



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

The long-term ecology and evolution of marine reptiles in a Jurassic seaway

Citation for published version:

Foffa, D, Young, M, Stubbs, TL, Dexter, K & Brusatte, S 2018, 'The long-term ecology and evolution of marine reptiles in a Jurassic seaway', *Nature Ecology & Evolution*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0656-6>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1038/s41559-018-0656-6](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0656-6)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Nature Ecology & Evolution

Publisher Rights Statement:

Copyright © 2018, Springer Nature

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



The long-term ecology and evolution of marine reptiles in a Jurassic seaway

Davide Foffa^{a,*}, Mark T. Young^a, Thomas L. Stubbs^b, Kyle G. Dexter^a, Stephen L. Brusatte^a

^a School of GeoSciences, University of Edinburgh, Grant Institute, James Hutton Road,
Edinburgh, Scotland EH9 3FE, United Kingdom; ^b School of Earth Sciences, University of
Bristol, Life Sciences Building, 24 Tyndall Avenue, Bristol BS8 1TQ, England, United
Kingdom.

*corresponding author

11 Marine reptiles flourished in the Mesozoic oceans, filling ecological roles today
12 dominated by crocodylians, large fish, sharks, and cetaceans. Many groups of these
13 reptiles coexisted for over 50 million years, through major environmental changes.
14 Little is known, however, about how the structure of their ecosystems or their ecologies
15 changed over millions of years. We use the most common marine reptile fossils—teeth—
16 to establish a quantitative system that assigns species to dietary guilds, and then track
17 the evolution of these guilds over the ca. 18 million year history of a single seaway, the
18 Jurassic Sub-Boreal Seaway of the United Kingdom. Groups did not significantly
19 overlap in guild space, indicating that dietary niche partitioning enabled many species
20 to live together. Although a highly diverse fauna was present throughout the history of
21 the seaway, fish and squid-eaters with piercing teeth declined over time while hard-
22 object and large-prey specialists diversified, in concert with rising sea-levels. High niche
23 partitioning and spatial variation in dietary ecology related to sea depth also
24 characterize modern marine tetrapod faunas, indicating a conserved ecological
25 structure of the world's oceans that has persisted for over 150 million years.

During the Mesozoic Era, when dinosaurs ruled the land, the oceans were teeming with a diversity of large reptiles adapted to an aquatic lifestyle¹⁻⁴. These included iconic groups such as the long-necked plesiosauroids, big-headed pliosaurids, dolphin-like ichthyosaurs, and an aberrant assemblage of crocodile relatives called thalattosuchians (subdivided into the gharial-like teleosaurids and cetacean-like metriorhynchids). These groups were exceptionally diverse and coexisted in the same environments for over 50 million years, from the Early Jurassic (ca. 180 million years ago) to the Early Cretaceous (ca. 130 million years ago)⁵⁻¹², through major changes in sea-level, climate, and ocean chemistry. They formed complex ecosystems and filled a variety of ecological roles—ranging from fast-swimming fish-eaters to large-bodied apex predators⁷⁻⁹—that are today dominated by crocodylians (in near-shore environments), sharks and other large fishes, and marine mammals^{1-2,13}. As modern oceans are undergoing rapid changes, understanding Mesozoic marine reptile ecosystems may provide critical insight into how species at or near the top of the food chain might respond to environmental shifts.

Although the phylogenetic relationships and taxonomic diversity patterns of Mesozoic marine reptiles have been the subject of intensive focus¹⁴⁻¹⁹, much less is known about their ecology, about the structure of their ecosystems, and how their ecosystems changed over millions of years of evolutionary time. Two main problems have hindered progress. First, it is difficult to determine the ecological niches and feeding styles of extinct species, particularly when they are represented by limited fossil material. The pioneering work of Massare⁷⁻⁸ assigned marine reptiles to broad ecological guilds, but these are qualitative in nature and have not been universally accepted⁹. Second, the marine reptile fossil record is notoriously patchy, dominated by fossil-rich localities (Lagerstätten) that register snapshots of ecosystems but do not document long-term changes³. These issues hamper comparisons

between Mesozoic and modern marine faunas, and make it difficult to draw parallels between the fossil record and contemporary environmental change.

Here, we use teeth—the most common marine reptile fossils, which are often preserved in the absence of more complete skeletal remains—to evaluate feeding ecology. Our quantitative approach validates the guild system of Massare⁷⁻⁸, and allows species to be placed in a functional morphospace that reflects the breadth of dietary niches. We then track changes in how these niches were filled over time, focusing on the remarkable fossil record of the Jurassic Sub-Boreal Seaway of the United Kingdom. Marine reptiles have long been known from two Lagerstätten formed in this seaway, the Oxford Clay Formation (Callovian-early Oxfordian, ~165-161 Ma) and the Kimmeridge Clay Formation (Kimmeridgian-early Tithonian, ~157-148 Ma)²⁰⁻²¹, but recent work has clarified the fossil record of the intervening Corallian Group (~161.5-157.3 Ma)^{17,22}. Thus, we can now examine long-term ecological changes in a single seaway spanning ca. 18 million years of the Middle-Late Jurassic, a time of known environmental changes that began with recovery from a drop in sea-level linked to a major glaciation, followed by a gradual rise in sea-level that culminated in a chaotic interval of rapid shifts in water depth²³⁻³⁰.

Results

Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCO) of our dental morphology dataset ordinated all specimens into a morphospace, the first three axes of which describe over 63% of total variance (Fig. 1; Supplementary Figures 2-3; Supplementary Table 1). A linear discriminant analysis found that clusters of species in the morphospace correspond to the feeding guilds of Massare⁷, originally qualitatively defined based on comparisons of tooth shape, wear, and size and with modern marine tetrapods (Supplementary Table 6). When the 35 specimens in

our dataset (encompassing 25 taxa) that were also included in Massare's study were assigned to Massare's guilds *a priori*, a jackknifing procedure found that our PCO axes successfully discriminated these groups, with 84% of species correctly attributed to the guild Massare assigned them to. This supports broad correspondence between our PCO morphospace and Massare's guilds, but 16% of species are mis-attributed, which may be because some species previously known from limited fossil material (particularly metriorhynchids) were misclassified when Massare introduced the guilds. We therefore used our PCO results to establish a revised system of five guilds, which linear discriminant analysis finds to be 97.30% accurate. Along with the fact that characters in our dataset were chosen to represent functionally significant features related to feeding, this indicates that the PCO morphospace can be interpreted as a functional morphospace reflecting diet (Table 1). This link was previously demonstrated by Massare⁷, by assessing tooth morphology, shape and gut contents of the same species, and validated with comparisons with modern marine tetrapods (for which dietary data are available).

