

Bite force data suggests relationship between acrodont tooth implantation and strong bite force (#45825)

1

First revision

Guidance from your Editor

Please submit by **20 May 2020** for the benefit of the authors .



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.



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)
- 5 Figure file(s)
- 2 Table file(s)
- 2 Raw data file(s)
- 1 Other 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.
-  All underlying data have been provided; they are 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.

Bite force data suggests relationship between acrodont tooth implantation and strong bite force

Kelsey M Jenkins^{Corresp., 1}, Jack O Shaw¹

¹ Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Yale University, New Haven, United States of America

Corresponding Author: Kelsey M Jenkins
Email address: kelsey.jenkins@yale.edu

Extant and extinct reptiles exhibit numerous combinations of tooth implantation and attachment. Tooth implantation ranges from those possessing roots and lying within a socket (thecodonty), to teeth lying against the lingual wall of the jawbone (pleurodonty), to teeth without roots or sockets that are attached to the apex of the marginal jawbones (acrodonty). Attachment may be ligamentous (gomphosis) or via fusion (ankylosis). Adaptive reasonings are proposed as an underlying driver for evolutionary changes in some forms of tooth implantation and attachment. However, a substantiated adaptive hypothesis is lacking for the state of acrodont ankylosis that is seen in several lineages of Lepidosauria, a clade that is plesiomorphically pleurodont. The convergent evolution of acrodont ankylosis in several clades of lepidosaurs suggests a selective pressure shaped the evolution of the trait. We hypothesize that acrodont ankylosis as seen in Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus*, is an adaptation either resulting from or allowing for a stronger bite force. We analyzed bite force data gathered from the literature to show that those taxa possessing acrodont dentition possess a stronger bite force than those taxa with pleurodont dentition. Dietary specialists with pleurodont dentition may also possess relatively high bite forces, though body size may also play a role in their ability to bite hard. Furthermore, our results have implications for the evolution of acrodont ankylosis and potential behaviors related to strong bite force that influenced the evolution of acrodonty within Acrodonta and Rhynchocephalia.

Bite Force Data Suggests Relationship between Acrodont Tooth Implantation and Strong Bite Force

Kelsey M. Jenkins^{1*}, Jack O. Shaw¹

¹ Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

Corresponding Author:

Kelsey M. Jenkins*

Department of Geology and Geophysics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA

Email address: kelsey.jenkins@yale.edu

Abstract

Extant and extinct reptiles exhibit numerous combinations of tooth implantation and attachment. Tooth implantation ranges from those possessing roots and lying within a socket (thecodonty), to teeth lying against the lingual wall of the jawbone (pleurodonty), to teeth without roots or sockets that are attached to the apex of the marginal jawbones (acrodonty). Attachment may be ligamentous (gomphosis) or via fusion (ankylosis). Adaptative reasonings are proposed as an underlying driver for evolutionary changes in some forms of tooth implantation and attachment. However, a substantiated adaptive hypothesis is lacking for the state of acrodont ankylosis that is seen in several lineages of Lepidosauria, a clade that is plesiomorphically pleurodont. The convergent evolution of acrodont ankylosis in several clades

of lepidosaurs suggests a selective pressure shaped the evolution of the trait. We hypothesize that acrodont ankylosis as seen in Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus*, is an adaptation either resulting from or allowing for a stronger bite force. We analyzed bite force data gathered from the literature to show that those taxa possessing acrodont dentition possess a stronger bite force than those taxa with pleurodont dentition. Dietary specialists with pleurodont dentition may also possess relatively high bite forces, though body size may also play a role in their ability to bite hard. Furthermore, our results have implications for the evolution of acrodont ankylosis and potential behaviors related to strong bite force that influenced the evolution of acrodonty within Acrodonta and Rhynchocephalia.

Introduction

Acrodont tooth implantation, where the tooth rests at the summit of the tooth-bearing bone, evolved multiple times within Lepidosauria. It appears at least twice within squamate reptiles, as seen in Acrodonta (Romer, 1956) and Trogonophidae (Gans, 1960), and once within Rhynchocephalia (Jenkins et al., 2017) (Fig. 1). In Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus*, the only living representative of Rhynchocephalia, the dentition is strongly ankylosed (i.e., fused) via the adjacent bone. In those taxa, teeth and surrounding tissues have been investigated thoroughly via histological studies (Cooper & Poole, 1973; Smirina & Ananjeva, 2007; Kieser et al., 2009, 2011; Haridy, 2018), CT data (Dosedělová et al., 2016), and *in vitro* staining (Buchtová et al., 2013). However, the evolution of acrodont tooth implantation is seldom discussed in an adaptive context.

Smith (1958) suggested that acrodonty is a trait associated with anchoring permanent dentition. However, it is unknown if acrodonty is truly associated with anchoring permanent dentition, or if those combined traits somehow inhibit tooth replacement. Presently, this remains

the only hypothesis associated with acrodont dentition. Smith (1958) also suggested that thecodonty, where the tooth sits within a socket, is associated with permanent dentition. While that is the case in mammals, it is well known that toothed archosaurs, which also possess thecodont implantation, replace their teeth with some regularity (e.g., Edmund, 1962; Gaengler, 2000; McIntosh et al., 2002; LeBlanc et al., 2017; D’Emic et al., 2019). Unlike acrodont dentition, thecodonty is not necessarily associated with ankylosis and may attach to the surrounding bone ligamentously, termed gomphosis (Osborn, 1984).

There are a suite of traits commonly associated with acrodont tooth implantation, most typically reduced tooth counts and severe tooth wear (Augé, 1997; Haridy, 2018). However, those characters are not necessarily associated with every taxon exhibiting acrodont tooth implantation. Though some have noted a loss of the alveolar foramen in the teeth of acrodontan squamates (Zaher & Rieppel, 1999), it was later found that *Pogona vitticeps* possesses nutrient foramina supplying the pulp cavities (Haridy, 2018). A slowing or lack of tooth replacement, called monophyodonty, is also commonly associated with acrodont tooth implantation (Smith, 1958; Cooper et al., 1970), although exceptions do exist (Gow, 1977; Haridy, LeBlanc & Reisz, 2018). Even with monophyodont dentition, additional teeth are typically still added to the posterior end of the tooth row throughout ontogeny, as is the plesiomorphic condition within Reptilia (Robinson, 1976; Gow, 1977; Rieppel, 1992; Reynoso, 2003).

As individuals of Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus* age, the boundary between tooth and bone becomes difficult to determine externally (Fig. 2). This is a result of alveolar bone growing to surround the outer portion of the tooth through ontogeny (Buchtová et al., 2013; Haridy, 2018). This feature has caused some to erroneously propose that *S. punctatus* lacks teeth entirely, instead possessing a serrated jawbone (Mlot, 1997). Severe wear may obscure the

anterior dentition in older, acrodont, monophyodont lepidosaurs, and in some cases the teeth may be worn to the point where the bone itself forms the occlusal surface in the anterior portion of the mouth (Robinson, 1976). To resist wear as the reptile ages, the pulp cavity infills with bone and secondary dentine as seen in members of Acrodonta (Throckmorton, 1979; Smirina & Ananjeva, 2007; Dosedělová et al., 2016; Haridy, 2018) or secondary dentine and pulp-stones as seen in *S. punctatus* (Kieser et al., 2009).

