

# Additional sauropod material from the Callovian Oxford Clay Formation, Peterborough, UK (#25725)

1

First revision

## Editor guidance

Please submit by **29 Nov 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.



### Author notes

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



### Raw data check

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



### Image check

Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

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

## Files

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

- 1 Tracked changes manuscript(s)
- 1 Rebuttal letter(s)
- 9 Figure file(s)
- 1 Table file(s)
- 1 Raw data file(s)



## Structure your review

The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

1. BASIC REPORTING
2. EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN
3. VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS
4. General comments
5. Confidential notes to the editor

 You can also annotate this PDF and upload it as part of your review

When ready [submit online](#).

## Editorial Criteria

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

### BASIC REPORTING

-  Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
-  Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
-  Structure conforms to [PeerJ standards](#), discipline norm, or improved for clarity.
-  Figures are relevant, high quality, well labelled & described.
-  Raw data supplied (see [PeerJ policy](#)).

### EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

-  Original primary research within [Scope of the journal](#).
-  Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how the research fills an identified knowledge gap.
-  Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.
-  Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

### VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

-  Impact and novelty not assessed. Negative/inconclusive results accepted. *Meaningful* replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.
-  Data is robust, statistically sound, & controlled.
-  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

3



The best reviewers use these techniques

## Tip

**Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources**

## Example

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

**Give specific suggestions on how to improve the manuscript**

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

**Comment on language and grammar issues**

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

**Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points**

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

**Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions**

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

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

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

# Additional sauropod material from the Callovian Oxford Clay Formation, Peterborough, UK

Femke M Holwerda<sup>Corresp., 1, 2</sup>, Mark Evans<sup>3</sup>, Jeff J Liston<sup>1, 4, 5</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Staatliche Naturwissenschaftliche Sammlungen Bayerns (SNSB), Bayerische Staatssammlung für Paläontologie und Geologie, Munich, Germany, Munich, Bavaria, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, Netherlands

<sup>3</sup> New Walk Museum and Art Gallery, Leicester Arts and Museums Service, Leicester, United Kingdom

<sup>4</sup> Department of Natural Sciences, National Museums Scotland, Edinburgh, Scotland

<sup>5</sup> Vivacity-Peterborough Museum, Peterborough, United Kingdom

Corresponding Author: Femke M Holwerda

Email address: f.holwerda@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

Four isolated sauropod axial elements from the Oxford Clay Formation (Callovian, Middle Jurassic) of Peterborough, UK, are examined. Two associated posterior dorsals show a dorsoventrally elongated centrum and short neural arch, and nutrient or pneumatic foramina. An isolated anterior caudal vertebra displays a ventral keel, a 'shoulder' indicating a wing-like transverse process, along with a possible prespinal lamina. This, together with an overall high complexity of the anterior caudal transverse process (ACTP) complex, indicates that this caudal could have belonged to a neosauropod. A second isolated middle-posterior caudal from the Oxford Clay of Peterborough is also described, also showing some diagnostic features, despite the neural spine and neural arch not being preserved and the neurocentral sutures being unfused. The positioning of the neurocentral sutures on the anterior 1/3rd of the centrum indicates a middle caudal position, and the presence of faint ventrolateral crests, as well as a rhomboid anterior articulation surface, show neosauropod affinities. The presence of possible nutrient foramina are only tentative evidence of a neosauropod origin, as they are also found in Late Jurassic non-neosauropod eusauropods. As the caudals from the two other known sauropods from the Peterborough Oxford Clay, *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* and an indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod, do not show the features seen on either of the new elements described, both isolated caudals indicate a higher sauropod species diversity in the region than previously recognised. An exploratory phylogenetic analysis using characters from all four isolated elements shows a basal neosauropod for the anterior caudal, and a diplodocid origin for the middle caudal. The dorsal vertebrae are an unstable OTU, therefore their provenance remains ambiguous. Together with *Cetiosauriscus*, and other material assigned to different sauropod groups, this study indicates the presence of a higher sauropod biodiversity in the

Oxford Clay Formation. This study shows that it is still beneficial to examine isolated elements, as these may be indicators for species richness in deposits that are otherwise poor in terrestrial fauna.

**Additional sauropod material from the Callovian Oxford Clay Formation, Peterborough, UK**

**Femke M. Holwerda<sup>a,b\*</sup>, Mark Evans<sup>c</sup>, Jeff J. Liston<sup>a,d,e</sup>**

*Author affiliations*

<sup>a</sup> Staatliche Naturwissenschaftliche Sammlungen Bayerns (SNSB), Bayerische Staatssammlung für Paläontologie und Geologie, Richard-Wagner-Straße 10, 80333 München, Germany

<sup>b</sup> Faculty of Geosciences, Utrecht University, Utrecht, the Netherlands

<sup>c</sup> New Walk Museum and Art Gallery, Leicester Arts and Museums Service, Leicester, United Kingdom

<sup>d</sup> National Museums Scotland, Edinburgh, Scotland

<sup>e</sup> Vivacity-Peterborough Museum, Peterborough, England

\*corresponding author: f.holwerda@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

## **ABSTRACT**

Four isolated sauropod axial elements from the Oxford Clay Formation (Callovian, Middle Jurassic) of Peterborough, UK, are examined. Two associated posterior dorsals show a dorsoventrally elongated centrum and short neural arch, and nutrient or pneumatic foramina. An isolated anterior caudal vertebra displays a ventral keel, a 'shoulder' indicating a wing-like transverse process, along with a possible prespinal lamina. This, together with an overall high complexity of the anterior caudal transverse process (ACTP) complex, indicates that this caudal could have belonged to a neosauropod. A second isolated middle-posterior caudal from the

~~Oxford Clay of Peterborough is additionally described,~~ also ~~showing~~ some diagnostic features, despite the neural spine and neural arch not being preserved and the neurocentral sutures being unfused. The positioning of the neurocentral sutures on the anterior 1/3rd of the centrum indicates a middle caudal position, and the presence of faint ventrolateral crests, as well as a rhomboid anterior articulation surface, ~~show~~ neosauropod affinities. The presence of possible nutrient foramina are only tentative evidence of a neosauropod origin, as they are also found in Late Jurassic non-neosauropod eusauropods. As the caudals from the two other known sauropods from the Peterborough Oxford Clay, *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* and an indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod, do not show the features seen on either of the new elements described, both isolated caudals indicate a higher sauropod species diversity in the region than previously recognised. An exploratory phylogenetic analysis using characters from all four isolated elements ~~shows a basal neosauropod~~ for the anterior caudal, and ~~a diplodocid origin~~ for the middle caudal. The dorsal vertebrae are an unstable OTU, therefore their provenance remains ambiguous. Together with *Cetiosauriscus*, and other material assigned to different sauropod groups, this study indicates the presence of a higher sauropod biodiversity in the Oxford Clay Formation than previously recognised. This study shows that it is still beneficial to examine isolated elements, as these may be indicators for species richness in deposits that are otherwise poor in terrestrial fauna.

## INTRODUCTION

The Middle Jurassic (Callovian) Oxford Clay Formation, UK, has yielded many marine vertebrates (ichthyosaurs, pliosaurids, cryptoclidids and other plesiosaurians, marine crocodylomorphs, sharks, and fishes (Andrews, 1910, 1913)), as well as invertebrates (Leeds, 1956). Land-dwelling vertebrates, however, are rare from this marine setting. The Jurassic

Gallery of the Vivacity-Peterborough Museum in Peterborough, and the New Walk Museum and Art Gallery in Leicester; however, house some dinosaur specimens from the Oxford Clay of Peterborough. The material consists of isolated partial elements of a stegosaur, and several isolated sauropod fossils, including a partial anterior caudal and a partial middle caudal. The caudals have been submerged in seawater; however, they do display some characters which may be used for diagnosis.

