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Abstract

The taphonomy and palaeoecology of the early Miocene (Burdigalian) vertebrate assemblage of Ullujaya (East Pisco Basin, Peru) is here described. Vertebrate remains are concentrated in marine facies (Ct1a association) of the exposed Chilcatay Formation (dated 19-18 Ma) deposited within a 30-40 m deep, semi-enclosed, offshore environment. Coupled with ichnological observations, the size distribution of pyrite framboid relics reveals fluctuation of euxinic and oxic-dysoxic conditions at the seafloor. The assemblage is dominated by toothed cetaceans (kentriodontids, squalodelphinids, physeteroids, and the eurhinodelphinid-like Chilcacetus), together with a large dermochelyid turtle, some bony fish, and diverse elasmobranchs, mostly juveniles of Carcharhinus brachyurus and Cosmopolitodus hastalis. The vertebrate assemblage comprises a coastal community, dominated by mesopredators, representative of a warm-temperate, sheltered embayment connected with riverine and open-ocean environments. Vertebrate skeletons are typically disarticulated and incomplete, and some bone elements display shark bite marks. Microborings are observed at the bone surface. Bones exhibit a good degree of apatite mineralisation and bone cavities are locally filled by Ca-Mg carbonates. Our taphonomic observations suggest prolonged flotation of carcasses during which they were subject to biogenic and physical processes of partial destruction (including scavenging by sharks), before final deposition on a soft compact substrate. Preservation was favoured by the oxygen-deficient bottom conditions that inhibited the action of benthic macro-scavengers.
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1. Introduction

Remarkable global climatic, oceanographic, and seal-level changes occurred during the
Cenozoic, promoting the redistribution and partitioning of food resources and consequent changes in diversity and disparity of marine vertebrates (Norris et al., 2013). Although some general models linking these environmental changes to the evolution of different marine vertebrate lineages have already been proposed (Marx and Uhen 2010), our knowledge of Cenozoic marine vertebrates is still primarily based on a chronostratigraphically and geographically heterogeneous fossil record. For these reasons, the reliability of such models in depicting global evolutionary trends has been questioned (Pyenson et al., 2010).

Contrasting with this fragmentary global scenario, the Eocene to Pliocene fill of the East Pisco Basin, southern coast of Peru (hereinafter: EPB), features one of the largest concentrations of Cenozoic marine vertebrate fossils discovered worldwide. The fossil content of the (?)middle Miocene to Pliocene Pisco Formation, the youngest portion of the basin fill, is well-known from a systematic, palaeoecological and taphonomic point of view, based on thirty-five years of research efforts (see Bianucci et al. 2016a, b and Di Celma et al. 2017 for a complete reference list). Besides strongly contributing to the clarification of several aspects of the Neogene global evolutionary trends for several marine vertebrate lineages, these studies also provided insights into the genesis of the extraordinary fossil assemblage of the Pisco Formation. By contrast, the knowledge on the fossil contents of the older deposits of the EPB is still fragmentary, although including some specimens of extraordinary relevance, for both their evolutionary significance and their exceptional preservation (e.g., Clarke et al., 2010; Uhen et al., 2011; Lambert et al. 2017a; Martínez-Cáceres et al., 2017).

Moreover, studies carried out in the last years by our team highlighted an unexpected abundance of fossil vertebrates in the lower Miocene strata of the Chilcatay Formation.

All fossil vertebrates represented by bone elements described so far from this formation belong to odontocetes (toothed whales) and particularly to the platanistoid family Squalodelphinidae (Lambert et al. 2014; Bianucci et al., 2015, 2018), the new family Inticetidae (Lambert et al., 2018), and the longirostrine eurhinodelphid-like genus Chilcacetus (Lambert et al., 2015b). In addition, the
fossil assemblages of some shark tooth-rich beds have been described in detail (Landini et al., 2018).

Most of these fossils have been discovered in a few localities along the western side of the Ica River (e.g., Roca Negra, Ullujaya, and Zamaca), where the Chilcatay beds are extensively exposed.

The aim of the present interdisciplinary work is to describe the marine vertebrate assemblage of one of these localities – Ullujaya – from a taphonomic and palaeoecological point of view in order to define the conditions and processes leading to the preservation of such a remarkable fossil record and to assess the ecological significance of this assemblage in the global evolutionary scenario of the Miocene marine vertebrate biota.

2. Tectono-stratigraphic context

Since Mesozoic times, the tectono-dynamics of Peru have been controlled by the convergence of the oceanic Nazca/Farallon Plate and the continental South American Plate. This transform-convergent margin, characterised by normal to strike-slip faults, formed elongated basins along the Peruvian forearc (Kulm et al., 1982; Dunbar et al., 1990; León et al., 2008; Zúñiga-Rivero et al., 2010; Viveen and Schlunegger, 2018) (Fig. 1). According to Thornburg and Kulm (1981), two long and narrow, trench-parallel structural highs - the Outer Shelf High and the Upper Slope Ridge - formed on the continental shelf and upper slope in Late Cretaceous–early Palaeogene times, segmenting the Peruvian offshore into an inner set of shelf basins and a seaward set of slope basins (Fig. 1A). In this frame, the onshore EPB lies east of the Outer Shelf High as a shelf basin, whereas the still-submerged West Pisco Basin lies west of the Outer Shelf High as an upper-slope basin.

Active subduction erosion (von Huene and Lallemand, 1990; Clift et al., 2003; Hampel et al., 2004) controlled a prolonged period of normal faulting and subsidence in the EPB since at least the middle-late Eocene (Dunbar et al., 1990; León et al., 2008; Rustichelli et al., 2016a, b). This protracted extensional regime was only interrupted during the middle Miocene by a widespread
pulse of uplift, possibly related to the Quechua 1 tectonic event (Viveen and Schlunegger, 2018).

The sedimentary fill of the EPB comprises, from the oldest to the youngest, the Eocene Caballas Formation and Paracas Group (including the Los Choros and Yumaque formations), the upper Oligocene–middle Miocene Chilcatay Formation, and the (?)middle Miocene–Pliocene Pisco Formation (Dunbar et al., 1990; DeVries, 1998, 2017; DeVries et al., 2017; DeVries and Jud, 2018).

Some of these units are bounded by regionally extensive angular unconformities, which account for periods of subaerial exposure (DeVries, 1998). During deposition of the Chilcatay Formation, the EPB was a shallow-water, semi-enclosed embayment bounded to the east by the Coastal Batholith (a complex of igneous rocks mostly emplaced during the Late Cretaceous–early Eocene) and protected to the west by a chain of crystalline basement islands (Marocco and Muizon, 1988; the Gran Tablazo Archipelago of DeVries and Jud, 2018) (Fig. 1B).

3. Study area and methods

Ullujaya is a richly fossiliferous site located in the Ocucaje area, along the western side of the Ica River, in the southern coastal desert of Peru (Fig. 1C). In this area, the Chilcatay Formation comprises two smaller units (namely, the Ct1 and Ct2 allomembers), separated by a major intraformational unconformity, CE0.2 (Figs. 2 and 3A). The stratigraphic interval of interest for the present study comprises the middle to upper part of the Ct1 allomember, since the older Ct1 strata and the unconformity at the base of the formation (CE0.1) are not exposed at Ullujaya. By using a 66-m-long measured section and a high-resolution geological map (Fig. 2), the vertebrate fossil assemblages of the Chilcatay Formation exposed in this area have already been placed into a proper sedimentological, stratigraphic, and chronostratigraphic context by Di Celma et al. (2018).

Twenty-three sediment samples were collected along the measured section for palaeoecological, sedimentological, and chronostratigraphic purposes. Smear slides of fine-grained sediments were analysed with an Olympus BX50 polarised optical microscope. Diatoms and silicoflagellates were
analysed at 1000x. Some samples were analysed using a ZEISS Scanning Electron Microscope, after carbon coating. The size distribution of relics of pyrite framboiids was used as an indicator of redox conditions (Wilkin et al., 1996). For the chronostratigraphic study, biotite phenocrysts from a tephra deposit were analysed for major elements using a JEOL 8200 Super Probe at the University of Milan to check for alteration. \(^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}\) analyses were performed on hand-picked biotite crystals at the University of Milano-Bicocca, with the NuInstruments™ Noblesse® noble gas mass spectrometer, using an updated procedure based on Villa et al. (2000). The sample was irradiated avoiding Cd shielding in the nuclear reactor at the McMaster University (Canada); the Fish Canyon sanidine was used as flux monitor (assumed age: 28.172 ± 0.028 Ma, Rivera et al., 2011).