The ancestral state of tooth implantation and attachment in the reptile lineage is thought to involve a tooth set in a shallow socket (i.e., subthecodonty) attached via ankylosis (Bertin et al., 2018), though some of the most basal reptiles exhibit pleurodont tooth implantation (LeBlanc & Reisz, 2015). Furthermore, the periodontal ligament is likely ancestrally present in all amniotes (LeBlanc et al., 2016). However, reptiles have since explored many forms of tooth implantation (acrodonty, pleurodonty, and thecodonty) and attachment (ankylosis and gomphosis) in varying combinations. Adaptive interpretations are occasionally used to explain why reptiles may stray from the ancestral state within their respective clades (Smith, 1958; Noble, 1969; Osborn 1984). Other adaptations for attachment include dentine infoldings, called plicidentine, which evolved independently multiple times within Reptilia, and it is interpreted to be a mechanism to strengthen tooth attachment in kinetic-feeding predators (Maxwell, Caldwell & Lamoureux, 2011; MacDougall et al., 2014). Even the loss of teeth may be associated with the evolution of other adaptive structures, like a keratinous beak (Davit-Béal, Tucker & Sire, 2009).

The ancestral state of tooth implantation and attachment for crown lepidosaurs is likely pleurodont ankylosis, seen in basal members of both Rhynchocephalia and Squamata (e.g., Evans, 1980; Whiteside, 1986; Reynoso, 1998; Simões et al., 2018). Additionally, the lepidosauromorphs *Marmoretta* and *Sophineta* possess pleurodont tooth implantation (Evans,

1991; Evans & Borsuk-Bialynicka, 2009). The evolution of acrodont ankylosis accompanied by bone and secondary dentine deposition, as seen in Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus*, lacks any adaptive hypothesis. Here we suggest that this combination of traits serves as an adaptation associated with strong bite force. Anecdotal evidence suggests that acrodont taxa possess a strong bite: *S. punctatus* is said to possess a painful and ‘vice-like’ bite (Robb, 1977; Daugherty and Cree, 1990), and one of the authors (KMJ) notes from personal experience that the veiled chameleon, *Chamaeleo calyptratus*, also possesses a painful bite and is reluctant to release its victim. Bite-force analyses also indicate agamids have a stronger bite than *S. punctatus*, relative to body size (Schaerlaeken et al., 2008; Jones and Lappin, 2009). The literature concerning bite force in lepidosaurs is numerous and implies a multitude of benefits for increased bite force. For instance, increase bite force is thought to improve prey capture and handling in lepidosaurs, particularly for the consumption of hard-bodied prey (Herrel et al., 1999; Herrel et al., 2001; Verwajen, Van Damme & Herrel, 2002; Meyers et al., 2018). High bite force may also aid in territory defense and dominance (Herrel, Meyers & Vanhooydonck, 2001; Lailvaux et al., 2004; Huyghe et al., 2005; Husak et al., 2006; Jones & Lappin, 2009), and mating success (Lappin & Husak, 2005; Husak et al., 2009; Herrel et al., 2010). Higher bite force in lizards is often accompanied by skeletal correlates in the cranium and increased mass of the adductor musculature compared to those with lower bite force (Herrel, McBrayer & Larson, 2007; Fabre et al., 2014). Cranial kinesis also plays a strong role in bite force, with a more rigid or akinetic skull being more capable of producing a strong bite (Erickson, Lappin & Vliet, 2003; Wroe, McHenry & Thomason, 2005; Tseng & Binder, 2010; Cost et al., 2020). Thus, the varying degrees of kinesis in lizard and tuatara skulls can certainly impact bite force within Lepidosauria (Frazzetta, 1962).

We suggest that acrodont tooth implantation is yet another skeletal trait associated with bite force. We hypothesize that taxa possessing acrodont dentition also possess a higher bite force, compared to those with pleurodont dentition, relative to body size. Furthermore, the accompanied bone deposition around the base of the dentition may also assist in resisting strong biting. In order to test our hypothesis, we analyzed bite force data based on a comprehensive literature review among lepidosaurian taxa. We found that size-normalized bite force was significantly greater in acrodont lepidosaurs than pleurodont lepidosaurs. Furthermore, we discuss the evolution of acrodont ankylosis within an adaptive context in response to high bite force.

Materials & Methods

To assess the relationship between lepidosaurian bite force and tooth implantation, we analyzed previously recorded bite force data. We collected mean snout-vent length (SVL), mean head depth (HD), and mean bite force (BF) measurements from thirty-nine peer-reviewed papers (Supplementary Files). Following previous studies (Erickson et al., 2004; Wroe, McHenry & Thomason, 2005; Sellers et al., 2017) we analyzed log-transformed measurements (analyses of non-transformed data provided in supplement).

We focused on the relationship between SVL and BF, as SVL is the most commonly reported measure of size in reptiles (Fig. 3). However, many squamate reptiles possess elongate body forms that are not necessarily correlated to cranial allometry, and thus may not strongly correlate with bite force. Because of this, we also standardized by head depth in separate analyses (Fig. 4). Multiple studies evaluating lepidosaur bite force suggest that head depth is a good predictor of bite force because it accommodates the adductor musculature (Herrel, de

Grauw & Lemos-Espinal, 2001; Lappin, Hamilton & Sullivan, 2006; McBrayer & Anderson, 2007; Herrel et al., 2010). Tooth implantation was assessed by the authors.

To examine differences in bite force between acrodont and pleurodont taxa, analyses of covariance (ANCOVA) were performed using both size variables (log-SVL and log-HD) as covariates. To further compare bite force across taxa of significantly different body masses, we calculated normalized bite force (NBF) as the residuals of a linear regression fit to (1) log-SVL and log-BF or (2) log-HD and log-BF. We refer to these values as SVL-NBF and HD-NBF, respectively. Differences in NBF between tooth implantation groups were then assessed using Kolmogorov–Smirnov (KS) tests.

To evaluate the proportion of the lepidosaurian tree that has been examined in terms of bite force, we tallied all known publications that record lepidosaurian bite force (Fig. 5; Supplementary Files). This includes those publications that were not included in the initial analyses that compare bite force between acrodont and pleurodont taxa due to a lack of raw bite force data or a lack of necessary variables (i.e., SVL).

Results

Bite force is higher in acrodont taxa than in pleurodont taxa after accounting for size differences (Fig. 3 & 4, panel B). Raw bite force values ranged from 0.3 to 409.3 Newtons, SVL ranged 13.0–389.0 mm, and HD ranged 4.0–55.5 mm. SVL-NBF ranged -2.17 to 1.76, whereas HD-NBF ranged -2.35 to 1.61 (Supplementary Files). ANCOVAs of tooth implantation type and SVL and of tooth implantation type and HD have low p-values (0.064 and 0.0023, respectively) indicating differences in bite force between the acrodont and pleurodont taxa after accounting for SVL and HD. According to one-sided KS tests, acrodont SVL-NBF and HD-NBF values were significantly greater than those of pleurodents. Linear regressions of log-SVL and log-BF, and of

log-HD and log-BF were statistically significant and exhibited positive slopes ($p\text{-value} < 0.05$). Correlations were stronger between log-SVL and log-BF (Adj R-square = 0.71), compared to log-HD and log-BF (Adj R-square = 0.69).

The only direct comparisons that could be made for both tooth implantation categories and diet were for insectivory and herbivory. According to one-sided KS tests, SVL-NBF and HD-NBF values were significantly greater for insectivorous acrodonts compared to insectivorous pleurodonts. Overall, pleurodont insectivores exhibited a large range NBF values. Although acrodont insectivores seemingly also exhibited a wide range of SVL-NBF values, this is influenced by the elongate body plan seen in on taxon, *Trogonophis wiegmanni*, in which head dimensions do not correlate strongly with SVL. HD-NBF values for acrodont insectivores range less than the SVL-NBF values of the same group. A direct comparison of herbivorous acrodonts and pleurodonts reveals a lack of significant difference between the NBF vales of the two groups, according to one-sided KS tests. While direct comparisons between tooth implantation types and other diets are not possible using the available data, we also found that pleurodont frugivores exhibit the highest median NBF values whereas durophagous pleurodonts exhibit the lowest median NBF values, although the latter is based on a small number of measurements ($n = 2$).

