Evidence for the Cretaceous shark *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* feeding on the pterosaur *Pteranodon* (#30992)

First submission

Editor guidance

Please submit by **3 Oct 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 materials page.

Image check
Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

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

Files
Download and review all files from the materials page.

4 Figure file(s)

Structure and Criteria

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.
- Speculation is welcome, but should be identified as such.
- Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.

Standout reviewing tips

The best reviewers use these techniques

Tip	*Example*
Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources	*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.*

Evidence for the Cretaceous shark *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* feeding on the pterosaur *Pteranodon*

David W E Hone Corresp., [1] , **Mark P Witton** [2] , **Michael B Habib** [3]

[1] School of Biological and Chemical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, London, United Kingdom
[2] School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Portsmouth, United Kingdom
[3] Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, United States

Corresponding Author: David W E Hone
Email address: d.hone@qmul.ac.uk

Here we describe a specimen of the large, pelagic pterodactyloid pterosaur *Pteranodon* sp. that shows the tooth of a large lamniform shark, *Cretoxyrhina mantelli*, associated with a cervical vertebra. Though the tooth does not pierce the vertebral periosteum the intimate association of the fossils – in which the tooth is wedged below the left prezygopophysis – suggests their association was not mere chance, and we interpret the association as evidence of *Cretoxyrhina* biting the pterosaur. There are several records of *Pteranodon* having been consumed by sharks (specifically, the anacoracid *Squalicorax kaupi*), and multiple records of *Cretoxyrhina* biting other vertebrates of the Western Interior Seaway, but until now interactions between *Cretoxyrhina* and *Pterandon* have remained elusive. The specimen increases the known interactions between large, pelagic, vertebrate carnivores of the Western Interior Seaway of North America during the Late Cretaceous, in addition to bolstering the relatively small fossil record representing pterosaurian interactions with other species.

Evidence for the Cretaceous shark *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* feeding on the pterosaur *Pteranodon*

David W. E. Hone[1*]

Mark P. Witton [2]

Michael B. Habib[3]

1. School of Biological and Chemical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, London, E1 4NS, UK.

2. School of Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of Portsmouth, Burnaby Road, Portsmouth PO1 3QL, UK.

3. Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA, United States of America

Corresponding author: David Hone, d.hone@qmul.ac.uk

Abstract:

Here we describe a specimen of the large, pelagic pterodactyloid pterosaur *Pteranodon* sp. that shows the tooth of a large lamniform shark, *Cretoxyrhina mantelli*, associated with a cervical vertebra. Though the tooth does not pierce the vertebral periosteum the intimate association of the fossils – in which the tooth is wedged below the left prezygopophysis – suggests their association was not mere chance, and we interpret the association as evidence of *Cretoxyrhina* biting the pterosaur. There are several records of *Pteranodon* having been consumed by sharks (specifically, the anacoracid *Squalicorax kaupi*), and multiple records of *Cretoxyrhina* biting other vertebrates of the Western Interior Seaway, but until now interactions between *Cretoxyrhina* and *Pterandon* have remained elusive. The specimen increases the known interactions between large, pelagic, vertebrate carnivores of the Western Interior Seaway of North America during the Late Cretaceous, in addition to bolstering the relatively small fossil record representing pterosaurian interactions with other species.

Introduction:

Pteranodon is a large pterodactyloid pterosaur from the Late Cretaceous (Coniacian-Campanian) of North America with an estimated maximum wingspan of 7.25 m (Bennett, 2001). The genus was among the first pterosaurs reported from North America (Marsh, 1876 – see Bennett, 2001 and Witton, 2010 for context of its discovery) and has become one of the best known flying reptiles thanks to a representation of well over 1000 specimens – the highest sample size for any pterosaur genus. Although most specimens are incomplete and crushed,

every component of its osteology is known and has been described in detail (Eaton, 1910; Bennett, 1991, 1994, 2001, 2017, 2018; Bennett & Penkalski, 2018). As a result of the number of available specimens, its long research history and comprehensive documentation, the genus has become a cornerstone of pterosaur research and one of the most completely understood flying reptiles. *Pteranodon* has been an important animal for understanding pterosaur flight (Hankin & Watson, 1914; Bramwell & Whitfield, 1974; Stein, 1975), the evolution of giantism in flying animals (Witton & Habib, 2010), as well as pterosaur ontogeny (Bennett, 1993), and palaeoecology (Bennett, 2001; Witton, 2018).

The majority of *Pteranodon* specimens are known from the Late Cretaceous Niobrara Formation from Kansas, U.S.A., a marine deposit created by the Western Interior Seaway, though other specimens also occur in additional formations in Wyoming and South Dakota (Bennett, 1994, 2001). Niobrara specimens of *Pteranodon* occur in localities that were hundreds of kilometres from the palaeocoastline and this, along with a number of aspects of functional anatomy, has seen the genus long interpreted as a seagoing, pelagic animal (e.g., Bennett, 2001; Witton, 2013, p. 179).