Macroscopic taphonomic data were collected both in the field and at the Museo de Historia Natural de la Universidad Nacional Mayor de San Marcos (hereinafter: MUSM) by examining fossils collected over the past years from the Ullujaya locality. Field observations were limited by the fact that most of the exposed specimens are still included in partially lithified sediment that has not been removed to avoid damaging the bones. Moreover, recent erosion partially destroyed and/or displaced the exposed bones. For selecting, describing, and quantifying this taphonomic information we also considered previous studies about the taphonomy of fossil vertebrates, with particular attention to the few papers dealing with marine mammal assemblages (e.g., Boessenecker et al., 2014, Danise and Dominici, 2014; Esperante et al. 2015). The articulation degree of associated bones was coded with numbers from 4 to 1 as follows: 4 (100-75% bones articulated); 3 (75-50%); 2 (50-25%); 1 (>25%); 0 (fully disarticulated bones). Similarly, for skeletal completeness: 4 (100-75% of the skeleton preserved); 3 (75-50%); 2 (50-25%); 1 (< 25%); 0 (one bone or one skeletal element, e.g. the cranium, preserved). Articulation and completeness of the cetacean skeletons were also quantitatively evaluated by using an approach similar to that used by Beardmore et al. (2012) and Beardmore and Furrer (2016a,b) for marine reptiles. Degrees of articulation and completeness, expressed as percentages, were plotted on a bivariate bubble plot in Microsoft Excel. A best-fit
linear trend line, forced through the point corresponding to 100% completeness and 100% articulation (i.e., the 'taphonomic origin' of the data, reflecting the common condition of specimens at death), was obtained. The 'T-value' was then defined by the intersect of the aforementioned trend line with the completeness axis. Pearson's r² value, indicating the goodness of fit of the regression line, was also obtained with Excel. Finally, the Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient (rs) was calculated in PAST (PAleaeontological STatistics program; Hammer and Harper, 2001) for having a non-parametric measure of the strength of correlation between articulation and completeness. Given the significant differences between reptile and cetacean skeletons (e.g., the cranial bones of cetaceans are less subject to disarticulation than those of reptiles), and considering also the relatively small size of our dataset (we analysed 52 specimens, excluding the remains exhibiting significant recent erosion and/or skeletons not found in situ), differing from Beardmore et al. (2012) and Beardmore and Furrer (2016a,b), we did not divide the skeleton in distinct units for the purposes of the quantitative taphonomic analysis.

In the field, taphonomic observations concerned the degree of preservation of the cortical bone and vertebral processes, as well as the presence/absence of: 1) bone abrasion; 2) bone fractures; 3) associated mollusc shells, remains of crabs and other invertebrates, teleostean and elasmobranch teeth; 4) associated remains of encrusting epibionts; and 5) traces of invertebrates and vertebrates. Shark bite marks were analysed using the morphological-genetic approach proposed by Cigala Fulgosi (1990) and modified by Bianucci et al. (2010b) and Collareta et al. (2017a), distinguishing five types of bite marks (Type I to V) on the basis of the producing impact.

For microscopic taphonomic features, nine bone samples from seven cetacean specimens were prepared as polished thin sections cut orthogonally to the elongation of the bone. They were analysed with Olympus BX50 and Leica Leitz Laborlux S transmitted light and Leica DM EP reflected light microscopes and with scanning electron microscopy and microanalysis (SEM-EDS; Tescan VEGA TS 5136 XM, University of Milano-Bicocca and the Philips -EDAX Genesis.
University of Pisa), obtaining semi-quantitative composition results.

4. Results

4.1. Stratigraphy, sedimentology, and age of the Chilcatay Formation at Ullujaya

The exposed portion of the Ct1 allomember is about 56 m thick and comprises a distinct two-fold subdivision of sedimentary facies, which includes a sub-horizontal package of interbedded medium- to fine-grained sandstones, sandy siltstones and siltstones (Ct1a facies association) and a stack of clinoformed units having a mixed siliciclastic-carbonate composition (Ct1b facies association).

The bulk of Ct1a is characterised by the dominance of massive, medium- to fine-grained siliciclastic sandstones and siltstones (Fig. 3B) with rare occurrences of silicoflagellates and diatoms, dominated by genera that are typical of coastal settings (Actinoptychus, Cocconeis, Delphineis, Grammatophora, Paralia). The diluted coarse biogenic fraction is composed of small amounts of redeposited skeletal elements including barnacles and mollusc shells (mainly ostreids and pectinids), both occurring as fragments and complete specimens, and rare echinoids and calcareous worm tubes. Rare encrusting bryozoans were observed on barnacle shells.

These fine-grained sediments are punctuated by laterally persistent beds of granule- to coarse-grained sandstones that range from 0.1 to 0.5 m in thickness and, locally, pass laterally into erosionally based cobble- to boulder-sized conglomerates up to 1.5 m thick. The bases of the granule- to coarse-grained sandstone beds are sharp and display dense burrow assemblages dominated by large Thalassinoides and subordinate Gyrolithes penetrating deeply into the subjacent fine-grained sediments (Figs. 3C, D). The burrows are backfilled with sediment from the overlying coarse-grained bed. The composition of the granule layers is a laterally variable mixture of siliciclastic grains, broken or whole shells of barnacles and small molluscs fragments, whereas that of the cobble- to boulder-sized conglomerates is dominated by rounded clasts from volcanic ash.
tuffs and from the igneous basement set in a coarse-grained bioclastic matrix.

During microscopic observations, abundant, subspherical framboidal aggregates of Fe-oxyhydroxide microcrystals, representing relic textures of pyrite framboids were detected through the sediment, which consists of small rhombohedral crystals of dolomite terrigenous clasts, and biogenic fragments (Fig. 4). The diameter of the framboids was measured in five samples from C1a, selected between 22 and 28.5 m above the base of the measured section (abbreviated: abs), where a high concentration of fossil vertebrates was found (Fig. 5). Framboids from 22 m abs, 23.5 m abs, 26 m abs, and 28.5 m abs exhibit a mean diameter of 4.6 ± 2.0 µm (as 1σ), 5.1 ± 1.9 µm, 5.3 ± 2.2 µm, and 5.0 ± 1.9 µm, respectively. Sample UL-D3 (25 m abs) exhibits a higher mean diameter of 8.3 ± 4.8 µm. Framboids having a diameter greater than 10 µm are 3.8% at most except for sample UL-D3 having a high percentage of large framboids (32.5%). Irregularly-shaped framboids are rare and concentrated in sample UL-D3.

Sediments of C1a underlie and, locally, landward interfinger with a 20-m-thick, clinostratified carbonate wedge (C1b). The dip direction of clinobeds is dominantly oriented to the southwest, indicating a uniform progradation direction. Clinoform height attains 15-20 m and maximum declivity ranges between 15° and 20°. Individual clinobeds are between 0.2 and 0.5 m thick and are composed of coarse-grained, well-sorted, skeletal-rich grainstones mixed with subordinate amounts of granule- and small pebble-sized terrigenous components. In terms of skeletal composition, C1b is largely dominated by large-sized, hard-substrate-related shore barnacles, occurring either as fragmented individuals or as clusters, with lesser amounts of molluscs, benthic foraminifera, and echinoids, representing a typical heterozoan assemblage (sensu James, 1997). All shells exhibit a high degree of fragmentation and disarticulation, and variably abraded shapes, indicative of transport. The lower boundary of the clinobedded deposit is a downlap surface characterised by a sharp and undulated lithologic contact with underlying sediments of C1a.

Diatom and silicoflagellate biostratigraphy already provides a robust chronology for the strata
exposed at Ullujaya and allows to define an age comprised between 18 and 19 Ma, with the age of
the youngest portion of the section being in agreement with the $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ age of 18.02 ± 0.07 Ma
obtained from biotite in tephra SOT-T3, sampled just 1 m below the erosional contact with the
overlying Pisco Formation (Di Celma et al., 2018). This chronostratigraphic framework is here
further supported by a new $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ dating of a volcanic ash layer (UJA-T35) sampled 2 m above
the lowermost exposure of the Ct1 allomember at Ullujaya.

Although microprobe analyses on biotite phenocrysts from this ash layer highlighted a loss of K in
the interlayer occupancy, it was one of the best preserved among the very few tephra detectable in
the section. The isochemical steps probably circumvent the alteration and give a $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ age of
19.00 ± 0.28 Ma (2σ uncertainty).

4.2. Overall composition of the fossil vertebrate assemblage

The assemblage includes bony vertebrates and chondrichthyan teeth. Eighty-two marine
vertebrate specimens are preserved as bony elements (Table 1). Remains of Cetacea dominate this
assemblage, accounting for 86.6% of the specimens, with a large number of indeterminate
specimens (56.1%). All specimens identifiable to suborder level belong to Odontoceti and no baleen
whale (Mysticeti) is recorded so far. Odontocete remains belong to Kentriodontidae (19.6%; early
relatives of today's true dolphins and porpoises), Squalodelphinidae (6.1%; a family closely related
to the extant South Asian river dolphin), Physeteroidea (2.4%; sperm whales), and to the genus
Chilcacetus (2.4%; an extinct lineage of homodont, long-snouted dolphins) (Fig. 6B).

Kentriodontids belong to an undescribed species within the genus Kentriodon Kellogg, 1927. This
kentriodontid is the most common cetacean taxon at Ullujaya, being known by several crania, some
of which are associated with mandibles and partial postcranial. Seven of these crania (MUSM 586,
631, 1393, 1397, 1398, and 2431) have been collected and are now under study. Squalodelphinid
remains include: 1) two specimens of Huaridelphis raimondii (the holotype MUSM 1396,
consisting of an isolated cranium, and the referred specimen MUSM 1403, a cranium, fragmentary mandible and some associated postcranial bones) (Lambert et al., 2014); 2) a well-preserved specimen attributed to *Notocetus vanbenedeni* (MUSM 1395, consisting of a cranium with an associated cervical vertebra) (Bianucci et al., 2015); and 3) two indeterminate specimens consisting of a disarticulated partial skeleton (MUSM 1484) and an isolated tympanic bulla (MUSM 1485).

Physeteroids consist of two isolated crania: 1) MUSM 3246, referred to cf. *Diaphorocetus* sp., sharing some affinities with *Diaphorocetus poucheti* from the lower Miocene Monte León Formation of Argentina; and 2) one badly damaged specimen previously regarded as an indeterminate mysticete (Lambert et al., 2014, Bianucci et al., 2015) but now confidently identified as a sperm whale (Physeteroidea indet.). Finally, the long-snouted archaic odontocete *Chilcacetus cavirhinus* is represented by two partial skeletons: 1) MUSM 1401, described by Lambert et al. (2015b); and 2) MUSM 2527, currently under study.