Sauropods are represented in the Middle Jurassic of the UK by two named species thus far: the Bajocian-Bathonian *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* (Phillips, 1871; Owen, 1875) and the Callovian *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* (Charig, 1980, 1993). *Cetiosauriscus* is known from material found in the Peterborough Oxford Clay, and has thus far not been encountered from other localities (Woodward, 1905; Heathcote & Upchurch, 2003; Noè, Liston & Chapman, 2010). The type material comprises a posterior dorsal vertebra, a partial sacrum, a partial caudal axial column, forelimb and partial pectoral girdle, hindlimb, and a partial pelvic girdle (Woodward, 1905). Thus far, it is recovered in phylogenetic analyses as a non-neosauropod eusauropod (e.g. Heathcote & Upchurch, 2003; Rauhut et al., 2005; Tschopp, Mateus & Benson, 2015). Another species of *Cetiosauriscus*, *Cetiosauriscus greppini*, is known from Switzerland; however, this specimen is from the Late Jurassic, and moreover, has recently been reidentified as a basal titanosauriform (Schwarz, Wings & Meyer, 2007).

Next to *Cetiosauriscus*, four anterior caudal vertebrae (NHMUK R1984), ascribed to a brachiosaurid (Upchurch & Martin, 2003, Noè, Liston & Chapman, 2010, Fig.6); however, more recently reidentified as an indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod (Mannion et al., 2013), are known from the Oxford Clay Fm. Also, a partial distal tail segment including ten posterior(most) caudals, which was initially assigned to a diplodocid (Upchurch, 1995; Noè, Liston & Chapman, 2010). However, more recently Whitlock (2011) showed the moderate elongation of these elements to not be conclusive of placement within Diplodocoidea, and furthermore, Mannion et al., (2012) suggested a tentative placement of neosauropod indet, later



more cautiously proposed as eusauropod indet (P.Mannion pers. comm. 2018). A partial pelvic girdle, dorsal rib and dorsal centrum NHMUK R1985-1988 (Noè, Liston & Chapman, 2010), referred to '*Ornithopsis leedsii*' (Hulke, 1887; Woodward, 1905) from the lower Callovian Kellaways Formation, were recently referred to an indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod (Mannion et al., 2013). Finally, three undiagnosed 'camarasaurid' sauropod teeth (Martill, 1988), tentatively ascribed to Turiasauria (Royo Torres & Upchurch, 2012) are known from the Oxford Clay. See Table 1 for a list of sauropod material from the Oxford Clay Formation.

Despite the locality being a classic site for fossils, and many historical finds of marine reptiles having been described and redescribed, the sauropod fauna from the Oxford Clay has not received much attention thus far. Though associated material such as *Cetiosauriscus* is scarce, isolated material can be studied in detail and reveal information on both morphology and species diversity, which is important for material from the Middle Jurassic of the United Kingdom, as this is relatively scarce (Manning, Egerton & Romano, 2015). Therefore, we here describe two isolated sauropod dorsal vertebrae, as well as two isolated caudal vertebrae from the collections of the Vivacity-Peterborough Museum and of the New Walk Museum of Leicester, all from the Oxford Clay Formation of Peterborough, United Kingdom (and previously indexed in collections under '*Cetiosaurus*'), and compare them to contemporaneous and other sauropod remains.

## MATERIALS & METHODS

### Institutional abbreviations

PETMG R.= Vivacity-Peterborough Museum, UK

LEICT G.= New Walk Museum, Leicester, UK

NHMUK = Natural History Museum, London, UK

# Systematic Palaeontology

Dinosauria (Owen, 1842)

Saurischia (Seeley, 1888)

Sauropoda (Marsh, 1878)

Eusauropoda (Upchurch, 1995)

Neosauropoda (Bonaparte, 1986a)

# Geological and historical setting

The two dorsal vertebrae PETMG R85 were found in 1922 by Mr. P.J. Phillips, at London Road, Peterborough, most likely indicating the vertebrae were from the vicinity of either the Woodston or Fletton pits, to the west and east of that roadway (see Figure 1). The ammonite embedded on the specimen is likely a *Kosmoceras jasoni*, a common ammonite for the Oxford Clay Formation (J.Cope pers. comm. 2018; Hudson & Martill, 1994).

Details on the provenance of the caudal specimen PETMG R272 are sparse, save that it is recorded as being from the King's Dyke pit (see Figure 1). No date of discovery is known, however, the King's Dyke pit first opened in 1969 (Hillier, 1981) Stratigraphically, this pit ranges

from the lower Athleta, Phaeinum Subchronozone, down to the Kellaways Sand (Lower Callovian Calloviense Chronozone, K.Paige pers. comm 2018), which is further supported by identifications of bivalves on PETMG R272 as *Economia timida* (T.Palmer pers. comm. 2018). Although LEICT G. 418.1956.21.0 is recorded as being from the Peterborough Oxford Clay Formation, its precise provenance is unknown. The original label on the specimen dates back to 1956, when a number of brick pits were active, including parts of the Orton, Fletton, Farcet and Yaxley pits (Hillier, 1981), and in addition there would also be the worked out pits that would be accessible for collectors to search the pit faces and spoil heaps of. The strata of all the Peterborough clay pits extend from the Kellaways Formation up to the Stewartby Member of the Peterborough Formation (see Hudson & Martill, 1994, for a more detailed geological setting), and therefore date exclusively to the Callovian (Middle Jurassic, ~155 Ma).

## RESULTS

### Morphology

The two associated dorsal vertebrae PETMG R85 (Figure 2 and 3) are incomplete; the first dorsal has the centrum and a small part of the neural arch preserved; the second dorsal only the centrum. Both dorsal elements are partially covered in sediment, probably clay, and are covered with marine invertebrates, showing long-time immersion in seawater. The position of

the dorsals is unclear; however, the relative dorsoventral length compared to the anteroposterior length of the centra suggests a more posterior position.

The first dorsal shows an oval anterior articular surface, which is dorsoventrally higher than transversely wide, and measures 24,7 by 21,4 cm. The anterior surface (Figure 2A) is slightly convex, whereas the posterior surface (Figure 2B), which is also dorsoventrally longer than transversely wide, is flat to concave, rendering the centrum very slightly opisthocoelous. The posterior articular surface measures 21,3 by 18,3 cm, and shows circular striations on the surface not covered by sediment. The anterior articular surface shows several small bivalves embedded in the matrix covering it, as well as an ammonite (Figure 2A), see Geological setting. It also displays a rim, 'cupping' the articular surface, which is also visible in lateral view (Figure 2E,F). The anterior ventral surface projects further ventrally than the posterior side. In ventral view, the centrum displays rugose anteroposterior striations, as well as a slight constriction of the ventral surface, bordered by two low ridges (Figure 2C). Furthermore, the ventral surface shows several bivalves and small pneumatic foramina. In lateral view, the centrum also shows small pneumatic or nutrient foramina (Figure 2F). Pleurocoels are not visible, only very shallow fossae ventral to the neural arch. The centrum measures 7,6 cm long anteroposteriorly in right lateral view, and 10,8 cm in left lateral view, displaying some mild distortion, which is also visible in ventral view (Figure 2C,E,F).

The neural arch on the first dorsal in anterior view shows the neural canal to be covered with sediment, making it unclear how large or what shape the neural canal originally was (Figure 2A). The posterior neural canal shows the same sedimentary infill (Figure 2B). As the infill here follows a specific shape, however, it is possible that the neural canal was oval, and dorsoventrally higher than transversely wide, both in anterior and posterior view. Anteriorly, lateroventral to the neural canal, rudimentary parapophyses are visible. Dorsolateral to the neural canal, possible prezygapophyseal bases are visible. Ventral to these, the base of the diapophyses is seen, which would project strongly dorsolaterally (Figure 2A). A lip-like structure

is seen dorsal to the neural canal, which is also visible in lateral (Figure 2E) and dorsal view (Figure 2D). Dorsal to this structure, both a rugose, triangular prespinal lamina (prsl)/hypanthrum is seen, flanked by two ridges which might be spinoprezygapophyseal laminae (sprl). The posterior neural arch also shows the diapophyseal base to project dorsolaterally (Figure 2B). A similar rugose triangular process is seen dorsal to the posterior neural canal, possibly the postspinal lamina (posl) or a rudimentary hyposphene (Figure 2B). Here too this structure is flanked by two ridges, possibly the spinopostzygapophyseal laminae (spol). Lateral and ventral to this structure, two wide laminae are seen to project dorsolaterally, these could be the centropostzygapophyseal laminae (cpol), which are also visible in lateral (Figure 2E,F) and dorsal (Figure 2D) view. In lateral view, the base of the diapophyses are supported by both an anterior and posterior centrodiaophyseal lamina (acdI, pcdI). In right lateral view, a possible small centrodiaophyseal fossa (cdf) is seen (Figure 2E). Finally, a possible spinodiaophyseal lamina (spdl) is seen to project dorsally to the base of the neural spine (which is not preserved) in both lateral views (Figure 2E,F). The base of the neural spine is seen to project dorsally and slightly posteriorly, making it possible that the neural spine also projected dorsally and posteriorly. In dorsal view, the base of the spine has an oval to rhomboid shape, and is transversely wider than anteroposteriorly long (Figure 2D).