Pteranodon was likely an important component of the Western Interior Seaway ecosystem. It seems to have been relatively abundant, being known from both a large number of fossils and making up some 97% of Niobrara Formation pterosaur finds. It was also a large animal - Bennett (1993) identified a bimodal size distribution among the large *Pteranodon* sample where two thirds of individuals were c. 3.5 m in wingspan, and the remaining third were much larger, some exceeding 7 m across the wings (Bennett, 2001). Larger specimens likely exceed the masses of any flying bird, extant or extinct, with estimated body masses of 35-50 kg

for animals of 6 m wingspan (Paul, 2002; Witton, 2008; Henderson 2010), compared to 21.9–40.1 kg in the largest fossil flying birds, the pelagornithids (Mayr & Rubilar-Rogers, 2010; Ksepka, 2014). *Pteranodon* populations may therefore have been major consumers in the Western Interior Seaway ecosystem, as well as potentially sources of food for other animals.

However, our understanding of interactions between *Pteranodon* and other taxa of the Seaway is limited. As with other pterosaur species, few *Pteranodon* fossils preserve remains of ingested content and they only rarely preserve evidence of consumption by other animals (Witton, 2018). Moreover, documentation of its palaeoecological data has not comprehensive. Regurgitated fish gut content is preserved in the gular region of one *Pteranodon* specimen (Brown, 1943; Bennett, 2001, 2018) and some palaeoecological significance has been ascribed to small fish vertebrae found in association with *Pteranodon* fossils (Bennett, 2001; Hargrave, 2007; Ehret, Harrell & Ebersole, 2015). Biting traces on *Pteranodon* elements, both briefly described (Ehret, Harrell & Ebersole, 2015) and undescribed, suggest some individuals were eaten by the anacoracid shark *Squalicorax kaupi* as well as other unidentified carnivores (Witton, 2018). The record of pterosaur ecological interactions is sufficiently sparse that any fossilised interactions with other species should be put on record, so we hereby report on a series of *Pteranodon* cervical vertebrae, LACM 50926, associated with a tooth of the lamniform shark *Cretoxyrhina mantelli*. This is first documented occurrence of this large shark interacting with any pterosaur.

Systematic nomenclature:

The taxonomy of *Pteranodon* is a matter of recent dispute. For the last two decades most workers have followed the treatment of the genus outlined by Bennett (1994), who made a case for reducing the 11 binomials associated with *Pteranodon* (excluding those names related to *Nyctosaurus*) to two sexually dimorphic chronospecies: the older *Pteranodon sternbergi* and the younger *P. longiceps*. In this scheme, the skulls of these species are distinguished by details of their cranial crests, and (more tentatively) occiput orientation and mandibular ramus depth. Postcranial bones of these specimens are near identical and of little taxonomic utility (Bennett, 1994). More recently, Kellner (2010) argued for *Pteranodon sensu* Bennett (1994) being comprised of four species in three genera. While agreeing with Bennett (1994) that all 'historic' *Pteranodon* species were problematic excepting *longiceps* and *sternbergi*, Kellner (2010) created a multi-taxic pteranodontid assemblage for the Niobrara specimens comprising *Pteranodon longiceps*, *Geosternbergia* (rather than *Pteranodon*) *sternbergi*, and two novel species, *Geosternbergia maiseyi* and *Dawndraco kanzai*. These taxa are primarily distinguished by headcrest morphology and details of the posterior skull, as well as finer stratigraphic divisions of the Niobrara Formation (Kellner, 2010) than the broader 'upper' and 'lower' divisions of the Smoky Hill Chalk *Pteranodon* fauna recognised by other workers (e.g. Bennett, 1994; Everhart, 2005; Carpenter, 2008). Subsequent criticism of this proposal has questioned the validity of the proposed differences between at least *Dawndraco* and *Pteranodon* sensu lato, noted incongruence between the stratigraphic divisions signified by Kellner (2010) against other Niobrara Formation taxa, as well as the lack of statistical support for splitting *Pteranodon* into multiple genera, compared to the strong statistical support for Bennett's interpretation (Martin-Silverstone et al., 2017; Acorn et al., 2017). We thus follow

