



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.



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.**

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

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

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

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

66

67 **Results**

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

74 our dataset (encompassing 25 taxa) that were also included in Massare’s study were assigned
75 to Massare’s guilds *a priori*, a jackknifing procedure found that our PCO axes successfully
76 discriminated these groups, with 84% of species correctly attributed to the guild Massare
77 assigned them to. This supports broad correspondence between our PCO morphospace and
78 Massare’s guilds, but 16% of species are mis-attributed, which may be because some species
79 previously known from limited fossil material (particularly metriorhynchids) were
80 misclassified when Massare introduced the guilds. We therefore used our PCO results to
81 establish a revised system of five guilds, which linear discriminant analysis finds to be
82 97.30% accurate. Along with the fact that characters in our dataset were chosen to represent
83 functionally significant features related to feeding, this indicates that the PCO morphospace
84 can be interpreted as a functional morphospace reflecting diet (Table 1). This link was
85 previously demonstrated by Massare⁷, by assessing tooth morphology, shape and gut contents
86 of the same species, and validated with comparisons with modern marine tetrapods (for
87 which dietary data are available).

88

| 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> , ' <i>M. cultridens</i> |
| 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> |

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

94
95 Many thalattosuchians (teleosaurids and metriorhynchids), plesiosauroids, and small-bodied
96 pliosaurids cluster together in morphospace, due to their thin teeth that lack serrations (Pierce
97 Guild), similar to modern shallow-water river dolphins and gharials; they are inferred to be
98 fish and squid-eaters (Fig. 1, Table 1). An adjacent region of morphospace is occupied by the
99 soft prey-eating Smash Guild, which is almost exclusively filled by ichthyosaurs with
100 conical, non-carinated and non-serrated teeth (Fig. 1, Table 1). Strongly ornamented, blunt
101 crowns of machimosaurin teleosaurids and the geosaurine *Torvoneustes* belong to the Crunch
102 Guild, inferred as hard-object (e.g. sea turtles) feeders (durophages) (Fig. 1, Table 1). There
103 are two clusters of cutting-type dentitions that correspond to different types of macrophagy
104 (feeding on large-bodied prey), analogous to modern deep-water cetaceans like killer whales:
105 the Cut Guild of geosaurine metriorhynchids (*Geosaurus*, *Plesiosuchus*, and *Dakosaurus*)
106 with large and serrated teeth, and the Generalist-Cut Sub-Guild (the macrophagous partition

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

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

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

126 There are no significant differences over time in the disparity of the pooled sample of
127 all marine reptile groups in the morphospace (as shown by permutation tests on range and
128 variance measures of morphospace occupation), indicating that an ecologically diverse fauna
129 persisted throughout the entire history of the seaway (Supplementary Table 5). There are few
130 instances of significant disparity changes within individual groups across successive time
131 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

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

159 **Discussion**

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

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

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

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

206 the more nearshore piercers that were devastated.

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

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

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

236

237 **Methods**

238

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

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

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

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

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

282

283 **Multivariate analysis.** The continuous characters were standardised using z-transformation
284 (distributions were equalized to the same mean value, $\mu = 0$, and standard deviation, $\sigma =$
285 1)^{11,48}. The entire taxon-character matrix (Appendix S1) was then transformed into a Gower
286 distance matrix (necessary for the combination of ordered discrete and continuous
287 characters)⁴⁹ and subjected to Principal Coordinates Analysis (PCO) in PAST v.3 and R
288 v3.4.3^{50,51}, following the procedure in Stubbs and Benton (2015)¹¹. The small number of
289 missing values (8.2% of the total scores) were automatically accounted for by pairwise
290 deletion. The scores of the first three PCO axes (which describe 28.54%, 22.16%, and
291 12.43% of total variance, respectively: Supplementary Table 1) were used to generate
292 morphospaces for data visualization (Figs. 1-2, Supplementary Figures 1-2), and the 15 PCO
293 axes that accounted for at least 0.5% of total variance were retained for discriminant function
294 analysis, statistical tests of morphospace overlap, and disparity calculations.

