A new eusuchian crocodylomorph from the Cenomanian (Late Cretaceous) of Portugal reveals novel implications on the origin of Crocodylia

OCTÁVIO MATEUS^{1,2*,•}, EDUARDO PUÉRTOLAS-PASCUAL^{1,2,4,•} and PEDRO M. CALLAPEZ³

¹Universidade Nova de Lisboa, Faculdade de Ciências e Tecnologia- GeoBioTec, Monte de Caparica, Portugal ²Museu da Lourinhã, Rua João Luis de Moura, 2530-157 Lourinhã, Portugal ³CGUC – Centro de Geofísica / Dep. Ciências da Terra, FCTUC, Univ.Coimbra, Largo Marquês de Pombal, 3001–401 Coimbra, Portugal ⁴Aragosaurus-IUCA Research group, Zaragoza, Spain

Received 17 October 2017; revised 12 July 2018; accepted for publication 10 August 2018

The fossil record of Eusuchia extends back to the Early Cretaceous (Barremian), with the English species *Hylaeochampsa vectiana* being the oldest known representative of the clade so far. However, the eusuchian record from the Barremian to the Santonian is scarce and fragmentary worldwide. Here we described a new eusuchian crocodylomorph based on a partial skull and lower jaw from the Early Upper Cenomanian of the Tentugal Formation, in the Baixo Mondego region, west-central Portugal. The specimen exhibits a series of characters not seen in other taxa, allowing its assignment to a new genus and species named *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. The results of a cladistic analysis place this specimen within Crocodylia, as the sister taxon to all other non-gavialoid crocodylians. Therefore, this Portuguese specimen represents the only well-documented and valid eusuchian species in the Cenomanian in Europe, and may be the oldest representative of Crocodylia known so far, helping to fill a gap in the fossil record of Eusuchia from the Barremian to the Campanian. In addition, the discovery of this new taxon sheds light on the radiation of Eusuchia and the origin of Crocodylia, which probably took place in Europe.

ADDITIONAL KEYWORDS: Crocodylomorpha – Eusuchia – phylogeny – systematics.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past ten years, a revolution in the study of the evolution of Crocodylomorpha has been carried out. Research efforts on this group of archosaurs has recently increased in Europe, thanks to the discovery of new and fairly complete fossil specimens, with important keys for understanding the evolution of this group. As a result, the evolutionary histories of many crocodylomorph clades (such as Thalattosuchia, Atoposauridae, Goniopholididae and Eusuchia) are being rediscovered and reinterpreted (Schwarz & Salisbury, 2005; Andrade *et al.*, 2011; Puértolas *et al.*, 2011; Salisbury & Naish, 2011; Buscalioni *et al.*, 2013; Puértolas-Pascual *et al.*, 2014; Tennant & Mannion, 2014; Narváez *et al.*, 2015, 2016; Turner, 2015; Turner & Pritchard, 2015; Tennant *et al.*, 2016; Young *et al.*, 2016). Nevertheless, the crocodylomorph remains from Portugal remain under-studied, and new research efforts on this topic are crucial to understanding the global evolutionary framework of several clades, such as Eusuchia and the crown group Crocodylia.

Of all Mesozoic crocodylomorphs, only Eusuchia remains until today. Eusuchia is a clade of neosuchian crocodylomorphs that possibly originated in the Early Cretaceous, with *Hylaeochampsa vectiana* Owen, 1874 from the Barremian on the Isle of Wight (Clark & Norell, 1992), being its oldest representative. The term 'Eusuchia', 'true crocodiles' in Greek, was first proposed by Huxley (1875), and is phylogenetically defined as the clade that includes the last common ancestor of

^{*}Corresponding author. E-mail: omateus@fct.unl.pt

[[]Version of Record, published online 6 December 2018; http://zoobank.org/urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:2664223F-8E48-4E43-B7DF-B527D190DB0B]

Crocodylia, and *Hylaeochampsa vectiana* and all their descendants (Brochu, 2003). The transition from other neosuchians to Eusuchia involves subtle but far-reaching changes throughout the body and skull (Salisbury *et al.*, 2006), and many authors (e.g. Clark, 1986; Benton & Clark, 1988; Norell & Clark, 1990; Clark & Norell, 1992; Brochu, 1999; Salisbury *et al.*, 2006) agree that most members of Eusuchia exhibit the following combination of characters: a fully developed bony palate, in which the secondary choana is included within the pterygoids; procoelous vertebrae; and the presence of a sagittally segmented paravertebral shield (osteoderms).

Although Eusuchia is known to have existed since the Barremian, there is no other unequivocal record of the group until the Santonian, for which the hylaeochampsid Iharkutosuchus Ösi et al., 2007 is known. Some fragmentary remains, and a few taxa from the Barremian to the Santonian, were assigned to Eusuchia (Salisbury et al., 2006; Buscalioni et al., 2011; Holliday & Gardner, 2012; Turner, 2015; Kubo et al., 2018) or to Crocodylia (Efimov, 1982), but the association of these to Eusuchia is still unclear and under debate (Martin & Delfino, 2010; Holliday & Gardner, 2012; Turner, 2015; Turner & Pritchard, 2015). Regarding the crown group, the earliest confirmed records of recognized crocodylians are of alligatoroids and gavialoids from the Campanian in North America and Europe (Brochu, 2003; Buscalioni et al., 2003; Martin & Delfino, 2010; Bronzati et al., 2015; Mannion et al., 2015; Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2016). The record of well-known species of Cenomanian crocodylomorphs from Laurasia is lacking, and includes forms such as Dakotasuchus kingi Mehl, 1941, Coelosuchus reedii Williston, 1906, Woodbinesuchus byersmauricei Lee, 1997 and Terminonaris robusta Osborn, 1904 from the USA (Wu et al., 2001; Adams et al., 2011; Frederickson et al., 2017), Paralligator gradilifrons Konzhukova, 1954 and Paralligator major Efimov, 1981 from Mongolia (Turner, 2015) and Oceanosuchus boecensis Hua et al., 2007 in France. Although new Late Cretaceous basal eusuchians (e.g. Hylaeochampsidae and Allodaposuchidae) have been discovered recently, the few eusuchian occurrences in the middle of the Cretaceous remain fragmentary and uninformative (Stromer, 1925, 1933; Persson, 1959; Brochu, 2003). Therefore, the Cenomanian taxon from Tentúgal Fm. described here (Fig. 1) may represent the oldest record of Crocodylia and one of the oldest eusuchians, shedding light on the phylogenetic relationships of the main lineages of Eusuchia and Crocodylia.

THE EARLIEST RECORDS OF EUSUCHIA AND CROCODYLIA

As demonstrated above, the eusuchian fossil record during the Early Late Cretaceous is scarce and fragmentary. The phylogenetic position of the taxa *Pietraroiasuchus* (Early Albian, Italy), *Pachycheilosuchus* (Albian, United States) and *Isisfordia* (Late Albian–Early Cenomanian, Australia) is still controversial and the subject of debate (Narváez *et al.*, 2015; Turner & Pritchard, 2015). However, if finally considered as eusuchians (Salisbury *et al.*, 2006; Buscalioni *et al.*, 2011; Turner, 2015; Narváez *et al.*, 2016), they would represent the only members of the group (together with *Hylaeochampsa*) in the Lower Cretaceous.

Furthermore, the European fossil record of crocodylomorphs is very scarce during the early Late Cretaceous, with marine taxa, such as Pholidosauridae (e.g. Oceanosuchus Hua et al., 2007), being the bestknown forms during this time interval, particularly during the Cenomanian (Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2016). In relation to Neosuchia, fragmentary remains of faunas are more typically found in the Early Cretaceous. For example, Bernissartiidae, Atoposauridae or Goniopholididae, have been recorded in the Cenomanian in France (Buffetaut & Pouit, 1994; Vullo & Neraudeau, 2008), and incomplete material assigned as undetermined neosuchians or eusuchians were recovered from the latest Middle Cenomanian to earliest Late Cenomanian of Spain (Buscalioni & Vullo, 2008; Vullo et al., 2009; Torices et al., 2012). It is worth mentioning, however, the possible presence of basal eusuchians in the Cenomanian of Gondwana, as Holliday & Gardner (2012) proposed that *Aegyptosuchus* (from the Cenomanian of Egypt) and Aegisuchus (from the Cenomanian of Maroco) would form the clade Aegyptosuchidae, which would be the the sister group of Crocodylia within Eusuchia.

Crocodylomorpha, especially the continental taxa, are practically non-existent during the Turonian and Coniacian in Europe. This is probably due to the transgressive episodes produced during this time interval in Europe (Fara & Benton, 2000; Martin & Delfino, 2010; Csiki-Sava *et al.*, 2015). The presence of the putative crocodylian *Tadzhikosuchus macrodentis* Efimov, 1982 in Asia (Tajikistan) during the Turonian–Santonian has been questioned and its affiliation cannot be considered valid due to its fragmentary nature (Martin & Delfino, 2010).

This scenario changes from the Santonian to the Maastrichtian. During this time interval, eusuchian diversity increased substantially, while other neosuchian clades become extinct (Buscalioni *et al.*, 2003). The first eusuchian radiation occurred in Europe during the Santonian-Early Campanian, with the appearance of taxa such as *Iharkutosuchus* (Hungary) and *Massaliasuchus* (France). Some marine taxa similar to *Thoracosaurus* have been recorded in this time interval, but unequivocal members of Gavialoidea are not described until the Maastrichtian (Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2016). The diversity of Eusuchia increased notably during the Campanian-Maastrichtian, including Acynodon (in Spain, Italy and France), Musturzabalsuchus (in Spain and France) and several members of Allodaposuchidae, i.e. Allodaposuchus, Arenysuchus, Lohuecosuchus and Agaresuchus (in Romania, France and Spain). The North American history is similar, where the oldest record of Crocodylia also dates from the Campanian-Maastrichtian, including taxa such as Borealosuchus, alligatoroids such as Brachychampsa, Stangerochampsa, Albertochampsa, Leidyosuchus and Deinosuchus, gavialoids such as Thoracosaurus and Eothoracosaurus, and crocodyloids such as Prodiplocynodon and Albertosuchus (Brochu, 1997; Buscalioni et al., 2003; Martin & Delfino, 2010; Puértolas et al., 2011; Wu & Brinkman, 2015; Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2016).

Finally, recent studies suggested that paralligatorids could be eusuchians (Turner, 2015; Turner & Pritchard, 2015; Narváez *et al.*, 2016). Although still a subject under debate, this could extend the record of eusuchians back to the Late Jurassic (Pol *et al.*, 2009; Montefeltro *et al.*, 2013; Adams, 2014; Narváez *et al.*, 2015).

CROCODYLOMORPHS IN PORTUGAL

Portugal is very rich in vertebrate fossils, mainly for the Late Jurassic, including mammals, crocodylomorphs and dinosaurs (Antunes & Mateus, 2003; Mateus, 2006). Comparatively, the Late Cretaceous, although apparently rich in vertebrates, requires much more research.

The oldest known crocodylomorph in Portugal is the Lower Jurassic Mystriosaurus (=Steneosaurus) bollensis (Antunes, 1967). The Late Jurassic outcrops provided an apparent peak in crocodylomorph diversity, with seven known taxa: Machimosaurus hugii von Meyer, 1837, Lisboasaurus estesi Seiffert, 1970, 1973, Lusitanisuchus mitracostatus Seiffert, 1970 (Schwarz & Fechner, 2004) Knoetschkesuchus guimarotae (Schwarz & Salisbury, 2005), cf. Alligatorium, Goniopholis baryglyphaeus Schwarz, 2002, and Bernissartia sp. (Buscalioni et al., 1996; Krebs & Schwarz, 2000; Schwarz, 2002; Fechner, 2003; Schwarz & Fechner, 2004, 2008; Schwarz & Salisbury, 2005; Mateus, 2008; Ribeiro & Mateus, 2012; Mateus, 2013; Russo et al., 2014, Young et al., 2016), and two crocodylomorph eggs, to which were assigned distinct ootaxa (Russo et al., 2014, 2017).

The Late Cretaceous provided fragmentary material that requires revision, such as '*Crocodylus*' *blavieri*? Gray, 1831 from the Upper Campanian-Maastrichtian of Viso, near Aveiro (Sauvage 1897–98). The Cenomanian of Portugal has a rich record that also requires revision: Oweniasuchus pulchelus Jonet, 1981 from the Upper Cenomanian, Thoracosaurus from the Middle Cenomanian of Cacém (Jonet, 1981), the nomen dubium Oweniasuchus lusitanicus (interpreted as a goniopholid) based on a fragmentary mandible from the Campanian-Maastrichtian and several remains from the Cenomanian of Portugal, and unidentified eusuchians from Nazaré (Buffetaut & Lauverjat, 1978; Callapez et al., 2014). Cenozoic crocodylians from Portugal include Iberosuchus macrodon Antunes, 1975 (Lower to Middle Eocene), Tomistoma calaritanus Capellini, 1890 (Aquitanian-Helvetian), Tomistoma lusitanica Vianna & Moraes, 1945 (Burdigalian-Helvetian) and Diplocynodon sp. (Antunes, 1961, 1987, 1994).

GEOGRAPHICAL AND GEOLOGICAL SETTINGS

The crocodylian remains described here were collected from mixed siliciclastic-carbonate sediments in the Cenomanian West Portuguese Carbonate Platform, near the small village of Casais dos Carecos, Coimbra, Baixo Mondego Region, west-central Portugal (Fig. 1). This rural area of woodlands and small farms lies close to the Mondego River alluvial plain and shows large extensions with exposed surfaces of fossiliferous carbonate beds that contain easily accessed fossil vertebrates. The Cenomanian of Portugal is quite rich in vertebrate remains, representing the second most diverse assemblage in the Mesozoic, after the Late Jurassic (Mateus, 2006).

The sampling point was the northern exploitation front of the Beiraterra Quarry, one of several low-scale extractive industries active recently in the region (40°15'7.98" N; 8°34'8.09" W). The local section was previously studied and sampled to determine biostratigraphic units and fossil associations based on invertebrate fauna, mainly molluscs and echinoids (Azenha, 2003). The outcrop has also been used for educational studies (Azenha et al., 2006, 2008), including the fieldwork activities that led to the discovery of these remains.

The local stratigraphic succession consists of nearly 80 m of braided alluvial to coastal marine coarse sandstones (Figueira da Foz Fm – Middle Aptian to Middle Cenomanian) (Dinis *et al.*, 2008) overlaid by an onlapping sedimentary succession of inner-shelf sandy limestones, limestones and marls (Tentúgal Fm – uppermost Middle to Upper Cenomanian) (Fig. 1C). This highly fossiliferous marine unit has been widely studied in stratigraphy, micropalaeontology and invertebrate palaeontology, notably by Choffat (1898, 1900), Soares (1966, 1972, 1980), Soares & Marques (1973), Lauverjat (1982), Berthou (1984), Callapez (1998,



Figure 1. Geographic and stratigraphic settings of the studied area. A, location in the Iberian Peninsula. B, simplified geologic map and location of Casais dos Carecos fossil site in the Region of Baixo Mondego (Coimbra, West Central Portugal). Legend: 1, Figueira da Foz Fm. (Aptian to Middle Cenomanian alluvial coarse sandstones); 2, Tentúgal Fm. (uppermost Middle Cenomanian to Lower Turonian platform carbonates); 3, Furadouro Fm. (Lower to Upper Turonian marine and alluvial micaceous sandstones); 4, Oiã Fm. (Coniacian and Santonian alluvial coarse sandstones); 5, Pleistocene alluvial terraces; 6, alluvial surface deposits. C, stratigraphic section of the Beiraterra quarry outcrop [units after Choffat (1900) and Callapez (1998)]. Unit C correlates to the basal Upper Cenomanian Calycoceras guerangeri ammonite standard zone. Abbreviations: F, location of the crocodylomorph remains described here.

1999, 2003, 2004, 2008), Barroso-Barcenilla *et al.* (2011) and Callapez *et al.* (in press).

The carbonate sequence starts with a lower member of littoral plain mixed sandstones, mudstones, marls and sandy limestones, with small biostromes of *Gyrostrea*, *Exogyra*, *Anisocardia* and *Septifer* (Unit B – uppermost Middle to basal Upper Cenomanian – 1.10 m thick). The vertebrate remains studied here were sampled on the top of these strata.

This first succession is overlaid by a transgressive surface with an introduction of fully marine nodular carbonates (Units C and D – Upper Cenomanian – 4.0 m thick) with a rich and diverse fauna of euryhaline bivalves (Neithea, Plicatula, Plagiostomma, Granocardium, Exogyra, Ceratostreon), gastropods (Harpagodes, Cimolithium, Plesioplocus) and echinoids (Heterodiadema, Diplopodia, Tetragramma, Anorthopygus, Hemiaster). Ammonites and nautiloids indicate a typical Tethyan association with Neolobites vibrayeanus d'Orbigny, 1841, Calycoceras naviculare Mantell, 1822 and *Lessoniceras mermeti* Coquand, 1862, which correlates to the basal upper Cenomanian standard Biozone of *Calycoceras guerangeri* Spath, 1926 (e.g. Callapez, 2003; Barroso-Barcenilla *et al.*, 2011).

The upper part of the carbonate sequence (Units F to I – Upper Cenomanian – 6.5 m thick) consists of inner shelf nodular marly limestones and marls with *Vascoceras* ammonites and a benthic palaeofauna with *Rhynchostreon*, *Ceratostreon* and abundant moulds of *Tylostoma* (Callapez, 1998, 2003). The ammonite associations correlate to the Upper Cenomanian standard Biozones of *Metoicoceras geslinianum* d'Orbigny, 1850 and *Neocardioceras juddii* Barrois & Guerne, 1878 (Kennedy, 1984), but also with *Rubroceras*, *Pseudaspidoceras* and other common Tethyan genera.

Palaeogeographically, the faunal associations and the spatial articulation of facies record depositional and biotic episodes related with the West Portuguese Carbonate Platform, including the development of marginal marine and inner-shelf palaeoenvironments with abundant Tethyan non-reefal species. However, the lower part of the sequence exposed in Casais dos Carecos reveals a dominance of mixed sandy-carbonate oyster beds (*Gyrostrea*) and a low diversity, associated with epifaunal taxa. This suggests that *Portugalosuchus* gen. nov. inhabited a shallow and slightly restricted environment, possibly a littoral plain with drainage channels connected to inner sectors of the nearby carbonate platform.

INSTITUTIONAL ABBREVIATIONS

ML, Museu da Lourinhã, Portugal; MAFI, Magyar Állami Földtani Intézet, Hungary; MTM, Magyar Természettudományi Múzeum, Hungary; PSMUBB, Paleontology-Stratigraphy Museum, University BabesBolyai, Romania; MPZ, Museo de Ciencias Naturales de la Universidad de Zaragoza, Spain.

SYSTEMATIC PALAEONTOLOGY

Archosauria Cope, 1870 Crocodylomorpha Hay, 1930 (*sensu* Walker, 1970)

NEOSUCHIA GERVAIS, 1871 (SENSU BENTON & CLARK, 1988)

EUSUCHIA HUXLEY, 1875

CROCODYLIA? OWEN, 1842 (SENSU BENTON & CLARK, 1988)

PORTUGALOSUCHUS GEN. NOV.

urn:lsid:zoobank.org:act:8EB46DEB-0C2B-4A63-8E4E-862530D43AB7

Etymology: Portugalo refers to Portugal, country where the fossil was found; *suchus* is the latinized form of souchos (Gr.), after a creature of Egyptian zoomorphism.

Type species: Portugalosuchus azenhae gen. et sp. nov.

PORTUGALOSUCHUS AZENHAE GEN. ET SP. NOV.

urn:lsid:zoobank.org:act:1C6E6EB7-4F58-46D2-BCA7-AFA13D647493

Etymology: 'azenhae' after Matilde Azenha, the geologist that discovered the specimen.

Holotype: ML1818, partial skull and mandible (Figs 2–10) recovered in anatomical association and belonging to the same individual (Supporting Information, Fig. S26). The specimen is housed in the

Museu da Lourinhã (ML), Lourinhã, Portugal. ML1818 is comprised of the posterior part of left maxilla, posterior parts of prefrontals and lacrimal, posterior fragments of the nasals, left jugal, frontal, parietal, incomplete postorbitals, squamosal, supraoccipital, exoccipital, basioccipital, pterygoid, palatines and ectopterygoid. Furthermore, ML1818 also comprises a section of the left mandible, composed by the posterior portion of the dentary, with the last four tooth alveoli (two of which with teeth), coronoid, part of the splenial, angular and surangular.

Diagnosis: Autapomorphic traits are marked with an asterisk: *external mandibular fenestra located at the dentary-angular suture, with a posterior process of the dentary forming its anterior and dorsal margins, the angular forming its posterior and ventral margins, and without the participation of the surangular in the fenestra; absence of splenial process between the angular and coronoid; maxilla broadly separates the ectopterygoid from the maxillary tooth row; massive postorbital bar transversely flattened; ventral margin of postorbital bar flush with lateral jugal surface; *dorsal margin of the infratemporal fenestra very elongated, with the quadratojugal contacting the base of the skull table posteriorly, giving a trapezoidal contour to the fenestra (rather than triangular); and braincase wall lateral to the basisphenoid rostrum smooth, without sulci.

Age and horizon: Lower member of Tentúgal Formation (Unit B with *Gyrostrea ouremensis*), Upper Cenomanian, Late Cretaceous (standard Biozone of *Calycoceras naviculare*, about 95 Myr).

Type locality: Limestone quarry of Casal dos Carecos, near Tentúgal, Portugal (40°15'7.98" N; 8°34'8.09" W).

Description

Skull: The skull is well-preserved, although incomplete (Figs 2–3), lacking the rostrum, part of right maxilla and the surface of some posterior-most bones. Its maximum proximodistal length is 166 mm, the maximum width is 146 mm, and maximum dorsoventral height is 93 mm. The dorsal surface is sculpted with pits and grooves (consistent with most crocodylomorphs). Based on regression equations applied to extant species (Hall & Portier, 1994; Wu *et al.*, 2006; Platt *et al.*, 2009), the total cranial length of the specimen ML1818 is estimated at 30–35 cm and the total body length at 2.5–3 m.