More than one thousand isolated elasmobranch teeth and spines, representative of at least nine families and sixteen different species, have been collected (Table 2 and Fig. 7). These remains belong to the following four orders: i) Carcharhiniformes (57.1% of the specimen), Lamniformes (35.2%), Myliobatiformes (7.5%), and Rhinopristiformes (0.2%) (Fig. 6C).

Carcharhiniformes are represented by seven species (*Carcharhinus brachyurus, Carcharhinus cf. leucas, Galeocerdo aduncus, Hemipristis serra, Negaprion brevirostris, Physogaleus contortus, and Sphyrna zygaena*), Lamniformes by seven (*Alopias superciliosus, Anotodus agassizii, Carcharias sp., Carcharocles chubutensis, Cosmopolitodus hastalis, Isurus oxyrinchus, and Megalolamna paradoxodon*), Myliobatiformes by one or more (*Myliobatoidea indet.*), and Rhinopristiformes by one (*Anoxypristis* sp.). Almost half of the elasmobranch remains consist of teeth of *C. brachyurus* (49.4%); teeth of *C. hastalis* (22.2%) and *I. oxyrinchus* (8.1%) follow in order of decreasing abundance.

Bony fish are represented by an indeterminate cranium, some very fragmentary tuna-like
skeletons, and the partial postcranial of a large istiophorid billfish tentatively referred to aff. *Makaira* sp. Similarly to the Pisco Formation (Collareta et al., 2015; Di Celma et al., 2017), cycloid scales consistent with those of the extant Pacific pilchard *Sardinops* are rather common in *Ct1a*.

Other marine vertebrates include a large dermochelyid marine turtle, represented by a single specimen consisting of some postcranial bones.

### 4.3. Distribution of the fossil vertebrates

Most of the fossils of vertebrates of Ullujaya come from a 1 km²-surface area where the *Ct1a* is exposed (Fig. 2A); in turn, based on our field observations, both *Ct1b* and the Ct2 allomember of the Chilcatay Formation exposed in the study area seem devoid of vertebrate specimens preserved as bony elements. Vertebrate fossils have been found between 9.7 and 33.5 m abs, representing a significant portion of the 35 m-thick *Ct1a* (Fig. 6A). Seventy-four specimens (97% of those with a stratigraphical collocation) are restricted in a 16.9 m-thick interval of sediments (13.9 to 30.8 m abs). The largest concentrations of fossil vertebrate remains are found between 14 and 15 m abs (22 specimens, 29%) and from 25 to 31 m abs (36 specimens, 7%). The large majority of the chondrichthyan specimens was collected from a single fossiliferous interval located about 23 m abs, whereas a few additional remains (mostly referable to *Cosmopolitodus* and *Carcharocles*) come from different horizons within *Ct1a*. Bony fish are homogeneously distributed between 14.2 m and 29.2 m abs, whereas the dermochelyid turtle specimen was found 14.8 m abs.

### 4.4. Physical taphonomy

Excluding twelve specimens that were not found *in situ* (due to recent erosion and subsequent dislocation), all the fossil vertebrate skeletons whose stratigraphic collocation is known display various degrees of disarticulation and are incomplete (Table 1 and Figs. 8, 9). The associated bones of the disarticulated skeletons exhibit a random disposition without any preferential orientation.
Among the sixteen cetacean crania found in situ, nine (56.2%) are disposed dorsal side-up and seven (43.8%) are disposed ventral side-up position (Fig. 8A). For most of the studied specimens, all skeletal elements are found within a single sediment layer, and evidence of sinking into the substratum are generally absent. Disarticulated vertebrae are typically observed with their epiphyseal surfaces parallel to the subjacent stratification – a disposition that would prove very stable for a vertebra resting for a prolonged time on a relatively compact soft substrate which does not allow sinking (Figs. 8B-E). The few exceptions include disarticulated vertebrae with transverse processes stuck into the underlying sediment (Figs. 9F, G) and a partly articulated vertebral column that moderately sank into the substratum (Figs. 9H, I).

Considering all the cetacean specimens that were found in situ, twenty-five of them (48.1%) consist of just one isolated anatomical element (e.g., cranium, vertebra, rib; Fig. 8A), thirteen (25.0%) of a few fully disarticulated bones (ca 25% of the skeleton being preserved; Figs. 8B-E), eleven (21.2%) of a few partially articulated bones (e.g., a few articulated vertebrae and ribs, with the remaining bones being disarticulated; Figs. 8F, G), two (3.8%) of fully disarticulated partial skeletons (ca 50% of the skeleton being preserved; Figs. 8H, I), and one (1.9%) of a fully articulated small portion of the skeleton (seven vertebrae; Figs. 8J, K). The articulation vs completeness bivariate bubble plot obtained with the above data (Fig. 10) highlights the high number of specimens whose completeness and articulation equal to zero. As a consequence, the T value is also very low (0.30), thus supporting biostratinomic conditions and processes favouring the disarticulation of the carcasses and the dispersal of the bony elements. The low value (0.08) of r² and the moderate (0.47) value of rs indicate that articulation and completeness are not firmly related to each other, as also evidenced by the observation of fully disarticulated skeleton with different degree of completeness.

Out of the thirteen cetacean skulls collected for systematic study, only one of them retains the mandible (but only the right ramus) articulated, only one has both periotics (ear bones) articulated,
one displays all the teeth in anatomical position, and six lack all teeth in their alveoli.

The smaller sample of non-mammalian vertebrates preserved as skeletal elements (one sea turtle and ten bony fish) confirms the taphonomic pattern observed for the cetaceans, all the detected skeletons being more or less incomplete and articulated. In particular, among bony fish, the most complete specimen (referred to aff. Makaira sp.) consists of an articulated, significant portion of the vertebral column with several skeletal elements scattered in a few square metres. The other fish specimens consist of six isolated portions of partly articulated vertebral columns (Figs. 9D, E), one fully articulated caudal fin (Fig. 9C), one isolated cranium, and two fragmentary portions of skulls.

Molluscs, barnacles, worm tubes, and other invertebrate remains, as well as shark teeth, are never found strictly associated to the bones. Bioerosion due to macro-invertebrates is never observed on the fossil bones, whereas shark bite marks are occasionally encountered (see paragraph 4.5). Bioturbations caused by the bone-eating worm Oseodax (Kiel et al., 2010) and other evidences of whale fall communities (Smith et al., 2015) have not been observed. None of the detected specimens was found included and/or associated to carbonate concretions, unlike what has been observed in the overlying Pisco Formation (Gariboldi et al., 2015; Gioncada et al., 2016). Furthermore, macroscopic evidence of adhering phosphate crusts or envelopes has not been observed.

Macroscopically, most of the bones preserved within the sediment have a reddish colour and appear well mineralised. SEM-BSE observations on representative samples (Table 3) indicate that the bone tissue is rather dense (Figs. 11A, B), confirming a good degree of mineralisation, with well-preserved bone structures. Under the optical microscope, in both the compact and the cancellous bone, Haversian canals and medullary cavities may exhibit cementation (Table 3 and Figs. 11C-F). In one of the samples, Ca-phosphate partially fills osteon porosity, indicating incipient permineralisation. In several cases (Table 3), the Haversian canals of the compact bone and the larger medullary cavities of the cancellous bone are totally or partially filled by Ca-Mg carbonates.
Several generations of carbonate cement are observed, having different Ca/Mg ratios. Furthermore, in several samples, sediment grains fill some of the bone cavities, thus providing evidence that the bone went broken before diagenesis occurred. In some cases, Fe-oxides/hydroxides fill the Haversian canals in the reddish portions of the bone. Gypsum can also fill partly the bone cavities.

When the external part of the bone is preserved, it can be intact, partly dissolved, or affected by microborings. Two of the four examined specimens having bones not decorticated exhibit microborings of the B-type (sensu Gariboldi et al., 2015) (Table 3). In these cases, borings are a few µm wide and can be filled by gypsum, apatite, or Fe-oxyhydroxides. The boundary between the bone tissue and the sediment is cemented by Fe-oxyhydroxides causing the bone surface to appear reddish.

Field evidence of abrasion and fracturing of the exposed bones is often not easy to interpret due to the erosion in the present-day desert. In this respect, the analysis of thirteen partial skeletons collected for systematic study has proven more useful. Most of these fossils lack evidence of abrasion, having their cortical bone well preserved (e.g., the Chilcacetus cavirhinus MUSM 1401 and the Huaridelphis raimondii MUSM 1403). However, weak abrasion is observed in some crania of the MUSM collections (e.g., the Kentriodon MUSM 2431 and MUSM 631), but that could be due to recent erosion. Fracturing is clearly observed in one cranium (MUSM 631) referred to Kentriodon, having its posterior portion damaged (Figs. 12A, B). In all the other collected skulls, fractures (if present) are minor and do not generate significant distortion of the bones (e.g., in the holotype skull MUSM 1396 of Huaridelphis raimondii, Figs. 12C, D). Delicate bone elements, such as the hamular processes and the laminae of the pterygoid, are preserved in several crania.

With regard to the postcranial remains, most bones are broken and fragmentary (in part, because of recent erosion), although some vertebrae exhibit a good state of preservation of the narrow and elongated neural spine and transverse processes.
4.5. Shark bite marks

Although shark bite marks were not observed in the field on the exposed surfaces of bones, four of the specimens collected for systematic study are affected by these traces (Fig. 13).

Only one of the eleven collected crania exhibits bite marks. It consists of an isolated cranium referred to *Kentriodon* sp. (MUSM 1398) displaying two unserrated marks on the dorsal surface of the right premaxilla at mid-length of the rostrum (Fig. 13O). Considering that these traces are short (ca 5 mm long) and shallow, they are probably due to scavenging rather than to active predation.

This hypothesis is consistent with the feeding behaviour of the extant white shark *Carcharodon carcharias*, which usually does not target the head region of dolphins in order to avoid biosonar detection (Long and Jones, 1996).

