AMEGHINIANA
A GONDWANAN PALEONTOLOGICAL JOURNAL



contained in this volume are to be published in future issues of the journal.
Please be aware that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content.
All legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Submitted: August 16th, 2016 – **Accepted**: February 17th, 2017

To link and cite this article:

doi: 10.5710/AMGH.17.02.2017.3048

SYSTEMATIC REVISION AND EVOLUTIONARY HISTORY OF *ACARECHIMYS* PATTERSON IN KRAGLIEVICH, 1965 (RODENTIA, CAVIOMORPHA, OCTODONTOIDEA)

MICHELLE ARNAL[1,6], MARÍA G. VUCETICH[2,6], DARIN A. CROFT[3], M. SUSANA BARGO[1,7], JUAN C. FERNICOLA[4,5,6] AND SERGIO F. VIZCAINO[1,6]

[1]Unidades de Investigación, Anexo Museo de La Plata, FCNyM-UNLP, Av. 122 y 60, CP 1900, La Plata, Argentina. michoarnal@gmail.com.ar; msbargo@fcnym.unlp.edu.ar; vizcaino@fcnym.unlp.edu.ar

[2]Museo de La Plata, Museo de La Plata, FCNyM-UNLP, Paseo del Bosque s/n, CP 1900, La Plata, Argentina. vucetich@fcnym.unlp.edu.ar

[3] Department of Anatomy, Case Western Reserve University School of Medicine, 10900 Euclid Ave., Cleveland, OH 44106-4930, USA. darin.croft@case.edu

[4] Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales 'Bernardino Rivadavia', Av. Ángel Gallardo 470, 1405DJR, Ciudad Autónoma de Buenos Aires, Argentina. jctano@yahoo.com

[5]Departamento de Ciencias Básicas, Universidad Nacional de Luján Ruta 5 y Avenida Constitución, 6700 Luján, Buenos Aires, Argentina.

[6] CONICET

[7] CIC

53 pages, 7 figures, 3 tables, 3 Supplementary Appendices

ARNAL *ET AL*.: REVISION AND HISTORY OF *ACARECHIMYS* (RODENTIA, HYSTRICOGNATHI).

*Corresponding author: michoarnal@gmail.com

Abstract. The octodontoid rodent *Acarechimys* was abundant during the early Miocene and had the widest temporal and geographic distribution of any extinct caviomorph. Despite this extensive fossil record *Acarechimys* has not been well characterized. In this work, we systematically revise *Acarechimys*, describe new early–middle Miocene fossils from Argentina and Bolivia, corroborate its monophyly, and study its evolutionary history. *Acarechimys* has brachydont molars, retained deciduous premolars, four crests on upper molars, lowers with variably developed mesolophid and metalophulid II, and absence of mental foramen in the mandible. *Acarechimys* includes: *Acarechimys leucotheae* (late Oligocene, Chubut, Argentina), *A. gracilis* and *A. constans* (early Miocene, Chubut and Santa Cruz, Argentina), and *A. minutus* and *A. minutissimus* (early–middle Miocene of Patagonia Argentina, Bolivia, and Colombia). The temporal and geographic distributions suggest that *Acarechimys* could have evolved in Patagonia, by the early late Oligocene. Its acme was during the late early Miocene in Southern Patagonia. By the middle Miocene, *Acarechimys* decreased in diversity and was last recorded in high latitudes of South America (Patagonia). In lower latitudes, the oldest record is from the late early Miocene of Chucal, northern Chile, and during the late middle Miocene, the genus is recorded in localities of Colombia, Bolivia, and Peru. The available evidence suggests that *Acarechimys* was probably not present in lower latitudes (N of ~ 30° S) before the early Miocene. The reasons *Acarechimys* dispersed northward at this time remain to be elucidated, but the timing coincides with a massive disappearance of other octodontoids from Patagonia.

Key Words. Octodontoid. Oligocene. Miocene. South America. Evolutionary history.

Resumen. REVISIÓN SISTEMÁTICA E HISTORIA EVOLUTIVA DE *ACARECHIMYS* PATTERSON EN KRAGLIEVICH, 1965 (RODENTIA, CAVIOMORPHA, OCTODONTOIDEA). El roedor octodontoideo *Acarechimys* fue abundante durante el Mioceno temprano y tuvo la distribución geográfica y temporal más amplia para un caviomorfo viviente. A pesar de su amplio registro fósil *Acarechimys* nunca fue caracterizado correctamente. En este trabajo, realizamos la revisión sistemática de *Acarechimys*, describimos nuevos materiales del Mioceno temprano–medio de Argentina y Bolivia, corroboramos su monofilia y estudiamos su historia evolutiva. *Acarechimys* presenta dientes braquiodontes, retención de premolares deciduos, cuatro crestas en molares superiores, desarrollo variable del mesolófido y el metalofúlido II en molares inferiores y ausencia de foramen mentoniano en la mandíbula. *Acarechimys* incluye: *Acarechimys leucotheae* (Oligoceno tardío, Chubut, Argentina), *A. gracilis* y *A. constans* (Mioceno temprano, Chubut y Santa Cruz, Argentina), y *A. minutus* y *A. minutissimus* (Mioceno temprano–medio de Patagonia Argentina, Bolivia y Colombia). Su distribución temporal y geográfica sugiere que *Acarechimys* habría evolucionado en Patagonia en el Oligoceno tardío-temprano. Su acmé fue en el Mioceno temprano-tardío en el sur de Patagonia. Para el Mioceno medio *Acarechimys* disminuyó su diversidad y tiene su último registro en latitudes altas de América del Sur (Patagonia). En latitudes bajas, el registro más antiguo proviene del Mioceno temprano-tardío de Chucal, norte de Chile, y durante el Mioceno medio se lo registra en localidades de Colombia, Bolivia y Perú. La evidencia disponible sugiere que *Acarechimys* probablemente no estuvo presente en bajas latitudes (N de 30ºS)antes del Mioceno temprano. Las causas de su dispersión hacia el norte deben ser

todavía estudiadas, aunque la misma coincide con la desaparición masiva de octodontoideos en Patagonia.

Palabras clave. Octodontoideo. Oligoceno. Mioceno. América del Sur. Historia evolutiva.

ACARECHIMYS is an extinct rodent genus, part of the richest and most diverse clade of caviomorphs: Octodontoidea. It represents a successful evolutionary lineage with unusually wide temporal (late Oligocene–late Miocene) and geographic distributions (southern Argentinean Patagonia to Colombia); it was one of the most abundant octodontoids during the Burdigalian (late early Miocene; Santacrucian South American Land Mammal Age, SALMA; Pascual *et al*., 1965) of Santa Cruz Province, Argentina.

Ameghino (1887), while working at the Museo de La Plata (MLP), erected the genera *Acaremys*, *Stichomys*, and *Sciamys*, and recognized the species: *Acaremys minutus*, *A. minutissimus*, *Sciamys tenuissimus*, and *Stichomys constans*. Subsequently, he named additional species of these genera (Ameghino, 1889, 1891, 1894). Scott (1905) performed an exhaustive revision of the rodents from the Santa Cruz Formation based on fossils collected by the Princeton Expeditions to Patagonia (1896–1899; housed at the Yale Peabody Museum, New Haven, USA) and the collections housed in the museums of Buenos Aires and La Plata that he visited in 1902. As a result, he described additional materials and performed detailed descriptions of *Acaremys minutus*, *A. minutissimus*, *Sciamys tenuissimus*, *Stichomys constans*, and *Stichomys diminutus*. Bryan Patterson studied the paleontology collections deposited at the MLP and MACN in the years 1952–1954 (Olson, 1985) and performed an exhaustive investigation of caviomorphs that was never published. Nevertheless, in his unpublished manuscript (UMS, available at the Vertebrate Paleontology Section, MACN), Patterson provided information that was later used by Pascual (1967) and by the authors of this work (see below). The genus *Acarechimys* was first mentioned by Kraglievich (1965) in a footnote, explaining: '*Ce nom, inédit, a été appliqué par B. Patterson à l'espèce* Acaremys minutus *Amegh*. *(Patterson et*

Kraglievich, ms.)'. Later, based on Patterson UMS, Pascual (1967) mentioned the genus *Acarechimys* with the species *Acarechimys minutus*, *Acarechimys minutissimus*, and *Acarechimys constans*, and provided collection numbers of the lectotype of each species. Finally, Patterson (in Patterson and Wood, 1982) characterized the genus *Acarechimys* for the Santacrucian SALMA of Patagonia, with *Acarechimys minutus* as the type species (synonym: *Stichomys gracilis* Ameghino, 1891) and *Acarechimys minutissimus* as the only other referred species (synonyms: *Stichomys diminutus* Ameghino, 1891, *Sciamys tenuissimus* Ameghino, 1894, and provisionally *Stichomys constans* Ameghino, 1887). Since the 1990s, the genus *Acarechimys* has been recognized at numerous localities beyond Santa Cruz Province: Vucetich *et al*. (1993a) extended its biochron by describing *Acarechimys* sp. from the Langhian (early middle Miocene, Colloncuran SALMA) of Neuquén Province, Argentinean Patagonia; Walton (1997) identified *Acarechimys* cf. *A. minutissimus* from the Serravallian (late middle Miocene, Laventan SALMA) of La Venta, Colombia, and Croft *et al*. (2011) described new specimens of *Acarechimys* from the Serravallian (late middle Miocene, Laventan SALMA) of Quebrada Honda, Bolivia. Flynn *et al*. (2002, 2008) and Croft *et al*. (2007) mentioned *Acarechimys* for the early to middle Miocene of Chile, Antoine *et al*. (2016) for the early Miocene of Contamana, Peru, Tejada-Lara *et al*. (2015) for middle Miocene of the Fitzcarrald Arch in the Peruvian Amazonia, and Esteban *et al*. (2014) for late Miocene–early Pliocene of the Andalhuala and Chiquimil formations in Catamarca Province, Argentina.