The posterior part of the left maxilla preserves the last five or six alveoli, which are circular and without teeth. The lateral surface of the maxilla is damaged. The last maxillary alveolus is at the same level as the

© 2018 The Linnean Society of London, Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society, 2018, XX, 1–28



Figure 2. Photographs of the skull of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. (ML1818, holotype) from the Cenomanian of Tentúgal, Portugal in: dorsal (A), palatal (B), posterior (C), left lateral (D), anterior (E) and right lateral (F) views.

posterior rim of the orbit. In the lateral view, the ventral rim of the maxilla has a gentle curvature as it converges with the jugal posteriorly. Ventrally, the maxilla is posteriorly pinched between the jugal laterally and the ectopterygoid medially. The maxilla does not participate in the infratemporal bar.

Both prefrontals are preserved and their posterior part form most of the anteromedial margin of the orbit. The prefrontals contact the nasal anteriorly and are separated by the frontal medially. The contact with the maxilla is not preserved. The orbital margin of the prefrontals is flush with the skull surface, without any kind of structure or elevation. On the surface of the lateral wall, within the orbit, the prefrontal bears two small foramina. Although most of the prefrontal pillar is surrounded by matrix, it is possible to determine that its dorsal region is anteroposteriorly expanded. Its medial process is not visible.

The left lacrimal is preserved but, as its anterior part is missing, the contact with the nasal is unknown. The posterior part of the lacrimal forms most of the anterolateral margin of the orbit. It has an extensive contact with the prefrontal medially, with the maxilla lateroventrally, and with the jugal posteroventrally. The preserved dorsal surface lacks any kind of elevation or preorbital structure.

The left jugal is present but damaged anterolaterally and the infratemporal bar is incomplete posteriorly. In the lateral view, the dorsal margin of the jugal has a dorsal ridge at the posterolateral margin of the orbit. This ridge is anterior to the postorbital bar, which is flush with the lateral surface of the jugal.



Figure 3. Drawings of the skull of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. (ML1818, holotype) in: dorsal (A), palatal (B), posterior (C), and left lateral (D) views; Illustration by Joana Bruno. E, interpretative reconstruction of the skull in dorsal view, preserved bones in grey.

The dorsal process participates in the postorbital bar and projects itself dorsally until the midpoint of the posterolateral side of the postorbital bar. The base of the jugal part of the postorbital bar bears a large posterior foramen (Fig. 6). The presence and size of a medial jugal foramen, anterior to the postorbital bar, is unknown due to the matrix in this area. The infratemporal bar is slender and lateromedially flattened with a lens-shaped cross section.

The left postorbital is nearly complete, while only a small and poorly informative portion of the right postorbital is preserved. The dorsal surface at the skull table is sculpted. The contact with the squamosal occurs posteriorly, lateral to the supratemporal fenestra. In the dorsal view, the postorbital–squamosal suture is V-shaped. The postorbital bar is massive, anteroposteriorly longer than transversely wide, and the jugal extends until half of the extension of the bar (Fig. 6). Although the anterolateral corner of the skull table is partially eroded, the postorbital bar seems to be dorsally inset below the postorbital (Fig. 6C–D). The postorbital bar bears a dorsoventrally broad process on its anterior face with a spine at the dorsal portion (Fig. 6C–D). The presence of a second spine in the postorbital bar is unknown due to slight erosion. In the lateral view, the postorbital contacts the squamosal through a ventrally oriented suture. Although the sutures in this region are not very well marked in the ventromedial view (Fig. 6), the postorbital seems to contact both the squamosal and a long anterior process of the quadratojugal. The quadrate is posteriorly placed as an acute process between the squamosal and quadratojugal, without any contact with the postorbital.

The frontal is a single bone that forms the posteromedial margin of the orbits. It bears a long lanceolate anterior process, between the prefrontals and the posterior region of the nasals that extends beyond the anterior margin of the orbits. This process contacts the prefrontals laterally and the nasals anterolaterally. Although the anterior-most tip of this process was not preserved, it seems it would not surpass the anterior



Figure 4. Photographs of the left hemi-mandibule of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. (ML1818, holotype) from the Cenomanian of Tentúgal, Portugal in: lateral (A), medial (B) ventral (C), dorsal (D), posterior (E) and anterior (F) views.



Figure 5. Drawings of the left hemi-mandibule of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. (ML1818, holotype) from the Cenomanian of Tentúgal, Portugal in: anterior (A), lateral (B), posterior (C) medial (D), dorsal (E), and ventral (F) views. Illustration by Joana Bruno. G. interpretative reconstruction of the mandible in lateral view, preserved bones in grey.



Figure 6. A, close-up and ventromedial view of the left postorbital area of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. (ML1818). B, as in (A), with coloured bones illustrating the proposed sutural contacts in this region. C, close-up and lateral view of the left postorbital area of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. (ML1818). D, same photograph as in (C) but with coloured bones illustrating the proposed sutural relationship of this region. Abbreviations: ect, ectopterygoid; fo, foramen; ju, jugal; lsf, laterosphenoid; p, postorbital; q, quadrate; qj, quadratojugal; sq, squamosal. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

height of the prefrontals and the lacrimals. The dorsal surface of the frontal is well-sculpted. Posterior to the orbits, the frontal contacts the postorbital laterally and the parietal posteriorly. The contact with the latter occurs with a simple transversely linear suture, placed between the supratemporal fenestrae (Figs 3A, 7). The frontal has an important contribution (about one-third) in the anteromedial margin of the supratemporal fenestra (Fig. 7). This margin bears two small longitudinal grooves, horizontally parallel to one another (Fig. 7). However, these grooves seem to be different from the shallow fossa present at the anteromedial margin of the supratemporal fenestra of some eusuchians, such as Allodaposuchidae.

The parietal is cross-shaped in dorsal view, contacting the frontal anteriorly, the squamosal laterally, and extending through a broad posterior projection above the supraoccipital. The parietal comprises the posteromedial margin of the supratemporal fenestra. The intertemporal bar is noticeably narrow, half the width of the interorbital space. The dorsal surface of the squamosal at the skull table is totally flat. Part of its length bears a midline longitudinal line, which is probably a result of taphonomical damage. The



Figure 7. A, close-up of the medial margin of the right supratemporal fenestra of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. **nov.** (ML1818). B, as in (A), with coloured bones illustrating the proposed sutural contacts in this region. Abbreviations: fr, frontal; gr, groove; lsf, laterosphenoid; q, quadrate; pa, parietal. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Figure 8. A, close-up of the posteromedial margin of the right supratemporal fenestra of **Portugalosuchus azenhae gen. et sp. nov.** (ML1818). B, as in (A), with coloured bones illustrating the proposed sutural contacts in this region. Abbreviations: fr, frontal; gr, groove; lsf, laterosphenoid; q, quadrate; pa, parietal; sq, squamosal. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

parietal wall of the supratemporal fossa is imperforate (Figs 7, 8).

The left squamosal is partially preserved, as well as a very small part of the right bone, near the contact with the parietal. The squamosal comprises the lateral margin of the supratemporal fenestra, which is transversely thin. In the dorsal view, the squamosal contacts the quadrate posteromedially and the postorbital anteriorly. In the posterior view, it contacts the exoccipital ventrally and the supraoccipital medioventrally. The lateral margins are smooth and the posterior- and lateral-most regions of the squamosal are not preserved, making unknow the morphology of the groove for the ear valve musculature. On the posterior wall of the supratemporal fossa, there is a large aperture for the temporal canal (Fig. 8). Around this canal, the parietal and squamosal are widely separated by the quadrate, which enters into the temporal canal (Fig. 8).

The left quadrate is very incomplete, comprising just a small portion around the inner ear. The right quadrate is more complete, but the posterior part that articulates with the mandible was not preserved. As such, the suture patterning of the squamosal and exoccipital around the otic aperture is not distinguishable. The quadrate projects a ventral process between the pterygoid and basisphenoid in the lateral braincase wall (Fig. 9).

Only a small portion of the left quadratojugal is present, lateral to the supratemporal fenestra and contacting the squamosal at the dorsal roof of the infratemporal fenestra. This contact is very posteriorly



Figure 9. A, close-up of the left lateral braincase wall and foramen ovale region of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. **nov.** (ML1818). B, as in (A), with coloured bones illustrating the proposed sutural contacts in this region. Abbreviations: bsf, basisphenoid; gr, groove (caused by erosion); lsf, laterosphenoid; q, quadrate; ov, foramen ovale; pro, prootic; pt, pterygoid; VII, foramen for the palatine ramus of the cranial nerve VII. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)



Figure 10. A, close-up of the mandible and external mandibular fenestra of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. **nov.** (ML1818). B, as in (A), with coloured bones illustrating the proposed sutural contacts in this region. Abbreviations: ang, angular; emf, external mandibular fenestra; den, dentary; sur, surangular. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

placed in relation to the postorbital bar, so the dorsal roof of the infratemporal fenestra is horizontal, giving the fenestra a trapezoidal, rather than triangular, contour (Fig. 3D).

The supraoccipital is hexagonal in the posterior view due to the broad horizontal ventral contact with the exoccipitals. In the occipital view, the supraoccipital is posteriorly projected, forming a sagittal vertical ridge associated with two lateral concavities. Although the sutures in this region are not clearly visible, there is minimal participation of the supraoccipital on the dorsal surface of the skull table.

The right exoccipital, lacking the paroccipital process and its ventral-most part, is preserved. In the posterior view, lateral to the foramen magnum, there are three foramina. The medial-most corresponds to the foramen for the cranial nerve XII, and the other two correspond to the foramen vagi. The exoccipital is damaged ventrally, so its participation in the basioccipital tuberosity cannot be confirmed.

The basioccipital is very damaged, so the occipital condyle and the eustachian canals are not preserved. Only a small region of the basioccipital in the right ventral area was preserved, demonstrating that the external surface of the basioccipital, ventral to the occipital condyle, is vertical and posteriorly oriented.

The basisphenoid rostrum is a vertical thin sheet, dorsoventrally elongated, occupying the midline portion of the posterior cavity, below the laterosphenoid (Fig. 9). In the lateroventral region of the basisphenoid rostrum there is a groove (Fig. 9), which seems to be the result of erosion rather than a real sulcus, and the rostrum and the pterygoids are not recessed inward. Lateral to the basisphenoid rostrum, there are two perforations that also seem to be breakages rather than true foramina. Ventrolaterally, there is a foramen that may correspond to the palatine ramus of the cranial nerve VII (Fig. 9). In the lateral braincase wall, the basisphenoid is a thin lamina bordered by the quadrate dorsolaterally, the pterygoid ventrolaterally, the exoccipital dorsomedially and the basioccipital ventromedially (Fig. 9). The position of this lamina relative to the lateral carotid foramen cannot be determined. Although the occipital region of the basisphenoid is not well preserved, a broad exposure of the basisphenoid ventral to the basioccipital can be inferred, due to the shape and position of the posterior pterygoid process and the preserved parts of the basioccipital.

Only the left laterosphenoid remains. It is very elongated anteroposteriorly, and is x-shaped. It is located below the anteromedial margin of the supratemporal fossa. The anterior-most region and the lateral branch of the capitate process are not completely preserved, so its orientation can not be determined. Ventrally, it has a longitudinal ridge along its entire body. The foramen ovale is placed in the lateral braincase wall (Fig. 9). This foramen is surrounded by the laterosphenoid anteriorly and the quadrate posteriorly. There is an extensive exposure of the prootic around the trigeminal foramen (Fig. 9).

Both pterygoids are preserved, but the right one is incomplete laterally and the left one is incomplete posteriorly. This bone contacts the palatine anteriorly, the ectopterygoid laterally, the quadrate dorsally, and comprises the secondary choanae. The ventral surface of the pterygoid is nearly horizontal, except for a gentle transverse concavity towards the midline. The pterygoidal surface, lateral and anterior to the secondary choanae, is flush with the choanal margin. The choana is located very close to the posterior pterygoidal margin. The pterygoid posterior process is tall and prominent.

Both palatines are present, but incomplete anteriorly. The sutures with the maxillae are not distinguishable and, therefore, the morphology and extension of the anterior process of the palatine cannot be determined. The bones form a long bar bordered by the suborbital fenestrae. They contact the pterygoids posteriorly, at the end of the bar, anterior to the posterior margin of the fenestra. The lateral borders are almost parallel along their length and only gently narrower posteriorly. The vomers are only visible in section and are placed in the midline, dorsal to the palatines, totally obscured in the palatal view.

Only the left ectopterygoid is preserved. In ventral view, it contacts the pterygoid posteromedially, the maxilla anterolaterally and the jugal laterally. The anterior ectopterygoid process tapers to a point and the lateral border of the ectopterygoid is separated by the maxilla, avoiding contact with the last tooth alveolus. It gently curves medially, creating a small, subtle projection into the suborbital fenestra, and a bowed lateral margin of the fenestra. The posterior-most end of the ectopterygoid is not preserved. However, only the tip is missing and thus the ectopterygoid does not reach the posterior tip of the lateral pterygoid flange. Dorsally, the ectopterygoid extends along the medial face of the lower half of the postorbital bar.

The supratemporal fenestra is circular and nearly the same size as the orbit. The margins do not upturn, nor form any distinctive lip, and do not overhang the supratemporal fossa. The orbits have a sub-triangular outline, with a broader posterior half. The margins of the orbits are flush with the skull surface, not upturned or forming any different structure. The suborbital fenestra is three times longer than wide, being straight medially and curved laterally. The posterior part of the fenestra is broader than the anterior one, which ends in an acute shape. The fenestra's rim curvature is gentle and does not bear a posterior notch. The otic region is badly damaged and, therefore, it is impossible to see its sutural patterning. The secondary choana is a small, round, undivided fenestra slightly asymmetrically placed at the posterior margin of the pterygoids. The choana is damaged at its posterior section, but it is clear that the aperture is ventroposteriorly directed.

Mandible: The left mandible (Figs 4, 5) is partially preserved and is comprised of the posterior region of the dentary, the last four alveoli (two of them with teeth), the posterior part of the splenial, the anterior parts of both angular and surangular, and the coronoid.

The splenial is broad and occupies almost all of the medial surface of the preserved mandible. The splenial contacts the foramen *intermandibularis caudalis* and the angular posteroventrally, the coronoid posteriorly, the surangular posterodorsally and the dentary anteriorly. The medial surface is not perforated. However, as the region of the splenial anterior to the last four teeth is damaged, the presence of the exit for the cranial nerve V can not be determined. There is no posterior process of the splenial separating the angular and the coronoid.

The coronoid is badly preserved. It has a 'boomerang' shape and is placed in the anterior rim of the mandibular adductor fossa or Meckelian fossa. The anterior edge is damaged, so it is not clear where the foramen *intermandibularis medius* is located. The superior edge of the coronoid slopes strongly anteriorly, at an angle of about 45° from the horizontal plane. As the posterior region of the inferior process of the coronoid is broken, it can be seen in cross-section, showing the overlaps with the angular and the Meckelian fossa. The inferior process of the coronoid overlaps strongly into the inner surface of the Meckelian fossa. As the medial surface of the coronoid is partially damaged, it is impossible to know if it is perforated.

The dentary bears the last four alveoli, two of them with teeth. Posteriorly, the dentary is wedged between the angular and surangular, in the lateral view. The lateroventral area of the dentary is crossed by a welldefined longitudinal groove. This groove starts anteriorly at the height of the last dental alveolus and runs posteriorly to intersect the anterior margin of a small-sized and narrow, slit-shaped fenestra (Fig. 10). This fenestra, here interpreted as the external mandibular fenestra, is between the dentary-angular suture, with the dentary forming its anterior and dorsal margins, and the angular forming its posterior and ventral margins. The fenestra is not laterally coincident with the Meckelian fossa, as it is slightly more anterior than the latter. The preserved teeth are conical and ornamented with fine longitudinal striations ranging from the base to the apex. The mesial and distal carinae are very smooth and almost as lightly marked as the enamel striation.

The angular covers most of the ventral aspect of the mandible. At the lateral surface of the mandible, the surangular contacts the angular posterior to the dentary's posteriormost portion. In the medial view, and below the inferior process of the coronoid, the anterior process of the angular is visible. Although the surface is partially broken, this process extends dorsally towards a cavity, covered by matrix that is likely the foramen *intermandibularis caudalis*. The foramen is small, ellipsoidal and posteriorly placed relative to the Meckelian fossa, without reaching or surpassing the height of the anterior margin of the fossa.

The surangular is incomplete and only the anteriormost portion of the bone is preserved. This bone covers most of the dorsal aspect of the mandible posterior to the toothrow and reaches anteriorly to the posterior margin of the last tooth alveolus, without surpassing it. In the lateral and dorsal views, the surangular anterior processes are unequal in their contact with the dentary; the dorsal is much longer than the ventral. The surangular does not participate in the external mandibular fenestra. Dorsal to the mandibular adductor fossa, the surangular bears a conspicuous process that produces a dorsal concavity.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

PHYLOGENETIC ANALYSES

The early evolution of eusuchians and crocodylians is poorly understood, in part due to a lack of comprehensive phylogenetic analyses and despite important contributions by Clark (1994), Brochu (1999), Sereno *et al.* (2001) and Pol *et al.* (2009). However, during the last five years, a great amount of new eusuchian taxa have been discovered, leading to several new phylogenetic studies focused on providing a better understanding of the relationships among Crocodylia and non-crocodylian eusuchians (e.g. Buscalioni *et al.*, 2001, 2011; Salisbury *et al.* 2006; Delfino *et al.*, 2008a, 2008b; Martin, 2010; Puértolas *et al.*, 2011; Brochu *et al.*, 2012; Blanco *et al.*, 2014, 2015; Puértolas-Pascual *et al.*, 2014; Martin *et al.*, 2016; Narváez *et al.*, 2015, 2016), and between Eusuchia and non-eusuchian neosuchians (e.g. Turner, 2015; Turner & Pritchard, 2015).

To perform our cladistic analysis, *Portugalosuchus azenhae* was included in the dataset by Narváez *et al.* (2016), mainly based on the matrix by Brochu (1999), as it includes most of the new eusuchian taxa discovered in recent years. Character 60 was modified with the addition of a new character state, which is autapomorphic (*) for *Portugalosuchus*.

Character 60. Angular-surangular suture contacts external mandibular fenestra at posterior angle at maturity (0) or passes broadly along ventral margin of external mandibular fenestra late in ontogeny (1) or mandibular fenestra between dentary and angular, no surangular participation on the fenestra (2*).

In addition, the codings for *Allodaposuchus precedens* Nopcsa, 1928, *Iharkutosuchus makadii* Ösi *et al.*, 2007, *Agaresuchus subjuniperus* Puértolas-Pascual *et al.*, 2014 and *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum* Puértolas *et al.*, 2011 were modified from the original matrix by Narváez *et al.* (2016), based on first-hand observations of the specimens (see Supporting Information for the complete list of changes).

With the new taxon, the dataset included 107 taxa, which were coded for a total of 189 craniodental and postcranial characters. The taxon Goniopholis simus was used as the outgroup taxon. In TNT v.1.5 (Goloboff & Catalano, 2016), tree-space was searched using a heuristic search algorithm (traditional search method), with tree-bisection-reconnection (TBR) branch swapping, random seed set to 1 and 1000 random addition replicates holding 10 most parsimonious trees for each replicate. To recover all trees, a second search using the overflowed trees retained in the memory was performed. All characters were equally weighted and multistate characters were unordered. Bremer supports and bootstrap frequencies (1000 bootstrap replicates searched) were calculated to assess the robustness of the nodes.

The analysis found 4464 most parsimonious trees (MPTs) of 789 steps (ensemble consistency index, CI = 0.314; ensemble retention index, RI = 0.789; rescaled consistency index, RC = 0.248). The bootstrap frequencies and the Bremer supports (decay index) were summarized in the strict consensus tree (Fig. 11; for the complete cladogram with all the taxa used in the analysis, bootstrap frequencies over 50%, and the Bremer support see Supporting Information, Fig. S16).

With the inclusion of *Portugalosuchus*, the strict consensus topology is quite different from that of the original dataset of Narváez *et al.* (2016). The main differences are related to the loss of resolution among non-Crocodylia eusuchians and gavialoids.

In the strict consensus tree from the original dataset by Narváez et al. (2016), Theriosuchus is the sister taxon of Eusuchia and Pachycheilosuchus, Shamosuchus, Pietraroiasuchus, Acynodon iberoccitanus, Hylaeochampsa, Iharkutosuchus and Acynodon adriaticus are successive sister taxa to each other, forming a clade within Eusuchia. However, with Portugalosuchus included, Bernissartia is found as the sister taxon of Eusuchia, and Hylaeochampsidae is the sister clade of the unresolved node composed of Pachycheilosuchus, Shamosuchus and Pietraroiasuchus. Within Hylaeochampsidae, A. iberoccitanus, A. adriaticus, Hylaeochampsa and Iharkutosuchus are successive sister taxa to each other. The relationships within Allodaposuchidae have also changed, with Arenysuchus and Allodaposuchus forming the sister clade of the node composed by Agaresuchus and Lohuecosuchus. The relationships at the base of Gavialoidea are also slightly different, with Thoracosaurus and Eothoracosaurus forming a polytomy with the rest of the gavialoids. In our analysis, *Portugalosuchus* is located as the sister taxon to all other non-gavialoid crocodylians.

The position of *Portugalosuchus* is supported by the following unambiguous synapomorphies: absence of splenial process between the angular and coronoid (character 59, state 1); external mandibular fenestra placed between the dentary and angular without participation of the surangular (character 60, state 2); maxilla broadly separates the ectopterygoid from the maxillary tooth row (character 104, state 1); and braincase wall lateral to the basisphenoid rostrum smooth, without sulcus (character 162, state 1).

To test the robustness of *Portugalosuchus* within Crocodylia, we performed an alternative analysis forcing the position of *Portugalosuchus* outside Crocodylia (defining constraints in TNT), resulting in trees with only one extra step (790). The strict consensus tree (Supporting Information, Fig. S17) shows *Portugalosuchus*, the unresolved clade of Allodaposuchidae, and Crocodylia forming a polytomy. This suggests that the position of *Portugalosuchus* within Crocodylia is not robustly supported and the hypothesis of *Portugalosuchus* as a non-crocodylian eusuchian cannot be ignored or discarded.