Guild		Apex shape	Ornamentation	Cutting edges	Tooth size and shape	Examples
Cut		Pointed	Normally largely absent (in geosaurines, except cf. ' <i>Metriorhynchus hastifer</i> ')	Two functional cutting edges always present	Very large: generally > 4cm. Robust crowns, mid-to-high CR*	<i>Dakosaurus</i> , <i>Plesiosuchus</i> , <i>Geosaurus</i> , cf. ' <i>Metriorhynchus hastifer</i> '
Generalist	Generalist-Cut	Pointed	Present: high-relief with serration morphologies	Two or more cutting edges always present	Very large: generally > 5cm. Robust crowns, mid-to-high CR*	<i>Pliosaurus</i> spp.
	Generalist-Pierce	Pointed	Variable, it may be high relief	None, or non-prominent. If present they are smooth and non-serrated	Variably large: generally > 5cm. Normally conical. Variable CBR.	<i>Liopleurodon</i> , <i>Simolestes</i> , ' <i>Pliosaurus andrewsi</i> '

Pierce	Pointed	Variable, but never high relief	None, or non-prominent. In metriorhynchines if they are present they are smooth, or not functionally serrated.	Normally small (<3cm), but can be large (>3cm). Mid-to-high CR*, lateral compression variable (weak or absent, in plesiosauroids and metriorhynchines; laterally compressed in geosaurines).	All plesiosauroids, MJML K1885 , ' <i>Steneosaurus leedsi</i> , <i>Mycterosuchus</i> , <i>Gracilineustes</i> , <i>Peloneustes</i> ; <i>Metriorhynchus</i>, <i>Suchodus</i>, <i>Tyrannoneustes</i>, 'M.' cultridens
Smash	Pointed to Rounded	NA	None	Conical. Mid-CR*	<i>Ophthalmosaurus</i> , <i>Brachypterygius</i>
Crunch	Rounded	Strongly ornamented, with high-relief ridges and may have serration morphologies	Prominent carinae only on the top half of the crown.	Robust and conical, poorly to non-laterally compressed. Mid-to-low CR*.	<i>Lemmysuchus</i> , <i>Machimosaurus</i> , <i>Torvoneustes</i>

Table 1. Description of the main tooth features diagnosing the five guilds as used in this study. Note that this is a key that can be used to assign specimens to guilds based on consideration of a few general features, but more rigorous assignment can be made numerically using Linear Discriminant Analysis of PCO scores. Taxa in bold are classified in a different guild compared to Massare's System⁷ (see Supplementary Table 7, Appendix S3, S4). The table is adjusted from Massare (1987)⁷. *CR: Crown height to base Ratio.

Many thalattosuchians (teleosaurids and metriorhynchids), plesiosauroids, and small-bodied pliosaurids cluster together in morphospace, due to their thin teeth that lack serrations (Pierce Guild), similar to modern shallow-water river dolphins and gharials; they are inferred to be fish and squid-eaters (Fig. 1, Table 1). An adjacent region of morphospace is occupied by the soft prey-eating Smash Guild, which is almost exclusively filled by ichthyosaurs with conical, non-carinated and non-serrated teeth (Fig. 1, Table 1). Strongly ornamented, blunt crowns of machimosaurin teleosaurids and the geosaurine *Torvoneustes* belong to the Crunch Guild, inferred as hard-object (e.g. sea turtles) feeders (durophages) (Fig. 1, Table 1). There are two clusters of cutting-type dentitions that correspond to different types of macrophagy (feeding on large-bodied prey), analogous to modern deep-water cetaceans like killer whales: the Cut Guild of geosaurine metriorhynchids (*Geosaurus*, *Plesiosuchus*, and *Dakosaurus*) with large and serrated teeth, and the Generalist-Cut Sub-Guild (the macrophagous partition

of the Generalist Guild) of pliosaurids with huge, robust, heavily ornamented teeth (*Pliosaurus*) (Fig. 1, Table 1). The Generalist-Pierce Sub-Guild (the other partition of the Generalist Guild), characterised by large, conical and variably ornamented teeth and mostly including large Callovian pliosaurids, fills a space between the Generalist-Cut and Pierce Guilds (Fig. 1, Table 1).

We assessed changes in the dietary ecology of marine reptiles during the ca. 18 million year history of the Sub-Boreal Seaway by testing for changes in morphospace overlap and morphological disparity (amount of occupied morphospace) between phylogenetic groups. The major marine reptile groups do not significantly overlap in morphospace overall, and within each time slice (Appendix S2), indicative of large-scale dietary niche partitioning, but also a likely phylogenetic signal (e.g. through shared evolutionary ancestry). However, individual groups show evidence of morphospace migration over time (Fig. 2). Pliosaurids are the most extreme example, as they make a (nearly) significant jump (Supplementary Table 2) between their scattered Callovian morphospace into a more restricted region in the ensuing Oxfordian. This change is followed by another significant shift between the Oxfordian and Kimmeridgian, as a consequence of the appearance of the genus *Pliosaurus*.

Other groups do not exhibit significant shifts between successive time intervals, but do show significant changes between end points (e.g., Callovian vs. Tithonian, or Oxford Clay vs. Kimmeridge Clay Formations), which is indicative of gradual ecological changes.

There are no significant differences over time in the disparity of the pooled sample of all marine reptile groups in the morphospace (as shown by permutation tests on range and variance measures of morphospace occupation), indicating that an ecologically diverse fauna persisted throughout the entire history of the seaway (Supplementary Table 5). There are few instances of significant disparity changes within individual groups across successive time intervals, despite turnover at the species level (Fig. 2). Metriorhynchid groups are the

132 exceptions, as geosaurines significantly increased in disparity from the Oxfordian to the
133 Kimmeridgian, as their variety of niches expanded, in concert with the decline of fish-eating
134 metriorhynchines. This implies that, although groups were migrating through morphospace
135 over time, most continued to fill a similar breadth of niches, albeit in different regions of the
136 morphospace (Fig.2). Partial disparity trends show that teleosaurids and metriorhynchids
137 make up a large proportion of overall disparity in the Callovian but decline over time,
138 whereas geosaurines and macrophagous pliosaurids (*Pliosaurus*) become relatively more
139 disparate (Fig. 3). When partial disparity is instead tracked by guild, Pierce taxa are highly
140 disparate early but decline into the Oxfordian and beyond, as Crunch, Smash, and Cut species
141 assume a larger share of overall disparity (Fig. 3).