Two partial skeletons referred to *Chilcacetus cavirohinus* (MUSM 1401 and MUSM 2527) and one partial skeleton referred to *Huaridelphis raimondii* (MUSM 1403), exhibit bite marks on postcranial bones. Interestingly, to date, these three specimens are the only fossil vertebrates from Ullujaya for which significant postcranial material was collected, suggesting that bite marks could be relatively frequent on the postcranial remains of the Ullujaya odontocetes. The lack of field observations of bite marks could be favoured by the limited exposure of the bones and to the only partial preservation, due to recent erosion, of their cortical region.

The partial skeleton of *Chilcacetus cavirohinus* MUSM 2527 exhibits several bite marks on one of the three preserved ribs (Fig. 13A) and on the left humerus (Figs. 13B, C). Considering the unserrated nature and the size of these marks, all the bites observed on MUSM 2527 bones could have been inflicted by a young individual of *Cosmopolitodus hastalis*, a shark species known from C1a by abundant teeth. The (?)posterior rib is affected by several marks, the longest of which, about 20 mm long, are a type V bite mark (removing of a roughly prismatic or wedge-shaped chip of bone due to ubiquitous biting or as a result of a single cutting action directed deep into the bone; Collareta et al., 2017a) and two parallel type I marks (Cigala Fulgosi, 1990; Bianucci et al., 2010b).
The humerus is affected by two clusters of bite marks on the lateral and medial surfaces of the bone. Both clusters consist of several type I-II-III bite marks exhibiting a preferential orientation orthogonal to the main axis of the humerus, with several marks crossing each other. These marks are moderately deep, with lengths ranging from a few millimetres to 90 mm. They range in shape from rectilinear to weakly arched, their concavity being facing distally. The marks on the medial surface of the humerus are more numerous (ca 30) and generally more elongated than those on its lateral surface (ca 12). Although the skeleton of MUSM 1403 is rather incomplete, some speculations could be made about the trophic interaction between the shark(s) and the dolphin. The traces on the (?)posterior rib suggest an active attack from behind and below, a predation strategy documented for the extant white shark on pinnipeds and dolphins (Long and Jones, 1996; Klimley et al., 1996) and also suggested for other fossil cetaceans whose ribs display bite marks (Cigala Fulgosi, 1990; Bianucci et al. 2010b; Bianucci and Gingerich, 2011). This hypothesis is strengthened by the observation of a large number of marks, some of which are very deep (one even removing a chip of bone), indicating one or more powerful bites possibly causing the death of the dolphin. On the whole, the shape, size, and arrangement of the marks on the humerus suggest that a single shark grasped the flipper of the dolphin, trying to tear it off with repeated bites and by rotating the head (Fig. 13E). The greater number of traces on the medial surface of the humerus could be due to the greater number of functional teeth of the lower jaw of the shark as compared to the upper jaw (Fig. 13D), supposing that the dolphin was in a ventral up position. The pectoral fins are not included among the parts of the body of dolphins targeted by white sharks in active predation events (Long and Jones, 1996) suggesting that the bites on the humerus of MUSM 1403 were inflicted to the agonizing or even dead dolphin after a first attack to the abdomen (Figs. 13F, G). As young white sharks do not generally attack healthy cetaceans, and adult great whites only actively prey upon distinctly smaller food items (Long and Jones, 1996), it is possible that the odontocete individual MUSM 1403 was already weakened when the attack took place. However, as
in all documented cases of shark bite marks on fossil cetacean bones (Deméré and Cerutti, 1982; Cigala Fulgosi, 1990; Lambert and Gigase, 2007; Noriega et al., 2007; Ehret et al, 2009; Bianucci et al. 2010b; Bianucci and Gingerich, 2011; Collareta et al., 2017a), it is not easy to discriminate between marks being the result of active predation and marks resulting from scavenging on a carcass, either drifting at the water surface or lying along the seafloor.

The other partial skeleton of *Chilcacetus caviirhinus* (MUSM 1401) exhibits bite marks along the left mandible (Fig. 13H) and on the three preserved ribs (Figs. 13I-L). The marks on the left mandible are located on the lateral side of the symphyseal portion and consist of seven 4–7 mm-long unserrated incisions, six of which are type I bites inflicted almost perpendicular to the main axis of the bone, whereas another mark is a type V mark. Both the (?)second ribs are deeply incised with several bite marks. The (?)second left rib is almost complete and exhibits a high concentration of traces on its proximal posterior surface, where two deep, parallel, unserrated, *ca* 15-mm-long type I marks are observed alongside one irregular hole referable to the vertical impact of a shark tooth. The other marks are smaller and include a type III mark with parallel incisions produced by a serrated tooth. The longest traces on the fragmentary (?)second right rib are: 1) two (type II?) marks, 21 and 13 mm long respectively, on the proximal posterior surface of the bone, and 2) a type I or II mark, 16 mm long, on its anteroventral surface. The third incomplete rib exhibits some small type I marks on the dorsal surface and some weak incisions on the neck of the missing tubercle. The few long and deep unserrated marks detected on this bone, closely associated to several small and shallower traces (including one with serrated margins), suggest that the dolphin was first attacked or scavenged by one or more large lamniform sharks with non-denticulated teeth (e.g., *Cosmopolitodus*), then by smaller sharks (belonging to at least two different species) scavenging preferentially those parts of the carcass that were previously lacerated by stronger bites. Scavenging on cetaceans killed by other sharks is well documented in present-day mackerel sharks (Pratt et al., 1982; Casey and Pratt, 1985; Long and Jones, 1996).
Finally, the *Huaridelphis raimondii* partial skeleton MUSM 1403 exhibits some shallow incisions (most likely due to scavenging) near the end of a rib fragment (Fig. 13M) and two deep and short type I bite marks on the dorsal margin of another proximal rib fragment (Fig. 13N).

5. Discussion

5.1. Reconstruction of the depositional environment

Facies architecture, bedding patterns, and skeletal composition of the *Ct1b* clinoforms described here bear striking similarities with seaward-prograding mixed siliciclastic-carbonate wedges documented by Pomar and Tropeano (2001) and Massari and D’Alessandro (2012) and reflect the outwards dispersal of sediment in concert with the skeletal production rate and the available physical accommodation space (*sensu* Pomar and Kendall, 2008). According to these interpretations, *Ct1b* represents an entirely Submerged Infralittoral Prograding Wedge (ILPW; Hernández-Molina et al., 2000; Pomar et al., 2015), characterised by a storm-wave-graded profile, located at shoreface depth between the fair-weather and storm wave base, and distinctive clinoform foresets (Fig. 14). In this setting, high wave-current shear-stress in shoreface environment ensures that topsets of subaqueous clinoforms are regions of dominant sediment bypass through lateral advection, erosion, and redistribution. Accordingly, it is inferred that coarse-grained skeletal hash derived from a shallow-water carbonate factory inboard of the clinoform break-points was occasionally transported seawards and deposited on the sloping front of the ILPW separating the shoreface and the offshore (transition-slope setting of Pomar and Tropeano, 2001), leading to the formation of the clinoform foresets.

Downdip transport and dispersion of skeletal debris were especially active during storms by downwelling currents transforming into gravity flows at the clinoformed slope margin (Massari and Chiocci, 2006). At the same time, the winnowed-out fine-grained material actively bypassed the ILPW as part of the suspended load and was deposited farther downdip, into a deeper inner shelf
Basinward, these clinoformed skeletal-rich sediments interfinger with and downlap onto the vertebrate fossil-bearing siltstones and fine-grained sandstones of Ct1a. Given its downdip position with respect to the ILPW, Ct1a is considered to represent deposition by suspension fallout of shoreface-derived fine-grained material. The sharp-based, granule- to cobble-sized conglomerate beds interbedded into these fine-grained background sediments clearly reflect periodic high-energy events in otherwise quite marine offshore settings. Accordingly, they are interpreted as event beds resulting from tsunami backflows or storm-induced, offshore-directed density underflows transporting coarse-grained shoreface sediments beyond the toe of the transition slope. The exclusive association of discrete burrowed intervals with gravity-flow event beds intercalated in otherwise poorly bioturbated sediments and the restriction of burrow assemblages to *Thalassinoides* and *Gyrolithes* ichnogenera suggest a genetic relationship between bioturbation by decapod crustaceans and gravity flow deposition. As such, the *Thalassinoides-Gyrolithes*-burrowed intervals documented within Ct1a resemble the “doomed pioneers trace fossil assemblages” documented by Föllmi and Grimm (1990). In their doomed pioneer hypothesis, the authors argued that ichnofabrics beneath gravity-flow event beds deposited in generally inhospitable environments (e.g., benthic oxygen-deficiency) may be the product of adult allochtonous crustaceans that probably grew up in the well-oxygenated marginal areas and survived exhumation, transport by gravity-driven sediment flows, and re-deposition into deeper-water, oxygen-depleted depositional sites. Based on their interpretation, the displaced callianassid tracemakers are versatile enough to live and feed under the new oxygen-deficient bottom conditions for a short period of time before dying from suffocation and, therefore, may successfully penetrate the substrate to create conspicuous dwelling burrow networks. Accordingly, the systematic absence of additional ichnogenera and autochthonous body fossils of shelled benthic organisms throughout Ct1a supports the possibility that the *Thalassinoides-Gyrolithes*-burrowed intervals reflect short-term burrowing activity of doomed
pioneers in an otherwise oxygen-deficient sea-bottom environment normally inhibiting benthic life 
(Föllmi and Grimm, 1990).