Taking into account the unusual position, size, shape and configuration of the external mandibular fenestra



Figure 11. Phylogenetic relationships of eusuchians, depicting the position of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. (ML1818) based on the matrix of Narváez *et al.* (2016). Stratigraphically calibrated and synthesized strict consensus tree of 4464 most parsimonious cladograms with 789 evolutionary steps. Black rectangles represent known minimal age ranges of each taxon (based on: Brochu *et al.*, 2012; Narváez *et al.*, 2016; Puértolas-Pascual *et al.*, 2016). Numbers of each node indicate the Bremer support and the bootstrap frequencies over 50%.

in Portugalosuchus, a last alternative analysis was performed, considering this fenestra as a different structure, non-homologous to the external mandibular fenestra present in Crocodylia (changes: char $60(2 \rightarrow ?)$; char $63(1 \rightarrow 0)$). The resulting analysis yielded trees with less one step (788). Yet, it resulted in a poorly resolved strict consensus (Supporting Information, Fig. S18), with Portugalosuchus, the unresolved clade of Allodaposuchidae and Gavialoidea, forming a polytomy with the rest of Crocodylia. This analysis demonstrates the importance of the presence or absence of the external mandibular fenestra in Portugalosuchus and is a key character to define phylogenetic position. Further studies on the development of this structure in eusuchians and crocodylians, as well as the recovery of new specimens, could be essential to resolve this part of the cladogram.

Another possible reason for the low degree of support and resolution primarily affecting the relationships of taxa such as Allodaposuchidae, Borealosuchus, Gavialoidea and *Portugalosuchus*, is the inclusion of several recently discovered non-crocodylian eusuchian taxa, such as allodaposuchids and hylaeochampsids (e.g. Buscalioni et al., 1997, 1999; Buscalioni et al., 2001; Salisbury et al., 2006; Martin, 2007, 2010; Ösi et al., 2007; Delfino et al., 2008a, 2008b; Martin & Buffetaut, 2008; Puértolas et al., 2011; Brochu et al., 2012; Blanco et al., 2014, 2015; Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2014; Martin et al., 2016; Narváez et al., 2015, 2016). Most datasets used recently are mainly based (with some modifications) on Brochu (1999). This matrix was primarily elaborated to solve the phylogenetic relationships of the crown group Crocodylia, in a context where other eusuchians were very scarce and fragmentary. Since then, a large number of basal eusuchians have been discovered (e.g. Acynodon, Iharkutosuchus, Agaresuchus, Lohuecosuchus, Arenysuchus and Musturzabalsuchus). Therefore, all of these uncertainties around the base of Crocodylia could be influenced by the lack of diagnostic characters for these more recently described taxa. Another possibility related to these low supports could be that *Portugalosuchus* may belong to a previously unknown morphotype among Eusuchia, probably a member of a new, unknown clade. We have observed in the alternative analyses that minimum changes in some key characters, such as the presence of external mandibular fenestra, make this specimen act as a wildcard taxon thoroughout the tree. Further analyses on the skull (e.g. CT scan), findings of additional specimens and, above all, a better and more comprehensive dataset focused on the basal eusuchians, will allow a better coding that could alter these results in the near future and shed new light on the position of this taxon.

Due to all these issues, and to test the position of *Portugalosuchus* in a wider phylogenetic context

within Crocodylomorpha, we performed another cladistic analysis based on the dataset of Turner (2015). This matrix takes into account the main clades within Crocodylomorpha, including sphenosuchians, protosuchians, notosuchians, thalattosuchians and neosuchians. The character list is adapted from Turner & Sertich (2010), Pol *et al.* (2009), Turner & Buckley (2008), Pol & Norell (2004a,b) and Pol & Apesteguia (2005), and includes characters from Clark (1994), Turner (2006), Brochu (1997), Pritchard *et al.* (2012) and Adams (2013).

According with our previous analysis based on Narváez et al. (2016), the codes for Allodaposuchus precedens, Iharkutosuchus makadii, Allodaposuchus subjuniperus (now Agaresuchus subjuniperus Narváez et al., 2016) and Allodaposuchus cf. precedens (now Lohuecosuchus mechinorum Narváez, Brochu, Escaso, Pérez-García & Ortega, 2015) were also modified from the original matrix by Turner (2015), based on photographs and first-hand observations of the specimens (see Supporting Information for the new codifications of these taxa). Finally, the taxa Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum and Portugalosuchus azenhae have also been added to the Turner (2015) matrix.

The taxon *Gracilisuchus* was used as the outgroup taxon. In TNT v.1.5 (Goloboff & Catalano, 2016), tree-space was searched using the same parameters as in the first analysis. All characters were equally weighted. According to Turner (2015), the characters 1, 3, 6, 10, 23, 37, 43–45, 49, 65, 67, 69, 73, 77, 79, 86, 90, 91, 96, 97, 104–106, 108, 126, 142, 143, 149, 167, 182, 197 and 226 were set as additive. Also according to Turner (2015), characters 5, 277 and 281 were considered inactive.

With all these changes, the inclusion of the new taxa resulted in a dataset of 103 active taxa, which were coded for a total of 319 active characters. The analysis resulted in 660 most parsimonious trees (MPTs) of 1659 steps (ensemble consistency index, CI = 0.241; ensemble retention index, RI = 0.704; rescaled consistency index, RC = 0.169). The bootstrap frequencies and the Bremer supports (decay index) were summarized in the strict consensus tree (Fig. 12; for the complete cladogram with all the taxa used in the analysis, bootstrap frequencies over 50% and the Bremer support see Supporting Information, Fig. S20).

With the inclusion of *Portugalosuchus* and *Arenysuchus*, the strict consensus topology is very similar to that obtained from the original dataset by Turner (2015). The main differences are related to the loss of resolution within Crocodylia, *Araripesuchus* and Allodaposuchidae. As with the matrix by Narváez *et al.* (2016), *Portugalosuchus* appears within Crocodylia, but most of the taxa in this clade appear to form a large polytomy.



Figure 12. Phylogenetic relationships of eusuchians, depicting the position of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov. (ML1818) based on the matrix of Turner (2015). Stratigraphically calibrated and synthesized strict consensus tree of 660 most parsimonious cladograms with 1659 evolutionary steps. Black rectangles represent known minimal age ranges of each taxon (based on: Brochu *et al.*, 2012; Turner, 2015; Turner & Pritchard, 2015; Narváez *et al.*, 2016; Puértolas-Pascual *et al.*, 2016). Numbers of each node indicate the Bremer support and the bootstrap frequencies over 50%.

The position of *Portugalosuchus* is supported by the following unambiguous synapomorphies: postorbital bar transversely flattened (character 26, state 0); jugal portion of postorbital bar, relative to lateral surface of jugal, flush with lateral surface (character 167, state 0). Also, it is characterized by the following ambiguous synapomorphies: pterygoid ramus of quadrate with deep groove along ventral edge (character 50, state 1); absence of palpebrals (character 65, state 0); supratemporal fenestrae relatively large, covering most of surface of skull roof (character 68, state 0); lateral surface of the anterior region of surangular and posterior region of dentary with a longitudinal depression (character 118, state 1); dorsally robust splenial posterior to symphysis (character 161, state 1); cheek teeth not constricted at base of crown (character 162, state 0); maxilla broadly separates ectopterygoid from maxillary toothrow (character 264, state 1).

To check the importance of the external mandibular fenestra for the position of *Portugalosuchus* within Crocodylia, another alternative analysis was performed. Again, this analysis was performed considering that *Portugalosuchus* lacks external mandibular fenestra: char 70(0 \rightarrow ?); char 75(0 \rightarrow 1). The analysis yielded trees with one step less (1660) and the strict consensus topology was the same as the first analysis (Supporting Information, Fig. S20). These results reinforce the hypothesis that *Portugalosuchus* is within Crocodylia, since, in a broader phylogenetic context, its inclusion in the clade is not only influenced by the presence or absence of the fenestra.

COMPARISONS

The position of *Portugalosuchus* within Crocodvlia. as the sister taxon to all other non-gavialoid crocodylians, is supported by several synapomorphies. For example, Portugalosuchus shares many characters related to the postorbital with most gavialoids: the presence of a massive postorbital bar (also shared with hylaeochampsids and some allodaposuchids and tomistomines); large, nearly circular supratemporal fenestrae separated by a very narrow intertemporal bar; a postorbital bar with a process that is prominent and dorsoventrally broad (also present in Hylaeochampsa vectiana, some allodaposuchids and Borealosuchus wilsoni Mook, 1959); ventral margin of the postorbital bar flush with the lateral jugal surface (also shared with non-crocodylian eusuchians and several non-eusuchian neosuchians); postorbitalquadratojugal contact at dorsal angle of infratemporal fenestra (also present in H. vectiana, allodaposuchids,

Borealosuchus, planocraniids, tomistomines, and some alligatoroids and crocodyloids). A foramen *intermandibularis caudalis* that does not reach or surpass the level of the anterior margin of the Meckelian fossa is also present in some gavialoids, such as *Gavialis* and *Eosuchus*, and in the allodaposuchid *Lohuecosuchus*. However, *Portugalosuchus* lacks several characters typical of Gavialoidea, such as: the presence of a ventral margin of the orbit with a prominent notch; ventrally slopping skull table surface; pterygoid processes small and posteriorly projected; palatine-maxillary suture intersection at anteriormost limit of the suborbital fenestra (also present in hylaeochampsids and some allodaposuchids); and telescoped orbital margins.

Yet, Portugalosuchus also shares several characters with Borealosuchus, such as: a coronoid with its superior edge strongly sloping anteriorly (also common in caimans, Leidyosuchus canadiensis Lambe, 1907 and Tomistoma schlegelii (Müller, 1838)); external mandibular fenestra present as a narrow slit (present in Borealosuchus wilsoni, B. threeensis Brochu et al., 2012, Thoracosaurus, Deinosuchus, and some dyrosaurids and pholidosaurids); and margin of the orbit flush with the skull surface (also present in several non-crocodylian eusuchians and some crocodylians). Portugalosuchus differs from Borealosuchus due to the large supratemporal fenestra in relation with the orbit; round anterior rim of the orbit; narrow posterior ramus of jugal; posterior maxillary toothrow curved medially (concavity in the medial margin); and choanae near the posterior margin of the pterygoid. Unfortunately, as the specimen is incomplete, Portugalosuchus lacks most diagnostic characters of Borealosuchus (Brochu, 2000; Brochu et al., 2012), such as the presence of slender limb bones; the posterodorsal extension of the surangular through the retroarticular process; rectangular unkeeled dorsal osteoderms with a broad anterolateral process (also present in gavialoids and Bernissartia); bipartite ventral osteoderms (also present in Diplocynodon and Leidyosuchus); the nasals broadly separated from the external naris; the dentary teeth occluding in deep pits between the maxillary alveoli; the fourth and fifth maxillary alveoli similar in size (also present in other extinct crocodylians such as Leidyosuchus, most Diplocynodon, Pristichampsus and *Prodiplocynodon*); or the presence of two confluent enlarged caniniforms in the dentary (also present in diplocynodontines and *Leidyosuchus*).

The new taxon shares several similarities with Allodaposuchidae. Some of these similarities are related to the postorbital bar and have already been mentioned in the comparisons with Gavialoidea. With Allodaposuchidae, *Portugalosuchus* shares the presence of a secondary choana posteroventrally oriented, without a septum and flush with the pterygoid

surface (also shared with gavialoids and most noncrocodylian eusuchians); postorbital-squamosal suture ventrally oriented (also present in some gavialoids, *Iharkutosuchus* and some *Diplocynodon*); frontoparietal suture linear and deeply entering within the supratemporal fenestra (also shared with Hylaeochampsidae and *Diplocynodon*); and the presence of a smooth braincase wall lateral to the basisphenoid rostrum (shared with the allodaposuchid Agaresuchus and Crocodyloidea). Portugalosuchus also differs from Allodaposuchidae in several characters. One of the most important differences is the absence of a shallow fossa at the anteromedial corner of the supratemporal fenestra, which is usually considered very diagnostic for Allodaposuchidae. The anteromedial corner of the supratemporal fenestra of Portugalosuchus is not totally smooth and presents two small longitudinal grooves (Fig. 7), but not as the shallow depression present in *Bernissartia*, the Glen Rose Form, some goniopholidids and Allodaposuchidae. Another important difference is the presence of an external mandibular fenestra, which is absent in all members of Allodaposuchidae. The size relationship between the orbits and the supratemporal fenestra is also different from the allodaposuchids. Portugalosuchus has very large fenestrae, even slightly larger than the orbits, and a very narrow intertemporal bar, while the orbits and fenestrae in allodaposuchids are smaller, as the orbit is bigger than the fenestra. However, Portugalosuchus does not preserve important parts of the skull that are diagnostic for Allodaposuchidae, such as the otic region or the paroccipital processes, making further comparisons difficult.

In addition, the overall morphology of the skull of *Portugalosuchus* presents some characters that are reminiscent of Tethysuchia (Pholidosauridae and Dyrosauridae), such as the shape and size of the orbits and the supratemporal fenestrae, the skull table, the postorbital bar or the external mandibular fenestra. However, only the presence of a choana showing the eusuchian condition is enough to rule out its relation to any of these clades.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE EXTERNAL MANDIBULAR FENESTRA IN *PORTUGALOSUCHUS*

As suggested by the results of our phylogenetic analyses, the presence or absence of the external mandibular fenestra in *Portugalosuchus* is key for understanding and resolving its phylogenetic position among noncrocodylian eusuchians and crocodylians. This structure is absent in most neosuchians closely related to Eusuchia and non-crocodylian eusuchians, such as *Shamosuchus*, *Bernissartia*, some goniopholidids, *Theriosuchus*, *Pachycheilosuchus*, Hylaeochampsidae and Allodaposuchidae (Brochu *et al.*, 2012). As all crocodylians (with this region of the mandible preserved) have an external mandibular fenestra, the most parsimonious hypothesis would be that the presence of this structure is a synapomorphy of Crocodylia.

Although we acknowledge that this scenario could be more complex if the gavialoid Eothoracosaurus lacks the fenestra [as pointed out by Brochu et al. (2012)], making the fenestra plesiomorphically absent for Crocodylia, and it was gained independently at least twice in the group (in Gavialoidea and in nongavialoid crocodylians). However, it is very likely that Eothoracosaurus had an external mandibular fenestra. Brochu (2004; Fig. 9) illustrates that both mandibular rami of the holotype of Eothoracosaurus mississippiensis have a broken area at exactly the part where the fenestra would be located. This could be explained by the presence of a tiny fenestra in that region, creating a more fragile and breakable area. Finally, if present in *Eothoracosaurus*, the fenestra should be considered synapomorphic for Crocodylia.

Another problem is the position, shape and size of the fenestra throughout Crocodylia. Most crocodylians present a medium to large-sized elliptical fenestra, with the dentary splitting posteriorly to form both anterodorsal and anteroventral margins and the surangular and the angular composing the posterodorsal and posteroventral margins, respectively. Nevertheless, some crocodylians, such as Borealosuchus threeensis, B. wilsoni, Deinosuchus, Mekosuchus, Portugalosuchus and maybe *Eothoracosaurus*, present a small, narrow and slit-shaped external mandibular fenestra. The presence of a small fenestra in Eothoracosaurus, Deinosuchus and *Portugalosuchus* could indicate that this is the plesiomorphic condition for Crocodylia. In other nongavialid gavialoids, such as Thoracosaurus neocesariensis de Kay, 1842 and Thoracosaurus macrorhynchus de Blainville, 1835, the fenestra is poorly known (Brochu et al., 2012). A small fenestra in these latter taxa would reinforce this condition as plesiomorphic for Crocodylia. However, this scenario could be more complex given the small fenestrae and phylogenetic position of Borealosuchus threeensis, B. wilsoni and Mekosuchus. This raises two different hypotheses: either the fenestra was lost and later regained independently in these taxa, or it was simply reduced in size (Brochu, 2004; Brochu et al., 2012).

Taking into account this structure in *Portugalosuchus*, a series of problems also arise. Its position and its bones composition are exclusive to this taxon within Crocodylia. The fenestra is anteriorly located and not mediolaterally coincident with the Meckelian fossa. In addition, it is located between the dentary-angular suture, without the involvement of the surangular. As previously discussed, it is possible that this fenestra is not homologous to the external mandibular fenestra present in Crocodylia. However, our hypothesis of homology can be supported by the following:

- 1. As in most crocodylians, the fenestra of *Portugalosuchus* is anteriorly coincident with a longitudinal groove present in the dentary (Fig. 10);
- 2. It is more parsimonious that this structure corresponds to the external mandibular fenestra than to a new analogous fenestra.

A progressive posterodorsally enlargement of this fenestra (Fig. 13G) allows us to observe the different development states of this structure in crocodylians. Therefore, the position, size and configuration of the fenestra in *Portugalosuchus*, without participation of the surangular, may correspond to the most primitive state of this character within Crocodylia.

To test all of these evolutionary history hypotheses, we have performed several ancestral state reconstruction analyses (see Supporting Information, Figs S20–S25), where the fenestra went from small to larger or vice versa (character 63). The ancestral states were reconstructed using our dataset based on Narváez *et al.* (2016), by maximum-parsimony and maximum-likelihood-Mk1 methods in MESQUITE (Maddison & Maddison, 2018). These analyses were carried out for three different assumptions and obtained different results:

- The presence, size and morphology of the external mandibular fenestra is unknown for *Eothoracosaurus* (character 63 →?) (Supporting Information, Figs S20, S23). With this assumption, both maximum-parsimony and maximum-likelihood-Mk1 methods show a high probability (67%) for an ancestral state of character 63 corresponding to a small-sized and narrow slit-shaped external mandibular fenestra for Crocodylia;
- 2. Eothoracosaurus lacks an external mandibular fenestra (character $63 \rightarrow 0$) (Supporting Information, Figs S21, S24). In this case, the maximum-parsimony method shows a 50% probability of the presence of small fenestra as the ancestral character of Crocodylia, and 50% uncertainty (Fig. S21). Nevertheless, the maximum-likelihood-Mk1 method shows probabilities of 33% for the absence of fenestra, 22% for the presence of small fenestra and 45% uncertainty for the ancestral state reconstruction of this character in Crocodylia (Fig. S24);
- 3. *Eothoracosaurus* presents a small, narrow, slitshaped fenestra (character $63 \rightarrow 1$) (Supporting Information, Figs S22, S25). With this assumption, both maximum-parsimony and maximum-likelihood-Mk1 methods show a 100% of probability for an ancestral state of character 63 corresponding to

a small, narrow, slit-shaped external mandibular fenestra for Crocodylia.

Therefore, these results seem to support the hypothesis that the slit-like opening in the mandible is an early stage of the external mandibular fenestra and its presence is a synapomorphy of Crocodylia. Observing this structure in different developmental stages through Crocodylia, we can infer an evolutionary pattern (Fig. 13), from a small-sized and narrow slit-shaped aperture with a minimal participation of the surangular in the fenestral margin and the dentary covering most of the dorsal margin (e.g. *Borealosuchus wilsoni*, Fig. 13B), to a posterior enlargement of the opening reducing the participation of the dentary in the dorsal margin with the posterodorsal margin is occupied by the surangular (e.g. *Alligator mississippiensis*, Fig. 13F).

PALAEOBIOGEOGRAPHICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The palaeogeography of Europe during the Late Cretaceous was controlled by an increase in oceanic expansion due to the creation of a new crust in the mid-Atlantic ridge. The oceanic expansion peaked in the middle of the Cretaceous, producing some of the highest sea-levels during the Late Cretaceous. This phenomenon led to a significant increase in epicontinental seas and flooding of the cratonic areas of Europe, resulting in a large archipelago surrounded by shallow seas (e.g. Haq, 2014; Csiki-Sava *et al.*, 2015 and references therein).

Within this scenario, many works suggest a putative radiation of Crocodylia during the latest Cretaceous of Europe (e.g. Buscalioni et al., 2003; Martin & Delfino, 2010; Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2016). The situation was similar in North America, where the oldest records of Crocodylia also date from the Campanian-Maastrichtian, with specimens belonging to Borealosuchus, Alligatoroidea, Crocodyloidea and Gavialoidea (Brochu, 1997; Buscalioni et al., 2003; Martin & Delfino, 2010; Puértolas et al., 2011; Wu & Brinkman, 2015; Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2016). The joint presence of crocodylians in both North America and Europe suggests that the common ancestor of Crocodylia evolved in one of these continents, at pre-Campanian times (Buscalioni et al., 2003) and spread from one continent to the other through sporadic palaeobiogeographic bridges in the North Atlantic (Puértolas et al., 2011). These connections have also been observed in other continental vertebrates from the Late Cretaceous, such as marsupials, theropod



Figure 13. Schematic drawings of the different degrees of development of the external mandibular fenestra (emf) through Crocodylia in lateral view. A, *Portugalosuchus azenhae* gen. et sp. nov.; B, *Borealosuchus wilsoni*; C, *Gavialis gangeticus*; D, *Crocodylus niloticus*; E, *Borealosuchus formidabilis*; F, *Alligator mississippiensis*; G, reconstruction of the left mandible of *Portugalosuchus* gen. nov. (preserved bones in grey colour) showing a possible growth pattern of the fenestra within Crocodylia. Abbreviations: and, angular; den, dentary; emf, external mandibular fenestra; sur, surangular. Scale bar = 5 cm.

© 2018 The Linnean Society of London, Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society, 2018, XX, 1–28

dinosaurs and hadrosaurs, and snakes (e.g. Le Loeuff, 1991; Martin *et al.*, 2005; Pereda-Suberbiola, 2009; Prieto-Marquez & Wagner, 2009; Sues & Averianov, 2009; Benton *et al.*, 2010; Puértolas *et al.*, 2011).

However, the newest phylogenetic hypotheses propose a different palaeobiogeographic scenario, since European taxa previously assigned to Alligatoroidea (Acynodon, Musturzabalsuchus, Massaliasuchus) (Buscalioni et al., 1997, 1999; Delfino et al., 2008a; Martin & Buffetaut, 2008; Martin, 2007, 2010) and Crocodyloidea (Arenysuchus) (Puértolas et al., 2011) may actually be non-crocodylian eusuchians within the endemic European clades Hylaeochampsidae and Allodaposuchidae (e.g. Salisbury et al., 2006; Brochu, 2011; Buscalioni et al., 2011; Martin et al., 2016; Narváez et al., 2015, 2016; Turner & Pritchard, 2015). These new results imply that, except for the marine taxon Thoracosaurus (Gavialoidea) that was present in both continents and with a probable higher capacity for the dispersion between epicontinental seas (Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2016), there would be no true members of Crocodylia in the Late Cretaceous of Europe.