100 several other works (Witton, 2013, 2018; Bennett 2016, 2017, 2018) in retaining Bennett's
101 (1994) treatment of *Pteranodon* here. Note however that discussion of *Pteranodon* taxonomy is
102 ongoing (Brandão & Rodrigues, 2018).
103
104 **Materials and Methods:**
105 LACM 50926 (Los Angeles County Museum of Natural History, USA) is specimen of
106 *Pteranodon* mounted in a large glass case for public display at the Los Angeles County Museum
107 for Natural History and is unfortunately difficult to access directly (Fig 1). The specimen has a
108 large *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* tooth intimately associated with the fourth cervical vertebra (Fig 2).
109 Parts of the mount are genuine fossils and these are well preserved (showing only limited
110 crushing compared to many specimens of the genus). However, several elements are
111 reconstructed to replace missing parts and the mount composites material from at least two
112 individuals (see Bennett, 1991, 2001): size discrepancy between some neighbouring elements
113 also suggests at least one more individual may be incorporated. Bennett (pers. comm. 6/ 2016)
114 also notes material accessioned under this number (much of it in collections space and not in
115 the exhibit mount) includes three mandibular rami, confirming the multi-individual nature of
116 this specimen. An alternate specimen number (65218) occurs on the mandible and the cervical
117 bearing the shark tooth, but this cannot be seen on other elements. This may indicate that the
118 mandible and cervical were associated when discovered. Bennett (2001) was able to identify
119 many of the LACM 50926 forelimb elements as belonging to a single individual, although there
120 are no records to indicate which parts of the mounted specimen might relate directly to the
121 cervical series. The preservation quality and size of the vertebrae correspond well to the other

elements (including the forelimb bones) and this implies that LACM 50926 may represent a partial or nearly complete skeleton. However, the absence of both anteriormost and posterior cervical vertebrae means no anatomical continuity links the 50926 vertebrae with the rest of the material, and their association to the rest of the skeleton cannot be confidently assumed.

Notes held at the LACM show that the specimen was collected in 1965 by M.C. Bonner from Niobrara Chalk 23, Niobrara Formation, Logan County, Kansas. Bennett (1991) refers to two specimens under this number (LACM 50926 and 50926 "A") and concurs with this locality, adding that they were collected between Marker Units 14 and 19. This makes a Santonian age likely for LACM 50926 (Hattin, 1982; Bennett, 1994).

Description:

The anatomy of *Pteranodon* has been described in detail elsewhere (Bennett, 2001) and we will therefore focus exclusively on the association between the shark tooth and pterosaur material. The cervical vertebra bearing the shark tooth is preserved in contact with two other cervicals as a series of three elements. Thus, within the composite context of the LACM specimen, these vertebrae at least can be safely considered part of a single individual. The cervicals are preserved in articulation with contact between the successive post- and prezygopophyses. These are identified by Bennett (2001) as cervical vertebrae 4-6, and he also identified a preceding, though not articulated, cervical in the LACM 50926 mount as a cervical 3. The vertebrae retain some three-dimensionality, although they are somewhat crushed at an oblique angle, shearing them along their midline such that the left sides are depressed and right sides elevated (Figs 1-2). The neural spine is missing (now restored) from cervical 4 and parts of

the neural spines cervicals 5 and 6 are damaged. Damage to the bone cortex reveals the internal structure of the bones in all three vertebrae.

The centrum lengths of the three cervical vertebrae in the series have been measured as 69.0, 77.8, and 71.5 mm respectively (Bennett, 2001). Based on comparisons to other specimens this would correspond to a *Pteranodon* with a c. 5 m wingspan, and was presumably therefore osteological adult or near adult in size. The embedded shark tooth is approximately 24 mm long (this was measured from photographs as it was impossible to measure the tooth given its location and the mount of the specimen), subtriangular in shape and highly compressed labiolingually. A wide, lunate root is formed from two obtusely angled, swollen root lobes. The termination of the left lobe (viewed from lingual aspect) forms a broad, somewhat rounded surface, but the termination of the right lobe is missing (Fig. 2). The crown is swollen on the labial surface, c. 12 mm long (measured from the apex of the root to apex of the crown), almost symmetrical but not significantly recurved with respect to the root. The tooth appears to lack serrations but the lateral and medial crown edges are somewhat worn with chipped margins. The tooth enamel is bright white with grey to brown patches, and the base of the tooth is pale grey-brown and close in colour to that of the pterosaur elements.

The tooth lies between the left prezygopophysis of cervical 4 and the centrum. In some aspects it appears that the tooth is wedged or has cut into the base of the prezygopophysis and the centrum; however, it lies medial to the prezygopophysis and does not contact it directly. The tooth is at preserved at a shallow angle to the long axis of the vertebra, (though this may reflect the crushing of the specimen rather than its original orientation) and the crown apex