Further supporting the hypothesis of poorly oxygenated bottom waters, we observed the presence 
of disseminated iron oxide framboids, which we interpret as relics of pyrite framboids, in the 
sediments of Ct1a. According to Agbi et al. (2015), the size distribution of framboidal pyrite could 
be used for distinguishing between oxic-dysoxic and euxinic conditions in the palaeo-bottom water, 
using the method applied by Wilkin et al. (1996) in modern sediments. Wilkin et al. (1996) noticed 
that pyrite framboids from euxinic environments are generally smaller and less variable in size than 
those from sediments underlying oxic or dysoxic bottom water, and related this feature with the 
different formation mechanisms of pyrite (Raiswell and Berner, 1985), which is syngenic in 
euxinic settings and diagenetic in sediments underlying oxic water columns. In the Ct1a sediments 
exposed at Ullujaya, the size distribution of ex-pyrite framboids suggests an alternation of periods 
characterised by euxinic and oxic-dysoxic conditions (Figs. 5, 15). As recorded in the modern 
euxinic environments (Wilkin et al., 1996), framboids from samples UL-D1, UL-D2, UJA-49, and 
UL-D5 exhibit a mean diameter close to 5.0 ± 1.7 µm and large (i.e., > 10 µm) framboids are 
scarce, accounting for less than 4% of the measured aggregates. Indeed, framboids from sample 
UL-D3 exhibit a mean diameter of 8.3 µm (± 4.8) and more than 30% of them is large-sized, in 
agreement with the description of pyrite aggregates from modern oxic-dysoxic environments, with a 
mean of 7.7 ± 4.1 µm and 10-50 % of framboids > 10 µm (Wilkin et al. 1996). Therefore, the Ct1a 
palaeoenvironment of Ullujaya was interested by some euxinic events; on the other hand, the 
marine fossil assemblages found in the Ct1 allomember, including bivalves and barnacles in the 
shallow-water Ct1b and fish and cetaceans in the inner shelf Ct1a, suggest normal oxygenation in 
nearshore areas, where breaking waves efficiently mixed oxygen from the atmosphere into the 
water.

A key role in the development of oxygen-deficient conditions on the sea floor was probably
played by local factors, such as the semi-enclosed nature of the EPB during deposition of the Chilcatay strata (Fig. 1B) and the likely presence of a nearby upwelling zone where deep, nutrient-enriched water raised towards the surface, causing increased organic productivity and high oxygen demand on the shelf, as observed along the present-day Eastern Pacific margin (Pickering et al., 1989). As a matter of fact, however, diatom forms that are typical of upwelling settings (e.g., Thalassionema) do not occur in Ct1, but they are present in the overlying deposits of the Ct2 allomember.

The record of silicoflagellates from Ullujaya helps in further refining our reconstruction of the depositional environment. The silicoflagellate assemblage from Ct1a features the temperate genus Distephanopsis, the warm-water genera Corbisema and Naviculopsis, and the cold-water genus Stephanocha. This assemblage is best interpretable as witnessing warm-temperate thermal conditions.

Finally, an approximate estimation of the palaeobathymetry recorded by the toe of the slope at the transition between Ct1a and Ct1b can be obtained by summing up the depth of the break-points of the clinobedded units and the thickness of the clinobeds (15-20 m in Ct1b). The outer edge of the infralittoral wedge is naturally dependent on many different environmental factors, of which the wave climate, fetch, grain size, and general oceanographic conditions are among the most important (Mitchell et al., 2012). In the Mediterranean area, both Hernández-Molina et al. (2000) and Massari and Chiocci (2006) have found the outer edges of the breakpoints of the clinobedded units located at water depths of about 15–20 m. Due to the protected palaeogeography displayed by the EPB (Fig. 1B), the hydrodynamic conditions during deposition of the Chilcatay Formation would have been remarkably less energetic from those dictating the development of modern non-tropical skeletal carbonate sediments in oceanic settings exposed to vigorous storm-waves and probably resulted in the formation of prograding wedges at relatively shallower water depths. As a consequence, by assuming a water depth of the outer edge of the infralittoral wedge similar to that documented in the
Mediterranean area, an offshore depositional setting at least 30-40 m below the sea level can be interpreted for Ct1a at the toe of the slope. The bioturbated nature of the lower boundary of the Ct2 allomember and its association with a basal oyster-bearing shelly horizon and a mixture of extrabasinal pebble- to boulder-size clasts, indicate that erosional scouring and shell concentration took place during a period of sea-level fall followed by transgression (e.g., Kidwell, 1991; Abbott, 1998; Carnevale et al., 2011).

5.2. Genesis of the marine vertebrate fossil assemblage

Our taphonomic observations and the reconstruction of the Ct1a depositional environment suggest prolonged flotation and repeated movements through the water mass of the marine vertebrate carcasses before their final deposition on the seafloor (Schäfer, 1972). During this long-time floating phase, the carcasses were subject to biogenic and physical processes of partial destruction, as supported by the shark bite marks (at least part of them indicating scavenging action) and by the overall low degrees of completeness and articulation of the specimens. The high number of isolated crania of cetaceans may record the separation of the relatively heavy head from the rest of the body during the early phases of the flotation of the carcasses, as observed by Schäfer (1972) for extant dolphins and already hypothesised for fossil cetaceans from the upper Miocene of the EPB by Bianucci et al. (2010a). Further disarticulation could have occurred during the period when the carcasses laid exposed on the seafloor, due to the fluidization of the remaining soft tissues and consequent gravitational collapse (Reisdorf et al., 2014). In some cases, the presence of sediment infilling some bone cavities proves that the micro-breakages of the bones occurred before diagenesis and that bones were exposed on the seafloor after the carcass deposition, as a consequence of the early body dismemberment. Bottom currents can be discarded as a cause of disarticulation due to the lack of preferential orientation of the disarticulated remains and the lack of sedimentary structures, considering also that
the aforementioned evidence of euxinic conditions supports water stagnation close to the seafloor. Together with the scarcity of breakage and abrasion marks on the bones, the preservation of delicate bone structures further supports the absence of transport due to bottom currents. Scavenging action as a cause of disarticulation can be discarded due to the lack of fossil traces on the bones (with the notable exception of those left by sharks) and of closely associated macroinvertebrate remains (whose absence is probably due to the euxinic conditions of the bottom waters, see above).

Bones often exhibit a reddish colour on the surface, visible at both macro- and micro-scale (Figs. 11C-F and 13). This feature is probably due to the oxidation of Fe, available for the formation of abundant pyrite frambooids in anoxic bottom water and within the sediments.

Bone cavities, such as Haversian canals and medullary cavities, show in some cases a Ca-phosphate filling that occurred during early diagenesis and a later cementation of carbonates (spatic calcite and subordinate Mg-Ca carbonates) or gypsum. Differing from what has been recorded at various sites of the Pisco Formation, micritic clotted dolomite filling the bone cavities and dolomite envelopes have not been observed with fossil vertebrates at Ullujaya. In the deposits of the Pisco Formation, dolomite concretions grew around vertebrate carcasses during the very early phases of diagenesis, as a consequence of anaerobic degradation processes of organic matter leading to cementation of the surrounding matrix (Gariboldi et al., 2015; Gioncada et al., 2016, 2018). Therefore, the formation of dolomite nodules requires an early covering of the vertebrate carcass by sediment (e.g., via sinking into a soupy substrate or rapid burial by high rates of sediment deposition) (Gariboldi et al., 2015; Gioncada et al., 2016). Moreover, microbially mediated degradation processes inducing dolomite precipitation are more likely to be efficient if the amount of decaying organic matter is large and permeability of the embedding sediment is low, both conditions favouring a locally anoxic environment (Gioncada et al., 2018). At Ullujaya, taphonomic and sedimentological evidence accounts against rapid sinking and/or burial of the vertebrate carcasses, supporting instead the hypothesis that their deposition occurred after substantial
defleshing and the consequent exposure of the bones on the seafloor. Such a prolonged biostratinomic journey likely contributed to prevent the formation of dolomite envelopes around the Ullujaya marine vertebrate remains.

The fine-quality preservation of the bones, the absence of adhering phosphate crusts or nodules, and the above reported sedimentary evidence also exclude the interpretation of the *Ct1a* vertebrate assemblage as a condensed deposit due to hialtal and/or lag concentration consequent to low sedimentation rates or erosion (see Pyenson et al., 2009; Boessenecker et al., 2014).

5.3. Stratigraphic significance and comparison with other coeval vertebrate assemblages

5.3.1. Cetaceans

At the species level, the Ullujaya assemblage shares the squalodelphinid *Notocetus vanbenedeni* with the Aquitanian–lower Burdigalian Leonian assemblage, Argentina (Cozzuol, 1996). Similarly, both faunas include a species of *Kentriodon*, and a physeteroid from Ullujaya displays similarities with the Leonian *Diaphorocetus poucheti*. A squalodelphinid and a physeteroid are also recorded in the upper Aquitanian-lower Burdigalian Belluno assemblage, Italy (Bianucci and Landini, 2002), whereas at least one squalodelphinid and *Kentriodon* are known from the lower Miocene formations of the eastern U.S.A (Kellogg, 1932; Whitmore and Kaltenbach, 2008; Kidwell et al., 2015; Boessenecker, 2018). Finally, the long-snouted homodont odontocete *Chilcacetus cavirhinus* may belong to the same clade as the Leonian *Argyropectes patagonicus* and several species from the Aquitanian Pyramid Hill assemblage, California, U.S.A. (Lambert et al., 2015b).

Interestingly, the Ullujaya assemblage features no mysticetes, a condition shared by all other coeval sites, a main exception being the Leonian assemblage, which includes one 'cetothere' and one balaenid (Buono et al., 2017). The Aquitanian gap in the mysticete fossil record could partly reflect a limited number of cetacean-bearing localities (Marx and Fordyce, 2015). The low diversity of early Miocene filter-feeding mysticetes may also be correlated to a drop in diatom diversity that
would have particularly impacted cetaceans preying upon small-sized prey (Marx and Uhen, 2010).

