Reply to: Jaw roll and jaw yaw in early mammals

https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2364-z

Published online: 17 June 2020

Check for updates

Bhart-Anjan S. Bhullar[1,2,6] ✉, Armita R. Manafzadeh[3,6], Juri A. Miyamae[1,2], Eva A. Hoffman[4], Elizabeth L. Brainerd[3], Catherine Musinsky[5] & Alfred W. Crompton[5]

REPLYING TO D. M. Grossnickle *Nature* (2020)

In the accompanying Comment[1], Grossnickle disputes our conclusion[2] that roll-dominated processing is ancestral for therian mammals on the basis of the following assertions: that the surface of the therian talonid basin (Fig. 1a–i) is not homologous to the ancestral cladotherian talonid heel; that the inflected angle in marsupials suggests secondarily increased jaw roll; that the rotational grinding stroke as we describe it might be a passive movement; that the cladotherian angular process (Fig. 1j–s) increases mechanical advantage for yaw instead of for roll; and that the angular process of yaw-processing mammals has expanded instead of vanished.

The principal objection raised by Grossnickle[1] to a cladotherian origin of roll-based processing is that the talonid 'heel' or 'shelf' of the ancestral cladotherian is not homologous to the talonid basin of therians because the inner or lingual cusp that bit into it (which is conventionally known as the paracone) is not homologous to the lingual cusp of therians (the protocone). We contend that the name assigned to the upper cusp is inconsequential, given the underlying structural and functional continuity between the cladotherian paracone and the therian protocone. Every species on the direct line from Cladotheria to Theria had triangular upper molars, the inner vertex of which bit into a shelf or basin attached to the back of the complementary triangle on the lowers[3] (Fig. 1a–i). The name paracone, as currently used, is tied to the identity of the cusp that shears along the posterior face of the trigonid to form the primary trigonid embrasure (Fig. 1a–i, in red; shearing surface 1 in ref. [4]). In early cladotherians, this was the upper lingual cusp[4–6] (Fig. 1c–e), which also contacted or closely approached the talonid. Nearer to Theria, in some early tribosphenidans the anterior labial cusp sheared broadly against the back of the trigonid and is therefore given the name paracone, whereas the lingual cusp—topologically continuous with the cladotherian paracone, but now termed the protocone—maintained its relation to the talonid (Fig. 1f). The embrasure in opossums is again formed by the side of the lingual cusp: surface 4 in ref. [5] and phase I surface of ref. [7] (in which it is shown in hot pink) (Fig. 1i). Therefore, in the topological sense and in the important functional sense of interacting with the talonid, the inner cusp of the ancestral cladotherian upper molar was the antecedent of the inner cusp of the therian molar. Indeed, a comparative survey reveals that the inner cusp is the most conserved feature of the upper molar, and that it is always located below the internal (and largest) of the three roots[8,9] (Fig. 1a–i). In sum, regardless of the name given to the internal cusp, there has been a fundamental continuity: always an inner cusp above and always a platform below (Fig. 1a–i). The talonid as a platform is homologous across cladotherians[10], which calls into question the identification[1,11] of the ancestral cladotherian talonid surface with the therian hypoflexid alone. It is true that the primitive talonid favoured shearing, whereas the therian basin allowed grinding. However, it has previously been observed that mediolateral motion from jaw roll would have increased the efficiency of both kinds of processing[4], which exist as points on a continuum rather than a dichotomy.

With regard to the so-called inflection of the marsupial angle, this phenomenon has previously been found[12] to be little more than an elaboration of a ventral bony lamina known as the pterygoid shelf in stem therians. Muscle attachments are largely the same as in placentals, with the pterygoid shelf extending beneath them, contrary to the accompanying Comment in which attachments are shown to have shifted onto the shelf[1]. Recent studies have found little evidence for a biomechanical explanation, and instead invoke the ontogeny of the middle ear—specifically, an especially intimate or protracted association of the dentary with the ectotympanic[12].

In figure 2 of the accompanying Comment[1], Grossnickle suggests that yaw processing had its origins at Cladotheria and that it is retained in marsupials. He also suggests that roll processing is a marsupial autapomorphy. However, our data[2] show that, although yaw acts to position the teeth for occlusion on the working side of the jaw, yaw is the least important of the three rotational degrees of freedom at the temporomandibular joint. Grossnickle[1] is correct in observing that, in each half chew cycle, *Monodelphis* demonstrates a limited amount of yaw (approximately five degrees), for positioning. However, yaw nearly ceases (save for a highly variable number of small deviations) and roll continues when the jaws are sufficiently closed for food processing to occur (Fig. 2a).