Vucetich *et al*. (2010) transferred the species *Protacaremys pulchellus* Ameghino, 1902 to *Acarechimys*, erecting the new combination *Acarechimys pulchellus* (Ameghino, 1902) for the Aquitanian–Burdigalian (early Miocene, Colhuehuapian SALMA) of Patagonia. This taxonomic assignation was corroborated later by Arnal (2012) with a cladistic analysis. Vucetich *et al*. (2015a) described the most ancient species of the genus, *Acarechimys leucotheae*, from the Chattian (late Oligocene, Deseadan SALMA *c.a*. 29.4–24.2 Ma) of Cabeza Blanca, Chubut Province, Argentina. Recently, Verzi *et al*. (2016) reviewed and revised specimens included in this genus.

In this contribution, we review nearly all of the material hitherto assigned to *Acarechimys*, and describe new specimens with precise geographic and stratigraphic provenance from the Santa Cruz Formation (late early Miocene of Santa Cruz Province, Argentina), Collon Curá Formation (early middle Miocene of Neuquén Province, Argentina), and an unnamed formation in southern Bolivia (late middle Miocene of Quebrada Honda).

[FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE]

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A total of 127 specimens were studied (Supplementary appendix 1). Dental nomenclature follows Marivaux *et al*. (2002), Candela and Rasia (2012), and Arnal *et al*. (2014). Mandibular and cranial nomenclature follows Wible *et al*. (2005) and Woods and Howland (1979) (Fig. 1).

***Institutional abbreviations*. MACN-A**, Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales ‘Bernardino Rivadavia’, Ameghino National Collection, Buenos Aires, Argentina; **MACN-PV**, Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales ‘Bernardino Rivadavia’, Vertebrate Paleontology Collection, Buenos Aires, Argentina; **MLP**, Museo de La Plata, La Plata, Argentina; **MPM-PV**, Museo Regional Provincial ‘Padre Manuel Jesús Molina’, Vertebrate Paleontology Collection, Santa Cruz, Argentina; **UATF-V**, Universidad

Autónoma Tomás Frías, Vertebrate Paleontology Collection, Potosí, Bolivia; **YPM-VPPU**, Princeton University Collection of the Yale Peabody Museum, New Haven, USA.

Systematic revision. Recognition of the type series used by Florentino Ameghino (1887, 1889) was necessary to identify the specimens recovered by Carlos Ameghino during his filedtrip of 1887 in the cliffs of the Santa Cruz River, Santa Cruz province, Argentina (Fig. 2). In performing this investigation, we took into account different sources of information: Ameghino's catalog at the MACN, the MLP catalog, Patterson's UMS, collection labels and file cards, and the account of the history of the conflict between F. Ameghino and Moreno when the Santacrucian species were erected (Fernicola, 2011). Patterson studied the paleontology collections deposited at the MLP and MACN, but identified lectotypes and syntypes of fossils housed at the MLP [information that was published by Pascual (1967)]. Patterson mentioned and studied specimens figured by Ameghino (1889) and deposited at the MACN but dismissed the possibility that they might be holotypes because he believed that the fossils collected by C. Ameghino in 1887 were deposited exclusively at the MLP (UMS, pers, comm.). Fernicola (2011) determined that those fossils figured in the Atlas by Ameghino (1889) and housed in the MACN were collected by his brother Carlos in 1887, and therefore these fossils could be part of the type series of taxa founded in 1887 by F. Ameghino. Additionally, we have inferred that Patterson may have had access to labels with Ameghino's handwriting and other certain provenance information, since his UMS stresses differences among 'labeled materials', 'improperly labeled materials', and 'materials that agree with Ameghino's original descriptions'. Thus, with some exceptions (see below), we accept the information provided by Patterson in his unpublished manuscript and discuss the implications for each particular species.

***Statistical analyses*.** In order to test for size differences among *Acarechimys* species, we performed statistical analyses using m1 and m2 length, as these allowed for the largest sample sizes. Sixty-nine m1 and 62 m2 measurements were used in the analyses. Statistical analyses were performed using JMP Pro (SAS Institute, Inc., 2013).

***Cladistic analysis*.** In order to test the monophyly of the genus, we used an expanded and modified version of the data matrix of Arnal and Vucetich (2015) (Supplementary appendices 2 and 3). In total, it consists of 186morphological characters and 59 taxa. These include 19morphological characters from Verzi *et al*. (2016) that were added in order to evaluate comparable data matrices. The living *Abrocoma* was included in order to test whether some *Acarechimys* species group within Abrocomidae. The data matrix was analyzed under equally weighted parsimony using TNT 1.5 (Goloboff and Catalano, 2016). A heuristic search of 1,000 replications of Wagner trees (with random addition sequence) followed by tree bisection and reconnection (TBR) branch-swapping algorithm (holding 10 trees per replicate) was conducted. The best trees obtained at the end of the replicates were subjected to a final round of TBR branch swapping. Thirty-one characters were treated as ordered. The robustness of the obtained MPTs was calculated with relative and absolute Bremer supports (Bremer, 1994; Goloboff and Farris, 2001).

SYSTEMATIC PALEONTOLOGY

Order RODENTIA Bodwich, 1821

Suborder HYSTRICOGNATHI Tullberg, 1899

Parvorder CAVIOMORPHA Wood, 1955

Superfamily OCTODONTOIDEA Waterhouse, 1839

Genus ***Acarechimys*** Patterson in Kraglievich, 1965

Type species. *Acaremys minutus* Ameghino, 1887.

Stichomys Ameghino, 1887 *partim*

Sciamys Ameghino, 1887 *partim*

Ameghinomys Verzi *et al*., 2016

Stratigraphic and geographic occurrences. Upper levels of the Sarmiento Formation at Cabeza Blanca (Chubut, Argentina), late Oligocene, Deseadan SALMA (Vucetich *et al*., 2015 a); Sarmiento Formation (Chubut, Argentina), early Miocene, Colhuehuapian SALMA (Vucetich *et al*., 2010); Pinturas Formation (Santa Cruz, Argentina), late early Miocene, 'Pinturan' age (Kramarz and Bellosi, 2005); Santa Cruz Formation, (Santa Cruz, Argentina), late early Miocene, Santacrucian SALMA (Ameghino, 1887, 1889; Scott, 1905; Vizcaíno *et al*., 2012); Chucal Formation (Región XV, Chile), late early Miocene, Santacrucian SALMA (Croft *et al*., 2007); unnamed formation (Pampa Castillo, Región XI, Chile), late early Miocene, Santacrucian SALMA (Flynn *et al*., 2002); Curá Mallín Formation (Región VIII, Laguna del Laja, Chile), early to middle Miocene (Flynn *et al*., 2008); Collon Curá Formation (Neuquén, Argentina), early middle Miocene, Colloncuran SALMA (Vucetich *et al*., 1993a); Villavieja Formation (Colombia), late middle Miocene, Laventan SALMA (Walton, 1997); unnamed formation (Quebrada Honda, Bolivia), late middle Miocene, Laventan SALMA (Croft *et al*., 2011); unspecified formation, Fitzcarrald Arch (Peru), middle Miocene, Laventan SALMA (Negri *et al*., 2010; Tejada-Lara *et al*., 2015); Pebas Formation, Contamana (Peru), late? Miocene (Antoine *et al*., 2016).

[FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Emended diagnosis **[from Vucetich *et al*. (2015a); autapomorphies marked with an asterisk].** Small to very small sized caviomorph. Brachydont cheek teeth* (see Phylogenetic Analysis, below).Clearly evident cusps and thin crests separated by wide flexi/ids. Retention of deciduous premolars throughout life. Upper molars with four straight crests (anteroloph, protoloph, metaloph, and posteroloph); antero- and posteroloph fused labially in juveniles with proto- and metaloph delimiting the antero- and metafossette, respectively. Lower molars with variably developed metalophulid II: interrupted or absent on m1-m2, absent or interrupted on m3; presence of accessory cusp on lowers molars*. Lower deciduous premolar with variably developed metalophulid II and mesolophid united with or near the metaconid. Lower incisor long, with its posterior end located posterior to m3. Well-developed masseteric crest of the mandible, mental foramen generally absent, and masseteric fossa moderately to very deep anteriorly. Skull with a moderately developed groove for the passage of the nerve infraorbitalis *.

Acarechimys minutus (Ameghino, 1887)

Figure 3.1–5

Acaremys minutus Ameghino, 1887

Ameghinomys constans Verzi *et al*., 2016 *partim*

Type series. MLP 15-410a, left mandible with m1-3; MACN-A 237, right mandible with dp4-m3; MACN-A 238, right mandible with dp4-m3; MACN-A 4075, right mandible with dp4-m1.

Lectotype. MLP 15-410a Patterson (UMS, pers, comm.) and Pascual, 1967.

Paralectotypes. MACN-A 237, MACN-A 238, MACN-A 4075.

Referred material.(Supplementary appendix 1).

Geographic and stratigraphic occurrences. Santa Cruz and Neuquén provinces, Argentina; Quebrada Honda, Bolivia. Santa Cruz Formation, late early Miocene, Santacrucian SALMA; Collon Curá Formation, early middle Miocene, Colloncuran SALMA; unnamed formation, late middle Miocene, Laventan SALMA (Supplementary appendix 1).

Emended diagnosis. Smaller than *A. constans* and *A. gracilis*. Upper deciduous premolar tending toward reduction and loss of the metaloph, unlike *A. constans*. Lower deciduous premolar with variably developed metalophulid II and mesolophid, a combination not present in the remaining species. Lower molars with metalophulid II reduced to a small spur on m1-2 and absent on m3, as in *A. leucotheae*; presence of accessory cups in m1-2and variable presence of the posterior extension of the metalophulid I in m1-2; presence of posterior arm of the metaconid on m1-3, as in *A. gracilis*. Lower incisors laterally compressed, unlike *A. constans* and *A. gracilis*. Mandible with the notch for the insertion pars infraorbitalis of the masseter muscle (nmmpio) located below dp4-m1, unlike *A. constans* and *A. gracilis*.

Remarks. MLP 15-410a (left mandible with m1-m3) is labeled as 'lectotype' and MLP 15-410b (maxilla with right and left M1-M3) as 'type?' of *Acarechimys minutus* in the MLP collection. Based on the catalog information of this museum, we confirm that both specimens belong to the 'old collections', which include specimens from the expedition of C. Ameghino in 1887 and expeditions performed by other staff of the MLP in subsequent years (Vizcaíno *et al*., 2013). Unfortunately, the available information does not allow us to know which of these fossils were recovered by C. Ameghino (no labels or catalog written by Ameghino are available). However, according to the unpublished work of Patterson, MLP 15-410a is the lectotype of *Acarechimys minutus* since 'in fact the only specimen labeled as *minutus* or attributable to the species is M.L.P. nº15-410a, a portion of left ramus with base of I, roots of dm4, m1-3. This individual thus becomes the lectotype.' Thus, based on the confirmation made by Patterson, we interpret that MLP 15-410a could have had a label made by F. Ameghino. On the contrary, we think that MLP 15-410b was not available for Patterson in the 1950s, since in his UMS he stated that the palatal fragment described by Ameghino for this species was lost. Only later was MLP 15-410b relocated and available for study in the MLP collections. We believe that this took place after the accession of fossils belonging to old assemblages into the MLP collections, an occurrence that has taken place many times since the 1960s (Reguero and Tonni, pers. comm., 2016). The specimen file card of MLP 15-410b includes a note by R. Pascual that it possibly corresponds to the palatal fragment used by Ameghino in 1889 for the description of *Acaremys minutus* (handwriting by Pascual). We agree with Pascual that this specimen matches Ameghino's description; nevertheless, there is no evidence that it was part of the collection studied by Ameghino. Therefore, we have not included MLP 15-410b among the syntypes of *Acarechimys minutus*. We recognize three additional specimens housed at the MACN collection as part of the original type series: MACN-A238 and MACN-A 4075, which are illustrated in the atlas of Ameghino (Ameghino, 1889; plate IV, figs. 22–23), and MACN-A 237, which is mentioned in the catalog of Ameghino (MACN) as being a member of the same stock as MACN-A238. In summary, we identify four fossils used by F. Ameghino to erect the species *Acaremys minutus*: MLP 15-410a, MACN-A237, MACN-A 238, and MACN-A 4075.

Pascual (1967) stated that MLP 15-410a was the lectotype of *Acarechimys minutus*. Although this material corresponds to an old specimen with the occlusal surface very worn, we agree with Patterson's assignation. By default, the remaining specimens of the original type series are paralectotypes.

Based on dental morphology (symmetric absence of mure on the M2 delimiting an antero- and posterofossette and a relatively large and fully tetralophodont M3) we can not assign MLP 15-410b to any recognized caviomorph species. It probably represents a new octodontoid (Arnal and Vucetich, personal observation) and will be the subject of future investigations.

Description. *Upper cheek teeth*. Both tooth rows are parallel to each other but are obliquely implanted with respect to the palatal plane.

The upper cheek teeth are wider than long (Tab. 1), slightly terraced, and tetralophodont. Molars have a long anteroloph that reaches the paracone and delimits an anterofossette in juvenile specimens (Fig. 3.1). The protoloph is anteriorly oblique and curved. The metaloph departs from the junction of the mure and the anterior arm of the hypocone, and its labial end, which includes the metacone, turns back to fuse with the posteroloph, delimiting a metafossette in juveniles (Fig. 3.1). The M3 has a labially placed hypocone, and a hypofossette is formed in adult specimens (Fig. 3.1).The anterofossette and metafossette are equally deep and extend further across the occlusal surface than the mesoflexus. The hypoflexus is the deepest flexus and is anteriorly oriented.

The DP4 is molarized and resembles the molars but usually differs in the presence of a reduced metaloph that does not reach the labial end of the posteroloph, by the presence of a short protoloph that does not reaches the paracone, and by a less oblique protoloph and hypoflexus (Fig. 3.1).

Upper incisors are oval in section. The anterior face is straight and the lingual face is curved.

Skull. The description is based on an almost complete skull (YPM-VPPU 15806; Fig. 3.2) and maxillary fragments (MACN-A 4070, MPM-PV 15088). The nasals extend posteriorly to the dorsal root of the zygoma. Posteriorly, the frontal bones have concave lateral margins. The premaxillae occupy the anterior half of the lateral wall of the snout (Fig. 3.2); the ascending processes of the premaxillae are slightly exposed on the skull roof and are a little longer than the nasals, unlike in *Acaremys murinus*, in which they are broadly exposed on the skull roof. The rostral masseteric fossa (*sensu* Patterson and Wood, 1982) is shallow, subtriangular, and limited ventrally by the incisor tuberosity (Fig. 3.2), unlike in *Acaremys murinus*, *Pseudoacaremys kramarzi*, and *Sciamys principalis*, in which the incisor tuberosity is included in the rostral masseteric fossa (Arnal and Vucetich, 2015). The dorsal root of the zygoma continues ventrally with a robust vertical ramus of the zygoma, similar to *Sciamys principalis* (Fig. 3.2). This vertical ramus is mainly straight, as in *Prospaniomys priscus*, rather than posteriorly oblique as in most octodontoids (Arnal and Kramarz, 2011). The ventral root of the zygoma extends slightly in front of the DP4 (Fig. 3.2), and its antero-posterior diameter is similar to its dorso-ventral diameter, unlike *Pseudoacaremys kramarzi,* where the antero-posterior diameter is twice the dorso-ventral one (Arnal and Vucetich, 2015). In ventral view, the masseteric tuberosity (for the origin of the masseter superficialis muscle, pars anterior) is conspicuous and continuous laterally with a shallow fossa for the origin of the masseter lateralis muscle. Posterior to the masseteric tuberosity is a small foramen of uncertain homology. On the dorsal face of the ventral root of the zygoma is a faint furrow for the passage of the infraorbitalis nerve. The horizontal ramus of the zygoma is high in lateral view (Fig. 3.2),unlike *Prospaniomys priscus* in which it is low (Arnal and Kramarz, 2011). It is formed mainly by the jugal bone, which lies at the base of the vertical ramus of the zygoma along with the maxillary bone (Fig. 3.2); this suture is straight and oblique. The paraorbital process is conspicuous and formed by the jugal and a small portion of the squamosal. The jugal fossa (for the origin of the posterior masseter muscle) is well-developed; it is antero-posteriorly long, dorso-ventrally high, and medio-laterally deep, unlike *Prospaniomys priscus*, in which it is short and shallow.