165 faces posteriorly and ventrally with respect to the vertebral corpus. The tip of the tooth does
166 appear to penetrate the centrum but the tip of the tooth contacts it.
167
168 **Results:**
169 *Taxonomic identities:*
170 The composite nature of LACM 50926 complicates discussions of its affinities, but there
171 is no doubt that the specimen can be referred to *Pteranodon* given its provenance and
172 matching anatomy to this pterosaur (Eaton, 1910; Bennett, 2001). Identification to species level
173 is more problematic as *Pteranodon* taxonomy is exclusively informed by the posterior skull
174 region (e.g. Eaton, 1910; Bennett, 1994; Kellner, 2010), and the vertebra is not associated with
175 any skull material. Following Bennett's (1994) tentative suggestion that *P. sternbergi* may have
176 a shallower mandible than *P. longiceps* we compared the LACM 50926 mandibular ramus with
177 specimens referred to these species. However, we were unable to determine a significant
178 match with either taxon. Hargrave (2007) suggested that the tomial margins of posterior *P.*
179 *longiceps* mandibles are curved, and this morphology is present in the LACM 50926 mandible.
180 However, while we agree this can be seen in some *P. longiceps* (e.g. YPM 2594 - YPM, Yale
181 Peabody Museum, USA) it does not seem to be a universal trait (e.g. YPM 1177).
182 The recovery of LACM 50926 from marker units 14-19 of Hattin's (1982) Smoky Hill
183 Chalk stratigraphy suggests it pertains to younger Niobrara beds yielding *Pteranodon longiceps*
184 rather than *P. sternbergi* (Bennett, 1994; Carpenter, 2008, although Kellner, 2010 argues that
185 species more closely related to *P. sternbergi* than *P. longiceps* may persist into younger

deposits) and this indicates LACM 50926 probably represents *P. longiceps*. In lieu of diagnostic fossil material however, we treat the specimen as *Pteranodon* sp.

A number of medium- to large-sized, sharp-toothed sharks are known from the Niobrara Formation, and they have left an extensive record of tooth marks and shed teeth among other vertebrates of the Smoky Hill Chalk Member (Everhart, 2005). The Niobrara species particularly best known for this behaviour is *Squalicorax kaupi*, but this identification can be excluded for the LACM tooth because it lacks the asymmetrical crown, notched cutting edge and serrations characterising the dentition of this genus (e.g. see Everhart, 2005; Becker & Chamberlain 2012). The tooth is a good march for the large lamniform shark *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* (Fig. 3), which has subtriangular, relatively broad and short crowns without serrated margins, and are not recurved (e.g. Schimada, 1997; Siverson & Lindgren, 2005, their fig 2; Bourdon & Everhart, 2011). In particular, the morphology of the tooth in LACM 50926 matches teeth recovered from anterior positions of *Cretoxyrhina* jaws (Schimada, 1997; Bourdon & Everhart, 2011, their figs 2, 5). This identification of the shark tooth has as belonging to *Cretoxyrhina* was also independently made by Konuki (2008). Comparison of the LACM tooth size with a superb *C. mantelli* skeleton, FHSM VP-2187 (Schimada, 1997), suggests that the shark individual was c. 2.5 m long. This is little more than one third of length of the largest known individuals of this species

Discussion:

Significance of association of Pteranodon *and* Cretoxyrhina

Ecological interactions between pterosaurs and other species are rarely represented in fossil specimens, despite vast increases in pterosaur specimen numbers in recent years (Witton, 2018). Data on diet from stomach contents is sparse, limited to a handful of taxa known to have eaten fish (e.g. *Eudimorphodon* – Wild, 1978, *Pteranodon, Rhamphorhynchus* – Wellnhofer, 1991). Coprolites are also scarce, with only one record for pterosaurs known to date (Hone et al., 2014). A number of animals are recorded as pterosaur consumers, including fish (e.g. Frey & Tischlinger, 2012), dinosaurs (e.g. Hone et al., 2012), Crocodyliformes (Vremir et al., 2013) and possibly plesiosaurs (Cicimurri & Everhart, 2001, but also see Witton, 2018), but they remain very rare fossils, despite the good fossil records of these 'consumer' taxa. Thus, this additional potential record of a pterosaur-carnivore association is significant.

The taphonomic history and association of LACM 50926 is unknown so it is difficult to draw firm conclusions about the action that left the shark tooth in situ. However, we rule out abiotic association of the shark and pterosaur tooth for several reasons: 1) embedded *Cretoxyrhina* teeth and feeding traces are known from numerous Smoky Hill vertebrate fossils, and are widely interpreted as related to feeding behaviour (Shimada, 1997; Everhart, 2004, 2005); 2) although isolated *Cretoxyrhina* teeth are common fossils in the Smoky Hill Chalk Member (Everhart, 2005), its teeth have not been reported in association with any *Pteranodon* fossils in the past, despite the large sample size of this pterosaur and the fact that other fish remains (e.g. vertebrae) are not uncommonly associated with their remains (Bennett, 2001; Hargrave, 2007); 3) the spatial relationship between the tooth and the vertebra is complex and intimate, and unlike that expected to have developed by chance in a low energy deposit such as

the Niobrara Chalk. We thus prefer an interpretation of the tooth being associated with the vertebra when as the remnant of a bite from a small *Cretoxyrhina*.

We were unable to find additional indications of bite marks or feeding traces on LACM 50926. There is a small and almost perfectly circular puncture on the neural arch of cervical four, behind the left prezygopohysis but this is most likely a preparation mark or damage derived from a previous museum mount. The damaged and missing neural spines of the cervical series may be linked to the shark bite, but other pterosaur fossils show that these elements are prone to damage and/or poor preservation, so other causes cannot be excluded.

