampa
160 (http://www.policia.lapampa.gov.ar/contenidos/ver/lluvias); and temperature data from Servicio
161 Meteorológico Nacional (www.smn.gov.ar), in both cases for the nearby 25 de Mayo and Puelén
162 towns.
163 Sandflat sediments were logged in a shallow pit using standard sedimentological methods, and
164 samples were taken for grain size and carbonate content analysis. Carbonate content of sediment
165 samples was estimated using the Digital Calcimeter "NETTO" that indicates the total percent
166 amount of calcium and magnesium carbonates. Grain size analyses of sediment samples were
167 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). The width between the fangs of chelicera in collected spider specimens was measured for comparison with the marks preserved in the casts.

RESULTS

Ocurrence of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows

In early spring (October, 2016) 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), appearing either open and 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^2) (Fig. 4F), at this time no casts were made. In late spring (December, 2016) burrow density was lower, they were 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 % of carbonate (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% of carbonate. Bed 3 (5 cm thick) is very poorly-sorted, dark yellowish brown (10 YR 4/2), silty sand with massive structure, containing 1.4% of

Eliminado: ,

Eliminado:

carbonate 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_3. 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 the bottom of the burrows).

Eliminado:

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 through the comparison of the males and females of *Pavocosa gallopavo* (Mello-Leitão, 1941) (Fig. 6A, 6C), the type species of the genus. The male holotype of *P. gallopavo* (MLP-15065) and females from MACN collection were examined and they share with *Pavocosa* sp. (Fig. 6B, 6D) the presence of deep furrows on the atrium, parallel to the median septum of the female epigyne and the coloration pattern (Fig. 6A, 6B), characters probably diagnostic of the genus (L Piacentini, personal observations). 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 -4.6 mm (Fig. 7H). The environmental distribution of *Pavocosa* is little known, although it seems to prefer bare patches in sandy grassland soils (L. Piacentini, personal observations).

Additional material of the described species 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 *Pavocosa* sp. from Córdoba (A. Peretti, C. Mattoni and M. Izquierdo, personal communication, 2008) and San Luis (M. Ramírez pers communication, 2016) are very similar to those described in this work.

Pavocosa sp. burrows

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

Modified _Pavocosa_ sp. burrows

Uninhabited *Pavocosa* sp. burrows (n=4) (Fig. 8) display some kind of modification in its overall form (Fig. 6A-D) (see Supplemental Material for interactive 3D models of each cast). All are composed of a highly inclined shaft (range: 78º-87º; average: 84.5º), with an upper constriction and an average maximum diameter ranging from 15 to 22 mm (average 19 mm). Three types of modifications were identified. 1) Subcylindrical burrows (108-116 mm long by 15-22 mm wide)

Eliminado: Supplementary

with a subhorizontal expansion in the middle part forming an "umbrella" (Figs. 8A-B). The shaft boundary exhibit scarce ornamentation in the form of sets of two linear parallel ridges similar to those of the inhabited *Pavocosa* sp. burrows. The "umbrella" structure shows an oval to lobed shape in the 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. 8E). 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

Clues for identification of wolf-spider burrows in the fossil record

Pavocosa sp. produces 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 margin. Most of these features are shared with other wolf spider burrows documented in the literature (Fig. 1) (Hancock, 1899; Ratcliffe & 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).