The second dorsal centrum of PETMG R85 (Figure 3) is preserved without any remnants of the neural arch. The centrum is amphicoelous/amphiplatyan. Neurocentral sutures are tentatively present on each lateral side of the centrum, however; these are also embedded in sediment. One is slightly visible in dorsal view (Figure 3F). The anterior articular surface (Figure 3A) measures 19,4 cm dorsoventrally and 19,3 cm transversely, and projects slightly further ventrally than the posterior side (Figure 3C,D). It is round in shape, and shows a small ventral indentation, which could be due to taphonomic damage. The surface is covered in matrix, which embeds ammonite and belemnite remains, as well as bivalves, indicating immersion in

seawater. The posterior articular surface (Figure 3B) is more oval in shape, and dorsoventrally longer (17,7 cm) than transversely wide (13,9 cm). This surface shows rounded striations around the rim, as in the other dorsal. The 'true' surface is partially visible and shows a pitted central surface, whereas a part of the posterior side is also embedded in matrix and bivalves. In right lateral view (Figure 3D), a possible damaged parapophysis is visible ventral to the possible neurocentral suture. The centrum furthermore shows no pleurocoels, only very shallowly concave areas below the possible neurocentral sutures. The surface is covered in shallow, oval nutrient or pneumatic foramina, as in the other dorsal. In ventral view, the centrum is slightly constricted transversely, and is concave, with both articular surfaces fanning out transversely from this constriction. Ventrally, also nutrient or pneumatic foramina are visible. The ventral surface of the centrum shows longitudinal striations.

The anterior caudal PETMG R272 (See Figure 4) measures a maximum of 27,2 cm dorsoventrally and 26,5 cm transversely. The anterior articular surface measures 23,1 by 24,7; the posterior 25,6 by 21,8. The centrum is 15,3 cm long anteroposteriorly. It is covered in bivalves which are embedded in the bone matrix (see Figure 4), demonstrating long-term submersion in seawater and possible epibiont activity (Martill, 1987; Danise, Twitchett, Matts 2014). The neural spine is missing, as well as the entire left transverse process; the right transverse process is partially preserved at its base. The centrum is transversely wider at its dorsal side than at the ventral side, and the posterior side protrudes further ventrally than the anterior side. The relative axial compression of the centrum, together with the apparent connection between the neural arch and base of the transverse processes (as far as can be seen) shows this vertebra to be one of the anterior-most caudals.

In anterior view (Figure 4A), the articular surface of the centrum is oval to round, and is transversely wider than dorsoventrally high. The outer surface of the articular surface is convex

and displays circular striations, as is common for weightbearing bones in sauropods (FH pers obs) (H Mallison pers comm). The internal  $\pm 1/3$ rd of the anterior articular surface is shallowly concave. The entire articular surface is 'cupped' by a thick rim, which mostly follows the oval to round contour of the articular surface, however, it is flattened ventrally, and on the dorsal rim it shows a slight indentation, rendering the dorsal rim heart-shaped. This rim is also seen in lateral view (Figure 4C). In posterior view (Figure 4B), the articular surface is heart-shaped to triangular: the ventral rim ends in a transversely pointed shape, whereas the dorsal rim shows a rounded depression on the midline, flanked by parallel convex bulges. The articular surface itself is concave, with an additional depression in the mid  $\pm 1/3$ rd part of the surface. The posterior articular surface is less rugosely 'cupped' by its rim than the anterior one.

In ventral view (Figure 4D), the posterior rim of the centrum shows rudimentary semilunar shaped chevron facets, which are not seen on the anterior side. The transverse processes are visible as triangular protrusions that project laterally. Below each is a small oval depression. The lateral sides of the centrum are constricted, and flare out towards the anterior and posterior sides. A keel-like structure can be seen on the ventral axial midline of this vertebra. This keel is not visible as a thin protruding line, but more as a broad band protruding slightly ventrally from the ~~ventral part of the~~ centrum. It is possible this keel is formed by the close spacing of the ventrolateral rims of the centrum, as is described for neosauropod anterior caudal vertebrae by Harris, (2006). In lateral view, the transverse processes are visible as triangular protrusions that project laterally. They are oval in cross-section. Below each is a small, oval, shallow depression. The lateral sides of the centrum are constricted, and flare out towards the anterior and posterior sides.

The anterior side of the neural canal and the base of the neural arch are set in a dorsoventrally high, anteroposteriorly flattened sheet of bone, consisting of the

spinodiapophyseal/prezygodiapophyseal and centrodiaophyseal laminae, which give the neural arch (without transverse processes and neural spine) a roughly triangular shape (Figure 4A). In particular, the high projection on the neural arch of the diapophyseal laminae suggest the existence of a 'shoulder', which would make the transverse processes wing-shaped (see Gallina & Otero, 2009). However; as the neural arch is incomplete, there is no certainty about the exact shape of the transverse processes and their connection to the neural arch. The neural canal is broadly arched (measuring 3,3 cm by 3,8 cm). Its dorsal rim is overshadowed by a lip-like, triangular protrusion, which could be a remnant of the hypantrum (Figure 4A). Right above this lip-like process, a rugosely striated lamina persists along the dorsoventral midline of the neural arch, up to the dorsal-most rim of the specimen. It is not entirely clear if this is a scar of a rudimentary single intraprezygapophyseal lamina (stprl) or a **prespinal lamina** (prsl, Figure 4A). The posterior side of the neural canal is more teardrop-shaped, and is set within the neural arch, which displays shallow depressions on both sides of the neural canal; these could be small postzygapophyseal spinodiapophyseal fossae (pocdf, sensu Wilson et al., 2011, Figure 4B)). Directly above it, the rami of the bases of the postzygapophyses are clearly visible. The postzygapophyses are rounded to triangular in shape (Figure 4B). A deep oval depression is seen between them; this could be the remnant of the spinopostzygapophyseal fossae (spof, sensu Wilson et al., 2011, Figure 4B). Finally, a V-shaped striated process is seen between the two postzygapophyses, which could be the remnant of the hyposphene, **or a rugose postspinal lamina (posl).**

The transverse processes appear like rounded protuberances, seen in anterior and lateral view (Figure 4A,C). The ventral sides of the bases of both transverse processes are concave. In lateral view, the transverse process has a rounded to triangular shape, and is axially wider ventrally than dorsally. It is dorsally supported by a spinodiapophyseal lamina (spdl, Figure 4E),



and seems to have an anterior centrodiapophyseal lamina (acdl); however, a posterior centrodiapophyseal lamina (pcdl) is not clearly visible.

The middle caudal LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 (Figure 5) is an isolated element, and has no connection with the anterior caudal. Unlike the anterior caudal, this middle caudal centrum is well-preserved, with minute details clearly visible. The neural arch and neural spine are not preserved, and as the unfused neurocentral sutures show, the animal this caudal belonged to, was not fully grown (Brochu, 1996) and probably in Morphological Ontogenetic Stage 2 (MOS 2), rather than MOS 1, given the large size (sensu Carballido & Sander, 2014).

The centrum is 21,9 cm long axially, its anterior maximum tranverse width is 21,7 cm and its posterior maximum width 18,6 cm, with posterior maximum height at 15,2 cm, giving an average Elongation Index (aEI, sensu Chure et al., 2010) of 1,31. The centrum is rectangular in shape, seen in dorsal (Figure 5E) and ventral view (Figure 5F), with mildly flaring anterior and posterior lateral ends of the articulation surfaces. In lateral view (Figure 5B,D), the posterior ventral side protrudes further ventrally than the anterior ventral side. However, the anterior dorsal side projects further dorsally than the posterior side. Transverse processes are only rudimentarily present, as oval, rugose, lateral bulges.