Low SVL-NBF values in Trogonophidae indicate that the clade exhibits lower bite force than expected for SVL. These values were much lower than for other acrodont taxa, dramatically impacting the range and median SVL-NBF values for acrodonts. This trend is not present in HD-NBF, in which Trogonophidae exhibits the highest median bite force. Excluding Trogonophidae, Chamaeleonidae exhibited the highest SVL-NBF and HD-NBF values among acrodonts. Among pleurodont taxa, Lacertidae exhibits the largest range of NBF values for both SVL and HD.

Anguidae exhibits the greatest median values for HD-NBF. Iguanidae exhibits the greatest median SVL-NBF values. Both Gekkonidae and Scincidae exhibit low median SVL-NBF values, but data does not exist for either clade for HD-NBF. Phrynosomatidae exhibits the lowest median HD-NBF values.

Seventeen lepidosaurian families were represented by bite force data, including four acrodont families and 13 pleurodont families. Dactyloidae was represented by the most species ($n = 49$), while the families of Sphenodontidae, Varanidae, and Trogonophidae were only represented by single species.

Discussion

Thus far, anatomical research related to bite force in lepidosaurian reptiles has focused primarily on cranial musculature and skeletal dimensions, namely head depth, length, and width. However, teeth are more intimately associated with biting and oral processing than the aforementioned elements. Dental morphology is often adapted for diet, with generalists possessing a more unspecialized dentition and specialists possessing more unique tooth morphologies (e.g., Estes & Williams, 1984), though true specialists within lizards are rare and diets are often quite varied (Greene, 1982; Schaerlaeken et al., 2012). It should come as no surprise that tooth implantation and attachment is also shaped by oral processing capabilities. For example, multiple hypotheses exist for the evolution of thecodonty and associated periodontal ligament: a means of shock absorption and dissipation (Noble, 1969; Picton, 1989; McIntosh et al., 2002; Bosshardt et al., 2008), facilitation of post-eruption tooth movement (Osborn, 1984; Bosshardt et al., 2008), creation of a sensory system to allow the jaws to reposition during mastication (Bosshardt et al., 2008), flexible attachment of tooth to bone (Leblanc & Reisz, 2013), and for anchoring permanent dentition in mammals as mentioned above (Smith, 1958).

There lacks such variable hypotheses for the evolution of acrodont ankylosis. Here we show that there is a relationship between acrodont ankylosis and high bite force. However, there is still the question of whether (1) acrodont ankylosis developed due to strong bite force, or if (2) strong bite force evolved in response to acrodont ankylosis.

In the first scenario, acrodont ankylosis is a response to increased bite force by further securing the tooth to the bone as a means to resist failure during strong biting. Previous work shows that a stouter, blunter tooth, like that of acrodont taxa, is more resistant to failure under increased bite forces (Lucas & Luke, 1984; Evans & Sanson, 1998; Jones, 2006), compared to a more columnar or piercing tooth see in most pleurodont lepidosaurs which is prone to breakage under increased forces (Evans & Sanson, 1998; Erickson, Lappin, & Vliet, 2003). We suggest that the ankylosis and bone deposition seen in Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus* that accompanies the typical acrodont tooth morphology would also aid in resisting tooth failure. Simply put, a fused tooth is sturdier than a tooth attached via soft tissue. The specific combination of morphology, implantation, and attachment seen in Acrodonta and *S. punctatus* allows for a tooth that is most resistant to failure. However, that is not to say that breakage is impossible in taxa possessing acrodont ankylosis. The extremely strong adherence of teeth can result in the occasional breakage of both tooth and bone (Dosedělová et al., 2016). Though pleurodont dentition in other lizards is also ankylosed, they lack the bone growth that adheres the tooth to the jaw that is seen in Acrodonta and *S. punctatus*.

In the second scenario, strong bite force is a response to acrodont ankylosis. Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus* are monophyodont and exhibit severe wear, particularly in the anterior dentition as seen in older individuals. Although those individuals have extremely worn teeth, they still manage to capture and consume prey. If dentition is severely worn due to a lack of

replacement, increased bite force would be crucial in allowing the jaws to clamp tightly onto prey. Thus, older individuals with few functional teeth can still forage and consume as needed. If strong bite force in Acrodonta and *S. punctatus* evolved as a mechanism to aid in territory defense or increased mating success (opposed to prey handling), an older animal may be successful even though it possesses severely worn teeth. At this time, we cannot favor one hypothesis over another. It is also possible that different lineages acquired acrodont ankylosis under either scenario.

Two other hypotheses unrelated to increased bite force could explain the evolution of acrodont ankylosis from an initially pleurodont state. The first is that this combination of implantation and attachment evolved convergently in response to a shared diet. All extant lepidosaurs possessing acrodont ankylosis fill various dietary niches ranging from insectivory to herbivory (Fig. 3 & 4), calling to question the idea that the combined traits are currently acting as an adaptation for similar diets. Furthermore, extant squamates eating hard-shelled organisms, such as *Varanus niloticus* and *Tiliqua scincoides* (Rieppel, 1979; Estes & Williams, 1984), and high-fibered fruit, such as *Gallotia galloti* (Valido, Nogales, & Medina, 2003), possess pleurodont dentition, so it cannot be assumed that acrodont ankylosis evolved as a means to process tough foods (or that it is the only means by which to process tough foods, see section below). We also doubt that acrodont ankylosis first arose in response to a particular diet, because basal rhynchocephalians possessing acrodont dentition were likely insectivorous (Evans, 1980; Fraser & Walkden, 1983; Whiteside, 1986). Insectivory is also widespread among extant squamates, which mostly possess pleurodont dentition, so it seems unlikely that the initial evolution of acrodont ankylosis would be strongly influenced by an insectivorous diet. Acrodonty remained widespread as rhynchocephalians diversified to fill various dietary niches

(Jones 2006, 2009), so it seems unlikely that acrodont ankylosis evolved in response to any particular diet. Possessing firmly ankylosed acrodont dentition in conjunction with a higher bite force does allow access to harder foodstuffs, but it cannot be assumed to be the sole reason for the evolution of acrodont ankylosis.

The second hypothesis is that shared oral mechanics shaped the evolution of acrodont ankylosis, implying a mechanical constraint influenced the evolution of the trait. Previous bite force measurements of *S. punctatus* only measure the orthal bite, and not the force of the propalinal stroke (Schaerlaeken et al., 2008; Jones and Lappin 2009), and orthal bite force measurements were also utilized for all squamates in this analysis. While both squamates and *Sphenodon punctatus* are capable of orthal shearing, *S. punctatus* is well-known for possessing an akinetic skull and using propalinal jaw movement, where the lower jaw moves in an anterior-posterior motion (Robinson, 1976; Gorniak et al, 1982; Cartland-Shaw et al., 1998; Jones, 2008). This is in contrast with most squamates which possess kinetic skulls and typically favor streptostyly in order to move the lower jaw in a fore and aft motion (Evans, 2008). The rigidity afforded by an akinetic skull does allow for a relatively stronger orthal bite in *Sphenodon punctatus* than most lizards, and kinesis is thought to reduce the strength of a bite though allowing for improved prey capture and handling. However, the acrodont taxa examined here possess some of the least kinetic skulls among squamates (Iordansky, 1990; Arnold, 1998), possibly improving the capability of a strong bite. So, while the acrodont taxa examined here do possess more rigid skulls, allowing for stronger biting, there does not seem to be a shared oral mechanism that would influence the evolution of acrodont ankylosis.