The diastema is longer than the tooth row and widens posteriorly but is shorter than in *Acaremys murinus* and *Pseudoacaremys kramarzi*. The large incisive foramina are damaged but seem to be wider than long. Posteriorly, they are continuous with the well-developed diastemal furrows that extend to the DP4s. The posterior palatine foramina are conspicuous and located between the M1s. The openings of the posterior nares are positioned near the posterior half of the M2.

Lower cheek teeth. The molars are of similar size (Tab. 1). The dp4 is longer than wide (Fig. 3.3; Tab. 1). The metalophulid I is curved and joins the protoconid and metaconid. The ectolophid is relatively short and oblique. A short but variably developed metalophulid II extends from the postero-lingual border of the protoconid (Figs. 3.3–4) as in some specimens of *A. minutissimus* and *A. constans*. The mesolophid is also variably developed; it varies from long and fused with the metaconid (MPM-PV 15089), as in *A. constans*, to reduced, forming a spur of the ectolophid, as in *A. gracilis* (Fig. 3.3). The hypolophid is straight and merges with the entoconid. The posterolophid is long and reaches the labial side of the tooth. The anterofossettid/anteroflexid is rounded, shallow, and merged with the mesoflexid when the mesolophid is reduced (Figs. 3.3–4). The posteroflexid is closed in adult specimens. The hypoflexid is the deepest flexid and is posteriorly oblique. In adult specimens, the dp4 becomes simplified with an oval outline (MACN-A 4071).

The molars have three main crests; a fourth crest, second in position (metalophulid II), is variably developed (Fig. 3.3). The metalophulid I is straight, unlike in *A. constans* and *A. gracilis*, where it is curved. The metalophulid II is reduced to a spur of the ectolophid near the area of the protoconid in m1-2 and is absent in m3 (Fig. 3.3). An accessory cusp of uncertain homologies is lingually aligned with this crest and often united to the metalophulid I by a posterior extension of the metalophulid I (Fig. 3.3). The posterior arm of the metaconid is present in m1-3. The hypolophid and posterolophid are as in dp4. The lingual end of the posterolophid lies near the entoconid, unlike in the dp4. The antero+mesoflexid is as broad and deep as the posteroflexid.

The lower incisors are laterally compressed and long, extending below the tooth row to the base of the coronoid process.

Mandible. The mandible is robust. The diastema is shorter than the tooth row, unlike the condition in the cranium. The diastema is concave, and the lowest part is immediately anterior to the dp4 (Fig. 3.5). A mental foramen is generally absent; when present, it is small and located below the anterior half of dp4. The nmmpio is conspicuous, antero-posteriorly long, slightly oblique, and the anterior half is located mainly below the dp4 (Fig. 3.5), as in *A. minutissimus*. The masseteric crest is well-developed, laterally projecting, and ventro-posteriorly oriented (Fig. 3.5). The masseteric fossa is deep in its anterior part as in *A. gracilis* but shallower than in species of *Acaremys*. This fossa is antero-dorsally limited by a faint furrow that extends from the posterior border of the nmmpio to the base of the coronoid process. The coronoid process extends postero-laterally from the m2 and delimits a retromolar fossa lateral to m3. On the lingual side of the mandible, the mandibular symphysis extends posteriorly to the posterior border of m1. The mandibular chin is at the level of the dp4.

[FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE]

Acarechimys constans (Ameghino, 1887)

Figure 4. 1–4

Stichomys constans Ameghino, 1887

Acarechimys pascuali Verzi *et al*., 2016 *partim*

Ameghinomys constans Verzi *et al*., 2016 *partim*

Type series. MACN-A 246, palatal fragment with left and right DP4-M2; MACN-A 247, left mandible with m1-2 and right mandible with dp4-m2;MLP 15-39, left mandible with m1-3; MLP 15-57, right mandible with m2-3 and broken m1; MLP 15-200, right mandible with dp4-m2; MLP 15-346, left mandible with dp4-m2; MLP 15-391, right mandible with dp4-m3; MLP 15-391a, right mandible with dp4-m2; MLP 15-391b, right mandible with m1-3; MLP 15-391c, left mandible with broken dp4-m1.

Lectotype. MLP 15-391 Patterson (UMS, pers, comm.) and Pascual (1967).

Paralectotypes. MACN-A 246, MACN-A 247, MLP 15-39, MLP 15-57, MLP 15-200, MLP 15-346, MLP 15-391a, MLP 15-391b, MLP 15-391c.

Referred material. (Supplementary appendix 1).

Geographic and stratigraphic occurrence. Santa Cruz Province. Santa Cruz Formation, late early Miocene, Santacrucian SALMA (Supplementary appendix 1).

Diagnosis. Larger than *A. minutus*, *A. minutissimus*, and *A. leucotheae*. Lower deciduous premolars with well-developed or reduced metalophulid II; mesolophid conspicuous, unlike in *A. gracilis*. Lower molars with metalophulid II well-developed on m1 and reduced or absent on m2-3, unlike *A. minutus* and *A. minutissimus*; accessory cusp on m1 variable present and conspicuous posterior arm of the metaconid absent, unlike *A. gracilis*. Lower incisors not compressed medio-laterally, unlike *A. minutus* and *A. minutissimus*. Mandible with the masseteric fossa and nmmpio located more posteriorly than in *A. minutus*, *A. minutissimus*, and *A. leucotheae*.

Remarks. We followed the same procedures as for *Acarechimys minutus* in identifying the original type series used by Ameghino to describe *Stichomys constans*. In the MLP collections, the specimen MLP 15-391 is catalogued as lectotype and MLP 15-391a, b, and c are catalogued as syntypes of *Acarechimys constans*. Based on the MLP catalog, we have confirmed that these specimens belong to the 'old collections' of the MLP. Patterson stated that this species was based 'on a series of incomplete mandibles in the Museo de La Plata, nos. 15-39, MLP 15-57, MLP 15-200, MLP 15-346, MLP 15-391 and MLP 15-391a-d (UMS, pers. comm.). Of these, 15-391 agrees most closely with the type description and is therefore designated as the lectotype'. Thus, it is evident that these fossils were available to Patterson, who did not hesitate in considering them as part of Ameghino's original type series. Additionally, three specimens figured in Ameghino (1889; Atlas: plate VI, figs. 6–8) housed at the MACN also belong to the original type series (MACN-A 246 and MACN-A 247). Patterson (UMS, pers. comm.) stated that the palatal fragment described by Ameghino as *Stichomys constans* (MACN-A 246; Atlas 1889: plate VI, fig. 8) should be referred to *Adelphomys candidus* Ameghino, 1887, an assignation with which we agree.

Patterson (UMS, pers. comm.) and Pascual (1967) stated that MLP 15-391 was the lectotype of *Acarechimys constans*. We agree with this assignation. By default, the remaining specimens of the original type series constitute the paralectotypes. Nevertheless, among the paralectotypes, MLP 15-200 has been lost since December 1978 (information provided by the specimen label), and we refer MLP 15-346, MLP 15-391, and MLP 15-391b to *Acarechimys gracilis* based on molar and mandibular morphology (see below).

Patterson (in Patterson and Wood, 1982) '*provisionally*' considered *Stichomys constans* a synonym of *Acarechimys minutissimus*. However, this assignation is odd, and we think it could have been an error, since Patterson in his UMS considered *Acarechimys constans* as a valid species (pers, comm.). Additionally, based on its size and dental morphology, this species has traditionally been considered a distinct species (Vucetich *et al*., 1993 a? b?, 2010, 2015a; Kramarz, 2004; Croft *et al*., 2011; Arnal, 2012). Recently, Verzi *et al*. (2016) erected the new genus *Ameghinomys* to include this species (*Ameghinomys constans*) based on materials referred to *Acarechimys minutus*, *Acarechimys pulchellus*, *Acarechimys constans*, and other previously undescribed specimens. The conclusions of our systematic revision of *Acarechimys* differ from those of this publication. Verzi *et al*. (2016) associate the palatal fragment labeled as 'type?' (MLP 15-410b) of *Acarechimys minutus* mentioned in the previous section with the lectotype of *Acarechimys constans* (MLP 15-391). They argue that MLP 15-410b is proportionally larger than *Acarechimys minutus*, that it has a short mure comparable to the short ectolophid present in lower molars of *Acarechimys constans*, and that although Ameghino (1887, 1889) did not mention cranial fragments for *Stichomys constans*, he figured one in 1889 (Verzi *et al*., 2016). Nevertheless, the mentioned palatal fragment (Ameghino, 1889; Atlas: plate VI, fig. 8) is MACN-A 246 (Fernicola 2011; pag. 52), and not MLP 15-410b as indicated by Verzi *et al*. (2016). Ameghino (1889) did provide the following description for *Stichomys constans*: ['*la primera muela superior tiene también tres raíces, como en la especie anterior* (Stichomys regularis)*; y las cuatro muelas superiores ocupan un espacio longitudinal de 9 milímetros, como las cuatro inferiores*'] ['the first upper molar also has three roots, as in the preceding species (*Stichomys regularis*); and the four upper cheek teeth occupy a longitudinal space of 9 millimeters, like the four lowers'] (1889; pag. 247).