Cretoxyrhina was a large (up to 7 m in length) and powerful carnivore, perhaps one of the top predators of the Smoky Hill Chalk fauna (Everhart, 2005). Shimada (1997) compared its likely ecological feeding guild to larger modern species of lamnid and carcharhinid sharks, and there is fossil evidence that it consumed a variety of large vertebrates including mosasaurs, plesiosaurs and large teleost fish (Schimada, 1997; Everhart, 2004, 2005). LACM 50926 is the first palaeoecological link between this shark genus and a pterosaur. The remains of large aquatic vertebrates bitten by *Cretoxyrhina* may be marked by not only shed teeth and tooth gouges but also shorn and broken bones, and its teeth are often chipped from the force of impacting animal skeletons. These are indications of a powerful bite, and the rarity of pterosaur-*Cretoxyrhina* associations may reflect the relatively delicate nature of pterosaur skeletons against the evident bite strength of this shark. Extremely hollow bones such as those characterising most of the *Pteranodon* skeleton are especially prone to failure against buckling forces (Currey, 2004) and likely broke easily under strong bites from large predators.

Both Bennett (2001) and Hargrave (2007) have noted that *Pteranodon* may have been consumed destructively by large aquatic carnivores, their relatively muscular torsos being targeted and perhaps explaining why wing skeletons (which had considerably less soft-tissue, see Bennett, 2008), are the commonest form of associated pterosaur fossil in the Smoky Hill Chalk Member. It should be noted however, that articulated wings are also common in the Late Jurassic Solnhofen fauna where this is interpreted to be a result of decay and the loss of wings from intact and floating corpses of pterosaurs (Beardmore, Lawlor & Hone, 2017), although this is not mutually exclusive with the effects of predation and scavenging. Witton (2016) noted that, to date, only the larger, more robust elements of larger pterosaur species – limb bones and neck vertebrae – are known to preserve embedded teeth, and speculated that small pterosaurs and/or more gracile pterosaur bones were probably too easily destroyed to record evidence of carnivore bites. It may be that pterosaurs were not rare dietary components of *Cretoxyrhina* or other animals, but that their anatomy precludes common fossilisation of evidence for these acts.

There is limited potential for knowing whether the LACM 50926 association reflects a predatory or a scavenging act. *Pteranodon* is widely considered to have been a pelagic pterosaur species which foraged for small aquatic prey by means of dip-feeding, fishing from an alighted position on the water surface or diving after food (Wellnhofer, 1991; Bennett, 2001; Witton, 2013, 2016). Adaptations to aquatic launch (identified by Habib & Cunningham, 2010) are apparent in *Pteranodon* and suggest that it may have routinely entered (and thus needed to launch from) bodies of water. There are thus good reasons to think living *Pteranodon* could have been within reach of predatory sharks, and the likely pterodactyloid floating posture

271 places their head and neck close to the waters' surface (Hone & Henderson, 2014). Various
272 seabirds are known to be predated by pelagic predators, including sharks, in modern times
273 (Wetherbee, Cortés & Bizzarro, 2004; Johnson et al., 2006) and we cannot exclude this
274 possibility for the LACM *Pteranodon*. Witton (2016) noted that even moderately-sized sharks
275 akin to the 2.5 m long *Cretoxyrhina* indicated by the LACM tooth would vastly outweigh the
276 largest *Pteranodon* (35-50 kg – see Paul, 2002; Witton, 2008; Henderson, 2010 for *Pteranodon*
277 mass estimates), and we have little doubt that such predators could subdue these pterosaurs if
278 they caught them (Fig. 4). Conversely, *Pteranodon* likely had a relatively low body density and
279 their carcasses may have floated for sustained periods (Hone & Henderson, 2014). This would
280 make them obvious targets for scavenging marine animals.
281 Evidence of the anacoracid shark *Squalicorax* consuming *Pteranodon* is known in the
282 Niobrara (e.g. KU 972 - KU, Kansas University, USA; YPM 2597, YPM 42810 – Bennett, pers.
283 comm. 06/16), and recent finds of Mooreville Chalk Formation *Pteranodon* also have bite marks
284 attributed to *Squalicorax kaupi* (RMM 3274 and ALMNH 20[illegible]1.200) (Ehret, Harrell & Ebersole
285 2015). This body of evidence, augmented with the *Cretoxyrhina-Pteranodon* association
286 described here, and the recovery of fish remains within the gular region of *Pteranodon*
287 specimens (Brown, 1943; Bennett, 2001) makes the trophic interactions of *Pteranodon* well
288 understood compared to most other pterosaurs (Witton, 2018). However, such finds are still
289 relatively rare occurrences - these seven associations are less than 1% of the >1100 specimens
290 of *Pteranodon* on record. In contrast, at least ten palaeoecologically significant fossil
291 associations are known for the Late Jurassic Solnhofen pterosaur *Rhamphorhynchus muensteri*
292 (including five associations with the carnivorous fish *Aspidorhynchus acutirostris* (e.g. Frey &