The anterior articular surface is rhomboid (hexagonal to almost octagonal) in shape (Figure 5A); the dorsal 1/3rd shows a wide transverse extension of the articular rim, whilst the lower 1/3rd shows a much narrower width, with sharply beveled constrictions between them. The ventral side shows a rounded indent on the midline, giving this articular surface a heart-shaped ventral rim. The rim itself is about 2-3 cm thick, shows concentric striations, and protrudes slightly anteriorly. The inner articular surface is flat to concave, however, the kernel shows a rugose rounded protrusion of bone. The morphology of the posterior articular surface (Figure 5C) is

much more simple, oval in shape, and is wider transversely than dorsoventrally high. The articular rim is less thick than anteriorly; about 1-2cm. The articular surface is mildly concave, with a dorsal slightly convex bulge, which is common in non-neosauropod eusauropods (e.g. *Cetiosaurus*, *Patagosaurus* (FH pers. obs)). The dorsal side of the centrum (Figure 3E) shows well-preserved and unfused neurocentral sutures, which span approximately the anterior 2/3rds of the axial length of the centrum. The ventral half of the neural canal is clearly visible, and shows four axially elongate, deep nutrient foramina embedded within the posterior half of the centrum. A further two shallow nutrient foramina are visible.

The ventral side of the centrum (Figure 5F) shows two sets of chevron facets, the posterior ones of which are more pronounced. Several rugose striations run along the axial length of the ventral surface, probably for ligament attachments. Along the midline, a ventral hollow runs anteroposteriorly, braced on each lateral side by a rounded, slightly protruding beam. On each lateral side of these, shallow oval asymmetrical depressions are visible; these are caused by preparing away sediment and debris. Two faint ventrolateral crests are also possibly present, also visible in right lateral view (Figure 5B). The crests are not pronounced, and on the left lateral side (Figure 5D) the crest does not run for the entire anteroposterior length. The right lateral side (Figure 5B) furthermore shows a faint longitudinal ridge, however, in left lateral view (Figure 5D), this ridge does not persist on the entire lateral side of the centrum. The lateral side of the centrum further shows several small nutrient foramina. Finally, very shallow oval depressions, possibly pneumatic, are seen ventral to the bulges of the transverse processes.

### Phylogenetic framework

To explore possible phylogenetic relationships, the material studied here is used as separate Operational Taxonomic Units (OTU's). The morphological characters of both dorsals and both

caudals of this study were coded in an existing sauropod-based matrix in Mesquite (Maddison & Maddison, 2010) using non-neosauropod eusauropods and neosauropods, from Carballido et al., (2017). A second analysis used the **neosauropod**-based datamatrix from Tschopp & Mateus, (2017). See supplementary material of Tschopp, Mateus & Benson, (2015)), for the character matrix, explanatory notes, and references therein. See Supplementary file for this manuscript for both datamatrices including our coding. Only dorsal characters were coded for PETMG R85, anterior caudal characters could be coded for PETMG R272, and only anterior to middle, and middle to posterior characters could be coded for LEICT G.418.1956.21.0. Next to these codings, the anterior and middle caudals of *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* were recoded, based on the descriptions of Woodward (1905), Charig (1980) and based on pictures of NHMUK R3078 which resulted in some character changes. See Supplemental file for our character matrix, adapted from Tschopp et al., (2015).

The **matrix** was analysed using TNT (Goloboff, Farris & Nixon, 2008; Goloboff & Catalano, 2016) using TBR, which yielded 15636 trees. The strict consensus tree shows the dorsals PETMG R85 as nested within *Europasaurus*, and both PETMG R272 as well as LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 to be sister taxa, and nested within Macronaria, and sister-group to Diplodocoidea (see Figure 6A). It should be noted, however, that PETMG R85 is unstable in this analysis. Moreover, most synapomorphies for the nodes were only applicable to a few caudal characters, which may not be explicit enough for the isolated material of this study.

The second analysis using the matrix of Tschopp & Mateus (2017) using New Technology search recovers four trees with PETMG R272 shown as nested with *Cetiosauriscus* in Diplodocimorpha, the dorsals PETMG R85 as sister-taxon to Diplodocidae, and finally LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 as jumping between being nested in Diplodocinae or sister-taxon to Rebbachisauridae (see Figure 6B).

# DISCUSSION

## Systematics

### *Peterborough dorsals PETMG R85*

The most notable features on these dorsal vertebrae are the ventral projection of the anterior articular surface, the relative elongation of the centrum when compared to the neural arch, the suggested dorsal projection of the diapophyses by the diapophyseal base, and the nutrient or pneumatic foramina.

The first dorsal centrum furthermore shows mild opisthocoely, and both show a slightly more ventral projection of the anterior articular surface. Opisthocoely in posterior dorsals for instance, is seen in *Mamenchisaurus*, *Omeisaurus* and *Haplocanthosaurus* (Hatcher, 1903; He, Li & Cai, 1988; Ouyang & Ye, 2002) and thus occur both in non-neosauropod eusauropods and in neosauropods. It should be noted, however, that posterior dorsal opisthocoely has not been found in non-neosauropod eusauropods basal to mamenchisaurids and *Omeisaurus*, such as *Cetiosaurus*, *Spinophorosaurus*, *Shunosaurus*, *Tazoudasaurus*, *Lapparentosaurus* and *Patagosaurus* (Bonaparte, 1986b,a; Upchurch & Martin, 2003; Allain & Aquesbi, 2008; Remes et al., 2009). A ventral projection of the anterior articular surface is seen to some extent in *Cetiosauriscus* (Woodward, 1905) and also in *Ferganasaurus* (Alifanov & Averianov, 2003).

The ratio of centrum dorsoventral length / neural arch length is roughly 4:1, whereas this is roughly 2:1 in *Cetiosauriscus* (Woodward, 1905), and also in *Haplocanthosaurus*, and *Apatosaurus* (Tschopp, Mateus & Benson 2015), and roughly 1:1 in *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* (Upchurch & Martin, 2003).

Pronounced dorsal projection of the diapophyses in dorsal vertebrae is a character shared with *Shunosaurus*, *Cetiosaurus*, turiasaurians, *Haplocanthosaurus*, and dicraeosaurids (Hatcher,

1903; Zhang, 1988; Casanovas, Santafé & Sanz, 2001; Upchurch & Martin, 2003; Rauhut et al., 2005) and are thus also present in a wide array of both non-neosauropod and neosauropod dinosaurs (See Figure 7).

Small nutrient or pneumatic foramina on the centrum is seen in the dicraeosaurid *Suuwassea*, however, in this taxon the foramina express on the anterior caudals (Harris, 2006). Moreover, the lack of any clear pleurocoels on the centra of PETMG R85 might rule out any neosauropod connection. The only dorsal of *Cetiosauriscus* shows a small but pronounced pleurocoel (Woodward, 1905).

# ***Peterborough caudal PETMG R272***

The anterior caudal PETMG R272 shows characteristics shared with both non-neosauropod eusauropods, as well as neosauropods.

The slightly more rounded shape of the centrum in lateral view is shared with *Apatosaurus*.

Anterior caudals of *Cetiosauriscus* are strongly axially compressed, as also seen in non-neosauropod eusauropods such as *Cetiosaurus* and *Patagosaurus* (Woodward, 1905; Charig, 1980; Bonaparte, 1986b; Upchurch & Martin, 2003).

The flat anterior articular surface and the mildly concave posterior articular surface of the centrum is a common feature, shared with non-neosauropod eusauropods (e.g. *Cetiosaurus*, *Patagosaurus* (Bonaparte, 1986b; Upchurch & Martin, 2003). The thick rim cupping the anterior surface is found in early Middle Jurassic non-neosauropod eusauropods (*Cetiosaurus*) but also in the (non-neosauropod eusauropod/potentially basal neosauropod) Callovian *Cetiosauriscus* (Woodward, 1905; Charig, 1980; Heathcote & Upchurch, 2003) and in the Oxfordian basal titanosauriform *Vouivria damparisensis* (Mannion, Allain & Moine, 2017). The morphology of the ventrally offset anterior articular surface, together with pronounced chevron facets, is seen in

non-neosauropod eusauropods from the Late Jurassic of Portugal (Mocho et al., 2017), however, this type of asymmetry is also seen in *Apatosaurus louisae* (Harris 2006).