142 These quantitative tests allow us to identify several major trends. Pliosaurids were
143 diverse in the Callovian, ranging across a broad span of fish-eating Pierce and apex-predator
144 Generalist-Generalist-Pierce guilds, but then in the Oxfordian atrophied into a more restricted
145 region of macrophagous morphospace (Generalist-Generalist Cut), where they diversified
146 further in the Kimmeridgian, without migrating back into the Pierce Guild. Similarly,
147 teleosaurids were highly diverse in the Callovian, including long-snouted fish-eaters in the
148 Pierce Guild and durophages in the Crunch Guild, but the former species mostly disappeared
149 from the Oxfordian onwards while the hard-object feeders persisted. Geosaurines began with
150 a large diversity of taxa spanning the Pierce Guild in the Callovian, and in the Oxfordian
151 bifurcated into a Crunch group that approached the durophagous teleosaurids in morphospace
152 and a Cut group of large-prey specialists, which were distinct from the macrophagous
153 Generalist-Cut pliosaurids in morphospace. Metriorhynchines included several Pierce Guild
154 piscivores in the Callovian, but then mostly disappeared afterwards. Ichthyosaurs were
155 relatively stable in almost exclusively occupying the soft-prey-eating Smash Guild from the
156 Callovian to Tithonian, but their share of partial disparity increases over time. Sample sizes

for plesiosauroids are too small to reasonably interpret, although they seem to stably occupy the Pierce Guild through time.

Discussion

In agreement with previous studies^{5,7,15}, we argue that there is a tight link between tooth morphology and dietary ecology in Jurassic marine reptiles. By assessing a limited number of discrete features and measurements of the teeth, species can be placed in a functional morphospace that distinguishes ecological guilds (Fig. 1). This morphospace differentiates marine reptiles that fed in different ways, including soft-object feeders, piercers of fish and squid, durophagous hard-object crushers, and apex predator macrophages that specialized on large vertebrate prey^{5,7,15}. Our approach is a powerful tool for predicting the feeding habits of long-extinct species, as it focuses on the most commonly preserved marine reptile fossils (teeth), and can incorporate even minimally complete specimens. Our approach provides a quantitative method for projecting Massare's guilds⁷—which have long been used by marine reptile workers—into a numerically-derived morphospace, meaning specimens can be assigned to these guilds more objectively, and changes in guild occupation over time can be analysed statistically.

Our study reveals the ecological structure of marine reptile faunas in the Sub-Boreal Seaway during ca. 18 million years of the Middle-Late Jurassic. The positions of species in our functional morphospace give insight into niche occupation. The major marine reptile groups do not significantly overlap with each other in morphospace, meaning that different groups generally employed distinct dietary strategies (possibly in part due to shared evolutionary ancestry). Partitioning niches in this way may explain why such a great diversity of marine reptiles were able to coexist in the Mesozoic oceans¹³, and parallels the situation in modern oceans, where aquatic tetrapods subdivide ecological space by feeding in different

ways and on different prey³¹⁻⁴⁰. Evidently, Jurassic marine reptiles partitioned niches to a fine degree, as testified by the development of two distinct and coexisting forms of macrophagy: the robust-toothed pliosaurids in the Generalist-Cut Guild and the thinner, slicing-toothed geosaurines of the Cut Guild. Other groups converged on similar niches—most notably machimosaurin teleosaurids and *Torvoneustes*-lineage geosaurines that independently colonized the same durophagous area of morphospace—which speaks to the maintenance of key niches over long spans of time. We also find no significant differences in overall morphological disparity of the Sub-Boreal assemblages over time, illustrating that a diverse marine reptile fauna was present throughout the entire history of the seaway, and in general terms was resilient to environmental change.

Nonetheless, the shifting distribution of species in the morphospace over time does provide evidence for long-term ecological changes. Although the imprecise ages of fossils make it difficult to untangle the tempo of these changes, they appear to be a mix of sudden transformations at or near the Callovian-Oxfordian (Middle-Late Jurassic) boundary and more gradual changes that occurred throughout the Oxfordian, Kimmeridgian, and Tithonian, as sea-levels rose and water depth increased. Most severe was the decimation of the Pierce Guild, which was filled by a diversity of teleosaurids, metriorhynchines, and small-bodied pliosaurids in the Callovian, but was then largely vacated from the Oxfordian onwards. Essentially, this reflects a drastic decline of nearshore, piscivorous species. Metriorhynchines excelled in this niche and were the most abundant component of the Callovian Oxford Clay ecosystem, but are almost unknown from the later Kimmeridge Clay. Replacing the Pierce species was a greater variety of macrophagous taxa, particularly large pliosaurids and geosaurines, and durophages, including the specialized machimosaurin lineage of teleosaurids. At the same time, ichthyosaurs maintained their position in the Smash Guild and diversified further, reflecting a blossoming of deep-diving species that fed on similar prey to

the more nearshore piercers that were devastated.

We hypothesize that these large-scale changes in marine reptile functional diversity and niche occupation in the Jurassic Sub-Boreal Seaway were related to changes in water depth over time, analogous to how modern aquatic tetrapod diversity and ecology are known to change from shallow water (nearshore) to deeper water (offshore) habitats³¹⁻⁴⁰. It is well established that the Sub-Boreal Seaway became generally deeper as global sea-levels rose from the Callovian into the Oxfordian, and then across the Oxfordian, Kimmeridgian, and early Tithonian. The main fossiliferous beds of the Callovian Oxford Clay Formation were deposited in nearshore waters ca. 50 metres deep^{25-26,30}; the middle-late Oxfordian Corallian Group rocks formed in deeper waters during a time of warming and sea-level transgression^{17,20-22,27-28,30}; and the main fossil-bearing units of the Kimmeridge Clay Formation, spanning the Kimmeridgian-Tithonian boundary, were deposited on continental shelves 100-200 metres deep^{29,30}. Although numerous factors (ranging from water temperature and turbidity to productivity and seasonality) control the distribution of extant marine tetrapods and their prey, water depth is widely recognized as one of the key drivers of ecological partitioning³³⁻⁴⁰. While small delphinoids such as bottlenose and spotted dolphins can be found both nearshore and sometimes further shelf-ward, large delphinoids like killer whales predominately live in deeper, open waters and infrequently venture nearshore³⁶⁻³⁸, and their abundance on continental shelves increases with water depth³⁹. The diets of mid-shelf to offshore delphinoids also becomes increasingly dominated by larger prey, and only off-shelf species actively prey upon large tetrapods^{13,31,39}.