Tishchlinger, 2012) and four examples of consumed items – see Witton, 2018 for a recent review). There are perhaps 150 specimens of *Rhamphorhynchus* in public collections, suggesting that recording of palaeoecological events is several times higher than in *Pteranodon* (>6%) despite a considerably smaller sample size. The taphonomic factors contributing to this difference may be worthy of further study.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Luis Chiappe and Maureen Walsh for access to the specimen and information on its history and Stephanie Abramowicz for access to archival photographs of the specimen. We would like to thank Steffi Klug for assistance on identification of the shark tooth, Dana Ehret (Alabama Museum of Natural History) for providing relevant literature, and Chris Bennett for discussions on the composite mount and bite marks on *Pteranodon* bones and providing key literature.

References:

Acorn JH, Martin-Silverstone E, Glasier JR, Mohr S, Currie PJ. 2017. Response to Kellner (2017)'Rebuttal of Martin-Silverstone, E., JRN Glasier, JH Acorn, S. Mohr, and PJ Currie, 2017'. *Vertebrate Anatomy Morphology Palaeontology* 3.

Beardmore SR, Lawlor E, Hone DWE. 2017. Using taphonomy to infer differences in soft tissues between taxa: an example using basal and derived forms of Solnhofen pterosaurs. *The Science of Nature* 104:65.

314 Becker MA, Chamberlain JA. 2012. *Squalicorax* chips a tooth: a consequence of feeding-related
315 behavior from the lowermost Navesink Formation (Late Cretaceous: Campanian-
316 Maastrichtian) of Monmouth County, New Jersey, USA. *Geosciences* 2:109-129.
317 Bennett SC. 1991. Morphology of the Late Cretaceous pterosaur *Pteranodon* and systematics of
318 the Pterodactyloidea. Doctoral dissertation, University of Kansas, Systematics and Ecology.
319 Bennett SC. 1992. Sexual dimorphism of *Pteranodon* and other pterosaurs, with comments on
320 cranial crests. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 12:422–434
321 Bennett SC. 1993. The ontogeny of *Pteranodon* and other pterosaurs. *Paleobiology* 19:92–106
322 Bennett SC. 1994. Taxonomy and systematics of the Late Cretaceous pterosaur *Pteranodon*
323 (Pterosauria, Pterodactyloidea). *Occasional Papers of the Museum of Natural History,*
324 *University of Kansas, Lawrence* 169:1–70.
325 Bennett SC. 2001. The osteology and functional morphology of the Late Cretaceous pterosaur
326 *Pteranodon*. (parts 1 and 2). *Paleontographica Abteilung A*, 260:1–153.
327 Bennett SC. 2003. A survey of pathologies of large pterodactyloid pterosaurs. *Palaeontology*
328 46:185-198.
329 Bennett SC. 2018. New smallest specimen of the pterosaur *Pteranodon* and ontogenetic niches
330 in pterosaurs. *Journal of Paleontology* 92:254-271.
331 Bennett SC, Penkalski P. 2017. Waves of bone deposition on the rostrum of the pterosaur
332 *Pteranodon*. Geological Society of London, Special Publications, 455:69.
333 Bourdon J, Everhart MJ. 2011. Analysis of an associated *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* dentition from
334 the Late Cretaceous (Smoky Hill Chalk, Late Coniacian) of western Kansas. *Transactions of*
335 *the Kansas Academy of Science* 114:15-32.

336 Bramwell CD, Whitfield GR. 1974. Biomechanics of *Pteranodon*. *Philosophical Transactions of*
337 *the Royal Society of London: Series B* 267:503–581.
338 Brandão RS, Rodrigures T. 2018. Reappraisal of *Dawndraco kanzai* as a valid taxon. *Flugsaurier*
339 *2018 conference abstracts*, 17.
340 Brown B. 1943. Flying reptiles. *Natural History* 52:104–111.
341 Carpenter K. 2008. Vertebrate biostratigraphy of the Smoky Hill Chalk (Niobrara Formation) and
342 the Sharon Springs Member (Pierre Shale). In: Harries PJ. ed. *High-Resolution Approaches in*
343 *Stratigraphic Paleontology: Topics in Geobiology Series,* 21:421–437.
344 Cicimurri DJ, Everhart MJ. 2001. An elasmosaur with stomach contents and gastroliths from the
345 Pierre Shale (Late Cretaceous) of Kansas. *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science*
346 104:129-143.
347 Eaton GF. 1910. Osteology of *Pteranodon*. *Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and*
348 *Sciences* 2:1–38.
349 Ehret DJ, Harrell TL, Ebersole J. 2015. Feeding traces on *Pteranodon longiceps* (Reptilia:
350 Pterosauria) bones from the Late Cretaceous (Campanian) Mooreville Chalk in Alabama,
351 USA. *75th Annual Meeting of the Society of Vertebrate Paleontology, Dallas, TX, USA. SVP*
352 *2015 Program and Abstract Book*, 120.
353 Everhart MJ. 2004. Late Cretaceous interaction between predators and prey. Evidence of
354 feeding by two species of shark on a mosasaur. *PalArch, vertebrate palaeontology*
355 *series* 1:1-7.
356 Everhart MJ. 2005. *Oceans of Kansas*. Indiana University Press.