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

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

306 New fossil discoveries and reanalyses of key specimens suggest that some of the guild
307 assignments of Massare may be problematic, perhaps explaining why 16% of specimens are
308 incorrectly assigned by the LDA. Over the last few decades, many specimens used in
309 Massare's study have been re-evaluated (particularly metriorhynchids) and further details of
310 tooth morphology have been described (particularly regarding carinae and denticles)
311 (Appendix S3). Thus, we used the results of our PCO analysis—particularly the visual spread
312 of taxa in morphospace—to modify Massare's guilds into a new system of five guilds: Pierce,
313 Crunch, Smash, Cut, and Generalist (subdivided into Generalist-Pierce, and Generalist-Cut)
314 (Appendix S3, S4). We assigned the same 35 specimens from taxa shared with Massare's
315 study⁷ to one of these guilds a priori, and then ran a second LDA, which correctly attributes
316 97.3% of the specimens to the proper guild. This indicates that our morphospace can be used
317 to sensibly cluster species into guilds, and thus be interpreted as a dietary function space.
318 This second LDA also serves to classify each of our 122 specimens into its best-fit guild. The
319 regions of our PCO morphospace occupied by each guild are denoted in Figure 1. This is the
320 first attempt to project Massare's⁷ qualitative guilds into a numerically-derived morphospace.

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

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

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

341 We employed four time bins when analysing trends over the Jurassic. These
342 correspond to stage level: Callovian (166.1–163.5 Ma), Oxfordian (163.5–157.3 Ma),
343 Kimmeridgian (157.3–152.1 Ma), and early Tithonian (152.1–148.5 Ma). The average length
344 of these time bins is 4.4 Ma, with a minimum of 2.6 Ma for the Callovian and maximum of
345 6.2 Ma for the Oxfordian. Given the age uncertainty of several specimens, equal-length bins

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

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

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

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

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

384 **Data availability**

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

388 **References**

- 389 1. Pyenson, N.D., Kelley, N.P., and Parham, J.F. 2014. Marine tetrapod macroevolution:
390 Physical and biological drivers on 250 Ma of invasions and evolution in ocean
391 ecosystems. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*. 400: 1–8.
- 392 2. Kelley, N.P., and Pyenson, N.D. 2015. Evolutionary innovation and ecology in marine
393 tetrapods from the Triassic to the Anthropocene. *Science* 348, aaa3716.
394 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 Pliosauroida (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

- 545 Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. ISBN 3-900051-07-0,
546 URL <http://www.R-project.org/>
- 547 53. Benjamini, Y., and Hochberg, Y. 1995. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical
548 and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series*
549 *B.* **57**(1): 289–300.
- 550 54. Wills, M.A., Briggs, D.E.G., and Fortey, R.A. 1994. Disparity as an evolutionary index: a
551 comparison of Cambrian and Recent arthropods. *Paleobiology* 20: 93–130.
- 552 55. Guillerme, T. 2016. dispRity: a package for measuring disparity in R. Zenodo.
553 10.5281/zenodo.55646
- 554 56. Brusatte, L.S., Lloyd, G.T., Wang, S.C., and Norell, M.A. 2014. Gradual assembly of
555 avian body plan culminated in rapid rates of evolution across the dinosaur-bird transition.
556 *Current Biology* 20: 2386–2392.
- 557 57. Foote, M. 1993. Contributions of individual taxa to overall morphological disparity.
558 *Paleobiology* 19: 403–419.
- 559 58. Navarro, N. 2003. MDA: a MATLAB-based program for morphospace-disparity analysis.
560 *Computers & Geosciences* 29: 655–664.

561 **Acknowledgements**

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

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

574 **Author contributions**

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

579 **Competing interests**

580 The authors declare no competing interests.

581 **Figure Captions**

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

587

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

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

594

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