In the Jurassic Sub-Boreal Seaway, a variety of marine reptiles shared environments by feeding in different ways, and nearshore fish-eating marine reptiles declined and open-ocean macrophages and durophages proliferated as sea-level increased over millions of years of evolutionary time. In the modern oceans, numerous species of large vertebrates coexist by

partitioning dietary niches, and there is a noted ecological partitioning of shallow-water small-object feeders and deep-water, large-prey specialists. These parallels between Jurassic and modern oceans—separated in time by ca. 150 million years, occupied by different groups of species, and shaped by vastly distinct paleogeography, temperature, and ocean chemistry—may indicate a conserved ecological structure near the top of ocean food webs over time.

Methods

Dataset. We compiled a dataset of 22 functionally-relevant anatomical characteristics of the teeth scored for 122 specimens of marine reptiles (representing ~50 species) that lived in the Jurassic Sub-Boreal Seaway of the modern-day United Kingdom during the Callovian-Tithonian stages of the Jurassic (Appendix S1). The specimens come from a variety of localities and lithological facies within the Jurassic Sub Boreal Seaway basins²¹. It is possible that the lower number of Oxfordian specimens is related to preservation (or sampling) bias of the Corallian Group facies compared to the fossil-rich and better exposed Oxford Clay Formation and Kimmeridge Clay Formation²¹. However, by focusing on the most commonly collected and preserved fossils (teeth), we minimize these biases. We focused on dental morphology for the following reasons: 1) teeth are more commonly preserved as fossils than any other part of the marine reptile skeleton; 2) teeth were the primary source of information that Massare⁷ used to assign marine reptiles into feeding guilds; 3) multivariate analyses of tooth measurements, of the type encapsulated in our dataset, have been commonly applied to other reptile groups (most notably dinosaurs^{41,42}) to determine feeding habits and track long-term trends in palaeoecology.

Included in our dataset are teeth belonging to the three major marine reptile clades that lived in the Sub-Boreal Seaway—Plesiosauria, Ichthyosauria, and Thalattosuchia—and

all major subclades within these lineages. We designed our specimen sampling to maximise the number of complete specimens for each taxon in each time bin. We selected an approximately equal number of specimens for each taxon to avoid oversampling biases. All tooth crowns in our dataset are from the anterior part of the tooth row, to avoid inflation of diversity caused by the marked heterodonty of some taxa^{15,43,44}. Selecting the largest teeth does not constitute a major problem in the interpretation of the final results because the signal in the analyses is dominated by the discrete characters, which code features that do not significantly change along the tooth row. Additionally, the largest ‘fangs’ are those that undergo the largest stress during predation, and thus are ideal for investigating feeding ecology^{7,43,44}. It is also worth noting that disarticulated teeth cannot always be oriented in their correct mesiodistal orientation, so the distinction between upper or lower jaw teeth is unnecessary.

Each specimen was scored for the 5 continuous and 17 discrete characters in our dataset (Appendix S1), which were selected largely from published phylogenetic and functional datasets^{12,18,19,45,46}. The main sources for discrete characters were the analyses of Young et al. (2016)⁴⁶, Foffa et al. (2017)⁴⁵, and Fischer et al. (2015, 2016, 2017)^{12,18,19}; as these studies were designed for specific lineages, it was necessary to modify the definitions and states of some characters, to make them broadly applicable to all marine reptiles. The modified characters were specifically targeted to describe tooth shape, proportions, ornamentation, and cutting edge (carina and denticle) morphologies (Table 1, 2) (Supplementary Figure 1). Most continuous measurements were taken directly from specimens with digital callipers, except for the curvature and crown angles (C4 and C5) that were measured using ImageJ⁴⁷, and a small number that were taken from the literature (Supplementary Information, Supplementary Figure 1).

General aspect	Carinae and serrations	Ornamentation	Roots
-----------------------	-------------------------------	----------------------	--------------

C1. Apicobasal crown height – CH	D1. Crown mediolateral compression	D2. Carinae: presence or absence	D7. Enamel surface ornamentation: anastomosed pattern	D16. Root cross-section
C2. Crown ratio – CR	D12. Crown cross-section	D3. Denticles: presence and size	D8. Enamel ornamentation presence and density: lingual side	
C3. Crown base ratio – CBR	D13. Trifaceted labial side	D4. ‘Functionally serrated edges’: presence or absence	D9. Enamel ornamentation presence and density: labial side	
C4. Labial-Lingual curvature – LLcufrv	D15. Tooth crown apex – shape	D5. Denticles: distribution along the carinae	D10. Enamel ridges, relief	D17. Bulbous root larger than the crown
C5. Crown Angle – Cang		D6. Presence or absence of denticle-like structures	D14. Enamel texture	
		D11. Ornamentation interfering with the carinae or cutting edges – false denticles		

Table 2. Table of continuous (C) and discrete (D) morphological characters used to represent marine reptile dentitions. See Supplementary Information for extended descriptions of each character.

Multivariate analysis. The continuous characters were standardised using z-transformation (distributions were equalized to the same mean value, $\mu = 0$, and standard deviation, $\sigma = 1$)^{11,48}. The entire taxon-character matrix (Appendix S1) was then transformed into a Gower distance matrix (necessary for the combination of ordered discrete and continuous characters)⁴⁹ and subjected to Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCO) in PAST v.3 and R v3.4.3^{50,51}, following the procedure in Stubbs and Benton (2015)¹¹. The small number of missing values (8.2% of the total scores) were automatically accounted for by pairwise deletion. The scores of the first three PCO axes (which describe 28.54%, 22.16%, and 12.43% of total variance, respectively: Supplementary Table 1) were used to generate morphospaces for data visualization (Figs. 1-2, Supplementary Figures 1-2), and the 15 PCO axes that accounted for at least 0.5% of total variance were retained for discriminant function analysis, statistical tests of morphospace overlap, and disparity calculations.