Additionally, MLP 15-410b isconsiderably smaller than *S. constans* [M1-3 are 6.85mm long, more than 2mm smaller than the value listed for *Stichomys constans* (9mm)]. Lastly, since relatively short ectolophids are common in small rodents, we do not think that the superficial resemblance to a 'short mure' on the upper molars (absent on both M2 of MLP 15-410b) can be used to refer unassociated upper and lower dentitions to the same species.

Description. *Upper cheek teeth*. As in *A. minutus*, both tooth rows are parallel to each other(Fig. 4.1) and are obliquely implanted labially with respect to the palatal plane. The upper cheek teeth are tetralophodont and wider than long (Fig. 4.1–2; Tab. 1). All molars and the DP4 have a subquadrangular occlusal outline. The molars have a short anteroloph that does not reach the paracone(Fig. 4.2), unlike in *A. minutus*, where it is long and fused with this crest. The protoloph is oblique anteriorly and curved. The metaloph is straight, departs from the junction of the mure and the anterior arm of the hypocone, and its labial end fuses with the posteroloph, delimiting a metafossette in juveniles(Fig. 4.2). The anterofossette and metafossette are equally deep and penetrate the occlusal surface slightly further than the mesoflexus. The hypoflexus is the deepest flexus and is posteriorly oriented.

The DP4 has a conspicuous metaloph, unlike in *A. minutus*, in which it is usually reduced(Fig. 4.2). It is fully molarized.

Skull. The description is based on MPM-PV 15002, a partial palatal fragment.

The ventral root of the zygoma extends slightly in front of the DP4(Fig. 4.1), and its antero-posterior diameter is similar to its dorso-ventral diameter, as in *A. minutus*. In ventral view, the masseteric tuberosity is conspicuous. Posterior to the masseteric tuberosity is a small foramen of uncertain homology(Fig. 4.1), as in the type species. On the dorsal face of the ventral root of the zygoma is a faint furrow for the passage of the infraorbitalis nerve. In palatal view, well-developed diastemal furrows are evident that extend posteriorly to M1(Fig. 4.1), farther than in *A. minutus*. The posterior palatine foramina are conspicuous and located between the M1s. The posterior nares open opposite the anterior half of the M2.

Lower cheek teeth. The dp4 is the longest tooth (Tab. 1). It has a curved metalophulid I. A well-developed (MACN-A 4058; MACN-A 4061; MACN-A 4064; MLP 15-391) (Fig. 4.3) or reduced (MACN-A 247a; MACN-A 4075) metalophulid II extends postero-lingually from the protoconid. The ectolophid is oblique and extends posteriorly from the posterior border of the protoconid. Near its posterior end, a well-developed mesolophid extends lingually and usually reaches the metaconid (Fig. 4.3), as in *A. minutissimus*. The hypolophid is straight or curved and reaches the entoconid. The posterolophid is long, anteriorly concave, and does not contact the entoconid (Fig. 4.3). The anterofossettid is rounded and relatively shallow, the metaflexid is narrow, and the posteroflexid is the largest and deepest of the lingual flexids/fossettids. The hypoflexid is posteriorly oriented and is deeper than the lingual flexids.

Lower molars have three main crests and a fourth, second in position, variably developed (Fig. 4.3). The metalophulid I is curved, unlike in *A. minutus* and *A. minutissimus*, where it is straight. A conspicuous metalophulid II is present in m1 but is reduced or absent on m2-3 (Fig. 4.3). In some cases, a labio-lingually aligned accessory cusp (Fig. 4.3) and/or a posterior extension of the metalophulid I is observed. These two structures are generally reduced or absent in m2-3. The ectolophid is generally longer than in the remaining species of the genus. The hypolophid and the posterolophid of the molars resemble the condition in the dp4. In juveniles, the hypoflexid is confluent with the posteroflexid (m2-3 in Fig. 4.3). The antero+mesoflexid is as broad and deep as the posteroflexid.

Lower incisors are not laterally compressed, unlike in *A. minutus* and *A. minutissimus*. They are long, with their posterior end located at the base of the coronoid process.

Mandible. The mental foramen, when present, is small and located opposite the anterior half of dp4 or slightly anteriorly (Fig. 4.4). The nmmpio is more poorly developed than the remaining species, antero-posteriorly short, and located mainly below m1 (Fig. 4.4), as in *A. gracilis*. The masseteric crest is well-developed and is continuous with the posterior end of the nmmpio; it extends laterally as in the remaining species of the genus. The masseteric fossa is as deep as in *A. minutus* and *A. gracilis*; it is posteriorly positioned, with its anterior border opposite m2 or the posterior end of m1 (Fig. 4.4). The furrow that delimits the masseteric fossa antero-dorsally is poorly developed. The base of the coronoid process extends anteriorly to a point between m2 and m3 (Fig. 4.4), unlike in the remaining species of the genus in which it extends to m2. The mandibular symphysis extends posteriorly to the level of m1, and a poorly developed chin is present just anterior to the anterior part of the dp4.

[FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE]

Acarechimys gracilis (Ameghino, 1891) **comb.nov.**

Figure 4.5–6

Stichomys gracilis Ameghino, 1891

Protacaremys pulchellus Ameghino, 1902

Acarechimys pascuali Verzi *et al*., 2016 *partim*

***Holotype*.** MACN-A 4263, left mandible with dp4-m3.

***Referred material*.** (Supplementary appendix 1).

***Geographic and stratigraphic occurrence*.** Chubut and Santa Cruz provinces. Sarmiento Formation, Colhué Huapi Member, early Miocene; Santa Cruz Formation, late early Miocene (Supplementary Appendix 1).

***Emended diagnosis*.** Within the size range of *A. constans* and slightly larger than *A. minutus*. Lower deciduous premolars with well-developed metalophulid II and reduced mesolophid, unlike remaining species. Lower molars with metalophulid II poorly developed in m1 and reduced in m2-3; accessory cusp and posterior arm of the metaconid present, as in *A. minutus*. Lower incisors not laterally compressed, as in *A. constans*. Mandible with the nmmpio and masseteric fossa located posteriorly, unlike in *A. minutus*, *A. minutissimus*, and *A. leucotheae*.

Remarks. *Stichomys gracilis* was originally described by Ameghino (1891). Patterson (in Wood and Patterson, 1982) considered *S. gracilis* to be a junior synonym of *Acaremys minutus*, upon which he based the genus *Acarechimys* (Patterson and Wood, 1982). Nevertheless, we do not think that MACN-A 4263 (holotype of *S. gracilis*) is assignable to *Acarechimys minutus*; rather, it is indistinguishable from MACN-A 52-128, the holotype of *Acarechimys pulchellus* (Ameghino, 1902). Thus, *Acarechimys pulchellus* is a junior synonym of *Stichomys gracilis*, and we erect the new combination *Acarechimys gracilis* (Ameghino, 1891).

***Description*.** *Lower cheek teeth*. The m2 is the largest tooth in the dental series (Tab. 1). The dp4 has a curved metalophulid I. The ectolophid and the metalophulid II extend posteriorly from the protoconid. The metalophulid II is conspicuous and postero-lingually oblique, as in *A. minutissimus* and *A. constans* (Fig. 4.5). The mesolophid is reduced to a short spur that extends from the posterior end of the metalophulid II and delimits a fossettid (Fig. 4.5). The hypolophid is long and straight. The posterolophid is long and curved but does not contact the lingual end of the hypolophid (Fig. 4.5). The hypoflexid is the deepest flexid and is posteriorly oblique.

The lower molars have three main crests and a fourth, second in position, variably developed (Fig. 4.5). The metalophulid I is curved, as in *A. constans*. The metaconid extends posteriorly to form the posterior arm of the metaconid, which is well-developed in m1-3 (Fig. 4.5), unlike in *A. constans*, in which is absent. The metalophulid II is reduced but more developed in m1 than in m2-3(Fig. 4.5). An accessory cusp is present, including in m3, unlike in other species of the genus (Fig. 4.5). The hypolophid and posterolophid are as in dp4.

The lower incisors are robust and not laterally compressed. They have a thick enamel layer, a straight lingual border, and a curved labial one. This tooth is long, as in the remaining species of the genus, with its posterior end posterior and labial to m3 (Fig. 4.6).