289 Another highly distinctive feature of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows is its surface ornamentation in the
290 form of two short parallel ridges oblique to perpendicular with the burrow axis that appear in the
291 most burrow casts (Fig. 7F-G). Although this surface ornamentation was not recorded in some
292 casts, probably due to the presence of the silk lining, all the burrow casts with delicate
293 preservation of the surface texture exhibit these paired ridges. This feature was not identified in
294 previous studies of wolf spider burrows and is potentially related to the burrowing technique used
295 by *Pavocosa* sp. Spiders uses two main mechanisms of excavation: 1) by pushing and
296 compressing sediment using the pedipalps (Hils & Hembree, 2015) and 2) by scraping the soil
297 with help of fangs from chelicerae (Stokes, 1884; Suter, Stratton & Miller, 2011; Hils &
298 Hembree, 2015; Foelix et al., 2016). Although we have not observed *Pavocosa* sp. during
299 digging, the sets of two linear parallel ridges observed on the better preserved burrow casts
300 surface are similar in form and shape with the arrangement of fangs of collected specimens. The
301 distance between fangs (3.9–4.6 mm) overlaps with distance between ridges within a set (2.2–4.5
302 mm). Thus we propose that excavation in *Pavocosa* sp. involves the use of fangs, as in type 2
303 excavation mechanism mentioned above.
304 Silk lined burrows are unique in spiders and essentially impart stability in soft substrates to
305 prevent collapse (Ratcliffe & Fagerstrom, 1980; Foelix et al. 2017; Hils & Hembree, 2015). The
306 presence of organic matter in the form of a silk lining increase the potential of preservation of
307 wolf spider burrows (Uchman, Vrenozi & Muceku, 2017), well above those of all others
308 arthropods that habit in the same environment.
309 Spider burrows may result modified by reoccupation or predation, as well as by environmental
310 changes. Reoccupation of abandoned lycosid and mygalomorph burrows by lizards, centipedes,
311 moths, wasps, beetles and ants have been documented (e.g., Fellows, Fenner & Bullet, 2009).
312 Ants have been also observed invading occupied wolf spider burrows with the purpose of prey

313 piracy (Marshall, 1995). However, it has not been documented if the reoccupation results in any
314 change in the morphology of the burrow. Common spider burrow disturbances caused by
315 predation includes those produced by pompilid wasps that preys the spider and occasionally digs
316 a tunnel perpendicular to the spider burrow (Gwynne, 1979; Costa et al., 2004), and excavation of
317 the upper part of the burrows by armadillos (Suter, Stratton & Miller, 2011).
318 Most of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows are susceptible to go through a large amount of disturbances,
319 including those caused by the reoccupation by another organism (Fig. 8A-B and F) and predation
320 of the dweller (Fig. 8G). Two kinds of burrow modifications observed during this study are
321 tentatively related to reoccupation of burrows: those with an expansion in the middle part as a
322 kind of "umbrella" (Fig. 8A-B) and that with smaller excavations at the bottom of the burrow
323 (Fig. 8F). Even if we cannot discard an inorganic origin (i.e., evaporite leaching) for the
324 "umbrella" structure seen in some casts is highly reminiscent of oval to lobed ant nest chambers
325 (Tschinkel, 2003). Although no ants were recorded when making the casts, they were commonly
326 seen in the sandflat surface constructing nests within vertebrate footprints and abandoned
327 burrows, presumably to avoid the hard efflorescent salt crust of the sandflat surface. The
328 producer of the smaller burrows at the bottom of *Pavocosa* sp. burrow is unknown. Funnel
329 shaped burrows (Fig. 8G) are alike to the probing marks related to predation by small mammals,
330 similar structures are described in the literature including Sarzetti & Genise (2011) from northern
331 Argentina, Suter, Stratton & Miller (2011: fig. 2), and Platt (2014), the two latter from
332 Mississippi, USA. Small mammals found in this area with similar behaviours are the armadillos
333 and skunks. The more likely producer is a small armadillo as suggested by the size of the funnel
334 and most importantly by the presence of sets of two large ridges in the cast surface (compare
335 Platt, 2014), interpreted as scratch marks (Fig. 8H).

Preservation of burrows in the margin of saline lakes, including those of wolf spiders, are affected by environmental factors like early cementation by evaporites and swelling of expansive clays during flooding (e.g., Scott, Renaut & Owen, 2010). Cementation by evaporites favors preservation, whereas wetting and drying cycles of swelling clays can destroy the burrows.