There is a decades-old literature surrounding kinematic observations of mammalian chewing; however, it is often difficult to fully separate roll, yaw and joint translations. Fortunately, kinematic plots based on 'X-ray Reconstruction of Moving Morphology' (XROMM) have recently become available for skunks and raccoons[13]. These eutherians have some specializations for carnivory, but retain a fairly conservative feeding anatomy that includes unfused symphyses. Both taxa roll their jaws extensively, and both show indications of a rotational grinding stroke; this stroke is more erratic in raccoons, which also possess a more derived dentition (Fig. 2b). Neither raccoons nor skunks yaw their jaws during occlusion. During the rest of the chewing cycle, raccoons yaw the jaws by under one degree and skunks yaw the jaws even less (Fig. 2b). The fact that the pattern of chewing—prevalent roll, roll processing and little-to-no yaw—in these eutherians is similar to that in opossums (Fig. 2a, b) contradicts the prediction made by Grossnickle[1]

[1]Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA. [2]Peabody Museum of Natural History, Yale University, New Haven, CT, USA. [3]Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology, Brown University, Providence, RI, USA. [4]Division of Paleontology, American Museum of Natural History, New York, NY, USA. [5]Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA, USA. [6]These authors contributed equally: Bhart-Anjan S. Bhullar, Armita R. Manafzadeh. ✉e-mail: bhart-anjan.bhullar@yale.edu



Fig. 1 | Evolution of mammalian molars and adductor muscles. a–i, Molars. The upper lingual or inner cusp (blue) and lower talonid basin (purple) are broadly conserved in a topological sense. The surface of the primary trigon or trigonid embrasure (red)—the presence of which defines the paracone—is also shown where it has been described as such in the literature; it has been omitted in cases in which occlusion is not explicitly described. Left upper (top) and right lower (bottom) molars in occlusal view redrawn from line art and electronic micrographs in primary descriptions, apart from *Monodelphis*, which is rendered from our computed tomography data. Sources are listed by taxon in Supplementary Information. **a**, *Spalacolestes cretulablatta* (Symmetrodonta: Spalacotheriidae). **b**, *Anebodon luoi* (Symmetrodonta: Zhangheotheriidae). **c**, *Laolestes eminens* (Cladotheria: Dryolestidae). **d**, *Brandonia intermedia* (Cladotheria: Meridiolestida). **e**, *Nanolestes drescherae* (Cladotheria:; Zatheria). **f**, *Pappotherium pattersoni* (Cladotheria: Tribosphenida). **g**, *Holoclemensia texana* (Cladotheria: Theria). **h**, *Alphadon marshi* (Cladotheria: Theria). **i**, *Monodelphis domestica* (Cladotheria: Theria). **j–s**, Adductor muscles. For **j–o**, taxa for which skulls and jaws are available, attachments of the superficial masseter are shown in yellow; attachments of the medial pterygoid are shown in red. Regions in which fibres of both muscles attach are indicated in orange. For **p–s** (taxa drawn after the accompanying Comment[1]), reconstructed actual muscle attachments (pterygoideus; masseter attachments are more difficult to estimate in the absence of a skull) are shown as solid grey lines, and hypothetical attachments in the absence of an angular process are shown as dashed lines. Condyles are marked with stars. Contrary to previous reconstructions[16], the superficial masseter originates broadly along its external contact with the zygomatic. Superficial fibres of the adductor externus in reptiles and the masseter in monotremes have their origin along the entire external surface of the zygomatic with no concentration at the anterior margin; therians show some anterior concentration, but fibres and connective tissue continue to attach along the length of the arch. Therefore, the major component of the muscle force vectors is vertical (for roll) and not horizontal (for yaw). The angular process projects both muscle insertions downward, which increases the mechanical advantage (inlever component) for jaw roll. The derived angular region of yaw-processing omnivores and herbivores (here exemplified by the pig (*Sus*)) represents a dorsal and posterior expansion of attachments, not a further development of the ancestral angular process; muscles attach only to the ventral border of this process. Sources are listed by taxon in Supplementary Information. **j**, The non-mammaliaform cynodont *Brasilodon*. **k**, The non-mammal mammaliaform *Morganucodon*. **l**, The eutriconodontan *Repenomamus*. **m**, The dryolestidan *Necrolestes*. **n**, The carnivoran *Nandinia*. **o**, The artiodactyl *Sus*. **p**, *Amphilestes*. **q**, *Amblotherium*. **r**, *Maotherium*. **s**, *Yanoconodon*.

that roll processing is a marsupial autapomorphy as well as his suggestion that conservative placentals should show less roll and more yaw than marsupials. Indeed, it would be reasonable to infer a lower magnitude of positioning yaw in the therian ancestor than is present in opossums, and no yaw processing.