The fact that the Argentinian localities are the southernmost among these lower Miocene assemblages may suggest that the circum-Antarctic areas were refuge regions for mysticetes at that time.

5.3.2 Elasmobranchs

Many elasmobranch taxa found at Ullujaya are stratigraphically uninformative, being common components of Neogene chondrichthyan assemblages from shallow-marine settings worldwide.

Most of them are also known from the late Miocene deposits of the EPB (Di Celma et al., 2017; Landini et al., 2017a). However, two otodontid taxa (Megalolamna paradoxodon and Carcharocles chubutensis) are of particular stratigraphic interest. M. paradoxodon is known from a few localities worldwide, being seemingly limited to the Aquitanian–Burdigalian interval (Shimada et al., 2017).

In turn, Carcharocles is one of the most ubiquitous and widespread Neogene elasmobranch genera. Pimiento et al. (2016) suggested that Carcharocles represents a lineage of chronospecies whose latest representatives are C. chubutensis (making its last appearance in Oligocene or earliest Miocene times) and the late early Miocene–Pliocene C. megalodon (whose presence in Burdigalian deposits has been demonstrated by Carrillo-Briceño et al., 2015). The present report of remains of C. chubutensis (including fragmentary adult teeth, always displaying lateral cusplets) from Ullujaya could suggest that C. chubutensis and C. megalodon coexisted during the late early Miocene (see also Aguilera and Aguilera, 2004). On the other hand, C. chubutensis and C. megalodon are not found together in the EPB, as C. megalodon is absent from the Chilcatay Formation, being in turn the sole otodontid featured in the geologically younger Pisco Formation (Landini et al., 2018).

5.3.3 Bony fish

Both the family Istiophoridae and the scombrid genus Thunnus are known from the Eocene onwards (Fierstine, 2006; Santini et al., 2013). Fossil pilchards are very rare in the Pacific realm, and the origin itself of the genus Sardinops is only tentatively referred to the early Miocene (Parrish
et al., 1989). Tuna-like fish, marlins, and *Sardinops* are also known from the upper Miocene strata of the EPB (Collareta et al., 2015, 2017b; Lambert et al., 2015a; Bianucci et al., 2016a; Di Celma et al., 2017).

5.3.4 Turtles

The fossil history of dermochelyids spans from the Palaeocene onwards (Delfino et al., 2013). A dermochelyid turtle (*Natemyx peruvianus*) has been described based on a partial shell from the “Late Oligocene Pisco Formation […] approximately 1.5 km southwest of Hacienda Ullujaya” (Wood et al., 1996). Based on our observations, only the Chilcatay Formation is exposed at that locality; that would also account better for the proposed Oligocene age of *Natemyx peruvianus*.

5.4. Vertebrate palaeoecology

5.4.1. Cetaceans

Palaeoecological analyses of fossil cetacean assemblages must account for some major caveats. First, floating cetacean carcasses can suffer substantial transport by marine or fluvial currents before depositing at the seafloor (Schäfer, 1972). Second, the reconstruction of the feeding and habitat preferences of fossil cetaceans is not obvious when the fossil taxa do not have close and phenetically similar extant relatives (e.g., *Chilcacetus* and cf. *Diaphorocetus*). Third, the absence of some significant clades of large-sized cetaceans (e.g., mysticetes) could reflect long-term biogeographical patterns rather than eco-environmental constraints. Finally, some of the Ullujaya fossil cetaceans could have entered accidentally, as living organisms, into the sheltered Ct1a area from adjacent fluvial or pelagic environments. Given these limitations, the reconstructed scenario of Figure 14 should be regarded as partly speculative. However, we are confident that at least the small dolphin *Kentriodon*, the most common cetacean in *Ct1a*, likely lived in this area.

Most of the Ullujaya cetaceans (*Chilcacetus, Huaridelphis, Kentriodon*, and *Notocetus*) exhibit narrow rostra and small teeth; moreover, they are homodont and polydont, thus suggesting a
raptorial feeding specialization for capturing small prey (e.g., small-sized fish and shrimps).

Taphonomic selection, preventing the preservation of the delicate skeletons of small-sized vertebrates and decapods, could account for the apparent lack of fossils of these hypothetical prey items at Ullujaya. Given its very elongated and narrow rostrum and symphyseal portion of the mandibles, *Chilcacetus cavirostris* could have been a coastal bottom-feeder (as the extant river dolphins) or an epipelagic piscivore (as hypothesised for the similarly long-snouted late Miocene beaked whale *Messapicetus gregarius*: Lambert et al., 2015a; Ramassamy et al., 2018). In both hypotheses, the long-snouted condition could have been driven by dietary preferences (e.g., a predilection for small fish) rather than by environmental conditions (McCurry et al., 2017).

The phytosaur cranial referred to cf. *Diaphorocetus* displays deep dental alveoli indicating a complete upper dentition and evoking a raptorial feeding behaviour that contrasts with the suction feeding technique of extant sperm whales. Compared to the size of the skull, the diameter of the alveoli is small, suggesting that this odontocete fed on smaller prey than other macroraptorial physeteroids (e.g., the large-toothed *Acrophyseter* and *Livyatan*: Lambert et al., 2017).

The Ullujaya vertebrate assemblage does not feature two recently described Chilcatay odontocetes, namely, the possibly suction feeding *Inticetus* (Lambert et al., 2018) and the macroraptorial squalodelphinid *Macrosqualodelphis* (Bianucci et al., 2018). This observation indicates that the morphological and ecological disparity of the Chilcatay cetaceans is greater than that recorded at Ullujaya.

### 5.4.2. Elasmobranchs

The Ullujaya elasmobranch assemblage is dominated by remains of *Carcharhinus brachyurus*, which currently inhabits warm-temperate waters 0–100 m deep (Compagno, 1984). *Carcharhinus brachyurus* occasionally occurs in brackish and estuarine waters and elects semi-enclosed embayments as nursery grounds (Duffy and Gordon, 2003). A shallow-water environment is also supported by the presence of *Negaprion brevirostris* and *Carcharhinus cf. leucas*, two strongly
littoral, tropical-subtropical carcharhinids that thrive in mangrove swamps and river mouths

(Compagno, 1984; Compagno and Niem, 1998). Similarly, *Anoxypristis* is a nectobenthic organism that is found in coastal and estuarine warm-water environments (D'Anastasi et al., 2013). In turn, strong connections with the pelagic realm are supported by the presence of *Alopias superciliosus*. All the recognised extant taxa are nevertheless consistent with a coastal environment. A predilection for coastal warm-temperate habitats is also regarded as characteristic of the extinct species *Carcharocles chubutensis, Megalolamna paradoxodon*, and *Hemipristis serra*; moreover, the extant *Hemipristis elongata* is a tropical coastal shark that inhabits waters up to 30 m depth (Compagno, 1984). The ontogenetic structure of the observed assemblage also suggests a shallow coastal environment, as *Carcharhinus brachyurus* and *Cosmopolitodus hastalis* are mostly represented by juvenile teeth, thus evoking the presence of overlapping coastal nurseries (e.g., Landini et al., 2017b, 2018). *Alopias superciliosus, Carcharhinus brachyurus, Isurus oxyrinchus, Negaprion brevirostris*, and *Sphyrna zygaena* mostly rely on small- to medium-sized fish and subordinate cephalopods and crustaceans, and similar considerations apply to the extant species of *Carcharias* and *Hemipristis* (Compagno, 1984, 2001; Cortés and Gruber, 1990; Devadoss and Chandrasekar, 1991; Smale, 1991; Duffy and Gordon, 2003; Manojkumar and Pavithran, 2004; Cailliet et al., 2009). In turn, the more diverse trophic habits of *Carcharhinus leucas* and extant *Galeocerdo* include occasional predation upon marine tetrapods (including diminutive cetaceans) (Simpfendorfer and Burgess, 2009). *Anotodus agassizii* and *Cosmopolitodus hastalis* have been interpreted as eurytrophic littoral predators whose adult stages foraged mostly on fish while secondarily preying on diminutive marine tetrapods (e.g., Landini et al., 2017a). Among Otodontidae, *Megalolamna* is regarded as a piscivore which relied on medium-sized fish (Shimada et al., 2017), whereas the diet of *Carcharocles* was likely similar to that of extant *Carcharodon* – i.e., characterised by a high contribution of marine mammals (Collareta et al., 2017a). As reported above, shark bite marks have been detected on some odontocete bones from
Ullujaya. These bones are referable to cetaceans roughly ranging in size between 1.5 m \( (\text{Kentriodon}) \) and 3.2 m \((\text{Chilcacetus})\). This size range overlaps with that of the known cetacean prey of large individuals of extant white sharks (e.g., Long and Jones, 1996). The bite marks are mostly referable to sharks with unserrated teeth. Smooth-edged teeth of \( C. \text{hastalis} \) are among the most common fossils at Ullujaya; this species presumably attained maximum size values comparable to those of the largest extant lamnids (Purdy et al., 2001). It is thus likely that \( C. \text{hastalis} \) was the most prominent predator of cetaceans in the Ullujaya palaeoecosystem. However, most of the \( C. \text{hastalis} \) teeth from Ullujaya belong to immature individuals, and juveniles of this species may have focused their diet on fish (Collareta et al., 2017b). Therefore, considering that large teeth referable to full-grown lamniforms (including also \( C. \text{hastalis} \)) are occasionally found all along the studied section, and taking also into account that extant mackerel sharks do not actively prey upon animals from their own size class, the most efficient predators of cetaceans at Ullujaya should have included large, transient individuals of \( C. \text{hastalis} \). Bites due to scavenging on floating carcasses should also be taken into account, as it is known that large-sized white sharks feature a significant component of cetacean carrion in their diet (Long & Jones, 1996; Fallows et al., 2013).