Of the taxa that were examined in previous publications, fewer species of lepidosaurs with acrodont tooth implantation have been studied in regard to bite force in comparison to those

with pleurodont implantation (Fig. 5). Of the pleurodont taxa, 49 species of *Anolis* lizards (Dactyloidae) were the subjects of 20 publications that record bite force alone. Those taxa make up the largest proportion of pleurodont taxa analyzed here. The large number of *Anolis*-based studies is partly because they are speciose and represent a particularly important model taxon for ecological and evolutionary studies in the Americas. Conversely, only 16 unique species of acrodont lepidosaurs belonging to four separate families are the subject of 17 publications that record bite force. Only 16 families of squamate lizards have been subjected to bite force analyses, which leaves a large portion of the squamate line understudied (Fig. 5). Further examination of bite force and diet across Lepidosauria may enforce our hypothesis while also revealing other ecological and evolutionary trends.

Can acrodont ankylosis be reversed?

The transition from pleurodont to acrodont tooth implantation occurred independently several times within Lepidosauria (Acrodonta, Trogonophidae, Rhynchocephalia) and it is even seen in stem lepidosauromorphs (Sobral, Simões & Schoch, 2020), but only in Acrodonta and Rhynchocephalia is the tooth-bone boundary difficult to detect upon initial inspection. Stem Acrodonta do not possess the extensive bone deposition that accompanies ankylosis, nor do they possess the apical tooth implantation that is seen in the crown group, although the roots of the teeth are much shorter than most other iguanian lizards and they possess a relatively increased degree of ankylosis (Simões et al., 2015). All crown acrodontans possess some degree of acrodont tooth implantation accompanied by ankylosis and bone deposition. Within that clade, acrodont ankylosis may be a fixed trait that lacks the plasticity to explore other forms of tooth implantation and attachment. It is also possible that there has been no selective pressure acted upon tooth implantation and attachment within Acrodonta that would drive members of the clade

away from acrodont ankylosis since it initially evolved. While this may imply a potentially adaptive circumstance to the initial evolution of this trait, it cannot be excluded that this trait may no longer act as an adaptation in extant Acrodonta.

Acrodont ankylosis is persistent within Rhynchocephalia, but several transitions in tooth implantation occurred from an initially acrodont state (Jenkins et al., 2017). *Ankylosphenodon pachyostosis* possesses ‘ankylotheodont’ dentition, in which the tooth has deeply implanted roots, but is nonetheless ankylosed to the surrounding bone (Reynoso, 2000). One genus, *Sapheosaurus*, potentially lacks marginal dentition, although it is unknown if this is due to extensive wear or if this taxon was truly edentulous (Cocude-Michel, 1963). The tooth plates seen in *Oenosaurus muelheimensis* also represent an interesting derivation from the typical tooth seen within Rhynchocephalia (Rauhut et al, 2012). Nonetheless, the tooth implantation seen in *O. muelheimensis* is acrodont. Although acrodonty is widespread within the Rhynchocephalia, tooth implantation seems to be a more plastic trait within this clade than it is within Acrodonta.

More than One Way to Crush a Clam – Durophageous Pleurodents

Aside from the state of acrodont ankylosis, other forms of dentition may act in a similar function. Many suggest that the molariform teeth of durophageous lizards are well equipped for withstanding strong, crushing bites necessary for ingesting molluscs and other hard-shelled prey (Evans & Sanson, 1998; Schaerlacken et al., 2012). *Dracaena guianensis* and *Tiliqua scincoides* (both pleurodont) are the only durophageous taxa for which SVL-NBF data could be analyzed within the present study. *D. guianensis* is the only durophageous representative for HD-NBF. Though sample size is limited, those durophageous taxa showed the lowest median NBF values (Fig 3 & 4). However, raw data reports a bite force of 383.3 N for *D. guianensis*, which is among the higher raw bite force values recorded. Given the general increase in bite force with size, the

larger overall size of *D. guianensis* compared to most taxa within the dataset (Supplementary Files) is likely the primary driver of its high bite force, although other morphological, evolutionary, and ecological factors may play supporting roles. Nonetheless, even under higher bite forces, their teeth are pleurodont, suggesting that not all dentition need evolve into acrodont ankylosis in order to withstand high bite forces.

Varanus niloticus has been subjected to several studies concerning its dental morphology and cranial kinematics (Rieppel, 1979; Rieppel & Labhardt, 1979; Condon, 1987; D'Amore, 2015). *V. niloticus* undergoes an ontogenetic change in dentition, with juveniles possessing more slender teeth that later transition to more bulbous molariform dentition (Rieppel & Labhardt, 1979; D'Amore, 2015). This ontogenetic shift in tooth morphology is often attributed to an ontogenetic shift in diet, with adults consuming larger proportions of molluscs and crabs (Rieppel & Labhardt, 1979; Luiselli, Akani & Capizzi, 1999; Lenz, 2004). However, some suggest there is no evidence for a dietary shift within this species (Bennett, 2002), while others show that certain populations consume snails and crabs while other populations do not consume hard-bodied prey (Losos & Greene, 1988). Other species of *Varanus* without specialized dentition are also known to eat hard-bodied prey, such as turtles and crabs (Losos & Green, 1988). We might presume *V. niloticus* has a relatively high raw bite force, allowing for the consumption of hard-bodied prey, but how that relates to body size and how it compares to the bite forces of other varanids is unknown.

Acrodonty in Amphisbaenia

We know little about tooth attachment in Trogonophidae, though the clade is thought to be acrodont and the teeth are likely ankylosed (Gans, 1960; Gans & Montero, 2008). The relatively lower bite force seen in *T. wiegmanni* compared to other acrodont taxa seen in our

results was likely impacted by the fact that *T. wiegmanni* is an elongate, serpentine-like form. Because of that, using SVL to standardize our results may not be meaningful in the case of this taxon. However, the other taxa examined in this study are not impacted by extremely elongate body plans. When bite-force is standardized by head depth, the same trend of greater acrodont bite force is more apparent for *T. wiegmanni*. Further histological work on the dentition of this clade would clarify if it too possesses strong ankylosis or bone deposition around the base of the dentition like that of Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus*.

Trogonophidae is the only clade within Amphisbaenia to evolve acrodont tooth implantation. However, other amphisbaenians possess teeth with roots of varying lengths. Overall, amphisbaenians possess shorter roots than what is seen in most iguanians and geckos. Tooth implantation in amphisbaenians is often described as ‘subacrodont’ or ‘subpleurodont’ to denote the stray from the ‘typical’ pleurodont tooth implantation seen in most other squamates (Estes, 1975; Yatkola, 1976; Sullivan, 1985; Charig and Gans, 1990; Kearney, Maisano & Rowe, 2004; Gans and Montero, 2008; Longrich et al., 2015; Čerňanský, Klembara & Müller., 2016). The evolution of tooth implantation and attachment in Amphisbaenia has not been explored further, but the trend towards dentition with shorter roots is intriguing. Bite-force experiments conducted on amphisbaenians could address if the evolution of acrodonty within the clade is related to high bite force and diet. However, we cannot exclude the evolution of acrodont tooth implantation within Amphisbaenia may have arose for other reasons, such as limited jaw space.

Conclusions

Acrodont ankylosis accompanied by bone deposition seen in Acrodonta and *Sphenodon punctatus* is likely an adaptation related to strong bite forces. We do not know if this form of tooth implantation and attachment evolved in response to high bite force, or *vice versa*.

367 Nonetheless, there are behavioral implications for the early evolution of this trait. Changes in
 368 tooth implantation and attachment are often associated with diet-related hypotheses. However, it
 369 cannot be presumed that increased bite force or changes in tooth implantation and attachment are
 370 only associated with diet. When discussing the evolution of such traits, we must take into
 371 account other possible behavioral influences, such as territory defense, intraspecific combat, and
 372 mating success, which are also associated with increased bite force. Testing such hypotheses in
 373 the fossil record may prove impossible, but it is still necessary to speculate all scenarios.
 374 Furthermore, these dental traits may have evolved convergently in response to different selective
 375 pressures depending on the clade. Acrodont ankylosis accompanied by bone deposition may be
 376 fixed traits in Acrodonta, which has not explored other forms of tooth implantation and
 377 attachment. However, rhynchocephalians were able to explore other forms of tooth implantation
 378 throughout their evolutionary history.