Mandible. A short, concave diastema is present, as in the remaining species (Fig. 4.6). The mental foramen is generally absent, but a very small foramen is present anterior to the dp4 in MPM-PV 17430. The nmmpio is long, conspicuous, and mostly located below m1 (Fig. 4.6). The masseteric crest is well-developed, continuous with the nmmpio, and projects laterally. The masseteric fossa is slightly deeper than in *A. constans* but shallower than in *A. minutissimus* (Fig. 4.6). The furrow that delimits the masseteric fossa antero-dorsally is poorly developed, as in the remaining species. The coronoid process extends anteriorly to the level of m2; it is postero-laterally extended and delimits a retromolar fossa lateral to m2-3. Its anterior border is straight, and its dorsal tip is dorsal to the cheek teeth.

Posteriorly the mandibular notch is shallow. Lingually, the mandibular symphysis extends posteriorly to the level of dp4; posteriorly, the mental process is moderately developed.

Acarechimys leucotheae Vucetich *et al*., 2015

Figure 5. 1

***Type and only material*.** MPEF-PV 10677, left mandibular fragment with dp4-m3 and incisor.

***Geographic and stratigraphic occurrence*.** Chubut Province, Argentina. Upper levels of Sarmiento Formation at Cabeza Blanca, late Oligocene; Deseadan SALMA.

***Diagnosis* [modified from Vucetich *et al*. (2015a)].** Very small, within the size range of *A. minutissimus*. Cheek teeth brachydont and terraced to a greater degree than in other species of the genus. Lower molars with three crests plus a very short metalophulid II and an accessory cusp in m1-2, as in *A. minutus*; posterior arm of the metaconid and posterior extension of the metalophulid I absent; posterolophid more transverse than in the other species, resulting in a more open posteroflexid. Lower deciduous premolar with the ectolophid conspicuously separated from the protoconid, very oblique, and more perpendicular to the antero-posterior axis of the tooth than in the other species of the genus; metalophulid II reduced, as in some specimens of *A. minutus* and *A. constans*. Mandible with the notch for the insertion of tendon of the masseter medialis pars infraorbitalis more oblique than in the remaining species; mental foramen absent, as in *A. minutissimus* and *A. minutus*.

Remarks. This species was recently described by Vucetich *et al*. (2015a) based on a single specimen (Fig 5.1). No new specimens or additional information are available.

[FIGURE 5 ABOUT HERE]

Acarechimys minutissimus (Ameghino, 1887)

Figure 5. 2–4

Stichomys diminutus Ameghino, 1891

Sciamys tenuissimus Ameghino, 1894

***Type series*.** MACN-A 256, left mandible with dp4-m3; MACN-A 257, left mandible with dp4-m3; MACN-A 258, right mandible with incisor and dp4-m3; MLP 15-188, left mandible with dp4-m3.

Lectotype. MLP 15-188 Patterson in Pascual, 1967.

Paralectotypes. MACN-A 256, MACN-A 257, MACN-A 258.

***Referred material*.** (Supplementary appendix 1).

***Geographic and stratigraphic occurrence*.** Santa Cruz and Neuquén provinces, Argentina; La Venta, Colombia. Pinturas, Santa Cruz, and Collon Curá formations, early Miocene, late early Miocene, and middle Miocene, 'Pinturan' age, Santacrucian and Colloncuran SALMAs; Villavieja Formation, middle Miocene, Laventan SALMA (Supplementary appendix 1).

***Emended diagnosis*.** Very small, within the size range of *A. leucotheae*. Cusps conspicuous in young specimens. Lower deciduous premolar with reduced metalophulid II and well-developed mesolophid, unlike the remaining species of the genus. Metalophulid II generally absent in the lower molars or present in m1 as a bulge into the ectolophid, unlike in the remaining species of the genus; accessory cusp in antero+mesoflexid of m1-2 variably present, and posterior arm of the metaconid and posterior extension of the metalophulid I absent, unlike in *A. minutus*. Lower incisors large relative to the mandible size. Mandible with the nmmpio straight and below dp4-m1, as in *A. minutus* and *A. leucotheae*.

Remarks. MLP 15-188 is labeled as the lectotype of *Acarechimys minutissimus*. The MLP collections include several specimens from the 'old collections' referable to *A. minutissimus* (MLP 15-1, MLP 15-188a, MLP 15-398, MLP 15-408), but unfortunately the available information does not indicate whether they were collected by C. Ameghino (as is the case for *A. minutus* and *A. constans*). Patterson (UMS, pers, comm.) mentioned MLP 15-188 as the type of the species. Thus, we can infer that only MLP 15-188 was available to him. Two specimens were figured by Ameghino (1889; Atlas: plate IV, figs. 24, 25). Figure 24 corresponds to MACN-A 257, but the specimen corresponding to figure 25 could not be found [Fernicola (2011) erroneously stated the reverse, that the figure 24 specimen could not be found and that figure 25 specimen is MACN-A 257]. Additionally, MACN-A 256 and MACN-A 258 are mentioned in Ameghino's catalog as belonging to the same stock as MACN-A 257. In fact, Ameghino (1889) mentioned that this species was represented by several mandibles. Thus, we conclude that four specimens (MLP 15-188, MACN-A 256, MACN-A 257, MACN-A 258) are part of the original type series used by Ameghino to erect *A. minutissimus*.

Patterson (UMS, pers, comm.) and Pascual (1967) determined MLP 15-188 to be the lectotype of the species. As a consequence, the remaining specimens of the original species are considered to be paralectotypes.

Description. *Upper cheek teeth*. Tooth rows labially obliquely implanted with respect to the palatal plane, as in *A. minutus*. Cheek teeth with four crests (Fig. 5.2). The M2 is slightly larger than DP4 and M1 (Tab. 1). Cusps discernable and molars slightly terraced.

The molars have a subquadrangular occlusal outline(Tab. 1) and well-defined paracone and metacone (Fig. 5.2). The protocone area is more rounded than in *A. minutus*. The anteroloph is short, unlike in the type species, but an anterofossette forms with little wear since the paracone does not extend very far anteriorly (M2; Fig. 5.2). The protoloph is slightly curved. The metaloph is straight and ends labially in the metacone, which is posteriorly extended and contacts the relatively short posteroloph. Consequently, the antero- and posterofossettes are delimited in juvenile specimens (Fig. 5.2). The paraflexus/fossette is the smallest and shallowest fossette, and extends across the occlusal surface as far as the mesoflexus. The hypoflexus is the deepest flexus and is anteriorly oriented.

The DP4 resembles the molars but differs in its rounded occlusal outline and in the absence of an anteriorly oriented paracone. Unlike in *A. minutus*, the anteroloph is short and oblique (Fig. 5.2), and in some specimens, the metaloph is reduced (MACN-A 4145), as in *A. minutus*.

The upper incisors are oval in section, as in *A. minutus*. The enamel is thick, and the anterior face is straight and the labial face is curved.

Skull. The description is based on two small, poorly preserved skull fragments (MACN-A 12683; YPM-PVPU 15178). In the ventral aspect of the skull, the incisive foramina are well-developed, as in *A. minutus*. Posteriorly, they are continuous with well-developed diastemal furrows that extend posteriorly to the anterior border of the DP4s. The ventral root of the zygoma extends just in front of the DP4, and its antero-posterior diameter is similar to its dorso-ventral diameter, as in the type species. The masseteric tuberosity is well-developed, and the lateral furrow for the insertion of the lateral masseteric muscle is shallow. Unlike in *A. minutus*, there is no foramen of uncertain affinities posterior to the masseteric tuberosity. On the dorsal face of the ventral root of the zygoma is a faint furrow for the passage of the infraorbital nerve.

Lower cheek teeth. Juveniles have terraced cheek teeth with the metaconid and entoconid higher than the protoconid and hypoconid, and adults have flat occlusal surfaces. The dp4 of this species is most variable: it has a curved metalophulid I whose lingual and labial portions can be separated from each other (MACN-A 4076; MACN-A 4083). The metalophulid II is usually reduced, as in *A. minutus*, *A. leucotheae*, and some specimens of *A. constans*(Fig. 5.3), but in some cases, it reaches the mesolophid. The ectolophid is lingually concave, and in juveniles (MACN-A 1896; MPM-PV 15098), as well as in those specimens from the Pinturas Formation, it is not connected to the protoconid. The mesolophid is always well-developed, as in *A. constans,* and reaches the metaconid to delimit an anterior fossettid (Fig. 5.3). In some cases, this crest is disconnected from the ectolophid (MACN-A 4094). The hypolophid is straight or curved, and reaches the lingual side of the tooth. The posterolophid is long and curved, unlike in *A. leucotheae*. The anterofossettid is rounded and shallow and disappears with the posterofossette in adults. The straight mesoflexid and the posteriorly oblique hypoflexid are the deepest flexi and remain open in adults.