To broaden our coverage, we mined data from as many kinematic studies of mammalian chewing as we could locate (Fig. 2c). Our survey revealed jaw roll in every mammal with a mobile symphysis, including monotremes[14]. Contrary to Grossnickle's[1] prediction, the wombat, which possesses a fused symphysis, does not roll its hemimandibles in the manner of ancestral therians[15]: its whole-mandible roll is a unique autapomorphy. Whereas positioning yaw occurs in most therians, extensive yaw processing occurs only in specialized herbivores and frugivores, most of which have immobile symphyses (Fig. 2c). The data indicate jaw roll, perhaps with no yaw, at the Mammalia node; roll processing and positioning yaw at the Theria node; and yaw processing only in specialized herbivores (Fig. 2c). Incidentally, we can set aside passive cusp–cusp effects as an explanation for the rotational grinding stroke because this stroke occurred consistently when the teeth were widely separated by large food items, and in symmetry on working and balancing sides[2].

Grossnickle[1] claims that the ancestral angle projected muscle attachments backward instead of downward and therefore increased



Fig. 2 | Evolution of jaw kinematics in Mammalia. a, Representative segment of chewing sequence for the opossum *M. domestica*. TMJ, temporomandibular joint. **b**, Representative segment of chewing sequence for the skunk *Mephitis mephitis*[13]. In the opossum, yaw (green) positions the jaw but largely halts during maximum jaw closure (blue); in the skunk, yaw is barely detectable at any time. At maximum closure, the opossum displays a single rotational grinding stroke and the skunk displays two such strokes. **c**, Distribution of symphysial mobility and chewing kinematics across Mammalia. Bold indicates taxa known from XROMM studies. Column 1, symphysial mobility: a single rectangle indicates an immobile symphysis, and two rectangles indicate a mobile symphysis. In columns 2–5, coloured shapes indicate the documented presence of an action; faded shapes with strikethroughs indicate an absence confirmed by an XROMM study; and no symbol indicates that presence or absence of the character could not be determined from the published literature. Column 2, independent hemimandibular roll; column 3, roll-based processing; column 4: mandibular yaw; column 5: yaw-based processing. The most parsimonious explanation of the data is that, minimally, the mammalian ancestor had a mobile symphysis and hemimandibular roll, and that the therian ancestor had roll-based processing and mandibular yaw for positioning but not processing. Sources are listed by taxon in Supplementary Information. Silhouettes from http://phylopic.org/; credit to Sarah Werning for opossum (CC-BY-3.0) and José Infante for skunk (CC-BY-3.0).

mechanical advantage (by lengthening the inlever) for yaw instead of roll. On the contrary, the cladotherian angular process does lower the position of muscle insertion, especially in cladotherians with conservative posterior dentaries (Fig. 1j–o). Moreover, the reconstructed force vectors (from muscle attachments) in ref. [16] and the reconstructed axis of rotation in the accompanying Comment[1] differ from those that we determined (Fig. 1j–o). With regard to force vectors, we found that the origins of the superficial masseter and medial pterygoid lie, at least in part, almost directly above the angular process in stem therians, not well in front of it as reconstructed in ref. [16] (Fig. 1l–m). The vertical (for roll) component of muscle force near occlusion is therefore much larger than reconstructed[16] and the horizontal (for yaw) component much smaller. With regard to mechanical advantage, we note that the author, in ref. [16], defined the jaw roll axis as passing through the jaw joint and the symphysis (as we also defined that axis[2]). It seems obvious that the jaw joint is the primary fulcrum for roll, and therefore that roll inlever should be approximated as the distance between the jaw joint and the location of muscle insertion on the jaw. The brackets in figure 2 of the accompanying Comment[1] should extend to the fulcrum if they are meant to depict inlevers. Regardless, the lowering of the muscle insertion permitted by the angular process clearly increases roll inlevers in all taxa, including those depicted in the accompanying Comment (Fig. 1j–s). As a final argument, we note that the first appearance of an angular process occurred before the reduction of the pterygoid transverse process made jaw yaw possible (Fig. 1j, k).