Considering this more recent phylogenetic framework, there would be a completely different palaeobiogeographic scenario. In this case, eusuchians would probably have arisen in Laurasia, at some point during the Lower Cretaceous (the earliest Eusuchia is Hylaeochampsa, from the Barremian of England) and would have diversified between the Early Cretaceous and the Late Cretaceous (Brochu, 1999; Buscalioni et al., 2001, 2003, 2011; Salisbury et al., 2006; Martin & Delfino, 2010; Puértolas et al., 2011). At this point, Eusuchia would have had vicariant evolution on each continent resulting in Crocodylia (with record from the Campanian) in North America, and Hylaeochampsidae (with record from the Barremian) and Allodaposuchidae (with record from the Campanian) in Europe. The presence of Crocodylia in the European Paleocene, with taxa such as Planocraniidae, alligatoroids such as Diplocynodon or crocodyloids such as Asiatosuchus, would be better explained by dispersal processes from North America or Asia to Europe after the K/Pg extinction event (Martin et al., 2014; Csiki-Sava et al., 2015; Puértolas-Pascual et al., 2016).

Taking into account all of these previous palaeobiogeographic hypotheses, and the phylogenetic results obtained after adding the new taxon *Portugalosuchus azenhae*, we can establish new preliminary hypotheses about the origin of Crocodylia. *Portugalosuchus* is one of the earliest records of Eusuchia and probably the earliest known record of Crocodylia, helping to fill a gap from the Barremian to the Campanian. Previous hypotheses pointed to a pre-Campanian origin of Crocodylia, probably during the middle of the Cretaceous (e.g. Brochu, 2003; Buscalioni *et al.*, 2003; Blanco *et al.*, 2014). However, until now, it was not possible to trace a more accurate temporal range for the origin of the crown group Crocodylia. The presence of *Portugalosuchus* in the Cenomanian of Europe, being the sister taxon to all other non-gavialoid crocodylians, indicates that the most likely origin of Crocodylia was during the Early Cretaceous, with a divergence from Gavialoidea before or during the Early Cenomanian.

The presence of the first eusuchians and crocodylians in Europe points to a more plausible European origin for both clades. Therefore, the discovery of the new taxon indicates a Laurasian origin for Eusuchia before the Barremian, probably in Europe, and that the common ancestor of all crocodylians evolved during the Early Cretaceous around the Tethys Sea (Holliday & Gardner, 2012; Rabi & Sebök, 2015) or the Protoatlantic Ocean, with a later divergence that began before the Late Cenomanian. Then, the first crocodylians dispersed throughout Europe and North America, resulting in the main lineages of Crocodylia. In order to test all these hypotheses, further studies, including palaeobiogeographic analyses, are necessary.

CONCLUSIONS

Portugalosuchus azenhae, described here, is the only well-documented and currently valid eusuchian species for the Cenomanian of Europe. Moreover, except for the Barremian Hylaeochampsa vectiana, Portugalosuchus azenhae is the oldest known occurrence of an eusuchian crocodylomorph so far.

The results of the phylogenetic analysis place this taxon within Crocodylia, as the sister taxon to all other non-gavialoid crocodylians. *Portugalosuchus* is also the only Late Cenomanian Crocodylia known for Portugal and, until now, the oldest member of the group worldwide. However, due to the low support in its phylogenetic position, a placement outside of Crocodylia should not be ruled out.

Morover, this taxon presents a series of novel features related to the shape and position of the external mandibular fenestra, which provide new clues on the evolution of this structure throughout Eusuchia. According to our analyses, the morphology of this fenestra in *Portugalosuchus* is very likely to represent the ancestral condition for Crocodylia.

Palaeobiogeographically, the age of this taxon indicates a pre-Cenomanian or Cenomanian origin for Crocodylia, around the Tethys Sea or the Protoatlantic Ocean, probably in Europe. Therefore, the discovery of this new taxon sheds light on the origin of Eusuchia and Crocodylia and helps fill a gap in the crocodylomorph fossil record during the Cretaceous.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Eduardo Puértolas Pascual is the recipient of a postdoctoral grant (SFRH/BPD/116759/2016) funded by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT-MCTES). The authors wish to thank, most especially, the precious contribution of Dr Matilde Azenha, head of the Portuguese Teachers Association of Biology and Geology (APPBG), for the donation of the crocodylian remains to the paleontological collections of the Museum of Lourinhã, as well as for field-work support and later collaboration. We also thank László Makádi from the Magyar Állami Földtani Intézet (Hungary), Zoltán Szentesi, Márton Szabó and Attila Ősi from the Magyar Természettudományi Múzeum (Hungary), Vlad Codrea from the Babes-Bolyai University (Romania) and José Ignacio Canudo from the Museo de Ciencias Naturales de la Universidad de Zaragoza (Spain) for access to specimens in their care. We thank Joana Bruno for the illustrations, Allan O'Connor and Marco Marzola for editing of the manuscript, and Christopher Brochu for the comments on the specimen. We thank Pedro Godoy and the anonymous reviewer for all their comments that have improved the article. Many thanks to Alexandra Fernandes for editing the text in English.

REFERENCES

- Adams TL. 2013. A new neosuchian crocodyliform from the Lower Cretaceous (Late Aptian) twin mountains formation of North-Central Texas. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 33: 85–101.
- Adams TL. 2014. Small crocodyliform from the Lower Cretaceous (Late Aptian) of Central Texas and its systematic relationship to the evolution of Eusuchia. *Journal of Paleontology* 88: 1031–1049.
- Adams TL, Polcyn MJ, Mateus O, Winkler DA, Jacobs LL. 2011. First occurrence of the long-snouted crocodyliform *Terminonaris* (Pholidosauridae) from the woodbine formation (Cenomanian) of Texas. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 31: 712–716.
- Andrade MB, Edmonds R, Benton MJ, Schouten R. 2011. A new Berriasian species of *Goniopholis* (Mesoeucrocodylia, Neosuchia) from England, and a review of the genus. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* **163**(s1): S66–S108.
- Antunes MT. 1961. Tomistoma lusitanica, crocodilien du Miocéne du Portugal. Revista da Faculdade de Ciências de Lisboa, Série 2 9: 5–88.
- Antunes MT. 1967. Um mesosuquiano do liasico de tomar (Portugal). Memorias dos Serviços Geologicos de Portugal, Nova Série 13: 1–66.
- Antunes MT. 1975. Iberosuchus, crocodile sebecosuchien nouveau, l'Eocène ibérique au nord de la Chaîne central, et l'origine du canyon de Nazaré. Comunicações dos Serviços Geologicos de Portugal 59: 285–330.

- Antunes MT. 1987. Affinities and taxonomical status of Miocene longirostrine crocodilians from Western Europe with remarks on phylogeny, paleoecology, and distribution. *Comunicações dos Serviços Geológicos de Portugal* 73: 49–58.
- **Antunes MT. 1994.** On Western Europe Miocene gavials (Crocodylia), their paleogeography, migrations and climatic significance. *Comunicações do Instituto Geológico e Mineiro* **80:** 57–69.
- Antunes MT, Mateus O. 2003. Dinosaurs of Portugal. Comptes Rendus Palevol 2: 77–95.
- Azenha MO. 2003. Trabalho de campo em Paleobiologia uma abordagem didáctica com alunos do 7º ano de escolaridade. Unpublished MsC Thesis, Coimbra.
- Azenha M, Oliveira T, Callapez PM. 2006. Trabalho de campo em Paleobiologia: aplicado a alunos do 7º ano de escolaridade. *Revista de Educação* 14: 95–124.
- Azenha M, Oliveira T, Callapez PM. 2008. Trabalho de campo em Paleontologia: propostas de actividades para alunos do 7º Ano. In: Callapez PM, Rocha RB, Cunha L, Marques JF, Dinis PM, eds. A terra conflitos e ordem. livro de homenagem ao Professor António Ferreira Soares. Coimbra: Museu Mineralógico e Geológico da Universidade de Coimbra, 361–372.
- Barrois C, Guerne J. 1878. Description de quelques espèces nouvelles de la Craie de l'est du bassin de Paris. Annales de la Société Géologique du Nord 5: 42–64.
- Barroso-Barcenilla F, Callapez PM, Ferreira Soares A, Segura M. 2011. Cephalopod associations and depositional sequences from the Upper Cenomanian and Lower Turonian of the Iberian Peninsula (Spain and Portugal). *Journal of Iberian Geology* 37: 9–28.
- Benton MJ, Clark JM. 1988. Archosaur phylogeny and the relationships of the Crocodylia. In: Benton MJ, ed. *The phyl*ogeny and classification of the tetrapods, Vol. 1: amphibians, reptiles, birds. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 295–338.
- Benton MJ, Csiki Z, Grigorescu D, Redelstorff R, Sander PM, Stein K, Weishampel DB. 2010. Dinosaurs and the island rule: the dwarfed dinosaurs from Hateg Island. *Palaeogeography*, *Palaeoclimatology*, *Palaeoecology* **293**: 438–454.
- Berthou PY. 1984. Albian–Turonian stage boundaries and subdivisions in the Western Portuguese Basin, with special emphasis on the Cenomanian–Turonian boundary in the ammonite facies and rudist facies. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of Denmark* 33: 41–55.
- **de Blainville HM. 1835.** *Système d'Herpetologie*. Paris: Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle.
- Blanco A, Puértolas-Pascual E, Marmi J, Vila B, Sellés AG. 2014. *Allodaposuchus palustris* sp. nov. from the upper cretaceous of fumanya (South-Eastern Pyrenees, Iberian Peninsula): systematics, palaeoecology and palaeobiogeography of the enigmatic allodaposuchian crocodylians. *PloS One* **9:** e115837.
- Blanco A, Fortuny J, Vicente A, Luján ÀH, García-Marçà JA, Sellés AG. 2015. A new species of *Allodaposuchus* (Eusuchia, Crocodylia) from the maastrichtian (Late Cretaceous) of Spain: phylogenetic and paleobiological implications. *PeerJ* 3: e1171.

- **Brochu CA. 1997.** Fossils, morphology, divergence timing, and the phylogenetic relationships of *Gavialis*. *Systematic Biology* **46**: 479–522.
- Brochu CA. 1999. Phylogenetics, taxonomy, and historical biogeography of Alligatoroidea. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 19(S2): 9–100.
- Brochu CA. 2000. Borealosuchus (Crocodylia) from the Paleocene of big bend national park, Texas. Journal of Paleontology 74: 181–187.
- **Brochu CA. 2003.** Phylogenetic approaches toward crocodylian history. *Annual Review of Earth and Planetary Sciences* **31:** 357–397.
- **Brochu CA. 2004.** A new Late Cretaceous gavialoid crocodylian from Eastern North America and the phylogenetic relationships of thoracosaurs. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **24:** 610–633.
- Brochu CA. 2011. Phylogenetic relationships of *Necrosuchus* ionensis Simpson, 1937 and the early history of caimanines. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 163(S1): S228–S256.
- Brochu CA, Wagner JR, Jouve S, Sumrall CD, Densmore LD. 2009. A correction corrected: consensus over the meaning of crocodylia and why it matters. *Systematic Biology* 58: 537–543.
- Brochu CA, Parris DC, Grandstaff BS, Denton Jr RK, Gallagher WB. 2012. A new species of *Borealosuchus* (Crocodyliformes, Eusuchia) from the Late Cretaceous–Early Paleogene of New Jersey. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 32: 105–116.
- Bronzati M, Montefeltro FC, Langer MC. 2012. A specieslevel supertree of crocodyliformes. *Historical Biology* 24: 598–606.
- Bronzati M, Montefeltro FC, Langer MC. 2015. Diversification events and the effects of mass extinctions on crocodyliformes evolutionary history. *Royal Society Open Science* 2: 140385.
- Buffetaut E, Lauverjat J. 1978. Un Crocodilien d'un type particulier dans le Cénomanien de Nazaré (Portugal). Comptes Rendus sommaires de la Société Géologique de France 2: 79-82.
- Buffetaut E, Pouit D. 1994. Restes de dinosaures et de crocodiliens dans le Crétacé Supérieur du centre-ouest de la France. Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences. Série 2 – Sciences de la terre et des planètes 319: 253–259.
- **Buscalioni AD, Vullo R. 2008.** Three steps in the cretaceous evolution of crocodylomorpha: example from barremian to maastrichtian diversity in the iberian peninsula, and what about mid-cretaceous gap. Mid-mesozoic life and environments. *Documents des Laboratoires de Géologie de Lyon* **164**: 29–32.
- Buscalioni AD, Ortega F, Pérez-Moreno BP, Evans SE. 1996. The Upper Jurassic maniraptoran theropod *Lisboasaurus estesi* (Guimarota, Portugal) reinterpreted as a crocodylomorph. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 16: 358–362.
- **Buscalioni AD, Ortega F, Vasse D. 1997.** New crocodiles (Eusuchia: Alligatoroidea) from the Upper Cretaceous of Southern Europe. *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des*

Sciences, Series IIA, Earth and Planetary Science **325**: 525–530.

- **Buscalioni AD, Ortega F, Vasse D. 1999.** The Upper Cretaceous crocodilian assemblage from Laño (North-Central Spain): implications in the knowledge of the finicretaceous European faunas. *Estudios del Museo de Ciencias Naturales de Alava* 14: 213–233.
- **Buscalioni AD, Ortega F, Weishampel DB, Jianu CM. 2001.** A revision of the crocodyliform *Allodaposuchus precedens* from the Upper Cretaceous of the Hateg Basin, Romania. Its relevance in the phylogeny of Eusuchia. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **21:** 74–86.
- Buscalioni AD, Pérez-Moreno BP, Sanz JL. 2003. Pattern of biotic replacement in modern crocodiles during the Late Cretaceous. *Coloquios de Paleontología* 1: 77–93.
- Buscalioni AD, Piras P, Vullo R, Signore M, Barbera C. 2011. Early eusuchia crocodylomorpha from the vertebraterich plattenkalk of Pietraroia (Lower Albian, Southern Apennines, Italy). Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 163: S199–S227.
- **Buscalioni AD, Alcalá L, Espílez E, Mampel L. 2013.** European Goniopholididae from the Early Albian Escucha formation in Ariño (Teruel, Aragón, Spain). *Revista Española de Paleontología* **28:** 103–122.
- Callapez PM. 1992. Estudo paleoecológico dos calcários de trouxemil (Cenomaniano–Turoniano) na região entre a Mealhada e Condeixa-a-Nova (Portugal Central). Unpublished MsC Thesis, Coimbra: University of Coimbra.
- **Callapez PM. 1998.** Estratigrafia e Paleobiologia do Cenomaniano-Turoniano. O significado do eixo da Nazaré-Leiria-Pombal. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Coimbra: University of Coimbra.
- Callapez PM. 1999. The Cenomanian–Turonian of the Western Portuguese basin: stratigraphy and palaeobiology of the central and Northern sectors. Lisbon: European Paleontological Association Workshop, Field Trip B.
- Callapez PM. 2003. The Cenomanian-Turonian transition in West Central Portugal: ammonites and biostratigraphy. *Ciências da Terra* 15: 53-70.
- **Callapez PM. 2004.** Cenomanian palaeogeographic evolution and ecostratigraphy from the Northern sectors of the West Portuguese carbonate platform. In: Pena dos Reis R, Callapez P, Dinis P, eds. 23rd IAS Meeting of Sedimentology, **75**.
- Callapez PM. 2008. Palaeobiogeographic evolution and marine faunas of the Mid-cretaceous Western Portuguese carbonate plataform. *Thalassas* 24: 29–52.
- Callapez PM, Barroso-Barcenilla F, Cambra-Moo O, Ortega F, Pérez-García A, Segura M, Torice A. 2014.
 Fossil assemblages and palaeoenvironments in the cenomanian vertebrate site of nazaré (West-Central Portugal). Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie-Abhandlungen 273: 179–195.
- Callapez PM, Barroso-Barcenilla F, Soares AF, Segura M, Santos VF. 2017. On the co-occurrence of *Rubroceras* and *Vascoceras* (Ammonoidea, Vascoceratidae) in the upper cenomanian of the West Portuguese carbonate platform. *Cretaceous Research* 88: 325–336.

- Capellini G. 1890. Sul cocodrilliano gavialoide (*Tomistoma calaritanus*) scoperto nella collina di Cagliari nel 1868. *Memoria della Regia Accademia dei Lincei* 6: 507–533.
- **Choffat PL. 1898.** Recueil d'études paléontologiques sur la Faune crétacique du portugal, Vol. ii les ammonées du bellasien, des couches à Neolobites vibrayeanus, du turonien et du sénonien. Lisbonne: Section des Travaux Géologiques du Portugal.
- **Choffat PL. 1900.** Recueil de monographies stratigraphiques sur le système Crétacique du Portugal – deuxième étude – le Crétacé Supérieur au nord du tage. Lisbonne: Direction des Services Géologiques du Portugal.
- **Clark JM. 1986.** *Phylogenetic relationships of the crocody lomorph archosaurs.* Unpublished PhD Thesis, Chicago: University of Chicago, Department of Anatomy.
- Clark JM. 1994. Patterns of evolution in Mesozoic crocodyliformes. In: Fraser N, Sues HD, eds. The shadow of the dinosaurs: Early Mesozoic tetrapods. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 84–97.
- **Clark JM, Norell MA. 1992.** The Early Cretaceous crocodylomorph *Hylaeochampsa vectiana* from the wealden of the Isle of Wight. *American Museum Novitates* **3032:** 1–19.
- Cope ED. 1870. Synopsis of the extinct batrachia, Reptilia and Aves of North America. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, New Series* 14:1–252
- **Coquand H. 1862.** Géologie et paléontologie de la région sud de la province de Constantine, **Vol. 1**. Marseille: Arnaud.
- Csiki-Sava Z, Buffetaut E, Ősi A, Pereda-Suberbiola X, Brusatte SL. 2015. Island life in the Cretaceous-faunal composition, biogeography, evolution, and extinction of landliving vertebrates on the Late Cretaceous European archipelago. *ZooKeys* **469**: 1–161.
- Delfino M, Smith T. 2012. Reappraisal of the morphology and phylogenetic relationships of the middle Eocene alligatoroid *Diplocynodon deponiae* (Frey, Laemmert, and Riess, 1987) based on a three-dimensional specimen. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 32: 1358–1369.
- **Delfino M, Martin JE, Buffetaut E. 2008a.** A new species of *Acynodon* (Crocodylia) from the Upper Cretaceous (Santonian-Campanian) of Villaggio del Pescatore, Italy. *Palaeontology* **51:** 1091–1106.
- Delfino M, Codrea V, Folie A, Dica P, Godefroit P, Smith T. 2008b. A complete skull of *Allodaposuchus precedens* nopcsa, 1928 (Eusuchia) and a reassessment of the morphology of the taxon based on the Romanian remains. *Journal* of Vertebrate Paleontology 28: 111–122.
- Dinis JL, Rey J, Cunha PP, Callapez PM, Reis RP. 2008. Stratigraphy and allogenic controls on the Western Portugal Cretaceous: an updated synthesis. *Cretaceous Research* 29: 772–780.
- Efimov MB. 1982. A two-fanged crocodile from the upper cretaceous in Tadzhikistan. *Paleontological Journal* 1982: 103–105.
- Fara E, Benton MJ. 2000. The fossil record of Cretaceous tetrapods. *Palaios* 15: 161–165.
- Fechner R. 2003. Die Wirbeltierfauna (Fische, Schildkröten, Krokodile, Pterosaurier und Dinosaurier) aus dem Jura/

kreide-grenzbereich von Porto Dinheiro (Portugal). Unpublished MsC Thesis, Berlin: Freie Universität.

- Frederickson JA, Cohen JE, Hunt TC, Cifelli RL. 2017. A new occurrence of *Dakotasuchus kingi* from the late cretaceous of Utah, USA, and the diagnostic utility of postcranial characters in crocodyliformes. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* 62: 279–286.
- Gervais P. 1871. Remarques sur les reptiles provenant des calcaires lithographiques de Cerin. *Comptes Rendus Académie Sciences, Paris* 73: 603–607.
- Goloboff PA, Catalano SA. 2016. TNT version 1.5, including a full implementation of phylogenetic morphometrics. *Cladistics* 32: 221–238.
- Gray JE. 1831. Synopsis reptilium; or short description of the species reptiles. London: Treuttel, Wurtz, and Co.
- Hall PM, Portier KM. 1994. Cranial morphometry of New Guinea crocodiles (*Crocodylus novaeguineae*): ontogenetic variation in relative growth of the skull and an assessment of its utility as a predictor of the sex and size of individuals. *Herpetological Monographs* 8: 203–225.
- Haq BU. 2014. Cretaceous eustasy revisited. Global and Planetary Change 113: 44–58.
- Hart MB, Hannant K, Price GD, Fisher JK, Monteiro JF, Callapez PM, Watkinson MP. 2005. Micropalaeontology and stratigraphy of the Cenomanian–Turonian boundary in the lusitanian basin, Portugal. *Journal of Iberian Geology* 31: 311–326.
- Hay OP. 1930. Second bibliography and catalogue of the fossil vertebrata of North America. *Carnegie Institute Wash Publications* 390: 1–1074.
- Holliday CM, Gardner NM. 2012. A new eusuchian crocodyliform with novel cranial integument and its significance for the origin and evolution of crocodylia. *PloS One* 7: e30471.
- Hua S, Buffetaut E, Legall C, Rogron P. 2007. Oceanosuchus boecensis n. gen, n. sp., a marine pholidosaurid (Crocodylia, Mesosuchia) from the lower cenomanian of normandy (Western France). Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France 178: 503–513.
- Huxley TH. 1875. On *Stagonolepis robertsoni*, and on the evolution of the crocodilia. *Quarterly Journal of the Geological Society* **31**: 423–438.
- Jonet S. 1970. Considérations préliminaires sur des vertébrés cénomaniens des environs de lisbonne. Boletim da Sociedade Geológica de Portugal 17: 177–180.
- Jonet S. 1981. Contribution à l'étude des vertébrés du crétacé portugais et spécialement du cénomanien de l'estremadure. Comunicações dos Serviços Geológicos de Portugal 67: 191–306.
- **de Kay JE. 1842.** Zoology of New York. Albany: White & Visscher.
- Kennedy WJ. 1984. Ammonite faunas and the 'standard zones' of the Cenomanian to the Maastrichtian stages in their type areas, with some proposals for the definition of stage boundaries by ammonites. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of Denmark* 33: 147–161.
- Krebs B, Schwarz D. 2000. The crocodiles from the guimarota mine. In: Martin T, Krebs B, eds. *Guimarota*. A Jurassic ecosystem. München, Germany: Verlag Dr. Friedrich Pfeil, 69–75.