The ventral keel is found in an Early Jurassic indeterminate sauropod caudal from York, UK (YORYM:2001.9337; Manning, Egerton & Romano, 2015), as well as the Middle Jurassic indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod '*Bothriospondylus*' NHMUK R2599 (Mannion, 2010), and finally, in material ascribed to the non-neosauropod eusauropod *Patagosaurus* (MACN-CH 232, FH pers obs). However, this structure is also found in neosauropods, specifically in flagellicaudates and diplodocids *Apatosaurus ajax*, *Apatosaurus louisae*, and the dicraeosaurid *Suuwassea* (Harris, 2006; Tschopp, Mateus & Benson, 2015). The former has a ventral keel which results from a transverse constriction of the ventral side of the centrum, forming a triangular protrusion on the ventral articular surface. This is also seen in non-neosauropod cervicals (such as *Cetiosaurus*, *Patagosaurus*, *Spinophorosaurus*, *Amygdalodon*, *Tazoudasaurus* (Bonaparte, 1986b Rauhut, 2003; Upchurch & Martin, 2003; Allain & Aquesbi, 2008; Remes et al., 2009)). The latter keel-like form, which seems to match more the morphology of PETMG R272, forms when there is a very close association of the two ventrolateral ridges that run along the ventralmost side of the centrum, and is only seen in neosauropods. No keel-like structure is seen in *Cetiosauriscus* anterior caudals, nor on the Callovian NHMUK R1984 caudals from the Oxford Clay (Upchurch & Martin, 2003, Noè, Liston & Chapman, 2010); the ventral surface of these anterior caudal vertebrae appearing to be smooth.

The triangular shape of the anterior caudal transverse process (ACTP) complex (Gallina & Otero, 2009) in PETMG R272 is seen to a lesser extent in non-neosauropod eusauropods, such as *Tazoudasaurus*, *Omeisaurus*, and *Shunosaurus*, but also in an unnamed anterior caudal from a possible titanosauriform, but as yet indeterminate eusauropod from the Bajocian of

Normandie, France, and in indeterminate non-neosauropod sauropods from the Late Jurassic of Portugal (He, Li & Cai, 1988; Zhang, 1988; Allain & Aquesbi, 2008; Läng, 2008; Mocho et al., 2017). The pronounced shape, however, is more suggestive of 'wing'-shaped transverse processes, due to the possible existence of a 'shoulder' (see Figure 2). This is used as a caudal character to define diplodocids (Whitlock, 2011; Tschopp, Mateus & Benson, 2015), and is found neither in non-neosauropod eusauropods nor the Bajocian French caudal. However, it is also seen in other neosauropods, such as *Camarasaurus* and titanosauriforms (Gallina & Otero, 2009). To a lesser extent, a triangular, sheet-like ACTP is seen in *Cetiosauriscus* (See Figure 8), as well as the NHMUK R1984 caudals from the Oxford Clay, however, the anterior caudals of *Cetiosauriscus* do not show a pronounced 'shoulder'. Moreover, the transverse processes of PETMG R272 are robust, and rounded to triangular in cross-section, whereas those of *Cetiosauriscus* are gracile, dorsoventrally elongated and axially compressed, providing a more oval cross-section. Though suggestive of a triangular ACTP, the lack of any clear transverse processes on PETMG R272 rule out any firm conclusion on their morphology.

The presence of clearly defined centrodiapophyseal laminae is considered to be an **autapomorphy** in the Late Jurassic titanosauriform *Vouivria* (Mannion, Allain & Moine, 2017). PETMG R272 does show short rugose centrodiapophyseal laminae.

If the rugosity dorsal to the prezygapophyses is indeed a **prespinal lamina (prsl)** and not the single intraprezygapophyseal lamina (stprl), then this is another neosauropod feature on PETMG R272 (Wilson, 1999; Gallina & Otero, 2009; Tschopp, Mateus & Benson, 2015). However, *Cetiosauriscus* has both a prespinal and postspinal lamina (prsl and psl), though the prsl in *Cetiosauriscus* is not rugose, but rather thin and gracile.

To summarize, more characters indicative of a neosauropod origin of this caudal are present than those indicative of a non-neosauropod (eu)sauropod origin. However, due to the lack of

complete transverse processes and neural spine, several morphological characters remain ambiguous.

***Leicester caudal LEICT G.418.1956.21.0***

The middle caudal LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 also shows characters shared with non-neosauropod eusauropods, as well as neosauropods.

The rhomboid, hexagonal to octagonal shape of the anterior articular surface is not seen in *Cetiosauriscus*; the middle caudal articular surfaces of the latter are rather round to oval in shape. Hexagonal articular surfaces are a derived condition found in neosauropods, such as *Apatosaurus ajax*, *Suuwassea*, but also in *Camarasaurus*, *Demandasaurus* and *Dicraeosaurus* (Upchurch & Martin, 2002; Tschopp, Mateus & Benson, 2015). Octagonal articular surfaces are also a derived feature seen in *Dicraeosaurus* and the potential neosauropod *Cetiosaurus glymptoniensis* (Upchurch & Martin, 2003; Harris, 2006).

The anterior placement of the neural spine is another neosauropod character seen in diplodocids and in titanosauriforms (Tschopp, Mateus & Benson 2015).

The ventrolateral crests seen on the ventral side of this caudal are a neosauropod feature, found in many Late Jurassic neosauropods (Harris, 2006; Mocho et al., 2017). See Figure 9 for lateral comparisons. The ventral hollow seen in LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 is also found in several neosauropods, such as *Tornieria*, *Diplodocus*, *Supersaurus*, but also *Demandasaurus* and *Isisaurus* (Tschopp et al., 2017). However, it is also seen in an unnamed caudal vertebra from the Bajocian-Bathonian of Skye, UK (Liston, 2004). The ventral hollow is also present in *Cetiosauriscus* (Figure 9), though not as pronounced as in LEICT G.418.1956.21.0.



The longitudinal ridge is another neosauropod feature, though it **may also have** been present in non-neosauropod eusauropods. A longitudinal ridge is seen on both *Cetiosauriscus* and LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 (See Figure 9), as are the lateral pneumatic foramina on the centra, and the ventrolateral crests.

Nutrient foramina are seen on the Late Jurassic dicraeosaurid *Suuwassea* (Harris, 2006), but also on Late Jurassic Portuguese non-neosauropod eusauropods; small foramina on the ventral surface of the centrum are also seen in the anterior caudals of non-neosauropod eusauropods from Late Jurassic of Portugal (Mocho et al., 2017).

### ***Phylogenetic signal and implications for biodiversity***

The phylogenetic analysis shows the isolated elements of this study to be unstable OTU's; in the first analysis based on Carballido et al., (2017), the dorsal elements jump between a position of non-neosauropod to a position nested in Macronaria, with the caudal elements nested a few steps below *Camarasaurus*. In the second analysis, the middle caudal element jumps between being sister-taxon to Rebbachisauridae to being nested in Diplodocidae. This, together with the low number of steps needed to break any relationships, shows that the characters on the isolated elements remain ambiguous, as a plesiomorphic array of characters are present. Any implications for sauropod biodiversity in the Peterborough Oxford Clay Formation are therefore speculative.

Nevertheless, the possibility exists, that in addition to *Cetiosauriscus*, a neosauropod assemblage (consisting of either diplocodimorph and diplodocid, or rebbachisaurid and diplodocimorph, or macronarian) ~~were~~ present in the Callovian Oxford Clay Formation.