Con formato: Fuente: Sin Cursiva

Con formato: Fuente: Sin Cursiva

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 ichnotaxonomicaly (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 repetitive. There are a few examples of ornamented *Skolithos*, all of them from continental settings and tentatively assigned to insects or spiders, but they are not comparable to that observed in *Pavocosa* sp. burrows (Bromley & Asgaard, 1979; Schlirf et al. 2001; Netto, 2007). These ornamented *Skolithos* exhibit indistinct striations, except for the example described by Netto (2007) that display horizontal striae forming a circular ring. In consequence, there is no known fossil burrow with all the features described for the studied wolf spider burrows.

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 & Trewin, 1995 (see also Platt, 2014). A fundamental difference with these ichnogenera is the lack of large 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 & Trewin, 1995). Conical sedimentary structures of inorganic origin can also resemble *Pavocosa* sp. burrows modified by predation. Buck & Goldring (2003) identified two main inorganic processes that produced 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, which 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 (Selden, Anderson & Anderson,

Eliminado:

Eliminado: that

Eliminado: .

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, mostly 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 Late Cretaceous or Cenozoic 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 their location 40 cm above 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

Eliminado: .

Eliminado: the depth to

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). The presence of abundant *Pavocosa* sp. burrows in the well-drained sandflat deposits of the Gran Salitral and similar occurrences of reported in the literature (e.g., Hudson & Adams, 1996) suggest that wolf spider colonization of saline lakes occur preferentially during dry periods of the lake.

Wolf spiders (Lycosidae) are 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 vagrant 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 *Tetralycosa* and other species as *Lycosa salifodina* McKay, 1976 from Australia (Hudson & Adams, 1996; 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

Con formato: Fuente: Cursiva

Eliminado: preferentialy

Eliminado: is

Eliminado: vagant

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. produces 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 margin. These features are considered typical of wolf spider burrows.

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 a lateral expansion in the middle part as a kind of "umbrella" and another with smaller excavations at the bottom of the burrow. Predation by small mammals results in funnel-shaped burrows.

3) *Pavocosa* sp. burrows have significant differences with those found in the *Skolithos* ichnospecies. Such features as the presence of a neck, a downward widening and the surface texture make them identifiable in the fossil record. The modified *Pavocosa* sp. burrows can be confused with *Daimoniobarax*, rhizoliths, and several conical sedimentary structures, although some key aspects allow their distinction.

4) The features of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows that are considered diagnostic of wolf spider burrows are not identified to date in any published description of fossil examples.

5) *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 inhabits the surface of saline lakes. Furthermore, as the wolf spiders avoid flooded substrates, it is

suggested that the occurrence of wolf spider burrows in saline lakes is probably related to dry periods.

6) 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. The landowner of Puesto La Porfía, Mr Tránsito Cerda is thanked for permission to work on his property.

Eliminado: Transito

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahlbrandt TS, Andrews S, Gwynne DT. 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). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 62:29-35. DOI 10.1007/s00265-007-0435-x.

Albín A, Simó M, Aisenberg A. 2015. Characterisation of burrow architecture under natural conditions in the sand-dwelling wolf spider *Allocosa brasiliensis*. *Journal of Natural History*, 50:201–209. DOI 10.1080/00222933.2015.1068395.

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

483 Alpert SP. 1974. Systematic Review of the Genus *Skolithos*. *Journal of Paleontology*, 48(4):661-
484 669. Available at http://www.jstor.org/stable/1303217.

485 Banks N. 1895. Some Missouri spiders. *Entomological News*, 6:204-207.

486 Bromley RG. 1981. Concepts in ichnology illustrated by small round holes in shells. *Acta*
487 *Geológica Hispánica*, 16:55-64.

488 Bromley RG, Asgaard U. 1979. Triassic freshwater ichnocoenoses from Carlsberg Fjord.
489 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 28:39-80.

490 Bryson HR. 1939. Identification of soil insects by their burrow characteristics. *Transactions of*
491 *the Kansas Academy of Science*. 42:245-253.