- Kubo T, Shibata M, Naksri W, Jintasakul P, Azuma Y. 2018. The earliest record of Asian Eusuchia from the Lower Cretaceous Khok Kruat formation of NorthEastern Thailand. *Cretaceous Research* 82: 21–28.
- Lambe LM. 1907. On a new crocodilian genus and species from the judith river formation of Alberta. *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* 4: 219–244.
- Lauverjat J. 1982. Le Crétacé Supérieur dans le Nord du Bassin Occidental Portugais. Unpublished PhD Thesis, Paris: Université Pierre et Marie Curie.
- Lee YN. 1997. The archosauria from the woodbine formation (Cenomanian) in Texas. *Journal of Paleontology* 71: 1147–1156.
- Le Loeuff J. 1991. Les vertébrés maastrichtiens du Mas d'Azil (Ariège, France): étude préliminaire de la collection Pouech. *Revue de Paléobiologie* 10: 61–67.
- Maddison WP, Maddison DR. 2018. Mesquite: a modular system for evolutionary analysis. Version 3.40 http://mesquiteproject.org
- Mannion PD, Benson RBJ, Carrano MT, Tennant JP, Judd J, Butler RJ. 2015. Climate constrains the evolutionary history and biodiversity of crocodylians. *Nature Communications* 6: 8438.
- Mantell G. 1822. The fossils of the South Downs, or illustrations of the geology of Sussex. London: Lupton Relfe.
- Martin JE. 2007. New material of the late cretaceous globidontan Acynodon iberoccitanus (Crocodylia) from Southern France. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 27: 362–372.
- Martin JE. 2010. Allodaposuchus Nopsca, 1928 (Crocodylia, Eusuchia), from the Late Cretaceous of Southern France and its relationships to Alligatoroidea. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 30: 756–767.
- Martin JE, Buffetaut E. 2008. Crocodilus affuvelensis matheron, 1869 from the Late Cretaceous of Southern France: a reassessment. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 152: 567–580.
- Martin JE, Delfino M. 2010. Recent advances in the comprehension of the biogeography of Cretaceous European eusuchians. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 293: 406–418.
- Martin JE, Case JA, Jagt WM, Schulp AS, Mulder EWA. 2005. A new European marsupial indicates a Late Cretaceous high-latitude transatlantic dispersal route. Journal of Mammalian Evolution 12: 495–511.
- Martin JE, Smith T, Lapparent de Broin F, Escuillié F, Delfino M. 2014. Late Palaeocene eusuchian remains from Mont de Berru, France, and the origin of the alligatoroid *Diplocynodon*. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* **172**: 867–891.
- Martin JE, Delfino M, Garcia G, Godefroit P, Berton S, Valentin X. 2016. New specimens of Allodaposuchus precedents from France: intraspecific variability and the diversity of European late cretaceous eusuchians. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society 176: 607–631.
- Mateus O. 2006. Late Jurassic dinosaurs from the Morrison formation, the Lourinhã and Alcobaça formations (Portugal), and the Tendaguru beds (Tanzania): a comparison. *New*

Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin **36**: 223–231.

- Mateus O. 2008. Checklist for Late Jurassic reptiles and amphibians from Portugal. *Livro de Resumos do X Congresso Luso-Espanhol de Herpetologia* 52.
- Mateus O. 2013. Crocodylomorphs from the Mesozoic of Portugal and a new skull of eusuchian from the Late Cretaceous. Abstract Book of Hwaseong International Dinosaurs Expedition Symposium, South Korea 66–68.
- Mateus I, Mateus H, Antunes MT, Mateus O, Taquet P, Ribeiro V, Manuppella G. 1998. Upper Jurassic theropod dinosaur embryos from Lourinhã (Portugal). *Memórias da Academia das Ciências de Lisboa* 37: 101–110.
- Mateus O, Araújo R, Natário C, Castanhinha R. 2011. A new specimen of the theropod dinosaur *Baryonyx* from the Early Cretaceous of Portugal and taxonomic validity of suchosaurus. *Zootaxa* 2827: 54–68.
- Mehl MG. 1941. Dakotasuchus kingi, a crocodile from the Dakota of Kansas. Journal of the Scientific Laboratories, Denison University 36: 47–65.
- Meyer von H. 1837. Mittheilungen, an Professor Bronn gerichtet. Neues Jahrbuch für Mineralogie, Geognosie, Geologie und Petrefakten-Kunde 1837: 557–562.
- Montefeltro FC, Larsson HC, França, MA, Langer MC. 2013. A new neosuchian with Asian affinities from the Jurassic of North-Eastern Brazil. *Naturwissenschaften* 100: 835–841.
- Mook CC. 1959. A new species of fossil crocodile of the genus Leidyosuchus from the green river beds. American Museum Novitates 1933: 1–6.
- Müller S. 1838. Waarnemingen over de indische krokodillen en beschrijving van Eene nieuwe Soort. *Tijdschrift voor Natuurlijke Geschiedenis en Physiologie* 5: 61–87.
- Narváez I, Brochu CA, Escaso F, Pérez-García A, Ortega F. 2015. New crocodyliforms from South-Western Europe and definition of a diverse clade of European late cretaceous basal eusuchians. *PloS One* 10: e0140679.
- Narváez I, Brochu CA, Escaso F, Pérez-García A, Ortega F. 2016. New Spanish Late Cretaceous eusuchian reveals the synchronic and sympatric presence of two allodaposuchids. *Cretaceous Research* **65**: 112–125.
- **Nessov LA. 1982.** Drevneishie mlekopitaiushchie SSSR [Ancient mammals of the USSR]. *Palyentologicheskogo Obshchyestva* **25:** 228–243.
- Nopcsa FB. 1928. Palaeontological notes on Reptilia. 7. Classification of the Crocodilia. Geologica Hungarica, Series palaeontologica 1:75-84.
- **Norell MA, Clark JM. 1990.** A reanalysis of *Bernissartia* fagesii, with comments on its phylogenetic position and its bearing on the origin and diagnosis of the Eusuchia. *Bulletin* de l'Institut Royal des Sciences Naturelles de Belgique Sciences de la Terre **60:** 115–128.
- d'Orbigny A. 1840–1942. Paléontologie Française: description zoologique et géologique de tous les animaux mollusques et rayonnés fossiles de France. terrains crétacés. Cephalopods, Vol. 1. Paris: A. Bertrand.

- d'Orbigny A. 1850. Prodrome de paléontologie stratigraphique universelle des animaux mollusques et rayonnés faisant suite au cours élémentaire de paléontologie et de géologie stratigraphiques, 2. Paris: Masson.
- **Osborn HF. 1904.** Teleorhinus browni, a teleosaur in the Fort Benton. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History **20:** 239–240.
- Ösi A, Clark JM, Weishampel DB. 2007. First report on a new basal eusuchian crocodyliform with multicusped teeth from the upper cretaceous (Santonian) of Hungary. *Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie-Abhandlungen* 243: 169–177.
- **Owen R. 1842.** On British fossil reptiles. *Reports of the British* Association for the Advancement of Science **11:** 60–204.
- **Owen R. 1874.** Monograph on the fossil reptilia of the Wealden and Purbeck formations. (*Hylaeochampsa*). *Palaeontographical Society Monographs* **27**(S6): 1–7.
- **Pereda-Suberbiola X. 2009.** Biogeographical affinities of Late Cretaceous continental tetrapods of Europe: a review. *Bulletin de la Société géologique de France* **180**: 57–71.
- Persson PO. 1959. Reptiles from the Senonian (U. Cret.) of Scania (S. Sweden). Arkiv för Mineralogi Och Geologi 2: 431–478.
- Platt SG, Rainwater TR, Thorbjarnarson JB, Finger AG, Anderson TA, McMurry, ST. 2009. Size estimation, morphometrics, sex ratio, sexual size dimorphism, and biomass of morelet's crocodile in Northern Belize. *Caribbean Journal* of Science **45**: 80–93.
- Pol D, Norell MA. 2004a. A new crocodyliform from Zos canyon, Mongolia. American Museum Novitates 3445: 1–36.
- **Pol D, Norell MA. 2004b.** A new gobiosuchid crocodyliform taxon from the Cretaceous of Mongolia. *American Museum Novitates* **3458:** 1–31.
- **Pol D, Apesteguia S. 2005.** New araripesuchus remains from the Early Late Cretaceous (Cenomanian–Turonian) of Patagonia. *American Museum Novitates* **3490:** 1–38.
- **Pol D, Turner AH, Norell MA. 2009.** Morphology of the Late Cretaceous crocodylomorph *Shamosuchus djadochtaensis* and a discussion of neosuchian phylogeny as related to the origin of Eusuchia. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History* **324:** 1–103.
- **Prieto-Marquez A, Wagner JR. 2009.** Pararhabododon isonensis and Tsintaosaurus spinorhinus: a new clade of lambeosaurine hadrosaurids from Eurasia. Cretaceous Research **30**: 1238–1246.
- Pritchard AC, Turner AH, Allen ER, Norell MA. 2012. Osteology of a North American goniopholidid (*Eutretauranosuchus delfsi*) and palate evolution in neosuchia. *American Museum Novitates* 3783: 1–56.
- Puértolas E, Canudo JI, Cruzado-Caballero P. 2011. A new crocodylian from the Late Maastrichtian of Spain: implications for the initial radiation of crocodyloids. *PloS One* 6: e20011.
- **Puértolas-Pascual E, Canudo J, Moreno-Azanza M. 2014.** The eusuchian crocodylomorph *Allodaposuchus subjuniperus* sp. nov., a new species from the latest Cretaceous (Upper Maastrichtian) of Spain. *Historical Biology* **26:** 91–109.
- Puértolas-Pascual E, Blanco A, Brochu CA, Canudo JI. 2016. Review of the Late Cretaceous–Early Paleogene

crocodylomorphs of Europe: extinction patterns across the K–PG boundary. *Cretaceous Research* **57:** 565–590.

- **Rabi M, Sebök N. 2015.** A revised Eurogondwana model: Late Cretaceous notosuchian crocodyliforms and other vertebrate taxa suggest the retention of episodic faunal links between Europe and Gondwana during most of the cretaceous. *Gondwana Research* **28:** 1197–1211.
- Ricqlès A, Mateus O, Antunes MT, Taquet P. 2001. Histomorphogenesis of embryos of Upper Jurassic theropods from Lourinhã (Portugal). Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences-Series IIA - Earth and Planetary Science 332: 647–656.
- Ribeiro V, Mateus O. 2012. Chronology of the Late Jurassic dinosaur faunas, and other reptilian faunas, from Portugal. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology Program and Abstracts* 32: 161.
- Russo J, Mateus O, Balbino A, Marzola M. 2014. Crocodylomorph eggs and eggshells from the Lourinhã fm. (Upper Jurassic), Portugal. *Comunicações Geológicas* 101(Especial I): 563-566.
- Russo J, Mateus O, Marzola M, Balbino A. 2017. Two new ootaxa from the Late Jurassic: the oldest record of crocodylomorph eggs, from the lourinhã formation, Portugal. *PloS One* **12**: e0171919.
- Salisbury SW, Naish D. 2011. Crocodilians. In: Batten DJ, ed. *English Wealden fossils*. London: The Palaeontological Association, 305–369.
- Salisbury SW, Molnar RE, Frey E, Willis PMA. 2006. The origin of modern crocodyliforms: new evidence from the cretaceous of Australia. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 273: 2439–2448.
- Sauvage HE. 1897–98. Vertébrés fossiles du Portugal. contribution à l'étude des poissons et des reptiles du jurassique et du crétacique. Lisbonne: Commissão do Serviço Geológico de Portugal.
- Schwarz D. 2002. A new species of *Goniopholis* from the Upper Jurassic of Portugal. *Palaeontology* **45**: 185–208.
- Schwarz D, Fechner R. 2004. Lusitanisuchus, a new generic name for Lisboasaurus mitracostatus (Crocodylomorpha: Mesoeucrocodylia), with a description of new remains from the Upper Jurassic (Kimmeridgian) and Lower Cretaceous (Berriasian) of Portugal. Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences 41: 1259–1271.
- Schwarz D, Fechner R. 2008. The first dentary of Lisboasaurus (Crocodylomorpha, ?Mesoeucrocodylia) from the Lower Cretaceous (Barremian) of uña, cuenca province, Spain. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 28: 264–268.
- Schwarz D, Salisbury SW. 2005. A new species of *Theriosuchus* (Atoposauridae, Crocodylomorpha) from the Late Jurassic (Kimmeridgian) of Guimarota, Portugal. *Géobios* 38: 779–802.
- Seiffert J. 1970. Oberjurassische lacertilier aus der kohlengrube guimarota bei leiria (Mittel Portugal). Unpublished Inaugural-Dissertation, Berlin: Freie Universität.
- Seiffert J. 1973. Upper Jurassic lizards from Central Portugal. Memórias dos Servicos Géologicos de Portugal (N.S.) 22: 7–88.
- Sereno PC, Larsson HCE, Sidor CA, Gabo B. 2001. The giant crocodyliform *Sarcosuchus* from the Cretaceous of Africa. *Science* 294: 1516–1519.

- Soares AF. 1966. Estudo das formações Pós-Jurássicas da região de entre sargento-mor e montemor-o-velho (Margem direita do Rio Mondego). *Memórias e Notícias* 62: 1–343.
- Soares AF. 1972. Contribuição para o estudo do Cretácico em Portugal (O Cretácico Superior da Costa d'Arnes). *Memórias e Notícias* 74: 1–56.
- Soares AF. 1980. A Formação carbonatada na região do baixomondego. Comunicações dos Serviços Geológicos de Portugal 66: 99–109.
- Soares AF, Marques AF. 1973. Os equinídeos Cretácicos da região do Rio Mondego (estudo sistemático). Memórias e Notícias 75: 1–45.
- Spath LF. 1926. On new ammonites from the English chalk. Geological Magazine 63: 77–83.
- Stromer E. 1925. Ergebnisse der Forschungsreisen Prof. E. Stromers in den Wüsten Ägyptens, II: Wirbeltier-Reste der Baharije-Stufe (Unterestes Cenoman), 7: Stomatosuchus inermis Stromer, ein schwach bezahnter krokodilier. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftliche Abteilung 30: 1–9.
- Stromer E. 1933. Ergebnisse der Forschungsreisen Prof. E. Stromers in den Wüsten Ägyptens. 12: Die Procölen Crocodilia. Abhandlungen. Abhandlungen der Bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften Mathematischnaturwissenschaftliche Abteilung Neue Folge 15: 1–55.
- Sues HD, Averianov A. 2009. A new basal hadrosauroid dinosaur from the Late Cretaceous of Uzbekistan and the early radiation of duck-billed dinosaurs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society Biological Sciences* 267: 2549–2555.
- **Tennant JP, Mannion PD. 2014.** Revision of the Late Jurassic crocodyliform *Alligatorellus*, and evidence for allopatric speciation driving high diversity in Western European atoposaurids. *PeerJ* **2**: e599.
- **Tennant JP, Mannion PD, Upchurch P. 2016.** Evolutionary relationships and systematics of Atoposauridae (Crocodylomorpha: Neosuchia): implications for the rise of Eusuchia. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* **177**: 854–936.
- Torices A, Barroso-Barcenilla F, Cambra-Moo O, Pérez-García A, Segura M. 2012. Palaeontological and palaeobiogeographical implications of the new Cenomanian vertebrate site of Algora, Guadalajara, Spain. Cretaceous Research 37: 231–239.
- Turner AH. 2006. Osteology and phylogeny of a new species of Araripesuchus (Crocodyliformes: Mesoeucrocodylia) from the Late Cretaceous of Madagascar. Historical Biology 18: 255–369.

- **Turner AH. 2015.** A review of *Shamosuchus* and *Paralligator* (Crocodyliformes, Neosuchia) from the Cretaceous of Asia. *PloS One* **10:** e0118116.
- **Turner AH, Buckley GA. 2008.** *Mahajangasuchus insignis* (Crocodyliformes: Mesoeucrocodylia) cranial anatomy and new data on the origin of the eusuchian-style palate. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **28:** 382–408.
- Turner AH, Pritchard AC. 2015. The monophyly of Susisuchidae (Crocodyliformes) and its phylogenetic placement in Neosuchia. *PeerJ* 3: e759.
- Turner AH, Sertich JJ. 2010. Phylogenetic history of Simosuchus clarki (Crocodyliformes: Notosuchia) from the Late Cretaceous of Madagascar. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 6(s1): 177–236.
- Vianna A, Morais A. 1945. Sur un crâne de crocodile fossile découvert dans le Miocene de Lisbonne. Boletim da Sociedade Geológica de Portugal 4: 161–171.
- Vullo R, Neraudeau D. 2008. Cenomanian vertebrate assemblages from SouthWestern France: a new insight into the European Mid-Cretaceous continental fauna. *Cretaceous Research* 29: 930–935.
- Vullo R, Bernárdez E, Buscalioni AD. 2009. Vertebrates from the Middle?-Late Cenomanian la Cabaña formation (Asturias, Northern Spain): palaeoenvironmental and palaeobiogeographic implications. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 276: 120-129.
- Walker AD. 1970. A revision of the Jurassic reptile Hallopus victor (Marsh), with remarks on the classification of crocodiles. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences 257: 323–372.
- Williston SW. 1906. American amphicoelian crocodiles. The Journal of Geology 14: 1–17.
- Wu XC, Brinkman DB. 2015. A new crocodylian (Eusuchia) from the uppermost Cretaceous of Alberta, Canada 1. Canadian Journal of Earth Sciences 52: 590-607.
- Wu XC, Russell AP, Cumbaa S. 2001. Terminonaris (Archosauria: Crocodyliformes): new material from Saskatchewan, Canada, and comments on its phylogenetic relationships. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 21: 492–514.
- **Wu XB, Xue H, Wu LS, Zhu JL, Wang RP. 2006.** Regression analysis between body and head measurements of Chinese alligators (*Alligator sinensis*) in the captive population. *Animal Biodiversity and Conservation* **29:** 65–71.
- Young MT, Tennant JP, Brusatte SL, Challands TJ, Fraser NC, Clark ND, Ross DA. 2016. The first definitive Middle Jurassic atoposaurid (Crocodylomorpha, Neosuchia), and a discussion on the genus *Theriosuchus*. *Zoological journal of the Linnean Society* **176**: 443–462.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's web-site.

Figure S1. Detail of the dentition and occlusion pattern of *Allodaposuchus precedens* (PSMUBB V 438). The arrows indicate the position of the occlusion pits. Abbreviations: mx, maxilla; n, nasal; pmx, premaxilla. Grey colour represents broken surfaces.

Figure S2. Detail of the preorbital region of *Allodaposuchus precedens* (PSMUBB V 438). The black arrow marks posterior process of maxilla. Abbreviations: fr, frontal; la, lachrimal; mx, maxilla.; na, nasal; pfr, prefrontal. Grey colour represents broken surfaces.

Figure S3. Different degrees of closure of the supratemporal fenestra. A, *Agaresuchus subjuniperus*; B, *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum*; C, *Allodaposuchus precedens*; D, *Caiman yacare*; E, *Osteolaemus osborni*; F, *Melanosuchus niger*; G, *Paleosuchus trigonatus*; H, *Paleosuchus palpebrosus*; I, *Iharkutosuchus makadii*. Scale bar = 5 cm.

Figure S4. Ventral view of *Allodaposuchus precedens* holotype (MAFI Ob3131), exhibiting the capitate process orientation and the exit for the cranial nerve in different coronal planes. Abbreviations: cap, capitate process; olf, olfactory nerve exit. Grey colour represents broken surfaces.

Figure S5. Ventral view of *Agaresuchus subjuniperus* holotype (MPZ 2012/288). Interpretation of the right choanal margin. Abbreviations: cho, choana.

Figure S6. Posterior view showing the relationships between basioccipital, basisphenoid and pterygoid in: A, *Agaresuchus subjuniperus* holotype (MPZ 2012/288); B, *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum* holotype (MPZ 2011/184); C, *Alligator mississippiensis*; D, *Crocodylus porosus*. Abbreviations: bo, basioccipital; bs, basisphenoid; pt, pterygoid. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Figure S7. Ventral view of *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum* holotype (MPZ 2011/184). The black arrow marks the real suture between the palatine and the pterygoid. Abbreviations: pa, palatine; pa-pt, palatine–pterygoid contact suture; pt, pterygoid. Grey colour represents broken surfaces.

Figure S8. Lateral view of the left (A) and right (B) otic regions of *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum* holotype (MPZ 2011/184). The white lines show where the posterior otic area is eroded. Abbreviations: q, quadrate; qj, quadratojugal; sq, squamosal.

Figure S9. Posterior view of the occipital region of *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum* holotype (MPZ 2011/184) showing the ducts of the pneumatic system within the parietal and the lateral carotid foramen laterally opened to the basisphenoid. Abbreviations: bs, basisphenoid; car fo, duct of the carotid foramen.

Figure S10. Medial view of the left mandible of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM V 2012.29.1). Abbreviations: ar, articular; fae, foramen aerum; fo, anterior perforation for mandibular ramus of cranial nerve V; sp, splenial.

Figure S11. Dorsal view of the left mandible of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM V 2012.29.1) showing a greater coronoid–angular contact at the lateral margin of the Meckelian fossa, location of the foramen aerum and a linear and anteroposteriorly oriented surangular–articular suture. Abbreviations: an, angular; ar, articular; den, dentary; cor, coronoid; fae, foramen aerum; sp, splenial.

Figure S12. Dorsal view of the skull holotype of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM 2006.52.1) showing the length/ width ratio of the external naris with black lines.