Neosauropods have already been reported from the Callovian of Europe (e.g. **Alifanov & Averianov, 2003; Mocho et al., 2017**) and are also **tentatively known from the UK** (e.g. Noè, Liston & Chapman, 2010). Moreover, even earlier Jurassic neosauropods have recently been

described from **Argentina** and China (Rauhut, Carballido & Pol, 2015; Xu et al., 2018). **More**  
**specifically**, macronarians are known from the Late Jurassic of Germany and Portugal (Mocho,  
 Royo-Torres & Ortega, 2014; Carballido & Sander, 2014) and from the **Early Cretaceous of the**  
**UK** (Upchurch, Mannion & Taylor, 2015), and rebbachisaurids are known from the Early  
 Cretaceous of the **UK** (Mannion, 2009; Mannion, Upchurch & Hutt, 2011). Though not as  
 species-rich as the later Kimmeridgian-Tithonian Tendaguru **beds** (Remes, 2007, 2009) or the  
 Morrison Formation (Foster, 2003) or the Lourinhã Formation (Mannion et al., 2012, 2013;  
 Mocho, Royo-Torres & Ortega, 2014; Mocho et al., 2016), the Peterborough Oxford Clay  
 material thus far has hinted at a relatively high diversity in sauropods. As this material is  
 incomplete, the diagnosis of indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod or at best  
 indeterminate neosauropod, is appropriate. In the future, more material may clarify the  
 provenance of these remains.

## CONCLUSIONS

In summary, the associated posterior dorsals show characters shared with both non-  
 neosauropod eusauropods, as well as neosauropods. This element will therefore be ascribed to  
 an indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod. The anterior isolated caudal shares few  
 morphological features with non-neosauropod eusauropods, and most morphological features  
 with neosauropods. The middle isolated caudal shares few features with non-neosauropod  
 eusauropods, and more with neosauropods. It is therefore possible that these caudals belong to  
 a neosauropod dinosaur, which might also be different to *Cetiosauriscus*. Phylogenetic analysis  
 tentatively recovers these caudals as neosauropodan. Therefore, these caudals give a higher  
 sauropod species diversity to the Peterborough Oxford Clay Formation than previously  
 assumed.

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank Glenys Wass and the staff of Vivacity-Peterborough Museum for kindly providing access to the specimen, as well as to the late Arthur Cruickshank of the New Walk Museum, Leicester, for preparing the Leicester material. Furthermore, All McGowan, Tim Palmer, John Cope and Kevin Page are thanked for providing invaluable information on the Oxford Clay invertebrate fossils. Darren Withers helped in identifying the provenance of the Peterborough clay pits. Emanuel Tschopp is thanked for discussion on his dataset. The suggestions and comments by editor Matt Wedel, reviewers Phil Mannion, Darren Naish and one anonymous reviewer greatly improved this paper. We acknowledge the Willi Hennig Society for phylogenetic analysis using TNT.

# Figure captions

Figure 1: Geological setting - geographical setting of King's Dyke, Orton and Star Pit, Whittlesey (adapted after Hudson & Martill (1994) with notes from Liston (2006)).

Figure 2: Posterior dorsal PETMG R85 in anterior (A), posterior (B), ventral (C), dorsal (D), right lateral (E) and left lateral (F) views. Scalebar is 10 cm.

Figure 3: Posterior dorsal PETMG R85 in anterior (A0, posterior (B), left lateral (C), right lateral (D), ventral (E) and dorsal (F) views. Scalebar is 10 cm.

Figure 4: Anterior caudal PETMG PETMG R272 in anterior (A), posterior (B), lateral (C), ventral (D), and dorsal (E) views. Scalebar is 10 cm.

Figure 5: Middle caudal Leict LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 in anterior (A) right lateral (B), posterior (C), left lateral (D), dorsal (E), ventral (F) views. Scalebar 10 cm.

Figure 6: Phylogenetic analyses. Strict consensus tree based on Carballido et al., (2017) (A) and second analysis based on Tschopp & Mateus (2017) (B) with revised *Cetiosauriscus* (purple) coding, and additionally PETMG R85 (orange) PETMG R272 (blue) and LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 (red) as OTU's.

Figure 7: Comparative schematic drawings of PETMG R85 with posterior dorsals of other sauropods. PETMG R 85 in posterior view (A) with *Cetiosauriscus* (B). PETMG R85 in anterior view (C) with *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* (D) and the Rutland *Cetiosaurus* (E). PETMG R85 in lateral view (F) with *Cetiosauriscus* (G). Scalebar is 10 cm, *Cetiosauriscus* not to scale.

Figure 8: Comparative schematic drawings of PETMG R272 with anterior caudals of other sauropods. PETMG R 272 in anterior view (A) with *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* (B), *Cetiosauriscus* (C) and an indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod from the Middle Jurassic of the UK (YORYM:2001.9337; Manning, Egerton & Romano, 2015), (D). Scalebar 10 cm, *Cetiosauriscus* not to scale.

Figure 9: Comparative schematic drawings of LEICT G. 418.1956.21.0 with middle caudals of other sauropods. LEICT G. 418.1956.21.0 in lateral view (A) with the Rutland *Cetiosaurus* (B), *Cetiosauriscus* (C) and *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* (D). Scalebar 10 cm, *Cetiosauriscus* not to scale.

# References

- Alifanov VR., Averianov AO. 2003. *Ferganasaurus verzilini*, gen. et sp. nov., a new neosauropod (Dinosauria, Saurischia, Sauropoda) from the Middle Jurassic of Fergana Valley, Kirghizia. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 23:358–372.
- Allain R., Aquesbi N. 2008. Anatomy and phylogenetic relationships of *Tazoudasaurus naimi* (Dinosauria, Sauropoda) from the late Early Jurassic of Morocco. *Geodiversitas* 30:345–424.
- Andrews CW. 1910. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Marine Reptiles of the Oxford Clay: Based on the Leeds Collection in the British Museum (Natural History), London Part I. British Museum (Natural History), London, England.*
- Andrews CW. 1913. *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Marine Reptiles of the Oxford Clay: Based on the Leeds Collection in the British Museum (Natural History), London, Part 2. order of the Trustees. British Museum (Natural History), London, England.*
- Bonaparte JF. 1986a. The early radiation and phylogenetic relationships of the Jurassic sauropod dinosaurs, based on vertebral anatomy. In: Padian K ed. *The Beginning of the Age of Dinosaurs*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 247–258.
- Bonaparte JF. 1986b. Les dinosaures (Carnosaures, Allosauridés, Sauropodes, Cétosauridés) du Jurassique Moyen de Cerro Cónдор (Chubut, Argentina). *Annales de Paléontologie (Vert.-Invert.)* 72:247–289.

616 Brochu CA. 1996. Closure of neurocentral sutures during crocodilian ontogeny: Implications for  
617 maturity assessment in fossil archosaurs. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 16:49–62.  
618 DOI: 10.1080/02724634.1996.10011283.

619 Carballido JL., Pol D., Otero A., Cerda IA., Salgado L., Garrido AC., Ramezani J., Cúneo NR.,  
620 Krause JM. 2017. A new giant titanosaur sheds light on body mass evolution among  
621 sauropod dinosaurs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 284:20171219. DOI:  
622 10.1098/rspb.2017.1219.

623 Carballido JL., Sander PM. 2014. Postcranial axial skeleton of *Europasaurus holgeri* (Dinosauria,  
624 Sauropoda) from the Upper Jurassic of Germany: implications for sauropod ontogeny  
625 and phylogenetic relationships of basal Macronaria. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology*  
626 12:335–387. DOI: 10.1080/14772019.2013.764935.

627 Casanovas ML., Santafé JV., Sanz JL. 2001. *Losillasaurus giganteus* , un nuevo saurópodo del  
628 tránsito Jurásico-Cretácico de la cuenca de " Los Serranos"(Valencia, España).  
629 *Paleontologia i Evolució*:99–122.

630 Charig AJ. 1980. A diplodocid sauropod from the Lower Cretaceous of England. In: Jacobs LL ed.  
631 *Aspects of Vertebrate History. Essays in Honor of Edwin Harris Colbert*. Flagstaff:  
632 Museum of Northern Arizona Press, 231–244.

633 Charig AJ. 1993. Case 1876. *Cetiosauriscus* von Huene, 1927 (Reptilia, Sauropodomorpha):  
634 proposed designation of *C. stewarti* Charig, 1980 as the type species. *Bulletin of*  
635 *Zoological Nomenclature* 50:282–283.