Grossnickle[1] observes that the jaw angle of yaw-processing herbivores is thickened and expanded; he interprets the thickening as an exaggerated angular process. We agree that herbivores have an expanded angular region. However, we maintain that the angular process, as a distinct structure and the primary site for superficial masseter and medial pterygoideus insertion, has vanished. Both muscles have become greatly enlarged and their insertions have migrated dorsally as a whole, in a reversal of the cladotherian ventral shift, to occupy large surfaces on the angle and ramus (Fig. 1n, o). Yaw processing requires much larger movements and greater forces than roll processing, and we posit that the expanded angular region of herbivore jaws accommodates the requisite muscle mass. In support of our hypothesis, we note that wombats, which anomalously roll the jaw despite symphysial immobility, have in fact retained the angular process.

Data availability

All referenced data are freely available as described in ref. [2].

1. Grossnickle, D. M. Jaw roll and jaw yaw in early mammals. *Nature* (2020).
2. Bhullar, B. S. et al. Rolling of the jaw is essential for mammalian chewing and tribosphenic molar function. *Nature* **566**, 528–532 (2019).
3. de Blainville, H. M. D. Doutes sur le prétendu Didelphe de Stonesfield. *Comptes-Rendus l'Académie des Sci*. **7**, 402–418 (1838).
4. Crompton, A. W. The origin of the tribosphenic molar. *Early Mammals* **50**, 65–87 (1971).
5. Crompton, A. W. & Hiiemäe, K. Functional occlusion in tribosphenic molars. *Nature* **222**, 678–679 (1969).
6. Patterson, B. Early Cretaceous mammals and the evolution of mammalian molar teeth. *Fieldiana Geol*. **13**, 1–104 (1956).
7. Schultz, J. A. & Martin, T. Function of pretribosphenic and tribosphenic mammalian molars inferred from 3D animation. *Naturwissenschaften* **101**, 771–781 (2014).
8. Butler, P. M. The teeth of the Jurassic mammals. *Proc. Zool. Soc. Lond*. **109**, 329–356 (1939).
9. Prothero, D. R. New Jurassic mammals from Como Bluff, Wyoming, and the interrelationships of non-tribosphenic Theria. *Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. Hist*. **167**, 5 (1981).
10. Luo, Z.-X. Tooth structure re-engineered. *Nature* **512**, 36–37 (2014).
11. Kielan-Jaworowska, Z., Cifelli, R. L. & Luo, Z.-X. *Mammals From the Age of Dinosaurs: Origins, Evolution, and Structure* (Columbia Univ. Press, 2004).
12. Sánchez-Villagra, M. & Smith, K. K. Diversity and evolution of the marsupial mandibular angular process. *J. Mamm. Evol*. **4**, 119–144 (1997).
13. Williams, S. H. in *Feeding in Vertebrates* (eds Bels, V. & Whishaw, I. Q.) 695–742 (Springer, 2019).
14. Murray, P. F. A unique jaw mechanism in the echidna, Tachyglossus aculeatus (Monotremata). Aust. J. Zool. **29**, 1–5 (1981).
15. Crompton, A. W., Lieberman, D. E., Owerkowicz, T., Baudinette, R. V. & Skinner, J. in *Primate Craniofacial Function and Biology* (eds Vinyard, C. et al.) 83–111 (Springer, 2008).
16. Grossnickle, D. M. The evolutionary origin of jaw yaw in mammals. *Sci. Rep*. **7**, 45094 (2017).

Acknowledgements B.-A.S.B. and J.A.M. were supported by Yale University and the Yale Peabody Museum of Natural History. A.R.M. and E.L.B. were supported by Brown University, by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship awarded to A.R.M. and by NSF grants 1661129 and 1655756 to E.L.B. E.A.H. was supported by the American Museum of Natural History and an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship. C.M. and A.W.C. were supported by the Harvard Museum of Comparative Zoology.

Author contributions All authors conceived and discussed the major elements of the response. B.-A.S.B., A.M. and E.A.H. wrote the paper and prepared figures.

Competing interests The authors declare no competing interests.

Additional information
Supplementary information is available for this paper at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2364-z.
Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to B.-A.S.B.
Reprints and permissions information is available at http://www.nature.com/reprints.

© The Author(s), under exclusive licence to Springer Nature Limited 2020