379 Acrodont ankylosis is not the only form of tooth implantation and attachment potentially
 380 associated with higher bite forces. Durophageous squamates, though pleurodont, often possess
 381 molariform tooth morphologies that are also able to withstand increased bite force. In the present
 382 study, it appears that higher bite force is likely related to larger body size for these specialists.
 383 However, bite force and its relationships with tooth morphology requires further study in
 384 durophageous squamates as well as other dietary specialists. Most of the taxa analyzed were
 385 insectivorous generalists, though carnivorous acrodonts, herbivorous acrodonts and pleurodonts,
 386 and durophageous, frugivorous, and omnivorous pleurodonts were also included. The array of
 387 diets seen in extant acrodont taxa suggests that *if* acrodont ankylosis evolved as an adaptation to
 388 a particular diet, it may no longer act in an adaptive capacity for a specific diet. We encourage
 389 further study on dietary specialists, for greater variation in bite force may exist among Squamata,

390 with subsequent implications for dental evolution in terms of tooth implantation, attachment, and
391 morphology.

392

393 **Acknowledgements**

394 We thank M. Fabbri, D. Meyer, and R. Armfield for providing helpful comments on an
395 early version of this manuscript. Access to specimens was aided by G. Watkins-Colwell. We
396 thank the two reviewers of this manuscript, Y. Haridy and A.R.H. LeBlanc, who provided
397 helpful comments and additional suggestions to this work.

References

- Arnold, E.N. 1998. Cranial kinesis in lizards: variations, uses, and origins. *Evolutionary Biology* 30:323-357.
- Augé, M. 1997. A consideration of the phylogenetic significance of acrodonty. *Herpetological Journal* 7:111-113.
- Bennett, D. 2002. Diet of juvenile *Varanus niloticus* (Sauria: Varanidae) on the Black Volta River in Ghana. *Journal of Herpetology* 36:116-117.
- Bertin, T.J.C., B. Thivichon-Prince, A.R.H. LeBlanc, M.W. Caldwell, and L. Viriot. 2018. Current Perspectives on tooth implantation, attachment, and replacement in Amniota. *Frontiers of Physiology* 6:1-20 DOI: 10.3389/fphys.2018.01630
- Bosshardt, D.D., M. Bergomi, G. Vaglio, and A. Wiskott. 2008. Regional structural characteristics of bovine periodontal ligament samples and their suitability for biomechanical tests. *Journal of Anatomy* 212:319-329 DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7580.2008.00856.x
- Buchtová, M., O. Zahradníček, S. Balková, and A.S. Tucker. 2013. Odontogenesis in the veiled chameleon (*Chamaeleo calyptratus*). *Archives of Oral Biology* 58:118-133.
- Cartland-Shaw, L.K., A. Cree, C.M. Skeaff, N.M. Grimmond. 1998. Differences in dietary and plasma fatty acids between wild and captive populations of a rare reptile, the tuatara (*Sphenodon punctatus*). *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* 168:569-580.
- Čerňanský, A., J. Klembara, and J. Müller. 2016. The new rare record of the late Oligocene lizards and amphisbaenians from Germany and its impact on our knowledge of the European terminal Palaeogene. *Palaeobiodiversity and Palaeoenvironments* 96:559-587.

420 Charig, A.J., and C. Gans. 1990. Two new amphisbaenians from the Lower Miocene of Kenya.
 421 *Bulletin of the British Museum of Natural History* 46:19-36.

422 Cocude-Michel, M. 1963. Les rhynchocéphales et les sauriens des calcaires lithographiques
 423 (Jurassique Supérieur) d'Europe occidentale. *Nouvells Archives du Museum d'Histoire*
 424 *Naturelle de Lyon* 7:1-187.

425 Condon, K. 1987. A kinematic analysis of mesokinesis in the Nile monitor (*Varanus niloticus*).
 426 *Experimental Biology* 47:73-87.

427 Cooper, J.S., and D.F.G Poole. 1973. The dentition and dental tissues of the agamid lizard,
 428 *Uromastix*. *Journal of Zoology* 169:85-100 DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7998.1973.tb04654.x

429 Cooper, J.S., D.F.G. Poole, and R. Lawson. 1970. The dentition of agamid lizards with special
 430 reference to tooth replacement. *Journal of Zoology* 162:85-98 DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-
 431 7998.1970.tb01259.x

432 Cost, I.N., K.M. Middleton, K.C. Sellers, M.S. Echols, L.M. Witmer, J.L. Davis, and C.M.
 433 Holliday. 2020. Palatal biomechanics and its significance for cranial kinesis in
 434 *Tyrannosaurus rex*. *The Anatomical Record* 303:999-1017 DOI: 10.1002/ar.24219

435 D'Amore, D.C. 2015. Illustrating ontogenetic change in the dentition of the Nile monitor lizard,
 436 *Varanus niloticus*: a case study in the application of geometric morphometric methods for
 437 the quantification of shape-size heterodonty. *Journal of Anatomy* 226:403-419 DOI:
 438 10.1111/joa.12293

439 Daugherty, C.H., and A. Cree. 1990. Tuatara: a survivor from the dinosaur age. *New Zealand*
 440 *Geographic* 6:66-86.

441 Davit-Béal, T., A.S. Tucker, and J-Y. Sire. 2009. Loss of teeth and enamel in tetrapods: fossil
442 record, genetic data and morphological adaptations. *Journal of Anatomy* 214:477-501
443 DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-7580.2009.01060

444 D'Emic, M.D., P.M. O'Connor, T.R. Pascucci, J.N. Gavras, E. Mardakhayava, and E.K. Lund.
445 2019. Evolution of high tooth replacement rates in theropod dinosaurs. *PLoS ONE*
446 14:e0224734.

447 Dosedělová, H., K. Štěpánková, T. Zikmund, H. Lesot, J. Kaiser, K. Novotny, J. Štembírek, Z.
448 Knotek, O. Zahradníček, and M. Buchtova. 2016. Age-related changes in the tooth-bone
449 interface area of acrodont dentition in the chameleon. *Journal of Anatomy* 229:356-368
450 DOI: 10.1111/joa.12490

451 Edmund, A.G., 1962. Sequence and rate of tooth replacement in the crocodilia. *Contributions to*
452 *the Life Science Division of the Royal Ontario Museum* 52:1-42.

453 Erickson, G.N., A.K. Lappin, and K.A. Vliet. 2003. The ontogeny of bite-force performance in
454 the American alligator (*Alligator mississippiensis*). *Journal of Zoology* 260:317-327 DOI:
455 10.1017/S0952836903003819

456 Erickson, G.M., A.K. Lappin, T. Parker, and K.A. Vliet. 2004. Comparison of bite-force
457 performance between long-term captive and wild American alligators (*Alligator*
458 *mississippiensis*). *Journal of Zoology* 262:21-28.

459 Estes, R. 1975. Lower vertebrates from the Fort Union Formation, Late Paleocene, Big Horn
460 Basin, Wyoming. *Herpetologica* 31:365-385.

461 Estes, R., and E.E. Williams. 1984. Ontogenetic variation in the molariform teeth of lizards.
462 *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 4:96-107.

463 Evans, S.E. 1980. The skull of a new eosuchian reptile from the Lower Jurassic of South Wales.
464 *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 70:203-264.