357 Frey E, Tischlinger H. 2012. The Late Jurassic Pterosaur *Rhamphorhynchus*, a frequent victim of
358 the ganoid fish *Aspidorhynchus*? *PLoS ONE* 7:e31945.
359 Habib M, Cunningham J. 2010. Capacity for water launch in *Anhanguera* and *Quetzalcoatlus*.
360 A*cta Geoscientica Sinica* 31:24–25.
361 Hankin EH, Watson DMS. 1914. On the flight of pterodactyls. *The Aeronautical Journal* 18:324-
362 335.
363 Hargrave JE. 2007. *Pteranodon* (Reptilia: Pterosauria): Stratigraphic distribution and taphonomy
364 in the lower Pierre Shale Group (Campanian), western South Dakota and eastern Wyoming.
365 In: Martin JE, Parris DC. eds. *The Geology and Paleontology of the Late Cretaceous Marine*
366 *Deposits of the Dakotas: Geological Society of America Special Paper* 427:215–225.
367 Hattin DE. 1982. Stratigraphy and depositional environment of Smoky Hill Chalk Member,
368 Niobrara Chalk (Upper Cretaceous) of the type area, western Kansas. *Kansas Geological*
369 *Survey Bulletin* 225:108.
370 Henderson DM. 2010. Pterosaur body mass estimates from three-dimensional mathematical
371 slicing. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 30:768–785.
372 Hone DWE, Henderson DM. 2014. The posture of floating pterosaurs: ecological implications for
373 inhabiting marine and freshwater habitats. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
374 *Palaeoecology* 398:89-98.
375 Hone DWE, Tsuhiji T, Watabe M, Tsogbataar K. 2012. Pterosaurs as a food source for small
376 dromaeosaurs. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 331:27-30.
377 Hone DWE, Henderson DM, Therrien F, Habib MB. 2015. A specimen of *Rhamphorhynchus* with
378 soft tissue preservation, stomach contents and a putative coprolite. *PeerJ* 3:e1191.

379 Johnson RL, Venter A, Bester MN, Oosthuizen WH. 2006. Seabird predation by white shark,
380 *Carcharodon carcharias*, and Cape fur seal, *Arctocephalus pusillus pusillus*, at Dyer
381 Island. *South African Journal of Wildlife Research* 36:23-32.
382 Kellner AWA. 2010. Comments on the Pteranodontidae (Pterosauria, Pterodactyloidea) with
383 the description of two new species. *Anais de Academia Brasileira de Ciencias* 82:1063–
384 1084.
385 Konuki Reira. 2008. Biostratigraphy of Sea Turtles and Possible Bite Marks on a *Toxochelys*
386 (Testudine, Chelonioidea) from the Niobrara Formation (Late Santonian), Logan County,
387 Kansas, and Paleoecological Implications for Predator-prey Relationships Among Large
388 Marine Vertebrates. Masters dissertation, Fort Hays State University,
389 Marsh OC. 1876. Notice of a new sub-order of Pterosauria. *American Journal of Sciences*
390 11:507–509.
391 Martin-Silverstone E, Glasier JRN, Acorn JH, Mohr S, Currie PJ. 2017. Reassessment of
392 *Dawndraco kanzai* Kellner, 2010 and reassignment of the type specimen to *Pteranodon*
393 *sternbergi* Harksen, 1966. *Vertebrate Anatomy Morphology Palaeontology* 3:47–59.
394 Paul GS. 2002. *Dinosaurs of the air: the evolution and loss of flight in dinosaurs and birds*. JHU
395 Press.
396 Shimada K. 1997. Paleoecological relationships of the Late Cretaceous lamniform shark,
397 *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* (Agassiz). *Journal of Paleontology* 71:926-933.
398 Siverson M. Lindgren J. 2005. Late Cretaceous sharks *Cretoxyrhina* and *Cardabiodon* from
399 Montana, USA. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* 50:301–314.