492 Buck SG, Goldring R. 2003. Conical sedimentary structures, trace fossils or not? Observations,
493 experiments, and review. *Journal of Sedimentary Research*, 73:338-353.

494 Carrel JE. 2008. Differential survival of *Geolycosa xera archboldi* and *G. hubbelli* (Araneae,
495 Lycosidae) after fire in Florida scrub. *Journal of Arachnology*, 36:595-599.

496 Carroll S, Trewin NH. 1995. *Cornulatichnus*: a new trace fossil from the Old Red Sandstone of
497 Orkney. *Scottish Journal of Geology*, 31:37-41.

498 Cazzaniga N. 2011. El género *Heleobia* (Caenogastropoda: Cochliopidae) en América del Sur.
499 *Amici Molluscarum*, special number: 1-79.

500 Chikhale MP, Santape GB, Bodkhe AK. 2013. Some observations on burrow architecture of
501 burrowing spider *Geolycosa* Montgomery, 1904 (Araneae, Lycosidae) At Vairat, Melghat Tiger
502 Reserve, Maharashtra, India. *Indian Journal of Arachnology*, 2:34-38.

503 Cloudsley-Thompson JL. 1983. Desert adaptation in spiders. *Journal of Arid Environments*,
504 4:307-317.

505 Coddington JA. 2005. Phylogeny and classification of spiders. In: Ubick D, Paquin P, Cushing
506 PE, Roth V. (Eds.), Spiders of North America: an Identification Manual. *American*
507 *Arachnological Society*, 18-24.

508 Costa FG, Pérez-Miles F, Mignone A. 2004. Pompilid wasp interactions with burrowing
509 tarantulas: *Pepsis cupripennis* versus *Eupalaestrus weijenberghi* and *Acanthoscurria suina*
510 (Araneae, Theraphosidae). *Studies on Neotropical Fauna and Environment*, 39(1):37-43. DOI
511 10.1080/01650520412331270945.

512 Curran HA, White B. 1991. Trace fossils of shallow subtidal to dunal ichnofacies in Bahamian
513 Quaternary carbonates. *Palaios*, 6:498-510.

514 Curran HA, White B. 2001. Ichnology of Holocene carbonate eolianites of the Bahamas. *Society*
515 *of Economic Paleontologists and Mineralologists*, Special Publication 71:47-55.

516 Dahmer G. 1937. Lebensspuren aus dem Taunusquarzit und den Siegener Schichten
517 (Unterdevon). *Preussischen Geologischen Landesanstalt zu Berlin Jahrbuch 1936*, 57:523-539.

518 De Simone GA, Aisenberg A, Peretti AV. 2015. Female and juvenile burrow digging in *Allocosa*
519 *brasiliensis*, a South American sand-dwelling wolf spider. *Arachnology*, 16(8):276-280.
520 http://dx.doi.org/10.13156/arac.2015.16.8.276.

521 Dunlop JA. 2010. Geological history and phylogeny of Chelicerata. *Arthropod Structure and*
522 *Development*, 39:124-142. DOI 10.1016/j.asd.2010.01.003.

Eliminado:

524 Dunlop JA, Braddy SJ. 2011. *Cteniza bavincourti* and the nomenclature of arachnid-related trace
525 fossils. *The Journal of Arachnology*, 39:250-257.

526 Dunlop JA, Penney D, Jekel D. 2017. A summary list of fossil spiders and their relatives. In
527 World Spider Catalog. Natural History Museum Bern, Available at http://wsc.nmbe.ch, version
528 18.5 (accessed 11 September 2017).

529 Fellows HL, Fenner AL, Bull CM. 2009. Spiders provide important resources for an endangered
530 lizard. *Journal of Zoology*, 279(2):156-163. DOI 10.1111/j.1469-7998.2009.00600.x.

531 Fernandes ACS, Borghi L, Carvalho IS. 1992. Icnofósseis de Artropodes na Formação Resende
532 (Bacia de Resende, RJ). *Academia Brasileira de Ciências*, 64:269-275.