465 Evans, S.E. 1991. A new lizard-like reptile (Diapsidia: Lepidosauromorpha) from the Middle
466 Jurassic of England. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 103:391-412.

467 Evans, S.E. 2008. The skull of lizards and the tuatara. In: Gans, C. and A.S. Gaunt (eds.) *Biology*
468 *of the Reptilia Volume 20: The Skull of Lepidosauria* pp. 1-347. Ithaca, New York.

469 Evans, S.E., and M. Borsuk-Bialynicka. 2009. A small lepidosauromorph reptile from the Early
470 Triassic of Poland. *Palaeontologia Polonica* 65:179-202.

471 Evans, S.E., and G.D. Sanson. 1998. The effect of tooth shape on the breakdown of insects.
472 *Journal of Zoology* 246:391-400.

473 Fabre, A-C., D.V. Andrade, K. Huyghe, R. Cornette, and A. Herrel. 2014. Interrelationships
474 between bones, muscles, and performance: biting in the lizard *Tupinambis merianae*.
475 *Evolutionary Biology* 41:518-527.

476 Fraser, N.C. and G.M. Walkden. 1983. The ecology of a Late Triassic reptile assemblage from
477 Gloucestershire, England. *Palaeogeology, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 42: 342-
478 365.

479 Frazzetta, T.H. 1962. A functional consideration of cranial kinesis in lizards. *Journal of*
480 *Morphology* 111:287-319.

481 Gans, C. 1960. Studies on amphisbaenids (Amphisbaenia, Reptilia): 1. A taxonomic revision of
482 the Trogonophinae, and a functional interpretation of the amphisbaenid adaptive pattern.
483 *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* 119:129-204.

484 Gans, C., and R. Montero. 2008. An atlas of amphisbaenian skull anatomy. *Biology of the*
485 *Reptilia* 21:621-738.

486 Gaengler, P. 2000. Evolution of tooth attachment in lower vertebrates to tetrapods. In: Teafor, M.F., M.M. Smith, and M.W.J. Ferguson (eds.) *Development, Function and Evolution of*
487 *Teeth*. Cambridge University Press.

489 Gorniak, G.C., H.I. Rosenberg, and C. Gans. 1982. Mastication in the tuatara, *Sphenodon*
490 *punctatus* (Reptilia: Rhynchocephalia): structure and activity of the motor system.
491 *Journal of Morphology* 171:321-353.

492 Gow, C.E. 1977. Tooth function and succession in the Triassic reptile *Procolophon trigoniceps*.
493 *Palaeontology* 20:695-704.

494 Greene, H.W. 1982. Dietary and phenotypic diversity in lizards: why are some organisms
495 specialized? In: Mossakowski, D. and G. Roth (eds.), *Environmental Adaptation and*
496 *Evolution*, pp. 107-128. New York City: New York.

497 Haridy, Y. 2018. Histological analysis of post-eruption tooth wear adaptations, and ontogenetic
498 changes in tooth implantation in the acrodontan squamate *Pogona vitticeps*. *PeerJ*
499 6:e5923 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.5923

500 Haridy, Y., A.R. LeBlanc, and R.R. Reisz. 2018. The Permian reptiles *Opisthodontosaurus*
501 *carrolli*: a model for acrodont tooth replacement and dental ontogeny. *Journal of*
502 *Anatomy* 232:372-382 DOI: 10.1111/joa.12754

503 Herrel, A., L. Spithoven, R. Van Damme, and F. De Vree. 1999. Sexual dimorphism of head size
504 in *Gallotia galloti*: testing the niche divergence hypothesis by functional analyses.
505 *Functional Ecology* 13:289-297.

506 Herrel, A., E. de Grauw, and J.A. Lemos-Espinal. 2001. Head shape and bite performance in
507 xenosaurid lizards. *Journal of Experimental Zoology* 290:101-107.

508 Herrel, A., J.J. Meyers, and B. Vanhooydonck. 2001. Correlations between habitat use and body
509 shape in a phrynosomatid lizard (*Urosaurus ornatus*): a population-level analysis.
510 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 74:305-314.

511 Herrel, A., L.D. McBrayer, and P.M. Larson. 2007. Functional basis for sexual differences in
512 bite force in the lizard *Anolis carolinensis*. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*
513 91:111-119.

514 Herrel, A., J.A. Moore, E.M. Bredeweg, and N.J. Nelson. 2010. Sexual dimorphism, body size,
515 bite force and male mating success in tuatara. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*
516 100:287-292.

517 Herrel, A., R. Van Damme, B. Vanhooydonck, and F. De Vree. 2001. The implications of bite
518 performance for diet in two species of lacertid lizards. *Canadian Journal of Zoology*
519 79:662-670.

520 Herrel, A., J.A. Moore, E.M. Bredeweg, and N.J. Nelson. 2010. Sexual dimorphism, body size,
521 and bite force and male mating success in tuatara. *Biological Journal of the Linnean*
522 *Society* 100:287-292.

523 Husak, J.F., A.L. Lappin, and R.A. Van Den Bussche. 2009. The fitness advantage of a high-
524 performance weapon. 2009. The fitness advantage of a high-performance weapon.
525 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 96:840-845.

526 Husak, J.F., A.K. Lappin, S.F. Fox, and J.A. Lemos-Espinal. 2006. Bite force performance
527 predicts dominance in male venerable collared lizards (*Crotaphytus antiquus*). *Copeia*
528 2006:301-306.

- 529 Huyghe, K., B. VanHooydonck, H. Sheers, M. Molina-Borja, and R. Van Damme. 2005.
530 Morphology, performance and fighting capacity in male lizards, *Gallotia galloti*.
531 *Functional Ecology* 19:800-807.
- 532 Iordansky, N.N. 1990. Evolution of cranial kinesis in lower tetrapods. *Netherlands Journal of*
533 *Zoology* 40:32-54.
- 534 Jenkins, K.M., M.E.H. Jones, T. Zikmund, A. Boyde, and J.D. Daza. 2017. A review of tooth
535 implantation among rhynchocephalians (Lepidosauria). *Journal of Herpetology* 51:300-
536 306 DOI: 10.1670/16-146
- 537 Jones, M.E.H. 2006. Tooth diversity and function in the Rhynchocephalia. In: P.M. Barrett &
538 S.E. Evans (eds.), *Ninth International Symposium on Mesozoic Terrestrial Ecosystems*
539 *and Biota*, pp. 55–58. London, UK.
- 540 Jones, M.E.H. 2008. Skull shape and feeding strategy in *Sphenodon* and other Rhynchocephalia
541 (Diapsida: Lepidosauria). *Journal of Morphology* 269:945-966.
- 542 Jones, M.E.H. 2009. Dentary tooth shape in *Sphenodon* and its fossil relatives (Diapsida:
543 Lepidosauria: Rhynchocephalia). *Comparative Dental Morphology* 13:9-15.
- 544 Jones, M.E.H., and K.A. Lappin. 2009. Bite-force performance of the last rhynchocephalian
545 (Lepidosauria: *Sphenodon*). *Journal of the Royal Society of New Zealand* 39:71-83.
- 546 Kearney, M., J.A. Maisano, and T. Rowe. 2004. Cranial anatomy of the extinct amphisbaenian
547 *Rhinerua hatcherii* (Squamata, Amphisbaenia) based on high-resolution x-ray computed
548 tomography. *Journal of Morphology* 264:1-33.
- 549 Kieser, J.A., T. Tkatchenko, M.C. Dean, M.E.H. Jones, W. Duncan, and N.J. Nelson. 2009.
550 Microstructure of dental hard tissues and bone in the tuatara dentary, *Sphenodon*

punctatus (Diapsida: Lepidosauria: Rhynchocephalia). *Comparative Dental Morphology* 13:80-85.