Figure S13. Ventral view of the skull of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM 2006.53.1). The red areas represent depressions and the yellow areas represent elevations. Abbreviations: bo, basioccipital; ch, choana; ect, ectop-terygoid; exo, exoccipital; lsf, laterosphenoid; mef, median eustachian foramen; mx, maxilla; pa, palatine; pmx, premaxilla; pt, pterygoid; q, quadrate; qj, quadratojugal. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)

Figure S14. Lateral (A) and posterior (B) views of the skull of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM 2006.54.1) showing the relations of the cranioquadrate passage. Abbreviations: cqp, cranioquadrate passage; exo, exoccipital; fae, foramen aerum; q, quadrate; qj, quadratojugal; sq, squamosal

Figure S15. Posterior view of the skull of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM 2006.53.1). Abbreviations: bo, basioccipital; bs, basisphenoid; bs tub, basioccipital tubera; exo., exoccipital; exo pro, exoccipital ventral process; fae, foramen aerum; fm, foramen magnum; pt, pterygoid; q, quadrate; sq, squamosal, su, supraoccipital.

Figure S16. Phylogenetic relationships of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* based on the matrix of Narváez *et al.* (2016). Strict consensus tree of 4464 most parsimonious cladograms with 789 evolutionary steps. Numbers of each node indicate the Bremer support and the bootstrap frequencies over 50%.

Figure S17. Phylogenetic relationships of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* when the taxon is forced outside Crocodylia, based on the matrix of Narváez *et al.* (2016). Strict consensus cladogram (790 steps).

Figure S18. Phylogenetic relationships of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* when we consider that *Portugalosuchus* lacks external mandibular fenestra, based on the matrix of Narváez *et al.* (2016). Strict consensus cladogram (788 steps). Numbers of each node indicate the Bremer support and the bootstrap frequencies over 50%.

Figure S19. Phylogenetic relationships of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* based on the matrix of Turner (2015). Strict consensus tree of 660 most parsimonious cladograms with 1659 evolutionary steps. Numbers of each node indicate the Bremer support and the bootstrap frequencies over 50%. Crown group Crocodylia in blue colour.

Figure S20. Maximum-parsimony reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez *et al.* (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow ?$).

Figure S21. Maximum-parsimony reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez *et al.* (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow 0$).

Figure S22. Maximum-parsimony reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez *et al.* (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow 1$).

Figure S23. Maximum-likelihood-Mk1 reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez *et al.* (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow ?$).

Figure S24. Maximum-likelihood-Mk1 reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez *et al.* (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow 0$).

Figure S25. Maximum-likelihood-Mk1 reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez *et al.* (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow 1$).

Figure S26. Pictures of *Portugalosuchus* during the laboratory preparation work. Ventral (A) and lateral (B) views of ML1818, below, the same pictures with coloured bones differentiating the skull (in red) and the mandible (in blue). Thick black arrows show the slight rotation of the mandible. Abbreviations: ang, angular; emf, external mandibular fenestra; den, dentary; sur, surangular; ju, jugal; la, lachrymal; mx, maxilla; pfr, prefrontal; po, post-orbital; q, quadrate; qj, quadratojugal; sq, squamosal.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

A new eusuchian crocodylomorph from the Cenomanian (Late Cretaceous) of Portugal reveals novel implications on the origin of Crocodylia

Supplementary Information from the article:

Octávio Mateus, Eduardo Puértolas-Pascual, Pedro M Callapez; A new eusuchian crocodylomorph from the Cenomanian (Late Cretaceous) of Portugal reveals novel implications on the origin of Crocodylia, *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*, , zly064, <u>https://doi.org/10.1093/zoolinnean/zly064</u>

1) Comments and modifications on the anatomical characters of basal eusuchians from the original matrix of Narváez et al. (2016).

2) Modifications and new taxa on the original matrix of Narváez et al. (2016).

3) Cladistic analyses based on the matrix of Narváez et al. (2016).

4) Synapomorphies of the main involved clades based on the matrix of Narváez et al. (2016).

5) Modifications and new taxa on the original matrix of Turner (2015).

6) Cladistic analysis based on the matrix of Turner (2015).

7) Synapomorphies of the main involved clades based on the matrix of Turner (2015).

8) Reconstruction of ancestral states of character.

9) State of preservation of the specimen ML1818.

10) References.

1) Comments and modifications on the anatomical characters of basal eusuchians from the original matrix of Narváez et al. (2016)

Several character scorings of some taxa belonging to Allodaposuchidae and Hylaeochampsidae have been modified after first-hand observation of several specimens, such as *Allodaposuchus precedens*, *Arenysuchus*, *Agaresuchus subjuniperus* and *Iharkutosuchus*. These changes are detailed and justified below.

Changes in Allodaposuchus precedens

Character 92 (2 to 0): All dentary teeth occlude lingual to maxillary teeth (0) or occlusion pit between seventh and eighth maxillary teeth; all other dentary teeth occlude lingually (1) or dentary teeth occlude in line with maxillary toothrow (2).

The specimen PSMUBB V 438 shows occlusion pits placed lingually to the toothrow (Fig. S1), exhibiting an overbite rather than interfingering in the dentition. Except for the position between the sixth and seventh maxillary teeth where an interalveolar pit is located.



Figure S1. Detail of the dentition and occlusion pattern of *Allodaposuchus precedens* (PSMUBB V 438). The arrows indicate the position of the occlusion pits. Abbreviations: mx., maxilla; n., nasal; pmx., premaxilla. Grey color represents broken surfaces.

Character 128 (? to 1): Lacrimal makes broad contact with nasal; no posterior process

of maxilla (0) or maxilla with posterior process within lacrimal (1) or maxilla with posterior process between lacrimal and prefrontal (2) or prefrontal extending an anterior process that separates the nasal from the lacrimal (3). State of character (3) from Aguilera *et al.* (2006).

In PSMUBB V 438, a posterior process of maxilla, within the left lachrymal, is observed (Fig. S2).



Figure S2. Detail of the preorbital region of *Allodaposuchus precedens* (PSMUBB V 438). The black arrow marks posterior process of maxilla. Abbreviations: fr., frontal; la., lachrimal; mx., maxilla.; na., nasal; pfr., prefrontal. Grey color represents broken surfaces.

Character 131 (? to 0): Anterior tip of frontal (0) forms simple acute point or (1) or forms broad, complex sutural contact either with the nasals or prefrontals. State of character (1) modified by Salas-Gismondi *et al.* (2015).

In PSMUBB V 438, the anterior process of the frontal forms an acute tip (Fig. S2).

Character 152 (1 to 0): Supratemporal fenestra with fossa; dermal bones of skull roof do not overhang rim at maturity (0) or dermal bones of skull roof overhang rim of

supratemporal fenestra near maturity; fenestrae small, with a circular or nearly circular shape (1) or supratemporal fenestra closes during ontogeny (2) or dermal bones of skull roof overhang rim of supratemporal fenestra near maturity; fenestrae large, significantly longer than wide, with an oval shape (3). State of character (3) from Cidade *et al.* (2017). This character has also been changed from state 1 to 0 in *Lohuecosuchus, Agaresuchus* and *Arenysuchus*; and from state 1 to 2 in *Paleosuchus*. The small overlap observed in Allodaposuchidae (Fig. S3A-C) cannot be considered to be the same state as observed in caimans, *Osteolaemus* and other taxa, such as *Voay* and *Baryphracta*. In these latter taxa, the dermal bones surrounding the fenestra (squamosal, parietal, postorbital) have laminae that clearly project over (and even hiding) the supratemporal fossa (Fig. S3D-F). We have also changed this scoring in *Paleosuchus* (from 1 to 2), since the supratemporal fenestra of this taxon is closed during ontogeny, as it is in *Iharkutosuchus* (Fig. S3G-I).



Figure S3. Different degrees of closure of the supratemporal fenestra. A. Agaresuchus subjuniperus; B. Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum; C. Allodaposuchus precedens; D. Caiman yacare; E. Osteolaemus osborni; F. Melanosuchus niger; G. Paleosuchus

trigonatus; H. Paleosuchus palpebrosus; I. Iharkutosuchus makadii. Scale bar = 5 cm.

Character 166 (0 to 1): Capitate process of laterosphenoid oriented laterally (0) or anteroposteriorly (1) toward midline.

The capitate process was originally coded as laterally oriented in *A. precedens*. Indeed, the lateral branch of the capitate process in *A. precedens* seems to be laterally oriented (as in most eusuchians). However, the original description of this character by Brochu (1997) refers to the relationship between this lateral branch and the exit of the olfactory nerve. In most eusuchians (including *A. precedens*), the exit of the olfactory nerve is anteriorly placed in relation to the capitate process (Fig. S4). While in a few taxa such as gavialoids, the exit of the olfactory nerve and the capitate process are in the same coronal plane.



Figure S4. Ventral view of *Allodaposuchus precedens* holotype (MAFI Ob3131), exhibiting the capitate process orientation and the exit for the cranial nerve in different coronal planes. Abbreviations: cap., capitate process; olf., olfactory nerve exit. Grey color represents broken surfaces.

Changes in Agaresuchus subjuniperus

Character 124 (? to 0): Posterior rim of internal choana not deeply notched (0) or deeply notched (1).

Although the choana is not well preserved in *A. subjuniperus*, the right margin is conserved (Fig. S5), and the notch present in caimans is not observed.



Figure S5. Ventral view of *Agaresuchus subjuniperus* holotype (MPZ 2012/288). Interpretation of the right choanal margin. Abbreviations: cho., choana.

Character 152 (1 to 0): Supratemporal fenestra with fossa; dermal bones of skull roof do not overhang rim at maturity (0) or dermal bones of skull roof overhang rim of supratemporal fenestra near maturity (1) or supratemporal fenestra closes during ontogeny (2).

This change of character is justified in the A. precedens section.

Character 173 (1 to 0): Basisphenoid not broadly exposed ventral to basioccipital at maturity; pterygoid short ventral to median eustachian opening (0) or basisphenoid exposed as broad sheet ventral to basioccipital at maturity; pterygoid tall ventral to median eustachian opening (1).

The basisphenoid is not broadly exposed and the pterygoid is short ventral to the median eustachian opening (Fig. S6A), presenting less exposure than what is observed in most alligatoroids (Fig. S6C).



Figure S6. Posterior view showing the relationships between basioccipital, basisphenoid and pterygoid in A. *Agaresuchus subjuniperus* holotype (MPZ 2012/288); B. *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum* holotype (MPZ 2011/184); C. *Alligator mississippiensis*; D. *Crocodylus porosus*. Abbreviations: bo., basioccipital; bs., basisphenoid; pt., pterygoid. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article).

Changes in Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum

Character 79 (? to 0): Teeth and alveoli of maxilla and/or dentary circular in cross-section (0), or posterior teeth laterally compressed (1), or all teeth compressed (2).

Although most of the teeth have not been preserved, *Arenysuchus* retains three teeth and most of the dental alveoli, so that the circular shape of the alveoli can be determined with certainty.

Character 118 (? to 1): Palatine-pterygoid suture nearly at (0) or far from (1) posterior angle of suborbital fenestra.

Although on the left side the suture cannot be determined due to poor preservation, on the right side the palatine-pterygoid suture is visible and clearly not placed in the most posterior angle of the suborbital fenestra (Fig. S7).



Figure S7. Ventral view of *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum* holotype (MPZ 2011/184). The black arrow marks the real suture between the palatine and the pterygoid. Abbreviations: pa., palatine; pa-pt., palatine - pterygoid contact suture; pt., pterygoid. Grey color represents broken surfaces.

Character 132 (? to 0): Ectopterygoid extends along medial face of postorbital bar (0) or stops abruptly ventral to postorbital bar (1).

As in *A. subjuniperus*, the sutures in this area are not well marked, but an ascending process of the ectopterygoid on the medial side of the postorbital bar can be observed.

Character 148 (0 to ?): Quadrate and squamosal not in contact on the external surface of the skull, posteriorly to the external auditory meatus (0) or quadratosquamosal suture
extends dorsally along posterior margin of the external auditory meatus (1) or extends only to the caudoventral corner of the external auditory meatus (2).

The posterior region of the external auditory meatus is not well preserved (Fig. S8), therefore this character and the **character 149 (0 to ?)** cannot be codified.



Figure S8. Lateral view of the left (A) and right (B) otic regions of *Arenysuchus* gascabadiolorum holotype (MPZ 2011/184). The white lines show where the posterior otic area is eroded. Abbreviations: q., quadrate; qj., quadratojugal; sq., squamosal.

Character 152 (1 to 0): Supratemporal fenestra with fossa; dermal bones of skull roof do not overhang rim at maturity (0) or dermal bones of skull roof overhang rim of supratemporal fenestra near maturity (1) or supratemporal fenestra closes during ontogeny (2).

This modification is justified in the A. precedens section.

Character 158 (0 to ?): Mature skull table with broad curvature; short posterolateral squamosal rami along paroccipital process (0) or with nearly horizontal sides; significant posterolateral squamosal rami along paroccipital process (1).

As most of the posterior region of the skull in *Arenysuschus* is partially eroded, the posterior extension of the squamosals and its relation with the paroccipital processes cannot be determined.

Character 167 (? to 0): Parietal with recess communicating with pneumatic system (0) or solid, without recess (1).

Due to damage in the occipital region, several ducts that could correspond with the pneumatic system of the parietal can be observed (Fig. S9).



Figure S9. Posterior view of the occipital region of *Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum* holotype (MPZ 2011/184) showing the ducts of the pneumatic system within the parietal and the lateral carotid foramen laterally opened to the basisphenoid. Abbreviations: bs., basisphenoid; car fo., duct of the carotid foramen.

Character 170 (? to 1): External surface of basioccipital ventral to occipital condyle oriented posteroventrally (0) or posteriorly (1) at maturity.

Part of the right basioccipital has been preserved (Fig. S6B) and a posterior orientation can be determined.

Character 173 (1 to ?): Basisphenoid not broadly exposed ventral to basioccipital at maturity; pterygoid short ventral to median eustachian opening (0) or basisphenoid exposed as broad sheet ventral to basioccipital at maturity; pterygoid tall ventral to median eustachian opening (1).

Although part of this area of the occipital region has been preserved (Fig. S6B), the exposure of the basisphenoid cannot be safely determined.

Changes in Iharkutosuchus makadii

Probably because the codings for *Iharkutosuchus* proposed by Narváez *et al*. (2016) are mainly based on the original codings of Ösi *et al*. (2007), and some new cranial

elements were discovered after the Ösi *et al.* (2007) publication, we have been able to codify many characters that originally appeared as (?).

Character 52 (? to 0): Splenial with anterior perforation for mandibular ramus of cranial nerve V (0) or lacks anterior perforation for mandibular ramus of cranial nerve V (1).

In the best preserved mandible MTM V 2012.29.1, the splenial has an anterior perforation for the mandibular ramus of cranial nerve V (Fig. S10).



Figure S10. Medial view of the left mandible of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM V 2012.29.1). Abbreviations: ar., articular; den., fae., foramen aerum; fo., anterior perforation for mandibular ramus of cranial nerve V; sp., splenial.

Character 53 (? to 0): Mandibular ramus of cranial nerve V exits splenial anteriorly only (0) or splenial has singular perforation for mandibular ramus of cranial nerve V posteriorly (1) or splenial has double perforation for mandibular ramus of cranial nerve V posteriorly (2).

No perforations are observed on the medial surface of the splenial (Fig. S10).

Character 54 (? to 0): Splenial participates in mandibular symphysis; splenial symphysis adjacent to no more than five dentary alveoli (0) or splenial excluded from mandibular symphysis; anterior tip of splenial passes ventral to Meckelian groove (1) or splenial excluded from mandibular symphysis; anterior tip of splenial passes dorsal to Meckelian groove (2) or deep splenial symphysis, longer than five dentary alveoli; splenial forms wide 'V' within symphysis (3) or deep splenial symphysis, longer than five dentary alveoli; splenial forms alveoli; splenial constricted within symphysis and forms narrow 'V' (4).

In the specimen MTM V 2012.29, the splenial shows a small participation in the symphysis, being adjacent to about 2 or 3 alveoli.

Character 57 (? to 0): Inferior process of coronoid overlaps strongly over inner surface of Meckelian fossa (0) or remains largely on medial surface of mandible (1).

Although the coronoid has not been preserved in MTM V 2012.29, the contact surfaces with the angular can be observed. The contact area between the coronoid and the angular is much more developed in the lateral margin of the Meckelian fossa (Fig. S11), therefore *Iharkutosuchus* would present the state 0.



Figure S11. Dorsal view of the left mandible of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM V 2012.29.1) showing a greater coronoid - angular contact at the lateral margin of the Meckelian fossa, location of the foramen aerum and a linear and anteroposteriorly oriented surangular - articular suture. Abbreviations: an., angular; ar., articular; den., dentary; cor., coronoid; fae., foramen aerum; sp., splenial.

Character 69 (? to 0): Lingual foramen for articular artery and alveolar nerve perforates surangular entirely (0) or perforates surangular/angular suture (1).

In the specimen MTM V 2012.29, this foramen can be observed and perforates the surangular entirely.

Character 70 (? to 0): Foramen aerum at extreme lingual margin of retroarticular process (0) or set in from margin of retroarticular process (1).

In the specimen MTM V 2012.29, the foramen can be distinguished and located at the lingual margin of retroarticular process (Fig. S11).

Character 71 (1 to 0): Retroarticular process projects posteriorly (0) or projects posterodorsally (1).

Probably, this character was originally codified with state (1) based on the incomplete specimen MTM V 2006.63.1 published by Ösi et al. (2007), from which the retroarticular process was interpreted. Nevertheless, taking into account the more complete specimen MTM V 2012.29, the retroarticular process is posteriorly projected

(Fig. S10) rather than posterodorsally.

Character 73 (? to 0): Surangular-articular suture oriented anteroposteriorly (0) or bowed strongly laterally (1) within glenoid fossa.

In the specimen MTM V 2012.29, the surangular-articular suture is linear and anteroposteriorly oriented (Fig. S11).

Character 83 (? to 1): Naris circular or keyhole-shaped (0) or wider than long (1) or anteroposteriorly long and prominently teardrop-shaped (2).

Taking into account the holotype MTM 2006.52.1, whose external naris is complete, it can be seen that it is clearly wider than long (Fig. S12).

Character 99 (? to 0): Vomer entirely obscured by premaxilla and maxilla (0) or exposed on palate at premaxillary-maxillary suture (1).

In the holotype MTM 2006.52.1, the palate is entirely preserved and no vomer is observed.

Character 103 (? to 0): Maxillary foramen for palatine ramus of cranial nerve V small or not present (0) or very large (1).

In the holotype MTM 2006.52.1 and in the specimen MTM 2006.53.1, most of the palate region is preserved and there is no foramen for the palatine ramus of the cranial nerve V (Fig. S13).

Character 123 (0 to 2): Pterygoid surface lateral and anterior to internal choana flush with choanal margin (0) or pushed inward anterolateral to choanal aperture (1) or pushed inward around choana to form neck surrounding aperture (2) or everted from flat surface to form neck surrounding aperture (3).

In the specimens MTM 2006.53.1 and MTM 2006.56.1, where the choanal area is best preserved, the choana is associated with a series of depressions resulting in a neck around the aperture (Fig. S13). In the holotype MTM 2006.52.1, these structures are not so obvious.

Character 129 (1 to 0): Prefrontals separated by frontals and nasals (0) or prefrontals meet medially (1).

In the holotype MTM 2006.52.1 and in the specimen MTM 2006.53.1, a wide anterior process of the frontal separates the prefrontals (Fig. S12).



Figure S12. Dorsal view of the skull holotype of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM 2006.52.1) showing the length / width ratio of the external naris with black lines.

Character 135 (? to 0): Ventral margin of postorbital bar flush with lateral jugal surface (0) or inset from lateral jugal surface (1).

In *Iharkutosuchus*, the dorsal margin of the jugal does not present the typical elevation in this area, therefore the postorbital bar insertion is at the same level with the lateral jugal surface.

Character 143 (? to 1): Postorbital neither contacts quadrate nor quadratojugal medially (0) or contacts quadratojugal, but not quadrate, medially (1) or contacts quadrate and quadratojugal at dorsal angle of infratemporal fenestra (2) or contacts quadratojugal with significant descending process (3).

In the specimens MTM 2006.52.1, MTM 2006.53.1, MTM 2006.54.1, MTM 2006.55.1, this contact can be observed, being the quadratojugal the element that contacts the postorbital (Fig. S13).



Figure S13. Ventral view of the skull of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM 2006.53.1). The red areas represent depressions and the yellow areas represent elevations. Abbreviations: bo., basioccipital., ch., choana; ect., ectopterygoid; exo., exoccipital; lsf., laterosphenoid; mef., median eustachian foramen; mx., maxilla; pa., palatine; pmx., premaxilla; pt., pterygoid; q., quadrate; qj., quadratojugal. (For proper interpretation of the coloured sutures and structures in this figure, the reader is referred to the web version of this article).

Character 146 (? to 0): Postorbital-squamosal suture oriented ventrally (0) or passes medially (1) ventral to skull table.

In the specimens MTM 2006.52.1, MTM 2006.53.1, MTM 2006.54.1, MTM 2006.55.1, this contact is visible, being the postorbital-squamosal suture ventrally oriented.

Character 148 (? to 0): Quadrate and squamosal not in contact on the external surface of the skull, posteriorly to the external auditory meatus (0) or quadratosquamosal suture extends dorsally along posterior margin of the external auditory meatus (1) or extends only to the caudoventral corner of the external auditory meatus (2).

Character 149 (? to 0): Posterior margin of otic aperture not defined and gradually merging into the exoccipital (0) or smooth and continuous with the paroccipital process (1) or posterior margin of otic aperture inset (2).

Referring to the characters 148 and 149, the posterior area of the otic aperture is best preserved in MTM 2006.54.1. This specimen shows the typical condition observed in *Hylaeochampsa* and allodaposuchids, with the quadrate and squamosal not in contact posteriorly to the external auditory meatus and the posterior margin of the otic aperture merging into the exoccipital, showing a laterally open cranioquadrate passage, more verticalized and ventrally oriented than in Allodaposuchidae (Fig. S14).

Character 159 (? to 0): Squamosal does not extend (0) or extends (1) ventrolaterally to lateral extent of paroccipital process.

In the specimens where this area is preserved, such as MTM 2006.53.1 and MTM 2006.54.1 (Fig. S14A), the squamosal does not extend to the lateral extent of the paroccipital process.