400 Stein RS. 1975. Dynamic analysis of *Pteranodon ingens*: a reptilian adaptation to flight. *Journal*
401 *of Paleontology* 49:534-548.
402 Vremir M, Kellner AW, Naish D, Dyke GJ. 2013. A new azhdarchid pterosaur from the Late
403 Cretaceous of the Transylvanian Basin, Romania: implications for azhdarchid diversity and
404 distribution. *PLoS One* 8:e54268.
405 Wellnhofer P. 1991. The Illustrated encyclopedia of Pterosaurs. Salamander Books, London.
406 Wetherbee BM, Cortés E, Bizzarro JJ. 2004. Food consumption and feeding habits. *Biology of*
407 *Sharks and their Relatives*, 225-246.
408 Wild R. 1978. Die Flugsaurier (Reptilia, Pterosauria) aus der Oberen Trias von Cene bei
409 Bergamo, Italien. *Bollettino della Società Paleontologica Italiana* 17:176-256
410 Witton MP. 2008. A new approach to determining pterosaur body mass and its implications for
411 pterosaur flight. *Zitteliana B* 28:143–158.
412 Witton MP. 2010. Pteranodon and beyond: the history of giant pterosaurs from 1870 onwards.
413 *Geological Society, London, Special Publications* 343:313-323.
414 Witton MP. 2013. *Pterosaurs: natural history, evolution, anatomy*. Princeton University Press.
415 Witton MP. 2018. Pterosaurs in Mesozoic food webs: a review of fossil evidence. *Geological*
416 *Society, London, Special Publications* 455:7-23.
417 Witton MP, Habib M. 2010. On the size and flight diversity of giant pterosaurs, the use of birds
418 as pterosaur analogues and comments on pterosaur flightlessness. *PLoS ONE* 5:e13982.
419

Figure captions.

Fig 1. A, mounted *Pteranodon* sp. skeleton LACM 50926 on display in the Los Angeles county museum with highlighted section of the vertebrae shown below; B, Close up of the vertebral series and shark tooth (indicated by an arrow). Cervical vertebrae III-VII are indicated. Scale bar is 50 mm – this is an approximate value based on published measurements of the vertebrae. Image credit: A, Stephanie Abramowicz, courtesy Dinosaur Institute, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, B, David Hone.

Fig 2. Two close up views of the *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* tooth with tracings. A, left dorsolateral view; B, left dorsoventral view showing its intimate association with cervical vertebra IV. The tooth is highlighted in medium grey, the 4th cervical vertebra in pale grey and the 5th cervical in dark grey. Abbreviations: ns neural spine, prz prezygopophysis, psz postzygopophysis, st shark tooth. Image credit: David Hone.

Fig 3. Tracing of *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* anterior teeth from Bourdon and Everhart (2011, their fig 5, mirrored from their original). A, position 3 in the jaw; B, position 4; C, LACM 50926 tooth. The bases of the teeth are shaded in pale grey and the enamel is dark grey. Image credit: David Hone.

Fig. 4. Life reconstruction of a c. 2.5 m long breaching *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* biting the neck of a 5 m wingspan *Pteranodon longiceps*, a scene inspired by LACM 50926. The predatory

442 behaviour of this scene is speculative with respect to the data offered by the specimen, but
443 reflects the fact that *Cretoxyrhina* is generally considered a predatory species, the vast
444 weight advantage of the shark against the pterosaur (see text), and the juvenile impulse of
445 the artist to draw an explosive predatory scene. Image credit: Mark Witton.

Figure 1

Mounted Pteranodon and close up of the neck

Fig 1. A, mounted *Pteranodon* sp. skeleton LACM 50926 on display in the L Angeles county museum with highlighted section of the vertebrae shown below; B, Close up of the vertebral series and shark tooth (indicated by an arrow). Cervical vertebrae III-VII are indicated. Scale bar is 50 mm – this is an approximate value based on published measurements of the vertebrae. Image credit: A, Stephanie Abramowicz, courtesy Dinosaur Institute, Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, B, David Hone.



Figure 2

Two close up views of the *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* tooth with tracings.

Fig 2. Two close up views of the *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* tooth with tracings. A, left dorsolateral view; B, left dorsoventral view showing its intimate association with cervical vertebra IV. The tooth is highlighted in medium grey, the 4th cervical vertebra in pale grey and the 5th cervical in dark grey. Abbreviations: ns neural spine, prz prezygopophysis, psz postzygopophysis, st shark tooth. Image credit: David Hone.



Figure 3

Cretoxyrhina mantelli anterior teeth

Fig 3. Tracing of *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* anterior teeth from Bourdon and Everhart (2011, their fig 5, mirrored from their original). A, position 3 in the jaw; B, position 4; C, LACM 50926 tooth. The bases of the teeth are shaded in pale grey and the enamel is dark grey. Image credit: David Hone.



Figure 4

Life reconstruction of a *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* attacking a *Pteranodon longiceps*

Fig. 4. Life reconstruction of a c. 2.5 m long breaching *Cretoxyrhina mantelli* biting the neck of a 5 m wingspan *Pteranodon longiceps*, a scene inspired by LACM 50926. The predatory behaviour of this scene is speculative with respect to the data offered by the specimen, but reflects the fact that *Cretoxyrhina* is generally considered a predatory species, the vast weight advantage of the shark against the pterosaur (see text), and the juvenile impulse of the artist to draw an explosive predatory scene. Image credit: Mark Witton.