533 Foelix R, Rechenberg I, Erb B, Joel AC. 2016. Über den Bau der Wohnröhren bei
534 wüstenlebenden Spinnen. *Arachne*, 21:4-17.

535 Foelix R, Rechenberg I, Erb B, Albín A, Aisenberg A. 2017. Sand transport and burrow
536 construction in sparassid and lycosid spiders. *Journal of Arachnology*, 45:255-264.

537 Framenau VW, Leung AE. 2013. *Costacosa*, a new genus of wolf spider (Araneae, Lycosidae)
538 from coastal north-west Western Australia. *Records of the Western Australian Museum*, 83:173–
539 184. DOI 10.18195/issn.0313-122x.83.2013.173-184.

540 Framenau VW, Hudson P. 2017. Taxonomy, systematics and biology of the Australian
541 halotolerant wolf spider genus *Tetralycosa* (Araneae: Lycosidae: Artoriinae). *European Journal*
542 *of Taxonomy*, 335:1-72. https://doi.org/10.5852/ejt.2017.335.

543 Fürsich FT. 1981. Invertebrate trace fossils from the upper Jurassic of Portugal. *Comunicacoes*

Con formato: Portugués (Brasil)

544 *Servicos Geologicos de Portugal*, 67:153-168.

545 Garrison NL, Rodriguez J, Agnarsson I, Coddington JA, Griswold CE, Hamilton CA, Hedin M,
546 Kocot KM, Ledford JM, Bond JE. 2016. Spider phylogenomics: untangling the Spider Tree of
547 Life. *PeerJ*, 4:e1719. DOI 10.7717/peerj.1719.

548 Gwynne DT. 1979. Nesting biology of the spider wasps (Hymenoptera: Pompilidae) which prey
549 on burrowing wolf spiders (Araneae: Lycosidae, *Geolycosa*). *Journal of Natural History*, 13:681-
550 692.

551 Haldeman SS. 1840. Supplement to number one of 'A monograph of the Limniades, and other
552 freshwater bivalve shells of the apparently new animals in different classes, and names and
553 characters of the subgenera in *Paludina* and *Anculosa*', J. Dobson, Philadelphia. 3 pp.

554 Hancock JL. 1899. The castle-building spider. *Entomological News*, 10:23-29.

555 Hasiotis ST. 2002. Continental Trace Fossils. Short Course Notes, SEPM (Society for
556 Sedimentary Geology), Tulsa, 134 p.

557 Hasiotis ST. 2007. Continental ichnology: fundamental processes and controls on trace fossil
558 distribution. The continental realm. In: Miller W III (ed) Trace Fossils: Concepts, Problems,
559 Prospects. Elsevier Sci, Amsterdam, 268–284.

560 Hasiotis ST, Bourke MC. 2006. Continental trace fossils and museum exhibits: displaying
561 burrows as organism behaviour frozen in time. *The Geological Curator*, 8(5):211-226.

562 Hembree DI. 2017. Neoichnology of tarantulas (Araneae: Theraphosidae): Criteria for
563 recognizing spider burrows in the fossil record. *Palaeontologia Electronica*, 20.3.45A:1-30.

Eliminado:

565 Available at palaeo-electronica.org/content/2017/2003-neoichnology-of-tarantulas.

566 Hentz NM. 1844. Descriptions and figures of the araneides of the United States. *Boston Journal*
567 *of Natural History*, 4:386-396.

568 Hickman VV.1944. Scorpions and spiders. In: The Simpson desert expedition, 1939-Scientific
569 reports No. 1, Biology. *Transactions of the Royal Society of South Australia*, 68:18-48.

570 Hils JM, Hembree DI. 2015. Neoichnology of the burrowing spiders *Gorgyrella inermis*
571 (Mygalomorphae: Idiopidae) and *Hogna lenta* (Araneomorphae: Lycosidae). *Palaeontologia*
572 *Electronica*, 18.1.7A:1-62. Available at palaeo-electronica.org/content/2015/1057-neoichnology-
573 of-spiders.