We ran a Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) (Appendix S3) to test the ability of the

PCO scores to assign individuals to the feeding guild assignments of Massare⁷. The 35 specimens in our dataset that were also included in Massare's study⁷ were a priori assigned to the guilds that Massare originally assigned them to (four guilds total: Pierce [also tested for separate Pierce I and Pierce II], Crunch, Smash, Cut) (for more details see the LDA Guild Sensitivity Analyses in Appendix S4), and the percentages of correct specimen-guild matches were determined using a jackknifing test in PAST v.3⁵⁰ (see Supplementary Information, Appendix S3). This revealed that 84% of specimens were correctly assigned to the Massare's original guilds (the same percentage, 84%, if the Pierce I and II guilds of Massare are split into two), indicating a broad correspondence between our quantitative PCO morphospace and Massare's qualitative guilds (see Supplementary Information, Appendix S3, S4).

New fossil discoveries and reanalyses of key specimens suggest that some of the guild assignments of Massare may be problematic, perhaps explaining why 16% of specimens are incorrectly assigned by the LDA. Over the last few decades, many specimens used in Massare's study have been re-evaluated (particularly metriorhynchids) and further details of tooth morphology have been described (particularly regarding carinae and denticles) (Appendix S3). Thus, we used the results of our PCO analysis—particularly the visual spread of taxa in morphospace—to modify Massare's guilds into a new system of five guilds: Pierce, Crunch, Smash, Cut, and Generalist (subdivided into Generalist-Pierce, and Generalist-Cut) (Appendix S3, S4). We assigned the same 35 specimens from taxa shared with Massare's study⁷ to one of these guilds a priori, and then ran a second LDA, which correctly attributes 97.3% of the specimens to the proper guild. This indicates that our morphospace can be used to sensibly cluster species into guilds, and thus be interpreted as a dietary function space. This second LDA also serves to classify each of our 122 specimens into its best-fit guild. The regions of our PCO morphospace occupied by each guild are denoted in Figure 1. This is the first attempt to project Massare's⁷ qualitative guilds into a numerically-derived morphospace.

Note that in creating our revised guild system, we preferred a unified Pierce guild over Massare's⁷ original subdivision of Pierce I and Pierce II guilds, because this distinction relied on wear patterns and features of cranial morphology that are not captured in our dataset (but see Appendix S4 for sensitivity analyses).

Statistical analyses. Specimens were binned by clade, guild, and time in order to conduct statistical analyses of morphospace overlap and morphological disparity.

We employed a hierarchy of taxonomic bins. We broadly divided the specimens into the three main order-level clades: Plesiosauria, Ichthyosauria, and Thalattosuchia. We then ran additional analyses in which these large clades were subdivided into less inclusive monophyletic groups of family-level, and subfamily-level. Plesiosauria was subdivided into Plesiosauroidea and Pliosauridae. Thalattosuchia was split into Metriorhynchidae and Teleosauridae, both of which were further divided (into Metriorhynchidae/Geosaurinae for the former, and into Machimosaurini/non-Machimosaurini for the latter). As all ichthyosaur specimens belong to Ophthalmosauridae, this group was not subdivided. Finally, for the disparity analyses, we examined three further lineages within Pliosauridae (non-*Pliosaurus* pliosaurids and *Pliosaurus* spp.) and Geosaurinae (the 'T-clade': *Torvoneustes*-*Metriorhynchus* 'hastifer'-Mr. Passmore's specimen clade ; the 'GPD clade': *Plesiosuchus*-*Dakosaurus*-*Geosaurus* clade; and 'Basal Geosaurinae', which includes *Metriorhynchus* 'brachyrhynchus', with and without *Tyrannoneustes lythrodektikos* – because of the unstable position of the latter in the latest phylogenetic analyses^{17,45}).

We employed four time bins when analysing trends over the Jurassic. These correspond to stage level: Callovian (166.1–163.5 Ma), Oxfordian (163.5–157.3 Ma), Kimmeridgian (157.3–152.1 Ma), and early Tithonian (152.1–148.5 Ma). The average length of these time bins is 4.4 Ma, with a minimum of 2.6 Ma for the Callovian and maximum of 6.2 Ma for the Oxfordian. Given the age uncertainty of several specimens, equal-length bins

were deemed unreasonable because too many specimens would be assigned to multiple time bins, decreasing the power of our analyses. We ran subsidiary analyses in which specimens was also assigned to stratigraphic bins representing the main marine reptile faunas of the Sub-Boreal Jurassic Seaway: Oxford Clay Formation (~Callovian - early Oxfordian), ‘Corallian Group’ (middle - late Oxfordian), and Kimmeridge Clay Formation (Kimmeridgian - early Tithonian). This binning scheme demonstrates changes in a series of temporally successive Lagerstätten. We recognize that, for both binning schemes, each time bin includes a time-averaged sample, as is necessarily the norm in most palaeoecological analyses of long-term change. Thus, these bins do not exactly represent individual ecosystems that existed at a moment in time, but rather summarize the pool of species present during the finest temporal resolution available.

We assessed whether taxonomic groups significantly overlapped in the overall morphospace, and for each time interval, using non-parametric multivariate analysis of variance (NPMANOVA)^{51,11,48} in R⁵² (Appendix S2). The null hypothesis is that there is no difference in the location of group centroids in PCO space; significant deviation from the null indicates that the groups in question occupy significantly different areas of morphospace. The p values were adjusted using the false-discovery rate (FDR) method to account for ‘false discoveries’ error that may be introduced by multiple comparisons⁵³. Changes in morphospace occupation over time, if confirmed by NPMANOVA, indicate the migration of clades into different niche space.

We measured the breadth of morphospace occupied by taxa by calculating morphological disparity. We used two metrics to quantify disparity: the sum of variances and the sum of ranges on the PCO axes for each group in question⁵⁴. Variance is a measure of the spread of taxa in morphospace relative to the group centroid, whereas range denotes the overall volume of morphospace occupied by the group. These disparity metrics were

calculated in R using functions in the ‘dispRity’ package⁵⁵ Statistical significance of disparity differences between groups, or within groups across time, were assessed by a permutation test developed by Steve Wang⁵⁶, which determined whether there was a significant difference in the observed disparity value between the two comparisons and the expected disparity difference between them. As the expected difference is generated based on the size of each group, this procedure accounts for sample size differences between the groups, which otherwise could be a major source of bias (particularly for sum of ranges).