Among rays, forms such as \( \text{Myliobatis} \) and \( \text{Anoxypristis} \) forage mainly on benthic-demersal prey, including hard-shelled invertebrates, fish, and squids (e.g., Jardas et al., 2004; Peverell, 2009; Molina and Cazorla, 2015; Rezende et al., 2015).

The Ullujaya elasmobranch assemblage is thus dominated by mesopredators, i.e., by juveniles and adults of species whose mature stages mainly relied on fish and macro-invertebrates and by juveniles of top-predator species (e.g., juveniles of \( C. \text{hastalis} \)) whose adult stages featured a significant component of marine tetrapods in their diet.

5.4.3 Bony fish

The co-occurrence of two families of primarily oceanic bony fish (Istiophoridae and Scombridae) supports connection with the open-ocean environment. Extant marlins are generally
close to the apex of pelagic food pyramids (Kitchell et al., 2006), their diet including large-sized bony fish such as mackerels, whereas tuna-like scombrids are opportunistic predators that feed at a slightly lower trophic level (Bertrand et al., 2002). Pilchards are small-sized epipelagic schooling fishes that inhabit highly productive coastal-pelagic environments and may enter semi-enclosed embayments; huge populations of *Sardinops* inhabit the present-day waters off Peru and represent a key prey item for other vertebrates (Chavez et al., 2003). Strong fossil evidence indicates that, during the late Miocene, *Sardinops* occupied a prominent position in the trophic chains of the EPB (Collareta et al., 2015, 2017b; Lambert et al., 2015). Pilchards likely also represented a fundamental trophic link at Ullujaya in Burdigalian times, although they were perhaps more common seawards of the Gran Tablazo Archipelago.

5.4.4 Turtles

The sole extant dermochelyid, *Dermochelys coriacea*, is a strongly pelagic organism that feeds on gelatinous invertebrates (Eckert et al., 2012). A dermochelyid in the semi-enclosed embayment of Ullujaya could suggest the presence of a nesting site in proximity of this area. Indeed, extant dermochelyids elect coarse-grained beaches (sometimes within protected embayments) with little abrasive clasts (e.g., coral fragments), and a steep approach to the sea as nesting sites (COSEWIC, 2012).

6. Conclusions

We investigated an early Miocene (Burdigalian) vertebrate assemblage dominated by diverse toothed cetaceans and elasmobranchs from the *Ct1a* facies association of the Chilcatay Formation of southern Peru. Based on sedimentological, ichnological, and palaeontological considerations, *Ct1a* represents a sandy-silty sediment wedge deposited in a warm-temperate, 30-40 m in water depth, semi-enclosed embayment, connected with riverine and open-ocean environments and with recurrent euxinic
conditions at the seafloor.

Vertebrate skeletons are typically disarticulated and incomplete, and some of these are affected by shark bite marks. Bioerosion due to macro-invertebrates is never observed and none of the specimens was found included and/or associated to carbonate concretions.

A long-time floating phase allowed biogenic and physical partial destruction of the carcasses before deposition on a soft compact substrate. Oxygen-deficient bottom conditions inhibited the scavenging action of benthic organisms.
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Table captions

Table 1. Overview of the lower Miocene marine vertebrate assemblage from *Ct1a* of the Chilcatay Formation exposed at Ullujaya, with a summary of the main taphonomic features of the fossil specimens. Isolated teeth and spines of Elasmobranchii and scales of Osteichthyes are not considered. Field numbers are after Di Celma et al. (2018). Abbreviation: Height abs = Height above the base of the section. Precise geographic coordinates of individual specimens are available on request from the corresponding author.

Table 2. Composition of the lower Miocene elasmobranch assemblage from *Ct1a* of the Chilcatay Formation exposed at Ullujaya.

Table 3. General prospect of the vertebrate specimens selected for the microscopic analyses, with a summary of the macro- and microscopic taphonomic features of the bones.

Table 4. Synoptic comparison of the main diversified lower Miocene cetacean assemblages worldwide. See main text for data sources.
Figure captions

**Figure 1.** A) Sketch map of the major sedimentary basins of coastal Peru showing the position of both the Outer Shelf Ridge and Upper Slope Ridge, redrawn and modified from Travis et al. (1976) and Thornburg & Kulm (1981). The red dashed rectangle outlines the location of the area shown in detail in Fig. 1B. B) Inferred palaeogeographic map of the EPB during the Miocene (redrawn and modified from Marocco and Muizon, 1988). This basin was a semi-enclosed, shallow littoral embayment partially separated from the open ocean by a chain of basement islands (the Gran Tablazo Archipelago of DeVries & Jud, 2018) of the emerging Outer Shelf Ridge. C) Close-up of the red dashed inset box in Fig. 1B showing the geographic location of the study area along the western side of the lower Ica valley.

**Figure 2.** A) Schematic stratigraphic column exhibiting the formational lithostratigraphy and the main component units of the Miocene portion of the basin fill of the EPB (not to scale). B) Simplified geological map showing the whole fossil vertebrate distribution for part of the Miocene succession exposed at Ullujaya (modified after Di Celma et al., 2018). C) Close-up of the black solid inset box in Fig. 2B further detailing the distribution of several tens of fossil vertebrate specimens at Ullujaya. D) Measured stratigraphic section. Note that, in the study area, all the allostratigraphic units dip gently towards NE. Clinoforms of Ct1b dip towards SW.

**Figure 3.** Field photographs. A) Depositional-dip oriented annotated panoramic view of the upper part of the Chilcatay Formation and the overlying Pisco Formation near Cerro Las Tres Piramides (geographic coordinates: 14°35'22"S, 75°38'20"W). The principal surfaces used to further subdivide the Chilcatay Formation into allomembers and the internal facies architecture
are indicated. Clinoforms of Ct1b prograde basinwards, showing truncated tops and typical downlapping basal contact onto subhorizontal and finer grained sediments of Ct1a. The Ct2 allomember rests on the CE0.2 unconformity and exhibits a pronounced retrogradational (fining-upward) facies trend. The Chilcatay and Pisco formations are separated by the PE0.0 unconformity. B) A 8-m-thick interval of siltstones and sandy siltstones that typify Ct1a. Note, just above the 1.8 m-long logging pole (encircled), the occurrence of a dark, granule-size conglomerate (black arrows) demarcated at its base by a conspicuous assemblage of moderate- to large-diameter Thalassinoides and Gyrolithes burrows (white arrows). These coarse grained beds indicate rare high-energy events that swept fragmented shells and small clasts into an otherwise quiescent environment. C-D) Close-up views of beds of shell debris and granule-size conglomerate intercalated within Ct1a. Note as subjacent silty strata are cut by a dense network of Thalassinoides and Gyrolithes burrows (white arrows) forming a Glossifungites suite. Burrows emanate from the base of the shell debris and granule-size conglomerate beds (dashed white line) and are infilled with overlying sediment.

**Figure 4.** Optical photos (A, B) and backscattered Scanning Electron Microscope (C, D) images of pyrite relics from the sediments of Ct1a. A) Rhombohedral crystals of dolomite associated with relics of pyrite frambooids. B) Spherical relics of pyrite frambooids. C) Rhombohedral crystals of dolomite. D) Detail of the frambooidal texture of a pyrite relic.

**Figure 5.** Histograms of the size distribution of frambooids in Ct1a, between 22 and 28.5 m abs. The number of pyrite frambooids relics (N), the mean of frambooid diameter, the Standard Deviation (SD) of the mean, and the percentage of frambooids with a diameter greater than 10 µm are shown for each sample. Note the different distribution in the UL-D3 histogram with respect to the other samples.
**Figure 6.** A) Stratigraphic distribution of fossil vertebrates from *Ct1a* of the Chilcatay Formation exposed at Ullujaya. B) Quantitative composition of the fossil vertebrate assemblage of *Ct1a*, based on systematic surface prospecting (teeth and spines of Elasmobranchii are not considered). C) Quantitative composition of the fossil shark and ray assemblage from the *Ct1a* facies association, based on more than one thousand isolated teeth and spines.


**Figure 8.** Bedding view of fossil cetaceans from *Ct1a* of the Chilcatay Formation exposed at Ullujaya. A) Isolated cranium of *Kentriodon* sp. disposed ventral side-up position (field number: O7). B) Four associated and disarticulated vertebrae of aff. Odontoceti indet. (O57) and C) corresponding explanatory line drawing. D) Few associated and disarticulated bones (including mandibles and some vertebrae and ribs) of Odontoceti indet. (O29) and E) corresponding explanatory line drawing. F) Partial skeleton (including articulated vertebrae and disarticulated ribs and other fragmentary bones) of aff. Odontoceti indet. (O59) and G) corresponding explanatory line drawing. H) Fully disarticulated partial skeleton (including mandibles, humerus, ulna, vertebrae, and ribs.) of Squalodelphinidae indet. (O4) and G) corresponding explanatory line drawing. J) Seven articulated vertebrae of aff. Odontoceti indet. (O38) and K) Corresponding explanatory line drawing.
Figure 9. Fossil cetaceans (A-B, F-I) and tuna-like bony fish (C-E) from Ct1a of the Chilcatay Formation exposed at Ullujaya. Specimens depicted in panels F-I are exposed on vertical sections and exhibit evidence of partial sinking into the substratum. A) Disarticulated cranium, mandibles, and two ribs of an undescribed specimen of *Chilcacetus cavirhinus* (field number: O5; catalogue number: MUSM 2527) and B) corresponding explanatory line drawing. C) Fully articulated caudal fin (T2). D) Some associated and partially disarticulated vertebrae (T5). E) Few associated and partially disarticulated vertebrae and rays (T6). F) Three associated and disarticulated vertebrae of aff. Odontoceti indet. (field number: O40) with sunk transverse processes and G) corresponding explanatory line drawing. H) Partially articulated vertebral column of aff. Odontoceti indet. (O50) that moderately sank and I) corresponding explanatory line drawing. Red arrows indicate sinking of some portions of the bones.