- Chure D., Britt B., Whitlock J., Wilson J. 2010. First complete sauropod dinosaur skull from the Cretaceous of the Americas and the evolution of sauropod dentition. *Naturwissenschaften* 97:379–391. DOI: 10.1007/s00114-010-0650-6.
- Danise S., Twitchett RJ., Matts K. 2014. Ecological succession of a Jurassic shallow-water ichthyosaur fall. *Nature Communications*, 5:4789 doi: 10.1038/ncomms5789
- Foster JR. 2003. Paleoecological analysis of the vertebrate fauna of the Morrison Formation (Upper Jurassic), Rocky Mountain Region, U.S.A. *New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin* 23:2–100.
- Gallina PA., Otero A. 2009. Anterior caudal transverse processes in sauropod dinosaurs: morphological, phylogenetic and functional aspects. *Ameghiniana* 46:165–176.
- Goloboff PA., Catalano SA. 2016. TNT version 1.5, including a full implementation of phylogenetic morphometrics. *Cladistics* 32:221–238.
- Goloboff PA., Farris JS., Nixon KC. 2008. TNT, a free program for phylogenetic analysis. *Cladistics* 24:774–786. DOI: 10.1111/j.1096-0031.2008.00217.x.
- Harris JD. 2006. The axial skeleton of the dinosaur *Suuwassea emilieae* (Sauropoda: Flagellicaudata) from the Upper Jurassic Morrison Formation of Montana, USA. *Palaeontology* 49:1091–1121.
- Hatcher JB. 1903. Osteology of *Haplocanthosaurus*, with description of a new species and remarks on the probable habits of the Sauropoda and the age and origin of the *Atlantosaurus* beds: Additional remarks on *Diplodocus*. *Memoirs of the Carnegie Museum* 2:1–72.

658 He X., Li K., Cai K. 1988. *The Middle Jurassic dinosaur fauna from Dashanpu, Zigong, Sichuan.*  
659 *Vol. IV. Sauropod Dinosaurs (2)* Omeisaurus tianfuensis. Chengdu, China: Sichuan  
660 Publishing House of Science and Technology.

661 Heathcote J., Upchurch P. 2003. The relationships of *Cetiosauriscus stewarti* (Dinosauria;  
662 Sauropoda): implications for sauropod phylogeny. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*  
663 23:60A.

664 Hillier R. 1981. *Clay that burns: a history of the Fletton brick industry.* London Brick Company.

665 Hulke JW. 1887. Note on some dinosaurian remains in the collection of A. Leeds, Esq., of  
666 Eyebury, Northamptonshire. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society* 43:695–702.

667 Läng É. 2008. Les cétiosaures (Dinosauria, Sauropoda) et les sauropodes du Jurassique moyen:  
668 révision systématique, nouvelles découvertes et implications phylogénétiques. Ph. D.  
669 dissertation Thesis. Paris, France: Centre de recherche sur la paléobiodiversité et les  
670 paléoenvironnements.

671 Leeds ET. 1956. *The Leeds Collection of Fossil Reptiles from the Oxford Clay of Peterborough.* BH  
672 Blackwell.

673 Liston JJ. 2004. A re-examination of a Middle Jurassic sauropod limb bone from the Bathonian  
674 of the Isle of Skye. *Scottish Journal of Geology* 40:119–122.

675 Maddison WP., Maddison DR. 2010. Mesquite: a modular system for evolutionary analysis.  
676 2011; Version 2.75. See [mesquiteproject.org/mesquite/download/download.html](http://mesquiteproject.org/mesquite/download/download.html).

677 Manning PL., Egerton VM., Romano M. 2015. A New Sauropod Dinosaur from the Middle  
678 Jurassic of the United Kingdom. *PLOS ONE* 10:e0128107. DOI:  
679 10.1371/journal.pone.0128107.



Mannion PD. 2009. A rebbachisaurid sauropod from the Lower Cretaceous of the Isle of Wight, England. *Cretaceous Research* 30:521–526.

Mannion PD. 2010. A revision of the sauropod dinosaur genus ‘*Bothriospondylus*’ with a redescription of the type material of the Middle Jurassic form ‘*B. madagascariensis*.’ *Palaeontology* 53:277–296. DOI: 10.1111/j.1475-4983.2009.00919.x.

Mannion PD., Allain R., Moine O. 2017. The earliest known titanosauriform sauropod dinosaur and the evolution of Brachiosauridae. *PeerJ* 5:e3217.

Mannion PD., Upchurch P., Barnes RN., Mateus O. 2013. Osteology of the Late Jurassic Portuguese sauropod dinosaur *Lusotitan atalaiensis* (Macronaria) and the evolutionary history of basal titanosauriforms. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 168:98–206. DOI: 10.1111/zoj.12029.

Mannion PD., Upchurch P., Hutt S. 2011. New rebbachisaurid (Dinosauria: Sauropoda) material from the Wessex Formation (Barremian, Early Cretaceous), Isle of Wight, United Kingdom. *Cretaceous Research* 32:774–780.

Mannion PD., Upchurch P., Mateus O., Barnes RN., Jones MEH. 2012. New information on the anatomy and systematic position of *Dinheirosaurus lourinhanensis* (Sauropoda: Diplodocoidea) from the Late Jurassic of Portugal, with a review of European diplodocoids. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 10:521–551. DOI: 10.1080/14772019.2011.595432.

Marsh OC. 1878. Principal characters of American Jurassic dinosaurs, Part I. *American Journal of Science (series 3)* 16:411–416. DOI: 10.2475/ajs.s3-16.95.411.

- 701 Martill DM. 1987. A taphonomic and diagenetic case study of a partially articulated ichthyosaur.  
702 *Palaeontology* 30(3):543-555.
- 703 Martill DM. 1988. A review of the terrestrial vertebrate fossils of the Oxford Clay (Callovian-  
704 Oxfordian) of England. *Mercian Geologist* 11:171.
- 705 Mocho P., Royo-Torres R., Malafaia E., Escaso F., Ortega F. 2017. First occurrences of non-  
706 neosauropod eusauropod procoelous caudal vertebrae in the Portuguese Upper Jurassic  
707 record. *Geobios* 50:23–36.
- 708 Mocho P., Royo-Torres R., Ortega F. 2014. Phylogenetic reassessment of *Lourinhasaurus*  
709 *alenquerensis*, a basal Macronaria (Sauropoda) from the Upper Jurassic of Portugal.  
710 *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 170:875–916. DOI: 10.1111/zoj.12113.
- 711 Noè LF., Liston JJ., Chapman SD. 2010. ‘Old bones, dry subject’: the dinosaurs and pterosaur  
712 collected by Alfred Nicholson Leeds of Peterborough, England. *Geological Society,*  
713 *London, Special Publications* 343:49–77.
- 714 Ouyang H., Ye Y. 2002. The first mamenchisaurian skeleton with complete skull,  
715 *Mamenchisaurus youngi*. Chengdu, China: Sichuan Publishing House of Science and  
716 Technology.
- 717 Owen R. 1842. Report on British Fossil Reptiles Pt. II. *Report of the British Association for the*  
718 *Advancement of Science* 1841:60–204.
- 719 Owen R. 1875. Monographs on the British fossil Reptilia of the Mesozoic Formations, Part II  
720 (Genera *Bothriospondylus*, *Cetiosaurus*, *Omosaurus*). *Palaeontographical Society*  
721 (*Monograph*):1–93.
- 722 Phillips J. 1871. *Geology of Oxford and the Valley of the Thames*. Clarendon Press.