Figure S14. Lateral (A) and posterior (B) views of the skull of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM 2006.54.1) showing the relations of the cranioquadrate passage. Abbreviations: cqp., cranioquadrate passage; exo., exoccipital; fae., foramen aerum; q., quadrate; qj., quadratojugal; sq., squamosal

Character 168 (? to 0): Significant ventral quadrate process on lateral braincase wall (0) or quadrate-pterygoid suture linear from basisphenoid exposure to trigeminal foramen (1).

In the specimens MTM 2006.53.1 and MTM 2006.54.1, this sutural contact can be observed in ventrolateral view, and the quadrate sends a ventral process (Fig. S13), with the quadrate-pterygoid suture not linear posterior to the trigeminal foramen.

Character 176 (0 to 2): Exoccipitals terminate dorsal to basioccipital tubera (0) or send robust processes ventrally and participate in basioccipital tubera (1) or send slender processes ventrally to basioccipital tubera (2).

This area is well preserved in the specimen MTM 2006.53.1, and a long ventral extension of the exoccipital to the basioccipital tubera can be observed (Fig. S15).

Character 177 (? to 1): Quadrate foramen aerum on mediodorsal angle (0) or on dorsal surface (1) of quadrate.

Character 178 (? to 0): Quadrate foramen aereum is small (0), comparatively large (1), or absent (2) at maturity.

The region related to characters 177 and 178 is well-preserved in specimens MTM 2006.53.1 and MTM 2006.54.1, in which the foramen aereum is clearly small and dorsally placed (Figs. S14B, 26).

Other minor changes from the original matrix of Narváez et al. (2016)

Eothoracosaurus mississippiensis

Character 63 (0 to ?): External mandibular fenestra absent (0) or present as narrow slit, no discrete fenestral concavity on angular dorsal margin (1) or present with discrete

concavity on angular dorsal margin (2) or present and very large; most of foramen intermandibularis caudalis visible in lateral view (3).

According to Brochu (2004) and Brochu et al. (2012) the presence of the fenestra in this taxon is not certain, and the area where this fenestra is usually placed is broken (see Brochu 2004, Fig, 9).

Purussaurus neivensis

Character 152 (1 to 3): Supratemporal fenestra with fossa; dermal bones of skull roof do not overhang rim at maturity (0) or dermal bones of skull roof overhang rim of supratemporal fenestra near maturity; fenestrae small, with a circular or nearly circular shape (1) or supratemporal fenestra closes during ontogeny (2) or dermal bones of skull roof overhang rim of supratemporal fenestra near maturity; fenestrae large, significantly longer than wide, with an oval shape (3). State of character (3) from Cidade *et al.* (2017).

We have added a new state of character (3), based on the work of Cidade *et al.* (2017), which is applicable to the taxon *P. neivensis*.



Figure S15. Posterior view of the skull of *Iharkutosuchus makadii* (MTM 2006.53.1). Abbreviations: bo., basioccipital; bs., basisphenoid; bs tub., basioccipital tubera; exo., exoccipital; exo pro., exoccipital ventral process; fae., foramen aerum; fm., foramen magnum; pt., pterygoid; q., quadrate; sq., squamosal, su., supraoccipital.

2) Modifications and new taxa on the original matrix of Narváez et al. (2016)

These are the new codes of the taxa modified from the original matrix of Narváez et al. (2016), used in our first analysis.

Allodaposuchus precedens (based on holotype skull table MAFI Ob3131; and complete skull PSMUBB V 438)

Agaresuchus subjuniperus (based on the holotype complete skull MPZ 2012/288)

Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum (based on holotype nearly complete skull MPZ 2011/184 (ELI-1))

Iharkutosuchus makadii (based on holotype nearly complete skull MTM 2006.52.1; and nearly complete skull MTM 2006.53.1; three partial skulls MTM 2006.54.1-2006.56.1; complete left mandible MTM V 2012.29.1; nearly complete right mandible MTM V 2006.63.1; fragmentary mandibles MTM V 2006.59.1, MTM V 2006.61.1, MTM V 2006.64.1, MTM V 2006.70.1, MTM V 2006.71.1, MTM V 2006.72.1, MTM V 2006.74.1; partial maxilla MTM V 2006.57.1; parietal MTM V 2006.67.1; 148 isolated teeth MTM V 2006.80.1)



3) Cladistic analyses based on the matrix of Narváez et al. (2016)

Figure S16. Phylogenetic relationships of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* based on the matrix of Narváez et al. (2016). Strict consensus tree of 4464 most parsimonious cladograms with 789 evolutionary steps. Numbers of each node indicate the Bremer support and the bootstrap frequencies over 50%.



Figure S17. Phylogenetic relationships of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* when the taxon is forced outside Crocodylia, based on the matrix of Narváez et al. (2016). Strict consensus cladogram (790 steps).



Figure S18. Phylogenetic relationships of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* when we consider that *Portugalosuchus* lacks external mandibular fenestra, based on the matrix of Narváez et al. (2016). Strict consensus cladogram (788 steps). Numbers of each node indicate the Bremer support and the bootstrap frequencies over 50%.

4) Sinapomorphies of the main involved clades based on the matrix of Narváez et al. (2016)

In our results Eusuchia is only weakly supported (Bremer = 3; bootstrap < 50%), and it is characterized by the presence of the following unambiguous synapomorphies: procoelous presacral vertebral centra (character 21, state 1); wide and rounded olecranon process of the ulna (character 29, state 1); pterygoid ramus of ectopterygoid bowed, posterolateral margin of fenestra concave (character 119, state 1); non-septate choanae (character 125, state 0); and thin and rod-like posterior cervical neural spines (character 189, state 1).

The clade formed by Crocodylia is poorly supported (Bremer = 1; bootstrap < 50%), and characterized by the following unambiguous synapomorphies: external mandibular fenestra present as narrow slit, no discrete fenestral concavity on angular dorsal margin (character 63, state 1); and exoccipital with small or no boss on the paroccipital process (character 174; state 1).

The position of *Portugalosuchus* is supported by the following unambiguous synapomorphies: absence of a splenial process between the angular and coronoid (character 59, state 1); external mandibular fenestra placed between the dentary and angular without participation of the surangular (character 60, state 2); maxilla broadly separates the ectopterygoid from the maxillary tooth row (character 104, state 1); and braincase wall lateral to the basisphenoid rostrum smooth, without sulcus (character 162, state 1).

5) Modifications and new taxa on the original matrix of Turner (2015)

These are the new codes of the taxa modified from the matrix of Turner (2015), used in our second analysis.

Allodaposuchus precedens (based on holotype skull table MAFI Ob3131; and complete skull neotype PSMUBB V 438)

Lohuecosuchus mechinorum (based on the holotype complete skull MDE/CM-616)

Agaresuchus subjuniperus (based on the holotype complete skull MPZ 2012/288)

Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum (based on holotype nearly complete skull MPZ 2011/184 (ELI-1))

Iharkutosuchus makadii (based on holotype nearly complete skull MTM 2006.52.1; and nearly complete skull MTM 2006.53.1; three partial skulls MTM 2006.54.1-2006.56.1; complete left mandible MTM V 2012.29.1; nearly complete right mandible MTM V 2006.63.1; fragmentary mandibles MTM V 2006.59.1, MTM V 2006.61.1, MTM V 2006.64.1, MTM V 2006.70.1, MTM V 2006.71.1, MTM V 2006.72.1, MTM V 2006.74.1; partial maxilla MTM V 2006.57.1; parietal MTM V 2006.67.1; 148 isolated teeth MTM V 2006.80.1)



6) Cladistic analysis based on the matrix of Turner (2015).

Figure S19. Phylogenetic relationships of *Portugalosuchus azenhae* based on the matrix of Turner (2015). Strict consensus tree of 660 most parsimonious cladograms with 1659 evolutionary steps. Numbers of each node indicate the Bremer support and the bootstrap frequencies over 50%. Crown group Crocodylia in blue color.

7) Sinapomorphies of the main involved clades based on the matrix of Turner (2015).

In this analysis, Eusuchia is moderately supported (Bremer = 3; bootstrap < 50%) and it is characterized by the presence of the following unambiguous synapomorphies: first caudal vertebra biconvex being the other procoelous (character 94, state 1). Also it is characterized by the following ambiguous synapomorphies: nasal contribution to narial border (character 13, state 0); choanal groove undivided (character 69, state 0); cheek teeth constricted at base of crown (character 162, state 1); presence of exposure of supraoccipital in skull roof (character 171, state 1).

The clade formed by Crocodylia is moderately supported (Bremer = 6; bootstrap < 50%) and characterized by the following unambiguous synapomorphies: insertion area for M. pterygoideous posterior extends onto lateral surface of angular (character 76, state 1); rodlike posterior cervical neural spines (character 90, state 1); presence of hypapophyses in cervical vertebrae (character 91, state 1); proximal end of radiale expanded symmetrically, similarly to the distal (character 117, state 0); absence of shallow fossa at anteromedial corner of supratemporal fenestra (character 265, state 1); boss small or absent on paroccipital process, process lateral to cranioquadrate opening long (character 268, state 1). In addition it is characterized by the following ambiguous synapomorphies: primary pterygoidean palate completely encloses choana (character 43, state 1); Prefrontal pillars longitudinally expanded in their dorsal part and columnar ventrally (character 182, state 2).

The position of *Portugalosuchus* is supported by the following unambiguous synapomorphies: postorbital bar transversely flattened (character 26, state 0); jugal portion of postorbital bar, relative to lateral surface of jugal, flush with lateral surface (character 167, state 0). Also it is characterized by the following ambiguous synapomorphies: pterygoid ramus of quadrate with deep groove along ventral edge (character 50, state 1); absence of palpebrals (character 65, state 0); supratemporal fenestrae relatively large, covering most of surface of skull roof (character 68, state 0); lateral surface of the anterior region of surangular and posterior region of dentary with a longitudinal depression (character 118, state 1); dorsally robust splenial posterior to symphysis (character 161, state 1); cheek teeth not constricted at base of crown (character 162, state 0); maxilla broadly separates ectopterygoid from maxillary toothrow (character 264, state 1).

8) Reconstruction of ancestral states of character



Figure S20. Maximum-parsimony reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez et al. (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow ?$).



Figure S21. Maximum-parsimony reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez et al. (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow 0$).



Figure S22. Maximum-parsimony reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez et al. (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow 1$).



Figure S23. Maximum-likelihood-Mk1 reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez et al. (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character 63 \rightarrow ?).



Figure S24. Maximum-likelihood-Mk1 reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez et al. (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow 0$).



Figure S25. Maximum-likelihood-Mk1 reconstruction of ancestral states of character 63 of 4464 most parsimonious trees traced over the strict consensus tree and using our matrix based on Narváez et al. (2016) (*Eothoracosaurus*; character $63 \rightarrow 1$).

9) State of preservation of the specimen ML1818

As can be observed in Figure S26, the block contained a partial skull and mandible in anatomical association. As can be seen in ventral view (Fig. S26A), the mandible is slightly rotated medially at its anterior margin in relation to its original anatomical position. However, in lateral view (Fig. S26B), it is observed that the mandible fits perfectly with the associated skull. Therefore the association of both bones to the same individual is undoubted.



Figure S26. Pictures of *Portugalosuchus* during the laboratory preparation work. Ventral (A) and lateral (B) views of ML1818, below, the same pictures with coloured bones differentiating the skull (in red) and the mandible (in blue). Thick black arrows show the slight rotation of the mandible. Abbreviations: ang., angular; emf., external mandibular fenestra; den., dentary; sur., surangular; ju., jugal; la., lachrymal; mx., maxilla; pfr., prefrontal; po., postorbital; q., quadrate; qj., quadratojugal; sq., squamosal.

10) References

Aguilera OA, Riff D, Bocquentin-Villanueva J. 2006. A new giant *Purussaurus* (Crocodyliformes, Alligatoridae) from the Upper Miocene Urumaco Formation, Venezuela. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 4(3): 221-232.

Brochu CA. 1997. Fossils, morphology, divergence timing, and the phylogenetic relationships of *Gavialis*. *Systematic Biology* 46(3): 479-522.

Brochu CA. 2004. A new Late Cretaceous gavialoid crocodylian from eastern North America and the phylogenetic relationships of thoracosaurs. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 24(3): 610-633.

Brochu CA, Parris DC, Grandstaff BS, Denton Jr RK, Gallagher WB. 2012. A new species of *Borealosuchus* (Crocodyliformes, Eusuchia) from the Late Cretaceous– Early Paleogene of New Jersey. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 32(1): 105-116.

Cidade GM, Solórzano A, Rincón AD, Riff D, Hsiou AS. 2017. A new *Mourasuchus* (Alligatoroidea, Caimaninae) from the late Miocene of Venezuela, the phylogeny of Caimaninae and considerations on the feeding habits of *Mourasuchus*. *PeerJ* 5: e3056.

Narváez I, Brochu CA, Escaso F, Pérez-García A, Ortega F. 2016. New Spanish Late Cretaceous eusuchian reveals the synchronic and sympatric presence of two allodaposuchids. *Cretaceous Research* 65: 112-125.

Ösi A, Clark JM, Weishampel DB. 2007. First report on a new basal eusuchian crocodyliform with multicusped teeth from the Upper Cretaceous (Santonian) of Hungary. *Neues Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie-Abhandlungen* 243(2): 169-177.

Salas-Gismondi R, Flynn JJ, Baby P, Tejada-Lara JV, Wesselingh FP, Antoine PO. 2015. A Miocene hyperdiverse crocodylian community reveals peculiar trophic dynamics in proto-Amazonian mega-wetlands. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 282(1804): 20142490.

Turner AH. 2015. A Review of *Shamosuchus* and *Paralligator* (Crocodyliformes, Neosuchia) from the Cretaceous of Asia. *PloS one* 10(2): e0118116.

xread

342 122

Gracilisuchus stipanicicorum 00?0000000?0???0000?0?0?0000013013?00?0????0?01?01000??1?01???000002002?0? Terrestrisuchus gracilis 000??00??0??0?00000?000?00?000?110?00000?0000?000??0?000?????00????1 0??0?000000?010?0000?02000001301??0110??00000?10100??10?00?110?0?0??[0,1] Dibothrosuchus elaphros 000?00?020??001???000000??????00110000000?00000?00000?00000?0?0102000?0101 00?0010?000?????2000?0?????013011?0110?0?00000101001?10?00?1?000102011100 Protosuchus richardsoni 10001010100001100[1,2,3,4]00?120011010012102101010000[0,1]100000?01??01?? 10010[0,1,2]0101000000???011000000000000001?0000000?0???0000?0100120000 Hemiprotosuchus leali ?00?00?10??????10010?0??00?0010?11?0??01??0020?00?11?1100101??1?3?11??1?2 Orthosuchus stormbergi 21100001201?0001001000[0,1]10000010001000?000?002011001111100??1?1?03011? 0?0?001000100011100000?120010013022142101?10010?000000001?0101000000?00 0?0???00001??0000???1010000001?0?000000?0????00?012?000011110?0001000 Kayenta Form [1,2]01110?1200000?10010?0??00????0???11110?002010011111100001011?3011? 0102100?1010??0????00??0?12001011001212????0????01000?00?01000111?101001? Edentosuchus tienshanensis 2,3]?311????10?01010?????????[2,3,4]???????????????????[2,3]????????00010?? 1?01?1???1000110?11?1????????01??001?1?1?00?????0?????0?0?0?0?????3??0?101?? Zaraasuchus shepardi

zly064_suppl_Appendix 2_Turner.tnt

Sichuanosuchus_shuhanensis

Shantungosuchus_hangjinensis

Zosuchus_davidsoni

Fruitachampsa_callisoni

Notosuchus_terrestris

zly064_suppl_Appendix 2 Turner.tnt ?01030??1?1?????2100?00????11?[1,2]?41421??00?0100211111011??????0?0110?? Malawisuchus mwakasyungutiensis 101?00?11200001[0,1]10001[0,1]111100110001?22110100011??20???1000?10?1?0[2,3]?111[0,1]2?0101110001????1??210000010??011[1,2]2211??01?0???01000101? ? Candidodon itapecuruense Simosuchus clarki 10301011000000120010111110101101021110100011?110111100001001?0301121210 10110000100121?023000202011002021102101?00?101101101202000010100112002110 01201[0,1]021010000101[0,1]00[1,2]011100?[0,1]?0000[0,1]0??11100111101011 ????? Yacarerani boliviensis 101100?1020000??00?0101111?01110010221101000?1???011?1000??0?????13121210 00?10100?????????????????????002212??01?????01201101?1001?000111101101??? ?11????010?000?10[0,1]1001??0?0??0?0000?001010?0[0,2]1110101100001?100000 Sphagesaurus hueni 101?000102??00??100?????110???????21101?00??????011?1000??????13?2???? ????0?100000??1?00?000000???????10??000???0?1????100???0?001????1?0???01? Sphagesaurus montealtensis 101?00?1020000??1000111111?01100010221101000?1??1011?1?0?0?0????0312121??? ?0?1[2,3]000?????????????????????11??01????012111?1?11111?11111?0 101??1?????01??0000?0?100?0?010????0000?0010?000[0,2]?110101100?01?100000 Adamantinasuchus navae

Bretesuchus_bonapartei

zly064_suppl_Appendix 2_Turner.tnt

Libycosuchus brevirostris

Anatosuchus_minor

Araripesuchus_gomesii

Araripesuchus patagonicus

Araripesuchus wegeneri

Araripesuchus_tsangatsangana

201?0011021?00111000101111101100010221101?0011112011?1000010?110201121210

zly064 suppl Appendix 2 Turner.tnt 0011110[0,1]111121?01300010?0???1010[1,2]0021010000101101001??1000?001001 12102000001101?01?1?10010100210[0,1]??00?0?10001100110[0,1]00101011110000 11100100000000100??000?000[0,1]0?100000000?00000000000000?1??00?1010??01 Lomasuchus palpebrosus 201????1221?00111000101111?011000102211010001?112?11?1000010?1??3?212???? 00??0[1,2]11????????????????????????00??00?????0?101??1[0,1]11000011?000 Peirosaurus torminni Hamadasuchus rebouli 20100011220000111000101111?0110001002110100111112011?10100100110?0212???? ????0?3000000?10010000020?00000100?00????100?0?1100???00000?0????0?0?100 Uberabasuchus terrificus Montealtosuchus arrudacamposi 20100001221?00??1000101111?0110001022110100011112?11?1000010?1?0302121110 00??0?3000000?100?0000020?0000001?0?00????100?000110???00?1100??100101100 Trematochampsa 2?[1,2,3]?00?1?2????11??010[1,2]111?011000?01???????1111??11???0000?1? 0??20??3?0???2?????????????1000[1,2]0?0?????00?0?????1????0?10???????0??0? Mahajangasuchus insignis 203?1[1,2]?1021??012110010111100110001002110100101112011?10100101110??212 1110100001111?1121??140000100??01301[1,2]00?10101?01011010?13110010001000 Kaprosuchus saharicus [1,2]03112?1?21?001?11?0101111001100010321101?01???1201111010??????0212 131000111211???????????????????1101300??01?????01001011311010000?0001210 Stolokrosuchus lapparenti 202000011200001110001011110001100101211?1?0?0111201111010010?1?0?021?0???

zly064_suppl_Appendix 2_Turner.tnt

Hsisosuchus_chungkingensis

Pelagosaurus_typus

Steneosaurus_bollensis

Metriorhynchus_superciliosus

Metriorhynchus casamequelai

Cricosaurus araucanensis

zly064 suppl Appendix 2 Turner.tnt 202??????200??11100010011011010011012110100[0,1]01112011?1011010?1?11?302 10020?001?00?????1?????0?01[0,1]22000?0??0?000000????0??00?1010010??01?10 Sokotosuchus ianwilsoni 2?2??21112??10????001001???101001?012?1??????1112?11?1?11??0???1?1?????? Dyrosaurus 202?12?102?010?11??010011??101001?012?101000?1112011?1011?10?101113021??? Hyposaurus rogersii Pholidosaurus purbeckensis 212?121102??1??1110?10011??0010001012110100?01112?11?101??10?100?131[1,2] ??????00???????000?0000102?100????0?0000?0???000?00?10?0?10??01?110?0010?? Sarcosuchus imperator 203?12?10200101?10001001100101001012?10100101?12?1?10100?0?100?131213?? 000210101?112????[0,1]00?1200?00??011[0,1]0??00[0,1]001?0?001??121100??00 000010010?1???00???110?0[0,1,2]11010[0,1]022[0,1]00?0000?000000?00000?00 ?01001000?1?110?0010?0000000?0?0100000?100011110100?0?000100?10????00110 ??? Terminonaris robusta 202?[0,1]2?1020010?11??01001???1010001012?101001??????11?1010??0??0??13[0 ,1][1,2]13?000?2100011112??00000?1200?10??0?110210?1001001001??1??10??0?? 0?0010????1???000011100?0???101[0,1]2[1,2]10?????0?0000?0?0000?0?0001?0?00? ? Elosuchus cherifiensis Meridiosaurus vallisparadisi