Kieser, J.A., L-H. He, M.C. Dean, M.E.H. Jones, W.J. Duncan, M.V. Swain, and N.J. Nelson. 2011. Structure and compositional characteristics of caniniform dental enamel in the tuatara *Sphenodon punctatus* (Lepidosauria: Rhynchocephalia). *New Zealand Dental Journal* 107:44-50.

Lailvaux, S.P., A. Herrel, B. VanHooydonck, J.J. Meyers, and D.J. Irschick. 2004. Performance capacity, fighting tactics and the evolution of life-stage male morphs in the green anole lizard (*Anolis carolinensis*). *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London Series B* 271:2501-2508 DOI: 10.1098/rspb.2004.2891

Lappin, A.K., and J.F. Husak. 2005. Weapon performance, not size, determines mating success and potential reproductive output in the Collared Lizard (*Crotaphytus collaris*). *The American Naturalist* 166:426-436.

Lappin, A.K., P.S. Hamilton, and B.K. Sullivan. 2006. Bite-force performance and head shape in a sexually dimorphic crevice-dwelling lizard, the common chuckwalla [*Sauromalus ater* (=obesus)]. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 88:215-222.

LeBlanc, A.R.H., and R.R. Reisz. 2013. Periodontal ligament, cementum, and alveolar bone in the oldest herbivorous tetrapods, and their evolutionary significance. *PLoS ONE* 8: e74697 DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0074697

LeBlanc, A.R.H., and R.R. Reisz. 2015. Patterns of tooth development and replacement in the captorhinid reptiles: a comparative approach for understanding the origin of multiple tooth rows. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 35: e919928.

573 LeBlanc, A.R.H., R.R. Reisz, K.S. Brink, and F. Abdala. 2016. Mineralized periodontia in
574 extinct relatives of mammals shed light on the evolutionary history of mineral
575 homeostasis in periodontal tissue maintenance. *Journal of Clinical Periodontology*
576 43:323-332.

577 LeBlanc, A.R.H., K.S. Brink, T.M. Cullen, and R.R. Reisz. 2017. Evolutionary implications of
578 tooth attachment versus tooth implantation: a case study using dinosaur, crocodilian, and
579 mammal teeth. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 37: e1354006.

580 Lenz, S. 2004. *Varanus niloticus*. In: Pianka, E.R. and D.R. King (eds.), *Varanoid Lizards of the*
581 *World* pp. 133-138. Bloomington, Indiana.

582 Longrich, N.R., J. Vinther, R.A. Pyron, D. Pisani, and J.A. Gauthier. 2015. Biogeography of
583 worm lizards (Amphisbaenia) driven by end-Cretaceous mass extinction. *Proceedings of*
584 *the Royal Society B* 282:20143034.

585 Losos, J.B. and H.W. Greene. 1998. Ecological and evolutionary implications of diet in monitor
586 lizards. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* 35:379-407.

587 Lucas, P.W. and D.A. Luke. 1984. Chewing it over: basic principles of food breakdown. In:
588 Chivers, D.J., B.A. Wood, and A. Bilsborough (eds.) *Food Acquisition and Processing in*
589 *Primates* pp. 283-302. New York City, New York.

590 Luiselli, L., G.C. Akani, and D. Capizzi. 1999. Is there any interspecific competition between
591 dwarf crocodiles (*Osteolaemus tetraspis*) and Nile monitors (*Varanus niloticus ornatus*)
592 in the swamps of central Africa? A study from southeastern Nigeria. *Journal of Zoology*
593 247:127-131.

594 MacDougall, M.J., A.R.H. LeBlanc, and R.R. Reisz. 2014. Plicidentine in the Early Permian
595 parareptile *Colobomycter pholeter*, and its phylogenetic and functional significance

among coeval members of the clade. PLoS ONE 9:e96559 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0096559

Maxwell, E.E., M.W. Caldwell, and D.O. Lamoureux. 2011. The structure and phylogenetic distribution of amniote plicidentine. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 31:553-561.

McBrayer, L.D., and R.A. Anderson. 2007. Sexual size dimorphisms and bite force in the Norther Alligator Lizard, *Elgaria coerulea* 41:554-559.

McIntosh, J.E., X. Anderton, L. Flores-de-Jacoby, D.S. Carlson, C.F. Shuler, and T.G.H. Diekwisch. 2002. Caiman periodontium as an intermediate between basal vertebrate ankylosis-type attachment and mammalian “true” periodontium. *Microscopy Research and Technique* 59:449-459.

Meyers, J.J., K.C. Nishikawa, and A. Herrel. 2018. The evolution of bite force in horned lizards: the influence of dietary specialization. *Journal of Anatomy* 232:214-226.

Mlot, C. 1997. Return of the tuatara. *Science News* 152:300-301.

Noble, H.W. 1969. The evolution of the mammal periodontium. In: A.R. Melcher and W.A. Bowen (eds.), *The Biology of the Periodontium*, pp. 1-26. New York City: New York.

Osborn, J.W. 1984. From reptile to mammal: evolutionary considerations of the dentition with emphasis on tooth attachment. *Symposia of the Zoological Society of London* 52:549-574.

Picton, D.C.A. 1989. The periodontal enigma: eruption versus tooth support. *European Journal of Orthodontics* 11:430-439.

Rauhut, O.W.M., A.M. Heyng, A. López-Arbarello, and A. Hecker. 2012. A new rhynchocephalian from the Late Jurassic of Germany with a dentition that is unique amongst tetrapods. *PLoS ONE* 7:e46839 DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0046839

- 618 Reynoso, V.H. 1998. *Huehuecuetzpalli mixtecus* gen. et sp. nov: a basal squamate (Reptilia)
619 from the Early Cretaceous of Tepexi de Rodríguez, Central México. *Philosophical*
620 *Transitions of the Royal Society B* 353:477-500.
- 621 Reynoso, V.H. 2000. An unusual sphenodontian (Reptilia: Diapsida) from the Tlayua Formation
622 (Albian), Central Mexico. *Journal of Paleontology* 74:133-148.
- 623 Reynoso, V.H. 2003. Growth patterns and ontogenetic variation of the teeth and jaws of the
624 Middle Jurassic sphenodontian *Cynosphenodon huizachalensis* (Reptilia:
625 Rhynchocephalia). *Canadian Journal of Earth Science* 40:609-619.
- 626 Rieppel, O. 1979. A functional interpretation of the varanid dentition (Reptilia, Lacertilia,
627 Varanidae). *Gegenbaurs Morphologisches Jahrbuch* 125:797-817.
- 628 Rieppel, O. 1992. The skull in a hatchling of *Sphenodon punctatus*. *Journal of Herpetology*
629 26:80-84.
- 630 Rieppel, O. and L. Labhardt. 1979. Mandibular mechanics in *Varanus niloticus* (Reptilia:
631 Lacertilia). *Herpetologica* 35:158-163.
- 632 Robb, J. 1977. *The Tuatara*. New Zealand: Meadowfield.
- 633 Robinson, P.L. 1976. How *Sphenodon* and *Uromastyx* grow their teeth and use them.
634 *Morphology and Biology of Reptiles* 3:43-65.
- 635 Romer, A.S. 1956. *Osteology of the Reptiles*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- 636 Schaerlaeken, V., A. Herrel, P. Aerts, and C.F. Ross. 2008. The functional significance of the
637 lower temporal bar in *Sphenodon punctatus*. *The Journal of Experimental Biology*
638 211:3908-3914.
- 639 Schaerlaeken, V., V. Holanova, R. Boistel, P. Aerts, P. Velensky, I. Rehak, D.V. Andrade, and
640 A. Herrel. 2012. Built to bite: feeding kinematics, bite forces, and head shape of a