The molars have three crests. The metalophulid II is absent or reduced to a minute bulge on m1 (Fig. 5.3). The metalophulid I is straight, unlike in *A. constans* and *A. gracilis*, with a labio-lingually aligned protoconid and metaconid or a metaconid that is slightly anterior to the protoconid (Fig. 5.3). The hypolophid and posterolophid are as in the dp4. Antero+mesoflexid are merged owing to the absence of metalophulid II (Fig. 5.3). An accessory cusp is usually present on m1 and m2 (Fig. 5.3). This cusp can be connected to the metalophulid I by a posterior extension of the latter (MLP 15-398). The posterior arm of the metaconid is not present. In some juvenile specimens (MACN-A 4083; MACN-A 4092; MACN-A 4093; MLP 15-398), the hypoflexid is united with the posteroflexid. Antero+mesoflexid and posteroflexid are similar in depth; the hypoflexid is the deepest flexid and is posteriorly oblique.

Lower incisors are laterally compressed and very large relative to mandible size (Fig. 5.4). The enamel layer is thick, and the anterior face is straight and the labial face is curved. The incisors are long, extending below the m3 and ending in a bulge on the base of the coronoid process or in a furrow in broken specimens (Fig. 5.4).

Mandible. The mandible of this species has a conservative morphology that contrasts with the great variability of the lower cheek teeth. It is robust, and the diastema is dorsally concave and shorter than the tooth row as in the remaining *Acarechimys* species (Fig. 5.4). The mental foramen is nearly always absent (only on MACN-A 4081 is a very small foramen located anterior to the dp4). The nmmpio is straight and conspicuous, and extends below the dp4-m1 (Fig. 5.4). The masseteric crest is continuous with the posterior border of the nmmpio and protrudes laterally. The masseteric fossa is deep anteriorly, as in *A. minutus*(Fig. 5.4). The furrow that delimits this fossa antero-dorsally is poorly developed. The base of the coronoid process extends forward to the level of m2, as in *A. minutus* and *A. gracilis*, thereby delimiting a retromolar fossa lateral to m3. The mandibular symphysis extends posteriorly to m1, and a moderately developed chin is present anteriorly, which delimits the notch for the insertion of the digastric muscle.

Statistical Analysis. We tested for size differences among *Acarechimys* species using m1 and m2 length, as these allowed for the largest sample sizes. ANOVAs of both m1 length ($N = 69$) and m2 length ($N = 62$) were highly significant ($p < 0.0001$). Based on Tukey's HSD (Tab. 2), two subgroups of *Acarechimys* are statistically distinguishable: a group of larger species consisting of *A. constans*, *A. gracilis*, and the sample from Quebrada Honda (referred here tentatively to *A. minutus* and *A. minutissimus*), and a smaller group consisting of *A. leucotheae*, *A. minutissimus*, and *A. minutus*. These size groupings are distinct in a bivariate plot of m1 vs. m2 length (Fig. 6; $N = 58$).

Two conclusions can be drawn from this analysis. First, size does not appear to be a useful criterion for distinguishing *A. minutissimus* from *A. minutus*, even though this was the main criterion used by Ameghino (1887) for distinguishing these species. Although the smallest *Acarechimys* specimens do pertain to *A. minutissimus*, and m1 and m2 lengths are statistically different between these species (though only at the $p < 0.05$ to 0.005 level), there is significant size overlap between larger specimens of *A. minutissimus* and smaller specimens of *A. minutus* (Fig. 6). The single known specimen of *A. leucotheae* plots very close to this area of overlap. *Acarechimys constans* and *A. gracilis* show a pattern similar to *A. minutissimus* and *A. minutus* but with even greater size overlap (Fig. 6); the two species show virtually the same range of values for both m1 and m2 length and cannot be distinguished from one another based on size alone.

The other noteworthy result of this analysis is that the specimens in the *Acarechimys* sample from Quebrada Honda, tentatively identified as both *A. minutus* and *A. minutissimus*, are significantly larger than Patagonian specimens referred to these species, and similar in size to *A. constans* and *A. gracilis* (Fig. 6). This suggests that the Quebrada

Honda populations referred to *A. minutus* and *A. minutissimus* evolved in parallel toward larger size in this region during the late middle Miocene, or that they represent different species from those from Patagonia. If the first hypothesis is correct, the differences in size could be the result of similar responses to a common environmental factor such as climate or habitat. Body size change in response to climate has been documented in other extinct species (*e.g.*, Gingerich, 2003; Chew, 2015) and climate change has been proposed to have had a significant effect on the evolution of body size in North American Cenozoic mammals (Lovegrove and Mowoe, 2013). In this case, it is curious that the single specimen of *Acarechimys* from La Venta, Colombia, here referred to *A. minutissimus*, is similar in size to Patagonian specimens of this species (m1 length = 1.56 mm; Walton, 1990, tab. 1). If climate (temperature) were primarily responsible for the larger size of Quebrada Honda specimens, one might expect a similar pattern at La Venta, which is the same age as Quebrada Honda and also located in tropical latitudes. Testing this hypothesis requires studying additional specimens of *Acarechimys* collected at Quebrada Honda since the publication of Croft *et al*. (2011) and incorporating data from ongoing paleoenvironmental studies at the site (Cadena *et al*., 2015; Catena *et al*., 2016). It should also be noted that three *A. minutus* specimens from Patagonia are particularly large and fall within the range of specimens from Quebrada Honda (the first two are represented only by m1): MLP 82-XII-1-31 (Santa Cruz Province, exact provenance unknown), MLP 91-IX-1-200 (Collon Curá Formation at Cañadón del Tordillo), and MPM-PV 4193 (Puesto La Costa, costal Santa Cruz Province; Fig. 6). Each of these represents a relatively large individual within an otherwise small-bodied population and provides no systematic explanation for the relatively large size of the Quebrada Honda sample.

[FIGURE 6 ABOUT HERE]

Phylogenetic Analysis

The cladistic analysis resulted in 12 Most Parsimonious Trees (MPTs) of 798 steps each (Consistency index=0.318; Retention index=0.544) and the best score hit 57 times out of 1,000. The strict consensus tree (Fig. 7) has a well-resolved topology. Results are in general agreement with previous analyses, but minor differences are present with respect to the relationships of some groups. One interesting aspect is the basal position of *Draconomys verai* (early Oligocene of Chubut province, Argentina) within caviomorphs. The phylogenetic relationships of some species originally described as basal octodontoids (*e.g.*, *D*. *verai*; *Eosallamys simpsoni*, *Eoespina woodi*, and *Eosachacui lavocati* from the late Eocene?–early Oligocene of Peru; *Changquin woodi* from the late Oligocene of Chubut province; and *Dudumus ruigomezi* from the early Miocene of Chubut province, Argentina) and of those taxa from the late middle Eocene of Contamana, Peru (*Cachiyacuy contamanensis* and *Canaanimys maquiensis*) are not clear and vary in different analyses (Antoine *et al*., 2012; Arnal *et al*., 2014; Arnal and Vucetich, 2015). Therefore, the relationships of these species will be the subject of a future study focused on basal caviomorphs.

Pan-Octodontoidea (node 1) is characterized by six synapomorphies [metaloph on DP4 indistinct, probably fused to the posteroloph (character 13:1); mesostyle on DP4 indistinct or absent (character 15:0); mesolophule slightly oblique on M1-M2 (character 42:1); presence of an anterior flexid in metalophulid I of p4 (character 70:0); short mesolophid on p4 (character 73:0); nmmpio at the middle of the mandible high (character111:1)]. Nevertheless, node 1has a low support (Fig. 7), since most of those characters are scored in only a few taxa.

Within stem-Octodontoidea, several clades previously recovered in other analyses are also recovered here. Node 2 (Fig. 7) is the sister-clade to remaining octodontoids and includes *Eosallamys simpsoni*, *Migraveramus beatus*, and several other species including the enigmatic *Plesiacarechimys koenigswaldi* from the middle Miocene of Neuquén Province (Argentina). Later-diverging clades include (*Eoespina woodi* + *Sallamy*s? *minutus*), Acaremyidae, (*Caviocricetus lucasi* + *Dudumus ruigomezi*), and the five species of *Acarechimys*. The phylogenetic relationships of crown Octodontoidea (Fig. 7) should be considered tentative because the taxonomic sample of this study is not focused on this part of the tree.