574 Hudson P, and Adams M. 1996. Allozyme characterisation of the salt lake spiders (*Lycosa:*
575 Lycosidae: Araneae) of southern Australia: Systematic and population genetic Implications.
576 Australian Journal of Zoology 44:535-567. https://doi.org/10.1071/ZO9960535

577 INTA, UNLPam. 1980. Inventario Integrado de los Recursos Naturales de la Provincia de la
578 Pampa. Buenos Aires. ISAG.

579 Jensen S. 1997. Trace fossils from the Lower Cambrian Mickwitzia sandstone, south-central
580 Sweden. *Fossils and Strata*, 42:111.

581 Klappa CF. 1980. Rhizoliths in terrestrial carbonates: classification, recognition, genesis and
582 significance. *Sedimentology*, 27:613-629.

583 Koch CL. 1838. Die Arachniden. Nürnberg, Vierter Band, 109-144, Funfter Band, 1-124.

584 Lesquereux L. 1876. Species of fossil marine plants from the Carboniferous Measures.

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Con formato: Fuente: Cursiva, Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Código de campo cambiado

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Geological Survey of Indiana, Annual Report, 7:134-145.

Linck O. 1949. Lebens-Spuren aus dem Schilfsandstein (Mittl. Keuper, km 2) NW-Württembergs und ihre Bedeutung für die Bildungsgeschichte der Stufe. Jahreshefte des Vereins für vaterländische Naturkunde in Württemberg 97-101:1–100.

Logunov DV. 2011. Sexual size dimorphism in burrowing wolf spiders (Araneae: Lycosidae). *Proceedings of the Zoological Institute RAS*, 315:274-288.

Macsotay O. 1967. Huellas problemáticas y su valor paleoecológico en Venezuela. *GEOS Revista Venezolana de Ciencias de la Tierra*, 16:1-87.

Männil R. 1966. O vertikalnykh norkakh zaryvaniya v ordovikskikh izvestnyakakh Pribaltiki. In Hecker RF. (ed.), Organizm i sreda v geologischeskom proshlom. Akademiya Nauk SSSR. Paleontologicheskij Institut, 200-207.

Marshall SD. 1995. Natural history, activity patterns, and relocation rates of a burrowing wolf spider: *Geolycosa xera archboldi* (Araneae, Lycosidae). *Journal of Arachnology*, 23:65-70.

Marshall SD. 1996. Evidence for territorial behavior in a burrowing wolf spider. *Ethology*, 102:32-39.

McCrone JD. 1963. Taxonomic status and evolutionary history of the *Geolycosa pikei* complex in the Southeastern United States (Araneae, Lycosidae). *American Midland Naturalist*, 70:47-73.

McKay RJ. 1976. The wolf spiders of Australia (Araneae: Lycosidae): 8. Two new species inhabiting salt lakes of Western Australia. Memoirs of the Queensland Museum, 17: 417-423.

Melchor RN, Casadío S. 2000. Descripción Geológica de la Hoja 3766-III "La Reforma"

Con formato: Español (Uruguay)

Con formato: Español (Argentina)

Con formato: Español (Argentina)

Con formato: Español (Argentina)

(1:250.000), Provincia de la Pampa. Boletín del Servicio Geológico Minero Argentino, 295: 1-70.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Moradmand M, Schönhofer A, Jäger P. 2014. Molecular phylogeny of the spider family Sparassidae with focus on the genus *Eusparassus* and notes on the RTA-clade and 'Laterigradae'. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*, 74:48-65.

Con formato: Español (Argentina)
Con formato: Español (Argentina)
Con formato: Español (Argentina)
Con formato: Español (Argentina)
Con formato: Español (Argentina)

626 Netto RG. 2007. *Skolithos*-dominated piperock in non-marine environments: an example from
627 the Triassic Caturrita Formation, southern Brazil. In: Bromley RG, Buatois LA, Mángano MG,
628 Genise JF, Melchor RN (eds.), Sediment- Organism Interactions: a Multifaceted Ichnology.
629 *SEPM*, Special Publication, 88:109-121.