Oceanosuchus_boecensis

zly064 suppl Appendix 2 Turner.tnt Vectisuchus leptognathus 202??????????????01?1?011110011?0?002110?001?1?????1????00?0??????[2,3]02 14000001?[1,2]??????????[2,3,4]00?1200?10??00?0021?01???101001??1???00?? ?0?0001202101???00???010?0?11??0?022?0?????000???0?00???0010??01000?11 Paluxysuchus newmani 203???11?20010110100100111010100010021????0?1111201111010000?1?0??31?1?1? Goniopholis simus 203?1211120010111000100111?0010001002?101000?1110011?1010?10?1?021312?410 0[0,1]0[1,2]02011?1??1??0?00?1200?11?300100210010?1101001??101100?0000100 10001?1???00001110003110001022100?10?001000111??0000000101001000011110?00 Goniopholis simus pea2013 203?1211120010111000100111?0010001002?101000?1110011?1010?10?1?021312?410 0[0,1]0202011?1??1??0?00?1200?11?300100210010?1101101??101100?00001001000 1?1???00001110003110001022100?10?001000111??0000000101001000011110?001000000000?0?00000?1?10000[0,1]00000??0?000100?00???????000???????201?0??01 Goniopholis stovalli ????0?000000?1?0000000???0?000100?00?????0?0010?100??000?00010??0000??? Amphicotylus lucasii 203?121111??101?1000100111?001001001?1??000?1110011?10?0???0?1?021312?410 Calsovasuchus valliceps 203?0201110?10?10?01021111001000?001?1???00?1110?11??0?0??0?1?0?11?[1,2] Calsovasuchus new 203?0201110010?110?01021011001000?001?1???00?1110?11??0?0?0?1?0?11????? Sunosuchus junggarensis 203?0201111?10?1100010011110010001002110100011110011110100?0?11011312?410

zly064_suppl_Appendix 2_Turner.tnt

sunosuchusnew

Eutretauranosuchus delfsi

EutreALL

${\tt Eutretaurano such us_amnh}$

Goniopholis_baryglyphaeus

Alligatorium

Theriosuchus pusillus

11101105uclius_Symprestodoli 22122221222222222220111012222222

Theriosuchus guimarotae
zly064 suppl Appendix 2 Turner.tnt 0???0???000?00100?0???000??00000100?00??1?20001?00?????0001000??110000100 Shamosuchus major 213??[1,2]1102??00????0011?1???0010001002?101?01?1?????1?10000?0?1?0??312 10????????????????????????00010?2??1-???0?1?00?11???0?????101???0???1?1000?? ?0??2-???0??0??00?000-100??00000??-0?000100??0?????00?????0?????1??11?0?11 Shamosuchus djadochtaensis 203????10?1??0111000110111000100011021101?0011110?1111000000?110??310?410 0101?1???????1101[3,4]11[0,1][1,3]1?0?10?[0,3]00[1,2,3]002?00[0,1]????010 00??1?11?0?0000000100011101?00000??0?0?10?000021[0,1]?0?1??0?1000?100000? 0?001010010?001?10?0001000200200?10???000?0?100?0??00?00?000001?0?00001?1? Shamosuchus gradilifrons 20301[1,2]11020000??1000110111?001000110211010011111001111000000?110?0312 -1100101020?????21???[2,3,4]000[1,3]1???10-000100??00[0,1]0???01001011111 00-000000100010101000???01000001001021?11-10?0?1000?1100000000010100100 Shamosuchus gradilifronsholo 203012?10???00??10001101???001000110?1???????[2,1]1110011?1000000?1?0?031? -1100101020??????1???[2,3,4]000[1,2]1???10-000100??00[0,1]????01001011?11 ?0-000000100010101?00???010?00001001021?1?-10?0?1?00?110000?0?00?010???0 0???10?0?010??200200?10?0?0000????0000000??0?00000100?00????1000100?????0 Shamosuchus tersus 203??[1,2]?10?0000??10?011?10??001000100?11?1???11110011?1010000?110??31[1,2]???????[1,2]02??????????????????0-0?0?10??000?????10010?1?11?0-000 ?000120010101000???0?????1001021?11-???0?1?00?110??10??0??010?????11?10 Shamosuchus ancestralis shamoancestralis 203??[1,2]11020000??1000110111?0010001002110100[0,1]1111001111010000?110? ?312?110010102??????21???[2,3,4]000[1,3]1???10-000?[0,1]0??0000???010010? 101100-000?000120010101000???0100000?1001021?11-1??0?1000?110?000?0001010 ??? Shamosuchus ulanicus 203???1??2????0??1000110111?0010001002110100[0,1]11110011110100?0?110??312 -1100101?2??????21???[2,3,4]000[1,3]1???10-000?00??00[0,1]0???01001??1111 00-0???0001?0010101000???0100000???01022?11-1??0?10?0?110?000?0001?100100 001?10000010?0200200?10-??000?0-100?0???0?00-00000100?00????10000000?-000 Shamosuchus ulgicus

zly064 suppl Appendix 2 Turner.tnt Rugosuchus nonganensis 203??[1,2]?1?20?00??1??0110111????00011[0,1]2110?000?1110?11?1000000?1?0? ?31??4?0010102???????????????1[1,2]0??0?[0,3]0?100???0????01?01??1?1000 ?0?00??0100?1?1???00???100?0?1?100??2???0?10???10???110000?0?0????0?10000 Batrachomimus pastosbonensis Glen Rose Form 1??????10??13101001022??1?10?0?10?0?1000?000??01?1?010?0?1?1000???000?0?2 ????0?0000000100000000?0?00?00100?00????200011001???101?1000??1?0000100 Bernissartia fagesii 203??21112??00111000?00111?001000?002?????0101112?11?10100?0?1???1?1?410 ??0????1?0??31?100102210?1100001000111??000??0?1??????0??????00???10000??0 Hylaeochampsa vectiana 00???????21???11????1?01???0????0?002?1?1012????0????101??1??1????310???? Iharkutosuchus makadii 203?1211021?0011?10010?111?001?0?1002110101201110011?1010010?110013?0?310 Acynodon iberoccitanus 203-021102??00?210?0100111?0010001002110?012?1110011?10100?0?1?001310-3?? ??00???????00?1?001021?00-0?00?0?0?0-???000-0?1010?1000?1?100?0010-000?0 Acynodon adriaticus 203-02?1020000??10?01001110011000?0021101012?11?0?1??1???0???1?001310-3?0 11?0000?2???????????????!??[1,2]110??0-301100??0??????010000-141?0-??0000001211 1?1???00??000??0???000002110?-???0?0000?0-?000?-?0?1[1,0]10?1000?1110?000 Allodaposuchus precedens 203??2111?0?????1?0?10[0,1]1111001000?00211010120?110011?10000?0?1?00131? 10001?1?1100??????????1001022?01?1??0?1?00?11???0????0?1010?10??0??100000

10?0000??????0?0000000?1?0000000?0??00000100?10?????000110?0????00010?0???1

zly064_suppl_Appendix 2_Turner.tnt

juniperus

Pachycheilosuchus_trinquei

Pietraroiasuchus ormezzanoi

Unasuchus_reginae

Glichristosuchus_palatinus

Susisuchus_anatoceps

Isisfordia duncani

Borealosuchus_formidabilis

Argochampsa_krebsi

zly064 suppl Appendix 2 Turner.tnt [1,2]0?0??00???????????0001022?01?1??0?00?020????0????0???1?010?????1000?? Pristichampsus vorax 200?02?112000011100010111100010001002110??1211112011?10100?0?1?1?1310?3?? ?0?102011?112??0?311?1?????1?3?0100??001??1?1101??1?1100?000000012001010 0?000??[0,1]0??0300100002??01?1000?[0,1]001?1?00?000?001010010???11100000 Eothoracosaurus mississippiensis [1,2]02?1211120010??11?[0,1]100111?0010001002110??1?011?2??1?11????1?0? 131??3100??20000???????[1,2,3,4]111[1,2]1????1?3001002?0?1?0??01?01??12 1100?0000?00100?1?????00????0000010?001022101???????00000???00000?00101?0? Gavialis gangeticus 0012000001112110131112111100?300100210?10010[0,1]?001??121100?0000001000 101?1?00001?00000100001022101?1?0000000[1,2]1??00000?00101001000011100000 1?0000000000?000??00?100010000[1,2]00?0000010010111001011010?00100001 Leidyosuchus canadensis 031000110201???????????????20???10?300100??00??????01001??111100?00000001000 101?1?00???1[0,1]???31?1001022100?1000?1000211??0000?0010100100001?100000 Asiatosuchus germanicus 203?1211120000111000101111?0010001002?10?012111?2?1??1??0????1?0?131003?0 00110?012?1?21??1?11????????300100?10????1101001??1[1,2]1100????00001000 101???000??10000?10?001022?01?1????10?0?11000000?0?1?1001000?11100?0010?0 000?0???0?0000000?1?000000?000?0?000100?00101100010?111?0??000?000001?000 Crocodylus niloticus 10101?00001?0000310?001022101?100011000211??00000001010010000111000001000 Diplocynodon hantonensis 203?1211120010111000101111?0010001002110?01211112011110100?0?110?13100310 0010020111112110131112021110?3001002?001??1?01001??111[0,1]00??000001000 101?1?0000110000310?001022001?10?0?1000?11?00000?00101001000?11100?0010?0 Alligator mississippiensis 203112?102?0001110001021111001000?0021101012111120111101001011110103120310 0010020121112111131112021100?30010021001001001001??111000?00000001000[1,2 10101?000011?0003101001022000?100011000211??00000001010010000111000001000 Portugalosuchus azenhae 20???????????1110001001101001000???2110?012??11?11?11???010?1100?3000???

outgroup Gracilisuchus_stipanicicorum;

ccode + 0 2 5 9 22 36 42.44 48 64 66 68 72 76 78 85 89.90 95.96 103.105 107 125 141.142 148 166 181 196 225*] 4 276 280 322.341;

taxcode - Candidodon_itapecuruense Trematochampsa Stolokrosuchus_lapparenti Vectisuchus_leptognathus Goniopholis_simus_pea2013 Goniopholis_stovalli Calsoyasuchus_new sunosuchusnew Eutretauranosuchus_delfsi Shamosuchus_gradilifronsholo Shamosuchus_tersus Shamosuchus_ancestralis shamoancestralis Shamosuchus_ulanicus Shamosuchus_ulgicus Eutretauranosuchus_amnh Pietraroiasuchus_ormezzanoi Unasuchus_reginae Glichristosuchus palatinus;

hold 80000;

proc/;

zly064_suppl_Appendix 1_Narv+iez.tnt nstates 8 ; xread 'Data saved from TNT' 189 107 Goniopholis simus 0000000?10001?????0?0?00000??0?000?????0000 Theriosuchus pusillus 01100000010003?00000?000000?001?000????0000 Bernissartia fagesii 0?1010?0??00??0????????000?0000?000???00000 Shamosuchus djadochtaensis Pietraroiasuchus ormezzanoi Pachycheilosuchus trinquei Allodaposuchus precedens ?????00010?0000001020000100?100000????00000011010?0???1000?1?1110???01?0? 00001000?10100?????1?101?1001010000???0000? Lohuecosuchus megadontos ?????00011?0100000020011100?000000????0001001001000001100000101110?002110? 0000100001010???????110010?010000???0000? Lohuecosuchus mechinorum ?000?000?10?00???1?????1??00?010000???0010? Agaresuchus fontisensis 0????00110?0010000120000100?000000????00010111010001011000?001110?0021?0? 00001000010100?1?0?1??110010?010000???0000? Agaresuchus subjuniperus 00001000?10?????????1???10000?010000???0010? Arenysuchus gascabadiolorum ?????000?0?0000??00001???0?000???0?0???0?011010000?110000101110????1?00 0??01000?10????0???10?0100??????00????00?0? Acynodon iberoccitanus ?????00010?000001060000100??00100???0000000101?00???200100?0100?110?000 Acynodon adriaticus

zly064_suppl_Appendix 1 Narv+iez.tnt ?00??00010?000?0?10600001?0????110????00?00011010000?1?111?0?0100???0???? Iharkutosuchus makadii 1????00011?0000011061000100??00110????000000100112000120110010100?1?01000 000?12???10002????1?0?100000210110???1010? Hylaeochampsa vectiana 00001010000000????1?001001000?0110?????10? Borealosuchus threeensis ????0??????????????01?????????????????0???20???01002??1?????10?11?00000100 Borealosuchus formidabilis 001??00020?0000?00231000100?00000100000010100100000101002001?11000000?00? 011010100101000??????00100110000000???00001 Borealosuchus wilsoni ??????????????????????1001000000101??00?1?000?20???01002??100?0?00110000020100 0????00020?0?0???02310001?????00001?0?0?0010100100010100200101100?000100? ?111101001010000?00???010011?0?0000???00001 Borealosuchus acutidentatus 0?111010?101000??????010??1?0?0000???0000? Borealosuchus sternbergii 000??00020?00000013100010001000001?0?000001110100010100000111100?000100? 011000100101000000?1?00100110000000???00001 Eothoracosaurus mississippiensi 0????00120?000??1025000010??000000????0000101001000????000?000100???01??? 11100010?001?00??????10001000000???00001 Thoracosaurus neocesariensis ??????????????111?1?010????0011??0??0?0???0???1122???3??????10?000?01?0 1?100010000100000000?00100?10000000???00001 Thoracosaurus macrorhynchus ??????0???0?1111?1?01?????00????0????0???0???1?22???3??????0?1000000110 11101010?0010000???0??0100010000000???0000? Eosuchus minor 11?100100001?0100??1???101010101003???00001 Eosuchus lerichei ?????00120?0000?10250000100?000000???0000101001000001000000?0110?000?0?? 11?2001000010?1???????10?01?101003???00001 Eogavialis africanus 1111001000010100?000??0101010100000???00?01 Piscogavialis_jugaliperforatus

zly064_suppl_Appendix 1 Narv+iez.tnt 11120010000200?0?1?0?0?12??1?10?000????010? Gryposuchus colombianus 11111010000200000100?00121010100000???00101 Gavialis lewisi 111??0?000010000?????00121010100000???00101 Gavialis gangeticus Boverisuchus vorax 021000100101000???01??1100110000002???00001 Boverisuchus magnifrons 0?110010?10100???????????1???10000002???00001 Planocrania hengdongensis ???0?1?00100?0100?????1???1???10?10001???0000? Planocrania datangensis 0?100010010??0?????????????10??0?0????0000? Leidyosuchus canadensis ????0?0?????????????010000011?1??10?0?11??11???0110?00000?0?01?20000001110 0120001001010000001?00100110010001???00001 Deinosuchus riograndensis 1220001001?1000??000?0?????1??100?1???0000? Diplocynodon ratelii 1????00120?00000012300001000101000??0?000000111100010100010111100??101001 0110001011010000001?10100110010001???00001 Diplocynodon hantoniensis 100???1?1?01000010001000011111??1400?101?21???011021010????01120000011110 1????00120?0?000?11300?0100?1010001?0?000000101100010100010111100?110100? 012010101101000??0?1??010011?010001???00001 Diplocynodon muelleri 0????00120?10000012300001000101000????00000111110000010001?1?1100?110??0? 02?01010110100???????0100110010001????000? Diplocynodon tormis ?????0?120??000001230000100?1010001???000000111100?0?100010111100?1101000 01201010110100?0???1?001?0110010001???0000? Diplocynodon darwini 100001001?010000?00010000?1111??1400?101121???011020010??0?01?20000011110 100??00020?0000?01030000100?0??000??0?0000001111?001010001?111100?110100? 022010101101000??????0100110010001???00001

zly064_suppl_Appendix 1_Narv+iez.tnt Baryphracta deponiae 100?0?0?????????????1??????14?0?10??21????1?02??0?????01?20??0??1110 ?????001???000??010300001?0????000?????0001?11000?010001?111100?110100? 0??011?0?101?00?????????????????0001????0001 Brachychampsa montana 101011001?1100???0001??000111100?000?103111???11101101?????01120?00001110 100??00110?0002?11010000100?0010001?0?010000011110010120011111100?110200? 02210010110102000101?00100110010001???00001 Brachychampsa sealevi Stangerochampsa mccabei ????110???010010?0001000001111001000?01??11???111010100????0112110000?110 ?????00110?0002?11020000100?001000????000000011110010120011111100?110200? 0?2100102101000??1?1??0100110010001???00001 Ceratosuchus burdoshi Hassiacosuchus haupti 001?1?0?1??????01?000?1111?????0??11111????11110?0?????01?20????1110 02220010210101???????01???10010001???00001 Navajosuchus mooki 0222?0102101000????1??010??10010001???00001 Allognathosuchus polyodon Allognathosuchus wartheni ????1?0??????????????????0?0000?1111??1000?11???1???1???11111010?100?01121000001110 0222001021010000?1?1?0010011001?001???00001 Procaimanoidea kayi ????110?1??????0???010?00?1111??10?0?112121?????010?1??100?01?21000001110 022200102101010??????0100110010001??????01 Procaimanoidea utahensis 1????10110?0100?01020?00100??01000????0000000?111001011011?111100?1?0200? 02220010?101000??????0100110010001???0000? Arambourgia gaudryi ?????1001??010??010200001?0???10001000??000????11?0??11011?111100?1102?0? Wannaganosuchus brachymanus 0?22001??101000???????10011?010001???00001 Alligator sinensis 1010111017110010100010110111110011000112111110110000120?00101130000011110 0222001021010100011110010011001000111100001 Alligator mississippiensis

zly064 suppl Appendix 1 Narv+iez.tnt Alligator mefferdi 022210102101010??1???00100110010001???0000? Alligator thomsoni 02?21010210101?001?11?0100110010001???0000? Alligator olseni 022200102101010??????00100?1?010001???00001 Alligator mcgrewi 022200102101010?01???00100110010001???00001 Alligator prenasalis 10001?0?1?????10?0?01000011111??1000?112111???11101010?????01120000011110 022200102101000001?1?00100110010001???00001 Eocaiman cavernensis Tsoabichi greenriverensis Paleosuchus trigonatus 100111111?010010100010001111112113000111321120110021222111111120110001100 0222121?21010200010110010011021000110100001 Paleosuchus palpebrosus 0222121?21010200010110010011021000111100001 Purussaurus neivensis 101?100?1?000010?0??1????011???????0?11???1???1??00??1?1010?11130110001100 1????00110?0001?01020000100?0010001?0?0?00000111101211111?111110?110201? 0222031?210102000101??010??10210001???00?0? Orthogenysuchus olseni Mourasuchus atopus ???2111??111?30????1???100110?10001???00?0? Caiman yacare 101111001?100010000010101111110011000111221110110021121010111020110201100 0222011121010300010110010011021000100200001 Caiman crocodilus 101111001?10001000010101111110011000111221110110021121010111020110201100

zly064 suppl Appendix 1 Narv+iez.tnt 0110222011121010300010110010011021000100200001 Caiman latirostris 101110001?10001000001010?111110011000111221210110021121010111?20110201100 0222111121010300010110010011021000100200001 Caiman lutescens ?????1????0??????????????????100?1???0000? Melanosuchus fisheri 0????11??1010????????010??1?2?0001???0000? Melanosuchus niger 101111001?1?0010000010101111110011000111221210110021121010111120110201100 0222111121010300010110010011021000100200001 Brachyuranochampsa eversolei 1????00110?0000110210000100??00000??0?00010011010001010001?111100?????00? 0?221010?101000??????1100010000003???0000? Crocodylus acer ?????00110?0000?10210000100??000001???000100?10100010100010111100?002?01? 01?2001001010001??0??11100010000003????000? Crocodylus depressifrons 01220010010100011001?11100010000003???00001 Crocodylus affinis 0122001001010001??0???1100010000003???00001 Asiatosuchus_germanicus ?00??00010?0000?0001000010???10000??0?00010???010001010000?111100???0100? 012110100101000??????1100?10000003???00001 Prodiplocynodon langi ?????00110?0000??0030000100??100001??000010011?1000101???0?111100???0?0?? 0?21?010?1010001??01?01100110000003???0000? Tomistoma schlegelii 021000001?0010100010110001111110110001013011011122?104000001002000000101 0122101001010001100101111001000000311100001 Tomistoma lusitanica 11221010010100011001??1110010000003???00001 Tovotamaphimaea machikanensis 1??21010?1010????????110010?00003???00001 Gavialosuchus eggenbergensis ?????00120?0000?10240000100??00000????00?0101001000?012000?0?1110?0??????

zly064_suppl_Appendix 1 Narv+iez.tnt 1?221010?10100???????11???10000003???0000? Paratomistoma courtii Tomistoma cairense 0????00?20?0?????025?0??1?0????000??0?000010100100010?00?0?011110???01??? 11?2001001010001??0???11?001?000003???0000? Thecachampsa antiqua 02000000??001010?00011010111?1??11?0?00???1???1122???4?100????2000031?101 ?0???00120?0000110210000100?100000??0?0000101?0100010110000011110???011?? 112200100101010??00???11100100?2003???00001 Tomistoma petrolica Dollosuchoides densmorei 1??20010?1010001??????10?01000?003???00001 Kentisuchus spenceri 0??20010?10100??????111?0?100?0?03???0000? Crocodylus megarhinus 1????00110?0000?0023000010001?0000??0?000000110100010120000111110?002?11? 0122?01001010?01100???1110010000003???0000? Australosuchus clarkae ??????0???????1??0??1?????11??????0?10???1???1110?101?????00120000110101 1????00110?000011021000010001000001?0?000000???????101000?0111110?002011? 02220010010100011??1??11?001000?001???0000? Kambara implexidens ??????0?????????????01?????11????1100?10???1???11102101?????00120000110101 1????00110?000011021000010001000001?010000001001000010100000111110?002011? 01220010010100011101?11110010000001???00001 Trilophosuchus rackhami ?????0?????0??????????????????1000????0?1?000001010???01?0??0111110??120111 Quinkana spp ?????21010?0000?10[02][15]00[01]0?000100000????0?0?????????????1??100?0111?1 Mecistops cataphractus 0122001001010001110101111001000000300?11101 Crocodylus niloticus 101000001?101010001011100111112012000111201101110021010100010120001110101 110010011000000100210000100110000[01]110100[01]00011010001011000011111000 0101110122001001010001110101111001100000301100001 Crocodylus porosus 111000001?00101010101011100011112012000111201101110021010100010120001110101 1100100110000001002100011001100000110100[01]00011010001010000011111000010 1110122001001010001110101111001100000301100001

zly064_suppl_Appendix 1_Narv+iez.tnt Crocodylus rhombifer 001000001?101010001011100111112011000111201101110021010100010120001110101 1100100110000001002101001001100000110100[01]00011010001011000011111000010 1110122001001110001110101111001100000301200001 Euthecodon arambourgii 012210100101100????1??11?0?1000?003???0000? Osteolaemus tetraspis 012211100101100111010111101000000311000001 Osteolaemus osborni 0122111001011001110101111011000000310000001 Voay_robustus 012201100111110?1101?1111001000003???00001 Rimasuchus lloydi ?????00110?0000?00210001100?100000110100000????10??1??1000?111110?001011? 012200100101100111?1??1110?1000?003?????00? Brochuchus pigotti ??????????0?010?00?11??01111??????10???0??11102??1???????2??2??111???1?????00010?0100?002100011000100000????0010101101010001?0?00111110???1?1?? 012210100101100??1?1??1100?10000003???0000? Portugalosuchus azenhae ?????00?????????????????01?0???10001???0?0?011010000?1?0?00000100????1?00 ???01010010??001?0???0?10?1??????0????0000?

;