We also tracked partial disparity over time, for taxonomic groups and guilds (Fig. 3). The contribution of each group/guild to overall disparity in each time bin was calculated as the average squared distance of each group/guild member point from the overall time bin centroid, with the resulting value weighted by a factor taking into account the sample size of the group/guild compared to the overall sample⁵⁷. This procedure was conducted with the Morphological Disparity Analyses (MDA) package for MATLAB® R2016a v9.0.0⁵⁸.

Data availability

The authors declare that all the data supporting the findings of this study are available within the paper and its supplementary information files. The R-codes used to perform statistical tests are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

References

1. Pyenson, N.D., Kelley, N.P., and Parham, J.F. 2014. Marine tetrapod macroevolution: Physical and biological drivers on 250 Ma of invasions and evolution in ocean ecosystems. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*. 400: 1–8.
2. Kelley, N.P., and Pyenson, N.D. 2015. Evolutionary innovation and ecology in marine tetrapods from the Triassic to the Anthropocene. *Science* 348, aaa3716.
DOI:10.1126/science.aaa3716

- 395 3. Benson, R.B.J., Butler, R.J., Lindgren, J., and Smith, A.S. 2010. Mesozoic marine
396 tetrapod diversity: mass extinctions and temporal heterogeneity in geological megabiases
397 affecting vertebrates. *Proceedings Royal Society B* 277: 829–834.
- 398 4. Ciampaglio, C.N., Wray, G.A., and Corliss, B.H. 2005. A Toothy Tale of Evolution:
399 Convergence in Tooth Morphology among Marine Mesozoic – Cenozoic Sharks,
400 Reptiles, and Mammals. *The Sedimentary Record* 3(4): 4–8.
- 401 5. Andrews, C.W. 1909. A descriptive catalogue of the marine reptiles of the Oxford Clay,
402 Part One. London: British Museum (Natural History).
- 403 6. Andrews, C.W. 1913. A descriptive catalogue of the marine reptiles of the Oxford Clay,
404 Part Two. London: British Museum (Natural History).
- 405 7. Massare, J.A. 1987. Tooth morphology and prey preference of Mesozoic marine reptiles.
406 *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 7: 121–137.
- 407 8. Massare, J.A. 1988. Swimming capabilities of Mesozoic marine reptiles: implications for
408 method of predation. *Paleobiology* 14: 187–205.
- 409 9. Buchy, M.-C. 2010. Morphologie dentaire et régime alimentaire des reptiles marins du
410 Mésozoïque: revue critique et réévaluation. *Oryctos*, 9: 49-82.
- 411 10. Chiarenza, A.A., Foffa, D., Young, M.T., Insacco, G., Cau, A., Carnevale,
412 G., and Catanzariti, R. 2015. The youngest record of metriorhynchid crocodylomorphs,
413 with implications for the extinction of Thalattosuchia. *Cretaceous Research*, 56: 608– 616.
- 414 11. Stubbs, T.L., and Benton, M.J. 2015. Ecomorphological diversifications of Mesozoic
415 marine reptiles: the roles of ecological opportunity and extinction. *Paleobiology* 1-27.
416 doi:10.1017/pab.2016.15
- 417 12. Fischer, V., Bardet, N., Benson, R.J.B., Arkhangel'sky, M.S., and Friedman, M. 2016.
418 Extinction of fish-shaped marine reptiles associated with reduced evolutionary rates and
419 global environmental volatility. *Nature Communications*. 7: 10825.

- 420 13. Kelley, N.P., and Motani, R. 2015. Trophic convergence drives morphological
421 convergence in marine tetrapods. *Biology Letters* 11: 20140709.
- 422 14. Young, M.T., Brusatte, S.L., Andrade, M.B., Desojo, J.B., Beatty, B.L., Steel, L.,
423 Fernández, M.S., Sakamoto, M., Ruiz-Omeñaca, J.I., and Schoch, R.R. 2012a. The
424 cranial osteology and feeding ecology of the metriorhynchid crocodylomorph genera
425 *Dakosaurus* and *Plesiosuchus* from the Late Jurassic of Europe. *PLoS ONE* 7, e44985.
- 426 15. Young, M.T., Brusatte, S.L., Andrade, M.B., Beatty, L., and Desojo, J.B. 2012b. Tooth-
427 On-Tooth Interlocking Occlusion Suggests Macrophagy in the Mesozoic Marine
428 Crocodylomorph *Dakosaurus*. *The Anatomical Record* 295: 1147–1158.
- 429 16. Benson, R.B.J., and Druckenmiller, P.S. 2014. Faunal turnover of marine tetrapods during
430 the Jurassic–Cretaceous transition. *Biological Reviews* 89: 1–23.
- 431 17. Young, M.T. 2014. Filling the ‘Corallian Gap’: re-description of a metriorhynchid
432 crocodylomorph from the Oxfordian (Late Jurassic) of Headington, England. *Historical*
433 *Biology: An International Journal of Paleobiology* 26(1): 80–90.
- 434 18. Fischer, V., Arkhangelsky, M.S., Stenshin, I.M., Uspensky, G.N., Zverkov, N.G., and
435 Benson, R.B.J. 2015. Peculiar macrophagous adaptations in a new Cretaceous pliosaurid.
436 *Royal Society Open Science* 2: 150552.
- 437 19. Fischer, V., Benson, R.B.J., Zverkov, N.G., Soul, L.C., Arkhangelsky, M.S., Stenshin,
438 I.M., Lambert, O., Stenshin, I.M., Uspensky, G.N., and Druckenmiller, P.S. 2017.
439 Plasticity and Convergence in the Evolution of Short-Necked Plesiosaurs. *Current*
440 *Biology* 27: 1667–1676.
- 441 20. Cox, B.M. 2001. In Wright, J.K., and Cox, B.M. British Upper Jurassic Stratigraphy,
442 Geological Conservation Review Series, No. 21, Joint Nature Conservation Committee,
443 Peterborough, 266pp.
- 444 21. Cope, J.C.W. 2006. Jurassic: the returning seas. In Brenchley, P.J., and Rawson, P.F.,

445 (Ed.) The geology of England and Wales. 2nd ed. London: Geological Society 559pp.