- specialized durophagous lizard, *Dracaena guianensis* (Teiidae). *Journal of Experimental Zoology Part A* 317:371-381 DOI: 10.1002/jez.1730
- Sellers, K.C., K.M. Middleton, J.L. Davis, and C.M. Holliday. 2017. Ontogeny of bite force in a validated biomechanical model of the American alligator. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 220:2036-2046.
- Simões, T.R., E. Wilner, M.W. Caldwell, L.C. Weinschütz, and A.W.A. Kellner. 2015. A stem acrodontan lizard in the Cretaceous of Brazil revises early lizard evolution in Gondwana. *Nature Communications* 6:8149.
- Simões, T.R., M.W. Caldwell, M. Talanda, M. Bernardi, A. Palci, O. Vernygora, F. Bernardini, L. Mancini, R.L. Nydam. 2018. The origin of squamates revealed by a Middle Triassic lizard from the Italian Alps. *Nature* 557:706-711 DOI: 10.1038/s41586-018-0093-3
- Smirina, E.M., and N.B. Ananjeva. 2007. Growth layers in bones and acrodont teeth of the agamid lizard *Laudakia stoliczkana*. *Amphibia-Reptilia* 28:193-204.
- Smith, H.M. 1958. Evolutionary lines in tooth attachment and replacement in reptiles: their possible significance in mammalian dentition. *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science* 61:216-225.
- Sobral, G., T.R. Simões, and R.R. Schoch. 2020. A tiny new Middle Triassic stem-lepidosauromorph from Germany: implications for the early evolution of lepidosauromorphs and the Vellberg fauna. *Scientific Reports* 10:2273 DOI: 10.1038/s41598-020-58883-x
- Sullivan, R.M. 1985. A new middle Paleocene (Torrejonian) rhineurid amphisbaenian amphisbaenian, *Plesiorhineura tsentasi* new genus new species, from the San Juan Basin, New Mexico. *Journal of Paleontology* 59: 1481-1485.

664 Throckmorton, G.S. 1979. The effect of wear on the cheek teeth and associated dental tissues of
665 the lizard *Uromastix aegyptius* (Agamidae). *Journal of Morphology* 160:195-208.

666 Tseng, Z.J. and W.J. Binder. 2010. Mandibular biomechanics of *Crocota crocuta*, *Canis lupus*,
667 and the late Miocene *Dinocrocota gigantea*. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*
668 158:683-696.

669 (Carnivora, Mammalia)

670 Valido, A., M. Nogales, and F.E. Medina. 2003. Fleshy fruits in the diet of Canarian lizards
671 *Gallotia galloti* (Lacertidae) in a xeric habitat of the Island of Tenerife. *Journal of*
672 *Herpetology* 37:741-747.

673 Verwaijen, D., R. Van Damme, and A. Herrel. 2002. Relationships between head size, bite force,
674 and prey handling efficiency and diet in two sympatric lacertid lizards. *Functional*
675 *Ecology* 16:842-850.

676 Whiteside, D.I. 1986. The head skeleton of the Rhaetian sphenodontid *Diphydontosaurus avonis*
677 gen. et sp. nov., and the modernising of a living fossil. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
678 *Royal Society of London B* 312:379-430.

679 Wroe, S., C. McHenry, and J. Thomason. 2005. Bite club: comparative bite force in big biting
680 mammals and the prediction of predatory behaviour in fossil taxa. *Proceedings of the*
681 *Royal Society B* 272:619-625.

682 Yatkola, D.A. 1976. Mid-Miocene lizards from western Nebraska. *Copeia* 1976:645-654.

683 Zaher, H., and O. Rieppel. 1999. Tooth implantation and replacement in squamates, with special
684 reference to mosasaur lizards and snakes. *American Museum Novitates* 3271:1-19.

685

686 **Figure Legend**

687 **Figure 1: Simplified phylogeny of Lepidosauria from Gauthier et al. (2012).** Orange

688 branches indicate acrodont ankylosis. Phylogeny is based on a morphological dataset and

689 parsimony analysis.

690 **Figure 2: Acrodont ankylosis as seen in two species of Acrodonta (A & B) and a**

691 **rhynchocephalian (C) and pleurodont ankylosis (D).** A) the chameleon *Fercifer oustaleti*

692 YPM R 1214, B) the agamid *Agama agama* YPM R 17936, and C) the rhynchocephalian

693 *Sphenodon punctatus* YPM R 10647. D) Pleurodont tooth implantation as seen in *Ctenosaura* sp.

694 YPM R 11060.

695 **Figure 3: Acrodont vs. Pleurodont bite force (SVL).** A) Linear regression (grey line) of log-

696 transformed snout-vent length (SVL) and bite force. Acrodonts indicated by red datapoints and

697 pleurodents indicated by blue datapoints. B) Boxplot of the distributions of snout-vent length

698 normalized bite force (SVL-NBF), calculated as the residual values from the linear regression in

699 (A), overlain with residual values as datapoints. C) Breakdown of SVL-NBF values show in (B)

700 by diet. D) Breakdown of SVL-NBF values shown in (B) by family and separated based on tooth

701 implantation (acrodonts in red, pleurodents in blue).

702 **Figure 4: Acrodont vs. Pleurodont bite force (HD).** A) Linear regression (grey line) of log-

703 transformed head depth (HD) and bite force. Acrodonts indicated by red datapoints and

704 pleurodents indicated by blue datapoints. B) Boxplot of the distributions of head depth

705 normalized bite force (HD-NBF), calculated as the residual values from the linear regression in

706 (A), overlain with residual values as datapoints. C) Breakdown of HD-NBF values show in (B)

707 by diet. D) Breakdown of HD-NBF values shown in (B) by family and separated based on tooth

708 implantation (acrodonts in red, pleurodents in blue).

709 **Figure 5: Number of species analyzed for bite force by family, colored by tooth**

710 **implantation.**

711

Figure 1

Simplified phylogeny of Lepidosauria from Gauthier et al. (2012).

Orange branches indicate acrodont ankylosis. Phylogeny is based on a morphological dataset and parsimony analysis.




Figure 2

Acrodont ankylosis as seen in two species of Acrodonta (A & B) and a rhynchocephalian (C) and pleurodont ankylosis (D).

A) the chameleon *Fercifer oustaleti* YPM R 1214, B) the agamid *Agama agama* YPM R 17936, and C) the rhynchocephalian *Sphenodon punctatus* YPM R 10647. D) Pleurodont tooth implantation as seen in *Ctenosaura* sp. YPM R 11060.




Figure 3

Acrodont vs. Pleurodont bite force (SVL).

A) Linear regression (grey line) of log-transformed snout-vent length (SVL) and bite force. Acrodonts indicated by red datapoints and pleurodents indicated by blue datapoints. B) Boxplot of the distributions of snout-vent length normalized bite force (SVL-NBF), calculated as the residual values from the linear regression in (A), overlain with residual values as datapoints. C) Breakdown of SVL-NBF values shown in (B) by diet. D) Breakdown of SVL-NBF values shown in (B) by family and separated based on tooth implantation (acrodonts in red, pleurodents in blue).




Figure 4

Acrodont vs. Pleurodont bite force (HD).

A) Linear regression (grey line) of log-transformed head depth (HD) and bite force. Acrodonts indicated by red datapoints and pleurodents indicated by blue datapoints. B) Boxplot of the distributions of head depth normalized bite force (HD-NBF), calculated as the residual values from the linear regression in (A), overlain with residual values as datapoints. C) Breakdown of HD-NBF values shown in (B) by diet. D) Breakdown of HD-NBF values shown in (B) by family and separated based on tooth implantation (acrodonts in red, pleurodents in blue).




Figure 5

Number of species analyzed for bite force by family, colored by tooth implantation.