- 723   Rauhut OWM. 2003. Revision of *Amygdalodon patagonicus* Cabrera, 1947 (Dinosauria,  
724       Sauropoda). *Fossil Record* 6:173–181.
- 725   Rauhut OWM., Carballido JL., Pol D. 2015. A diplodocid sauropod dinosaur from the Late  
726       Jurassic Cañadón Calcáreo Formation of Chubut, Argentina. *Journal of Vertebrate*  
727       *Paleontology* 35:e982798. DOI: 10.1080/02724634.2015.982798.
- 728   Rauhut OWM., Remes K., Fechner R., Cladera G., Puerta P. 2005. Discovery of a short-necked  
729       sauropod dinosaur from the Late Jurassic period of Patagonia. *Nature* 435:670–672.
- 730   Remes K. 2007. A second Gondwanan diplodocid dinosaur from the Upper Jurassic Tendaguru  
731       beds of Tanzania, East Africa. *Palaeontology* 50:653–667.
- 732   Remes K. 2009. Taxonomy of Late Jurassic diplodocid sauropods from Tendaguru (Tanzania).  
733       *Fossil Record* 12:23–46.
- 734   Remes K., Ortega F., Fierro I., Joger U., Kosma R., Ferrer JMM., Ide OA., Maga A. 2009. A new  
735       basal sauropod dinosaur from the Middle Jurassic of Niger and the early evolution of  
736       Sauropoda. *PLoS One* 4:e6924. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0006924.
- 737   Schwarz D., Meyer CA., Wings O., Le Loeuff J. 2007. Revision of *Cetiosauriscus greppini*—new  
738       results and perspectives. In: *Fifth Meeting of the European Association of Vertebrate*  
739       *Palaeontologists Abstract Volume, Musée des Dinosauriens, Espéraza, France*. 57–58.
- 740   Schwarz D., Wings O., Meyer C. 2007. Revision of *Cetiosauriscus greppini*: the revival of a Late  
741       Jurassic sauropod from Switzerland. In: *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 143A–143A.
- 742   Seeley HG. 1888. Classification of the Dinosauria. *Geological Magazine (Decade III)* 5:45–46.


- 743 Tschopp E., Mateus O. 2017. Osteology of *Galeamopus pabsti* sp. nov. (Sauropoda:  
744 Diplodocidae), with implications for neurocentral closure timing, and the cervico-dorsal  
745 transition in diplodocids. *PeerJ* 5:e3179. DOI: 10.7717/peerj.3179.
- 746 Tschopp E., Mateus O., Benson RBJ. 2015. A specimen-level phylogenetic analysis and  
747 taxonomic revision of Diplodocidae (Dinosauria, Sauropoda). *PeerJ* 3:e857. DOI:  
748 10.7717/peerj.857.
- 749 Upchurch P. 1995. The evolutionary history of sauropod dinosaurs. *Philosophical Transactions*  
750 *of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences* 349:365–390.
- 751 Upchurch P., Mannion PD., Taylor MP. 2015. The Anatomy and Phylogenetic Relationships of  
752 “*Pelorosaurus*” *becklesii* (Neosauropoda, Macronaria) from the Early Cretaceous of  
753 England. *PLoS One* 10:e0125819.
- 754 Upchurch P., Martin J. 2002. The Rutland *Cetiosaurus*: the anatomy and relationships of a  
755 Middle Jurassic British sauropod dinosaur. *Palaeontology* 45:1049–1074.
- 756 Upchurch P., Martin J. 2003. The anatomy and taxonomy of *Cetiosaurus* (Saurischia, Sauropoda)  
757 from the Middle Jurassic of England. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 23:208–231.
- 758 Whitlock JA. 2011. A phylogenetic analysis of Diplodocoidea (Saurischia: Sauropoda). *Zoological*  
759 *Journal of the Linnean Society* 161:872–915. DOI: 10.1111/j.1096-3642.2010.00665.x.
- 760 Wilson JA. 1999. A nomenclature for vertebral laminae in sauropods and other saurischian  
761 dinosaurs. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 19:639–653.
- 762 Wilson JA., D’Emic MD., Ikejiri T., Moacdieh EM., Whitlock JA. 2011. A nomenclature for  
763 vertebral fossae in sauropods and other saurischian dinosaurs. *PLoS ONE* 6:e17114.

- Woodward AS. 1905. On parts of the skeleton of *Cetiosaurus leedsii*, a sauropodous dinosaur from the Oxford Clay of Peterborough. Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London 1:232-243.
- Xu X., Upchurch P., Mannion PD., Barrett PM., Regalado-Fernandez OR., Mo J., Ma J., Liu H. 2018. A new Middle Jurassic diplodocoid suggests an earlier dispersal and diversification of sauropod dinosaurs. *Nature communications* 9:2700.
- Zhang Y. 1988. *The Middle Jurassic dinosaur fauna from Dashanpu, Zigong, Sichuan, vol. 1: sauropod dinosaur (I): Shunosaurus*. Chengdu, China: Sichuan Publishing House of Science and Technology.

**Figure 1**(on next page)

Geographical position of King's Dyke, Orton and Star Pit, Whittlesey, UK.

(adapted after Hudson & Martill (1994), with notes from Liston, (2006)).




# Figure 2

Figure 2: Posterior dorsal PETMG R85.

In anterior (A), posterior (B), ventral (C), dorsal (D), right lateral (E) and left lateral (F) views.

Scalebar is 10 cm.






# Figure 3

Figure 3: Posterior dorsal PETMG R85.

In anterior (A0, posterior (B), left lateral (C), right lateral (D), ventral (E) and dorsal (F) views.


Scalebar is 10 cm.



# Figure 4

Figure 4: Anterior caudal PETMG R272.

In anterior (A), posterior (B), lateral (C), ventral (D), and dorsal (E) views. Scalebar is 10 cm.




# Figure 5

Figure 5: Middle caudal Leict LEICT G.418.1956.21.0.

In anterior (A) right lateral (B), posterior (C), left lateral (D), dorsal (E), ventral (F) views.



Scalebar 10 cm.



# Figure 6(on next page)

Figure 6: Phylogenetic analyses.

Strict consensus tree based on Carballido et al., (2017) (A) and second analysis based on Tschopp & Mateus (2017) (B) with revised *Cetiosauriscus* (purple) coding, and additionally PETMG R85 (orange) PETMG R272 (blue) and LEICT G.418.1956.21.0 (red) as OTU's.




# Figure 7 (on next page)

Figure 7: Comparative schematic drawings of PETMG R85 with posterior dorsals of other sauropods.

PETMG R 85 in posterior view (A) with *Cetiosauriscus* (B). PETMG R85 in anterior view (C) with *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* (D) and the Rutland *Cetiosaurus* (E). PETMG R85 in lateral view (F) with *Cetiosauriscus* (G). Scalebar is 10 cm, *Cetiosauriscus* not to scale.









# Figure 8<sub>(on next page)</sub>

Figure 8: Comparative schematic drawings of PETMG R272 with anterior caudals of other sauropods.

PETMG R 272 in anterior view (A) with *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* (B), *Cetiosauriscus* (C) and an indeterminate non-neosauropod eusauropod from the Middle Jurassic of the UK (YORYM:2001.9337, Manning, Egerton & Romano, 2015), (D). Scalebar 10 cm, *Cetiosauriscus* not to scale.









10 cm

# Figure 9(on next page)

Figure 9: Comparative schematic drawings of LEICT G. 418.1956.21.0 with middle caudals of other sauropods.

LEICT G. 418.1956.21.0 in lateral view (A) with the Rutland *Cetiosaurus* (B), *Cetiosauriscus* (C) and *Cetiosaurus oxoniensis* (D). Scalebar 10 cm, *Cetiosauriscus* not to scale.



**Table 1** (on next page)

Table 1: Oxford Clay Formation sauropod material.

Collection reference	material	diagnosis
NHMUK R1967	10 posterior caudal vertebrae	Non-neosauropod eusauropod indet
NHMUK R1984	4 anterior caudal vertebrae	Non-neosauropod eusauropod indet
NHMUK R1985	Left and right pubis	Non-neosauropod eusauropod indet
NHMUK R1986	Dorsal centrum (w/o neural arch)	Non-neosauropod eusauropod indet
NHMUK R1987	Dorsal rib	Non-neosauropod eusauropod indet
NHMUK R1988	Left and right ischium	Non-neosauropod eusauropod indet
NHMUK R3078	posterior dorsal vertebra, a partial sacrum, a partial caudal axial column, forelimb and partial pectoral girdle, hindlimb, and a partial pelvic girdle	<i>Cetiosauriscus stewarti</i>
NHMUK R3377	3 isolated teeth	?Turiasauria

1