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

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

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

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

639 Platt BF. 2014. The foraging pits of the nine-banded armadillo, *Dasypus novemcinctus*
640 (Mammalia: Xenarthra: Dasypodidae), and implications for interpreting conical trace fossils.
641 *Palaeontologia Electronica*, 17.3.46A:1–17. Available at palaeo-
642 electronica.org/content/2014/1013-armadillo-foraging-pits.

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

645 Punzo F. (2000). Desert Arthropods: Life History Variations. Berlin, Springer – Verlag, 230 p.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Scott JJ, Renaut RW, and Owen RB. 2010. Taphonomic controls on animal tracks at saline, alkaline lake Bogoria, Kenya rift valley: Impact of salt efflorescence and clay mineralogy. Journal of Sedimentary Research 80:639-665.

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

669 Servicio Meteorológico Nacional. Meteorological station Neuquén Aero, Period 2016- 2017
670 (http://www.smn.gov.ar/).

671 Shepard FP. 1954. Nomenclature based on sand-silt-clay ratios. *Journal of Sedimentary*
672 *Research*, 24:151-158.

673 Simon E.1870. Aranéides noveaux ou peu connus du midi de l'Europe. *Mémoires de la Société*
674 *Royale des Sciences de Liège*, 2(3):271-358.

675 Smith JJ, Hasiotis ST, Kraus MJ, Woody DT. 2008. Relationship of floodplain ichnocoenoses to
676 paleopedology, paleohydrology, and paleoclimate in the Willwood Formation, Wyoming, during
677 the Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum. *Palaios*, 23:683-699.

678 Smith JJ, Platt BF, Ludvigson GA, Thomasson JR. 2011. Ant-nest ichnofossils in honeycomb
679 calcretes, Neogene Ogallala formation, high Plains region of western Kansas, U.S.A.
680 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoecology, Palaeoclimatology*, 308:383-394.

681 Stimpson W. 1865. Researches upon the Hydrobiinae and allied forms; chiefly made upon
682 materials in the Museum of the Smithsonian Institution. *Smithsonian Miscellaneous Collections*,
683 201:1-59.

684 Stokes AC. 1884. A burrowing spider. *Science*, 4:114-116.

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

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

687 Torell O. 1870. Petrificata Suecana Formationis Cambricae. *Lunds Universitet Årsskrift*, 6:1-14.

688 Toscano-Gadea CA., Costa FG. 2016. Description of the sexual behavior of the Neotropical wolf
689 spider *Pavocosa gallopavo* (Araneae: Lycosidae), with comments on sexual cannibalism. *Journal*
690 *of Arachnology*, 44:412-416.

691 Tschinkel WR. 2003. Subterranean ant nests: Trace fossils past and future? *Palaeogeography,*
692 *Palaeoecology, Palaeoclimatology*, 192:321-333.

693 Uchman A, Vrenozi B, Muceku B. 2017. Spider burrows in ichnological context: A review of
694 literature data and burrows of the wolf spider *Trochosa hispanica* Simon, 1870 from Albania B.
695 *Rendiconti Lincei. Scienze Fisiche e Naturali*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12210-017-0662-7.

696 Ungern-Sternberg F. 1876. Salicorniearum Synopsis. Atti del congresso internazionale botanico
697 tenuto in Firenze nel mese di maggio 1874. 1: 8, Firenze, 259-343.

698 **V**renozi B, Uchman A. 2015. Data on the burrows of the wolf spider *Geolycosa vultuosa* (C. L.
699 Koch, 1838), the first record for Albania. *First International Congress on Continental Ichnology*
700 *Abstracts*, 69-70.

701 Wallace HK. 1942. A revision of the burrowing spiders of the genus *Geolycosa* (Araneae,
702 Lycosidae). *American Midland Naturalist*, 27:1-62.