Figure 10. Bubble plot of articulation versus completeness for the marine vertebrate assemblage from Ct1a of the Chilcatay Formation exposed at Ullujaya. Abbreviations: $r^2$ = Pearson’s r-squared value; $rs$ = Spearman rank-order correlation coefficient; $T$ = intersect of the best-fit linear trend line with the completeness axis. For more details see chapter 3 of the present work and Beardmore et al. (2012).

Figure 11. Optical photos (A, B) and backscattered Scanning Electron Microscope images (C, F) of fossil marine mammal bones from Ct1a of the Chilcatay Formation exposed at Ullujaya. A) Detail of calcite cementing both the cancellous and the compact bone cavities of specimen O5; note that calcite started to grow from the surface of the bone trabecolae. B) Microborings on the bone surface of specimen O3. C) Transverse thin section in transmitted light of a rib from specimen O3; both cancellous and compact bone are visible. D) Reddish color of the bone surface of specimen O52 caused by the presence of Fe-oxyhydroxides. E) Cancellous bone of a
rib of specimen O5 showing an infill of sediment in some marrow cavities cemented by calcite. F) Microborings of the B-type (*sensu* Gariboldi et al., 2015) on the surface of a rib of specimen O3.

**Figure 12.** Evidences of fracturing on fossil cetaceans from *Ct1a* of the Chilcatay Formation exposed at Ullujaya. A) Cranium of *Kentriodon* sp. (MUSM 631) in lateral view, exhibiting a damaged posterior portion. B) The same in posterior view. C) Cranium of the holotype of of *Huaridelphis raimondii* (MUSM 1396) in lateral view, exhibiting weak fractures of the occipital shield and temporal region. D) The same in posterior view. Yellow arrows indicate the main direction of compression that originated the observed fracturing patterns.


**Figure 14.** Stylised reconstruction of the early Miocene marine vertebrate fauna of Ullujaya during deposition of *Ct1a*, highlighting the diversity of the assemblage described in the present work. Different species are shown as silhouettes, and are roughly to scale. Sediments belonging to *Ct1a* and *Ct1b* are cream and brown, respectively.
Figure 15. Diagram of framoid size distribution as a result of euxinic or oxic-dysoxic conditions.

Data on modern euxinic and oxic-dysoxic environments are from Wilkin et al. (1996). Following the example of Agbi et al. (2015), these literature data are compared with our results. Samples from C1la provide evidence of the alternation of euxinic and oxic-dysoxic conditions at the seafloor.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field number</th>
<th>Height (ft)</th>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Preserved bones</th>
<th>In situ</th>
<th>Skull disposition</th>
<th>Skeletal completeness</th>
<th>Bone articulation</th>
<th>Marked recent erosion</th>
<th>Collected and kept at MESM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C13</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>cf. Diplodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dorsal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C14</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>Phacodocus indet.</td>
<td>Caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ventral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C15</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>アンロジサイロフロイダ</td>
<td>Partial skeleton including</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C16</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>Baladephalidinae</td>
<td>Partial skeleton including</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C17</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>Chilusaurus carinatus</td>
<td>Partial skeleton including</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C18</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Chilusaurus carinatus</td>
<td>Partial skeleton including</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C19</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ventral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C20</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal with tympanic bullae</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C21</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C22</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dorsal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C23</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dorsal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C24</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Partial skeleton including</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C25</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Fragmentary caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ventral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C26</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal with ear bones</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ventral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C27</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal, mandibles and</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dorsal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C28</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C29</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Fragmentary caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C30</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>Ctenodocus sp.</td>
<td>Fragmentary caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C31</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragments of humerus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C32</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ventral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C33</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dorsal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C34</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary skull</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Rostrum, cervical vertebra</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dorsal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C36</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C37</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C38</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Skull</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ventral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C39</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary rostrum</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dorsal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C40</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Mandible, vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C41</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C42</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Mandible, fragment, thoracic vertebrae, ribs, scapula</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C43</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Rostrum</td>
<td>fragment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Ventral</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C44</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragments of caudal</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C45</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Caudal and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C46</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Incomplete atlas and axis</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C47</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Gaudal vertebra</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C48</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Seven vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C49</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragments of vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C50</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Lambar and caudal vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C51</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Lambar and caudal vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C52</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Lambar and caudal vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C53</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C54</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C55</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Vertebrae (including atlas and axis and ribs)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C56</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Gaudal vertebra</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C57</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Vertebra and ribs</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C58</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C59</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Eight vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C60</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Thoracic vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C61</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>Odontodactylus indet.</td>
<td>Vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1
Table 1 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field number</th>
<th>Height abs (m)</th>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Preserved bones</th>
<th>In situ</th>
<th>Skull disposition</th>
<th>Skeletal completeness</th>
<th>Bone articulation</th>
<th>Marked recent erosion</th>
<th>Collected and kept at MUSM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O52</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O53</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O54</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O55</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O56</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Cervical and thoracic vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O57</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Lumbar to caudal vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O58</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O59</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Thoracic vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O60</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O61</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O62</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Lumbar vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O63</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O64</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Axis, thoracic vertebra and rib fragments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O65</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>aff Odontoceti indet.</td>
<td>Fragmentary vertebrae</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>Present</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testudines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R1</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>Testudines indet.</td>
<td>Fragments of carapax and partial forelimb</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ostroichthyes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T1</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>aff Thanus sp.</td>
<td>Skull bone (dental)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T2</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>aff Thanus sp.</td>
<td>Caudal fin</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T3</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>aff Thanus sp.</td>
<td>Fragment of skull bone (dental)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T4</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>aff Thanus sp.</td>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>aff Thanus sp.</td>
<td>Thirteen vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>aff Thanus sp.</td>
<td>Seven vertebrae and ribs</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T7</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>aff Thanus sp.</td>
<td>Partial skeleton</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T8</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>aff Thanus sp.</td>
<td>Vertebrae</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T9</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>aff Mokaru sp.</td>
<td>Vertebrae, skull bones, and other skeletal elements</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T10</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Ostroichthyes indet.</td>
<td>Ornament</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Dorsal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order</td>
<td>Family or superfamily</td>
<td>Genus and species</td>
<td>Number of specimens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamellibranchiidae</td>
<td>Abraidae</td>
<td>Abra sp.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ovulidae</td>
<td>Ovula ovum</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>Cardium sp.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Astyliidae</td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>planulidae</td>
<td>Planulidae</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turbinidae</td>
<td>Turbinidae</td>
<td>282</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trochidae</td>
<td>Trochidae</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrohalineidae</td>
<td>Hemipectenidae</td>
<td>Hemipecten sertorius</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pelecypodidae</td>
<td>Pelecypodidae</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nuculidae</td>
<td>Nuculidae</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiidae</td>
<td>Cardiidae cf. lineata</td>
<td>339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mytilidae</td>
<td>Mytilidae</td>
<td>Mytilus sp.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mytilidae</td>
<td>Mytilus edulis</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhanospongiidae</td>
<td>Rhanospongiidae</td>
<td>Rhanospongiidae</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mytilidae</td>
<td>Mytilus sp.</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Height abs (m)</th>
<th>Determination</th>
<th>Analysed bone elements</th>
<th>Bone colour</th>
<th>Bone surface</th>
<th>Bone mineralization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td><em>H. stellate</em></td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Reddish</td>
<td>Partially dissolved, with borings</td>
<td>Minor, Fe-oxides/hydroxides</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td><em>H. stellate</em></td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>White to brownish</td>
<td>Intact, no borings</td>
<td>High, calcite and dolomite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td><em>K. lineata</em></td>
<td>Rib</td>
<td>Pinkish</td>
<td>Intact, no borings</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>029</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>Odontoceri indet.</td>
<td>Bone fragment</td>
<td>Reddish</td>
<td>Partially dissolved, with borings</td>
<td>Moderate, Ca-Mg carbonates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>041</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>aff. Odontoceri indet.</td>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>Worn out*</td>
<td>Moderate, Ca-Mg carbonates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>062</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>aff. Odontoceri indet.</td>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>Reddish to black</td>
<td>Worn out*</td>
<td>Moderate, Ca-Mg carbonates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>053</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>aff. Odontoceri indet.</td>
<td>Vertebra</td>
<td>Brownish</td>
<td>Worn out*</td>
<td>Minor, Ca-phosphate and Fe-oxides/hydroxides</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The presence/absence of borings cannot be assessed due to the lack of bone surface.

Table 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Odonatoceri</th>
<th>Physoterraeidae</th>
<th>Physoterraeidae in situ</th>
<th>Diaphoroceras sp.</th>
<th>Diaphoroceras sp.</th>
<th>Idiophyllum paragonica</th>
<th>Oryxoceras crocodilus</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Platanitidae</td>
<td>Allodesmataceae</td>
<td>Plateostracum orbontii</td>
<td>Allodesmus prenti</td>
<td>Allodesmus spinus</td>
<td>Arionotheca nasuta</td>
<td>Zarthee's flagellator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospilodiscidae</td>
<td>Squispidelphidae</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squispidelphidae</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
<td>Squispidelphus australis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incertae sedis</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
<td>EElphinoselachidae</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mysteeri</td>
<td>Balanidae</td>
<td>Balanidae</td>
<td>Balanidae</td>
<td>Balanidae</td>
<td>Balanidae</td>
<td>Balanidae</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4