446 22. Foffa D., Young, M.T., and Brusatte, S.L. 2018. Filling the Corallian gap: new
 447 information on Late Jurassic marine reptile faunas from England. *Acta Palaeontologica*
 448 *Polonica* 63(2).

449 23. Cecca, F., Garin, B. M., Marchand, D., Lathuiliere, B., and Bartolini, A. 2005.
 450 Paleoclimatic control of biogeographic and sedimentary events in Tethyan and peri-
 451 Tethyan areas during the Oxfordian (Late Jurassic). *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
 452 *Palaeoecology* 222(1–2): 10–32.

453 24. Armstrong, H.A., Wagner, T., Herringshaw, L.G., Farnsworth, A.J., Lunt, D.J., Harland,
 454 M., Imber, J., Loptson, C., and Atar, E.F.L. 2016. Hadley circulation and precipitation
 455 changes controlling black shale deposition in the Late Jurassic Boreal Seaway.
 456 *Paleoceanography* 31: 1041–1053. doi:10.1002/ 2015PA002911.

457 25. Cox, B.M., Hudson, J.D., and Martill, D.M. 1992. Lithostratigraphic nomenclature of the
 458 Oxford Clay (Jurassic). *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association* 103: 343–345.

459 26. Mettam, C., Johnson, A.L.A, Nunn, E.V. and Schöne, B.R. 2014. Stable isotope ($\delta^{18}\text{O}$ and
 460 $\delta^{13}\text{C}$) sclerochronology of Callovian (Middle Jurassic) bivalves (*Gryphaea*
 461 (*Bilobissa*) *dilobotes*) and belemnites (*Cylindroteuthis puzosiana*) from the Peterborough
 462 Member of the Oxford Clay Formation (Cambridgeshire, England): Evidence of
 463 palaeoclimate, water depth and belemnite behaviour. *Palaeogeography,*
 464 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 399: 187-201.
 465 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2014.01.010>

466 27. Dromart, G., Garcia, J.P., Gaumet, F., Picard, S., Rousseau, M., Atrops, F., Lecuyer, C.,
 467 and Sheppard, S.M.F. 2003a. Perturbation of the carbon cycle at the Middle–Late Jurassic
 468 transition: geological and geochemical evidence. *American Journal of Science* 303: 667–
 469 707.

- 470 28. Dromart, G., Garcia, J.P., Picard, S., Atrops, F., Lécuyer, C., and Sheppard, S.M.F. 2003b.
471 Ice age at the Middle–Late Jurassic transition? *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* 213:
472 205–220
- 473 29. Gallois, R.W. 2004. The Kimmeridge Clay: the most intensively studied formation in
474 Britain. *Open University Geological Journal* 25: 33–38.
- 475 30. Haq, B.U., Hardenbol, J., and Vail, P.R., 1988, Mesozoic and Cenozoic
476 chronostratigraphy and cycles of sea-level change, in *Sea Level Changes - An Integrated*
477 *Approach*, eds. C.K. Wilgus, B.S. Hastings, C.A. Ross, H. Posamentier, J. Van Wagoner
478 and C.G.S.C. Kendall: SEPM Spec. Publ., v. 42, p. 71-108.
- 479 31. Pauly, D., Trites, A.W., Capuli, E., and Christensen, V. 1998. Diet composition and
480 trophic levels of marine mammals. *ICES Journal of Marine Science* 55: 467–481.
481 (doi:10.1006/jmsc.1997.0280)
- 482 32. Esteban, R., Verborgh, P., Gauffier, P., Giménez, J., Afán, I., Cañadas, A., García, P.,
483 Murcia, J., Magalhães, S., Andreu, E., and de Stephanis, R., 2013. Identifying key habitat
484 and seasonal patterns of a critically endangered population of killer whales. *Journal of the*
485 *Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom* 94: 1317–1325.
- 486 33. Forney, K.A. 2000. Environmental models of cetacean abundance: reducing uncertainty
487 in population trends. *Conservation Biology* 14:1271–1286.
- 488 34. Yen, P.P.W., Sydeman, W.J., and Hyrenbach, K.D. 2004. Marine birds and cetacean
489 associations with bathymetric habitats and shallow-water topographies: implications for
490 trophic transfer and conservation. *Journal of Marine Systems* 50: 79–99.
- 491 35. Balance, L.T., Pitman, R.L., and Fiedler, P.C. 2006. Oceanographic influences on
492 seabirds and cetaceans in the eastern tropical Pacific: A review. *Progress in*
493 *Oceanography* 69 (2–4): 360–390.
- 494 36. MacLoed, C.D., Weit, C.R., Pierpoint, C, and Harland, E.J. 2007. The habitat preferences

495 of marine mammals west of Scotland (UK). *Journal of the Marine Biological Association*
496 *of the United Kingdom* 87: 157–164.

497 37. Spitz, J. Cherel, Y., Bertin, S., Kiszka, J., Dewez, A. and Ridoux V. 2011. Prey
498 preferences among the community of deep-diving odontocetes from the Bay of Biscay,
499 Northeast Atlantic. *Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers* 58(3):
500 273–282.

501 38. Weir, C.R., MacLeod, C.D., and Pierce, G.J. 2012. Habitat preferences and evidence for
502 niche partitioning amongst cetaceans in the waters between Gabon and Angola, eastern
503 tropical Atlantic. *Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom*
504 92(8): 1735–1749.

505 39. Roberts, J.J., Best, B.D., Mannocci, L., Fujioka, E., Halpin, P.N., Palka, D.L., Garrison,
506 L.P., Mullin, K.D., Cole, T.V.N., Khan, C.B., McLellan, W.A., Pabst, D.A., and Lockhart,
507 G.G. 2016. Habitat-based cetacean density models for the U.S. Atlantic and Gulf of
508 Mexico. *Scientific Reports* 6, doi:10.1038/srep22615

509 40. Fossette, S. Abrahams, B., Hazen, E.L., Bogard, S.J., Zilliacus, K.M., Calambokidis, J.,
510 Burrows, J.A., Goldbogen, J.A., Harvey, J.T., Marinovic, B., Tershy, B., and Croll, D.A.
511 2017. Resource partitioning facilitates coexistence in sympatric cetaceans in the
512 California Current. *Ecology and Evolution* doi: 10.1002/ece3.3409.