703 White B, Curran HA.1988. Mesoscale physical sedimentary structures and trace fossils in
704 Holocene carbonate eolianites from San Salvador Island, Bahamas. *Sedimentary Geology*,
705 55:163-184. https://doi.org/10.1016/0037-0738(88)90095-4.

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Con formato: Inglés (Estados Unidos)

Eliminado:

Wisshak M, Kroh A, Bertling M, Knaust D, Nielsen JK, Jagt JWM, Neumann C, Nielsen KSS. 2015. In defence of an iconic ichnogenus – *Oichnus* Bromley, 1981. *Annales Societatis Geologorum Poloniae*, 85:445-451.

World Spider Catalog 2017. World Spider Catalog. Natural History Museum Bern. Available at http://wsc.nmbe.ch, version 18.5, (accessed 11 September 2017). DOI 10.24436/2.

714 **Figure captions**

715 Figure 1. Compilation of previous descriptions of wolf spider burrows: (A) *Geolycosa domifex*
716 (Hancock, 1899; fig. Pl II). (B) Generalized shape of spider burrows (Ctenizidae, Antrodiaetidae,
717 Theraphosidae and Lycosidae) from Ratcliffe & Fagerstrom (1980, fig. 1B). Not to scale. (C)
718 *Geolycosa xera archboldi* and (D) *G. hubbelli* burrows by Carrel (2008, fig. 1). (E) *Geolycosa*
719 *missouriensis* burrow (Suter et al., 2011, fig. 1). (F) *Geolycosa* sp. (Chikhale et al., 2013, fig. 7).
720 (G) *Allocosa brasiliensis* burrows produced by females (a)., males (b), and juveniles (c) (Albín et
721 al. 2015, fig. 1). (H) *Hogna lenta*: a. vertical shaft (Hils and Hembree ,2015; fig. 12-2), b. vertical
722 shaft with a terminal chamber (Hils and Hembree ,2015; fig. 14-4), c. subvertical shaft (Hils and
723 Hembree ,2015; fig. 13-4), and d. Y-shaped burrow (Hils and Hembree ,2015;, fig. 15-1) (I)
724 *Tetralycosa* (a) offset burrow (b) with original backfilled burrow (Framenau and Hudson, 2017,
725 fig. 3). (J) *Allocosa senex* (Foelix et al., 2017; fig. 16). (K) *Trochosa hispanica* (Uchman et al.,
726 2017; fig. 6A).

Con formato: Español (Argentina)

727 Figure 2. Location map of the study area. (A-B) Site of study in the Gran Salitral saline lake in
728 La Pampa Province, Argentina. (C) Geomorphologic map of the Gran Salitral area and location
729 of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows (GS).

730 Figure 3. Measurements on burrow casts. Length (L), neck length (NL), minimum (mD) and
731 maximum diameter (MD), angle of inclination (A).

732 Figure 4. View of *Pavocosa* sp. burrows in the field. (A) Site of observation of burrows in an
733 open area with sparse vegetation (*Heterostachys ritteriana*). (B) Longitudinal section of an
734 inhabited burrow with silk lining. Scale divisions in centimeters. (C) Entrance covered with a thin
735 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), arrow pointing deep furrows on the atrium. (B) Female epigyne of *Pavocosa* sp. (MACN-Ar 38582), arrow pointing deep furrows on the atrium. (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 (*Pavocosa* sp. Dweller is specimen GHUNLPam -4780). (B) GHUNLPam -4772. (C) GHUNLPam -4773. (*Pavocosa* sp. dweller and an egg sac found at the bottom of the burrow is specimen GHUNLPam -4770). (D) GHUNLPam -4774. Originally with an 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 of umbrella-like structure 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 mammal (GHUNLPam -4779).

Arrows point to a set of two parallel ridges. (H) Detail of the set of two linear parallel ridges (arrows). (I) Field view of burrow modified by predation (related to the cast figured in G). Note brecciated fragments produced during excavation.