513 41. Larson, D.W., Brown, C.M., and Evans, D.C. 2016. Dental Disparity and Ecological
514 Stability in Bird-like Dinosaurs prior to the End-Cretaceous Mass Extinction. *Current*
515 *Biology* 26(10): 1325–1333. doi: 10.1016/j.cub.2016.03.039.

516 42. Smith, J.B., Vann, D.R., and Dodson, P. 2005. Dental morphology and variation in
517 theropod dinosaurs: Implications for the taxonomic identification of isolated teeth. *The*
518 *Anatomical Record Part A Discoveries in Molecular Cellular and Evolutionary Biology*
519 285(2):699-736. 10.1002/ar.a.20206

- 520 43. Noè, L.F. 2001. A taxonomic and functional study of the Callovian (Middle Jurassic)
521 Pliosauroidea (Reptilia, Sauropterygia). Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Derby,
522 UK
- 523 44. Sassoon, J., Foffa, D., and Marek, R. 2015. Dental ontogeny and replacement in
524 Pliosauridae. *Royal Society Open Science* 2 150384. DOI: 10.1098/rsos.150384.
- 525 45. Foffa, D., Young, M.T., Brusatte, S.L., Graham, M.R., and Steel, L. 2017. A new
526 metriorhynchid crocodylomorph from the Oxford Clay Formation (Middle Jurassic) of
527 England, with implications for the origin and diversification of Geosaurini. *Journal of*
528 *Systematic Palaeontology* 10.1080/14772019.2017.1367730
- 529 46. Young, M.T., Hastings, A.K., Allain, R., Smith, T.J. 2016. Revision of the enigmatic
530 crocodyliform *Elosuchus felixi* de Lapparent de Broin, 2002 from the Lower–Upper
531 Cretaceous boundary of Niger: potential evidence for an early origin of the clade
532 Dyrosauridae. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* doi:10.1111/zoj.12452
- 533 47. Schneider, C.A., Rasband, W.S., and Eliceiri, K.W. 2012. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years
534 of image analysis. *Nature Methods* 9: 671–675.
- 535 48. Anderson, P.S.L., Friedman, M., Brazeau, M.D., and Rayfield, E.J. 2011. Initial radiation
536 of jaws demonstrated stability despite faunal and environmental change. *Nature* 476:
537 206–209.
- 538 49. Gower, J.C. 1971. A general coefficient of similarity and some of its properties.
539 *Biometrics* 27: 857–871.
- 540 50. Hammer, Ø., Harper, D.A.T., and Ryan, P.D. 2001. PAST: Paleontological statistics
541 software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica* 4(1): 1–9.
- 542 51. Anderson, M.J. 2001. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of
543 variance. *Austral Ecology* 26(1): 32–46. doi:10.1111/j.1442-9993.2001.01070.pp.x
- 544 52. R Core Team. 2012. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R

- Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0,
URL <http://www.R-project.org/>
53. Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical
and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series
B*. **57**(1): 289–300.
54. Wills, M.A., Briggs, D.E.G., and Fortey, R.A. 1994. Disparity as an evolutionary index: a
comparison of Cambrian and Recent arthropods. *Paleobiology* 20: 93–130.
55. Guillerme, T. 2016. dispRity: a package for measuring disparity in R. Zenodo.
10.5281/zenodo.55646
56. Brusatte, L.S., Lloyd, G.T., Wang, S.C., and Norell, M.A. 2014. Gradual assembly of
avian body plan culminated in rapid rates of evolution across the dinosaur-bird transition.
Current Biology 20: 2386–2392.
57. Foote, M. 1993. Contributions of individual taxa to overall morphological disparity.
Paleobiology 19: 403–419.
58. Navarro, N. 2003. MDA: a MATLAB-based program for morphospace-disparity analysis.
Computers & Geosciences 29: 655–664.

Acknowledgements

We thank Deborah Hutchinson and Isla Gladstone (BRSMG), Matthew Riley (CAMSM),
Paul Tomlinson (DORCM), Neil Clark (GLAHM), Steve Etches (MJML), Lorna Steel
(NHMUK), Eliza Howlett and Hilary Ketchum (OUMNH) and Emma Jarvis, Sarah King and
Stuart Ogilvy (YORYM) for access and guidance during DF's visits to museum collections.
DF's museum visits were funded by the Small Grant Scheme '2015 Wood Award'
(PASW201402), the Systematics Research Fund, and the Richard Owen Research Fund by
the Palaeontographical Society. MTY and SLB are supported by a Leverhulme Trust

Research Project grant (RPG-2017-167), and SLB is supported by a Marie Curie Career Integration Grant (630652). We thank Paige dePolo for comments on the manuscript, and Mark Puttick and Thomas Guillaume for discussion and technical support. We are grateful the reviewers Dr. Judy Massare, Dr. Benjamin C. Moon for the useful comments that greatly improve the quality of this manuscript.

Author contributions

DF led the project, conceived the study and wrote the initial draft manuscript. MTY and SLB helped develop the project, edited drafts, and provided guidance on statistical analyses. SLB wrote the final manuscript, which was revised by all authors. DF designed and performed the analyses with technical support from TLS and KGD.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Morphospace plots showing the distribution of marine reptile specimens based on tooth morphology. **a.** 3D plot of PCO1-PCO2-PCO3, derived from Principal Coordinates Analysis of our dental dataset; **b.** approximate position of the ‘feeding guilds’ (originally outlined by Massare⁷ and modified here) in the PCO morphospace. Tooth drawings depict the general tooth morphologies of key regions of the morphospace.

Figure 2. Morphospace plots showing the distribution of marine reptile clades based on tooth morphology through time, only statistically significant ecological and evolutionary shifts are noted. The morphospaces are 3D plots of PCO1-PCO2-PCO3, derived from Principal Coordinates Analysis (Fig. 1). The radiations and declines of groups through time gradually

changed the morphospace/ecosystem composition and partitioning. Note that some groups may have been limited to certain parts of ecomorphospace by evolutionary constraints.

Figure 3. Partial disparity of Jurassic Sub-Boreal Seaway marine reptile, mapped against global sea-level. **a.** Partial disparity of taxonomic groups, **b.** Partial disparity of dietary guilds; **c.** sea-level curve (modified from Haq 1987)³⁰, with fossil rich-intervals from the Sub-Boreal Seaway noted.