Acarechimys is recovered as a monophyletic genus of stem-octodontoids (Fig. 7) characterized by the presence of brachydont cheek teeth (character 3:0), the presence of an accessory cusp on m1-2 (character 97:0), and a groove for the passage of the nerve infraorbitalis (character 139:1). *Acarechimys minutus*, the earliest-diverging species, is distinguished by a metacone that is slightly lingual to the paracone on M2 (character 39:1). The clade of *Acarechimys gracilis* + *A. constans* is characterized by a lack of compressed lower incisors (character 101:1) and by having the nmmpio positioned beneath m1 (character 110:0). Its sister clade, *A. minutissimus* + *A. leucotheae*, is characterized by the presence of terraced occlusal surfaces in all cheek teeth (character 9:0) and a deep anterior portion of the masseteric fossa (character 113:2). A striking aspect of these results is the reacquisition of very low cheek teeth by the genus (interpreted as a reversal within octodontoids), although such a reversal has never been postulated for octodontoids. Analyses underway will further test this hypothesis. Lastly, unlike the proposal of Verzi et al. (2016) *Abrocoma cinerea* is not directly related to any species of *Acarechimys*; rather, it is the earliest-diverging crown-Octodontoidea.

[FIGURE 7ABOUT HERE]

Discussion and Conclusions

The systematic and phylogenetic analyses performed here allow us to define the content of the *Acarechimys* group and to better discriminate the included species. *Acarechimys* is characterized by a unique mix of states that are plesiomorphic (*e.g.*, low-crowned cheek teeth) and apomorphic (retention of the deciduous premolar, absence of mental foramen, presence of an accessory cusp on m1-2, and presence of a groove for the passage of the nerve infraorbitalis) among octodontoids. Additionally, *Acarechimys* species differ from each other by the presence/absence of dental and mandibular structures (Tab. 3). Our statistical analyses demonstrate that size is not a relevant feature for distinguishing *A. minutus* from *A. minutissimus*. Traditionally, this was the main feature used for distinguishing species, albeit tentatively (Vucetich *et al*., 1993a), but our metric analyses demonstrate that there are significant overlaps in size among specimens referred to these species (see above; Fig. 5).

The temporal and geographic distributions of *Acarechimys* species suggests that the genus could have evolved in Patagonia by at least the early late Oligocene (in the first Patagonian radiation event; Arnal and Vucetich, 2015). The geologically oldest species is the minute *Acarechimys leucotheae*, which has only been identified at the late Oligocene (Deseadan SALMA) site of Cabeza Blanca, in Chubut Province, Argentina (Fig. 2). Cabeza Blanca has produced the greatest diversity of late Oligocene rodents in South America, nearly three times as many species as any other site of this age (Vucetich *et al*., 2015a).This is likely due, at least in part, to the large number of rodent specimens that have been collected there and the thorough taxonomic investigations that have focused on this site (see Wood and Patterson, 1959; Vucetich *et al*., 2015a), though only a single specimen of *A*. *leucotheae* has been identified from the site thus far. This suggests that *Acarechimys* was relatively rare at that time, a conjecture that is supported by the absence of specimens referable to the genus from La Flecha, the other rich Patagonian locality. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that no specimens of *Acarechimys* have yet been identified from Salla, Bolivia, which has also produced a rather diverse and rich fauna of late Oligocene rodents (Lavocat, 1976; Patterson and Wood, 1982; Vucetich, 1991).Thus, the present evidence suggests that *Acarechimys* could have originated in Patagonia.

Acarechimys apparently continued to be rare prior to the late early Miocene, as *Acarechimys gracilis*, from the Colhuehuapian SALMA of Chubut Province (Fig. 2), is known only through one specimen, the holotype of *Protacaremys pulchellus* (Ameghino, 1902; Vucetich *et al*., 2010). Kramarz *et al*. (2004) mentioned the presence of *Acarechimys* for the Colhuehuapian beds of Chichinales Formation in Río Negro (Fig. 2), but we have studied this specimen and determined that it does not belong to *Acarechimys*. Despite the rich octodontoid fossil record and the great morphological disparity of this group prior to the late early Miocene, *Acarechimys* remained poorly diversified during this interval (about half of Colhuehuapian caviomorphs are octodontoids; Vucetich *et al*., 2010, 2015b).

By the late early Miocene, *A*. *minutissimus* is recorded for the 'Pinturan' age of Santa Cruz Province (Fig. 2) (Kramarz, 2004; see Kramarz and Bellosi, 2005 and Perkins *et al*., 2012 for a discussion about the overlap of some parts of the 'Pinturan' and Santacrucian levels). The acme of the genus was during the Santacrucian SALMA (Santa Cruz Formation), where four of the five recognized species lived in what is today

ArgentineanSanta Cruz Province (*A. minutus*, *A. constans*, *A. gracilis*, and *A. minutissimus*). This great diversity could partly be attributable to the fact that the Santa Cruz Formation exposures have a wide distribution (Fig. 2), and have been broadly prospected since the nineteenth century, resulting in an unparalleled collection of fossils (Ameghino, 1887, 1889; Scott, 1905; Vizcaíno *et al*., 2012; Fernicola *et al*., 2014). *Acarechimys* has also been recovered at other Santacrucian localities in Chile (Flynn *et al*., 2002, 2008; Croft *et al*., 2007), but these materials have not yet been figured nor described in detail. In general, Santacrucian caviomorphs are quite distinct from those of the Colhuehuapian and also from those of the 'Pinturan' age (Vucetich *et al*., 2015b), exhibiting a marked tendency toward increased hypsodonty (Kramarz, 2001; Pérez and Vucetich, 2012; Arnal and Pérez, 2013). This ecological shift in rodents is generally thought to be a consequence of climatic deterioration in Patagonia between Colhuehuapian and Santacrucian intervals (Vucetich, 1986; Pérez and Vucetich, 2012; Arnal and Pérez, 2013). However, the evidence for such deterioration is equivocal. Global temperatures remained relatively stable across this interval (Zachos *et al*., 2008), and open habitats were present at least episodically during both the Colhuehuapian and Santacrucian SALMAs (Dunn *et al*., 2015), though arid-adapted shrubs only became dominant in Patagonia after the late Miocene (Palazzesi and Barreda, 2012). Kay *et al*. (2012) interpreted the paleoenvironment of coastal Santa Cruz as highly seasonal with a mosaic of vegetation including both forested and more open areas. It is possible that an increase in exogenous grit, such as volcanic ash, may have driven the trend toward increased hypsodonty and a replacement of caviomorph species across this interval, but it is difficult to test such a hypothesis at present due to a paucity of studies that include data from both the Colhuehuapian and Santacrucian SALMAs. Regardless of the precise causes of the ecological shifts in other rodents, *Acarechimys* is noteworthy in being the only octodontoid lineage that retained generalized, brachydont cheek teeth into the late early Miocene in high latitudes.

The Patagonian fossil record is scarce for the middle Miocene, and known fossil sites have a more northerly location compared to the early Miocene (Pascual and Ordreman Rivas, 1971; Pascual and Ortiz Jaureguizar, 1990; Pérez, 2010; Arnal and Pérez, 2013). Rodents are represented in few Colloncuran localities (Colloncuran SALMA; earliest middle Miocene) in Neuquén and Río Negro provinces (*e.g.*, Cañadón del Tordillo and Pilcaniyeu Viejo respectively; Bondesio *et al.*, 1980; Vucetich *et al.*, 1993a; Fig. 2). During the Mayoan (latest middle Miocene), rodents have been reported from several small faunules in western Chubut and Santa Cruz provinces (Kraglievich, 1930; Bondesio *et al.*, 1980; Vucetich and Pérez, 2011; Pérez *et al.*, 2016), as well as the locality of El Petiso in Chubut Province, whose age is estimated to be post-Colloncuran (Villafañe *et al.*, 2008; Arnal and Pérez, 2013). Among these middle Miocene localities, *Acarechimys* has only been identified at Cañadón del Tordillo and Estancia Collon Curá. In a recent preliminary revision of unpublished caviomorphs of Cañadón del Tordillo and Estancia Collon Curá, a very high octodontoid diversity was identified (Vucetich and Arnal, pers. obs.). However, *Acarechimys* diversity appears to be lower than during the Santacrucian. During this time, northern Patagonia experienced a short period of regreening; forests and more humid conditions are inferred for Cañadón del Tordillo based on the presence of monkeys and a high diversity of porcupines (Candela, 2003; Dunn *et al.*, 2015; Vucetich *et al.*, 2015b), as well as many low-crowned octodontoids (Vucetich and Arnal, pers. obs.). Few late Miocene sites are known from Patagonia. These have yielded only fragmentary remains of rodents and no octodontoids (Pascual and Bondesio, 1985; Vucetich *et al*., 2005; Dozo *et al*., 2010).

A variety of fossil sites are known from central and northern Argentina and lower latitudes of the continent during the Eocene to Miocene interval. Sites of Eocene and Oligocene age are known from Peru, Bolivia, Brazil, and Uruguay. In general, the fossil record of these localities (with the exception of Salla, Bolivia) is very poor, and no *Acarechimys* or closely similar taxa have been described (Lavocat, 1976; Mones and Castiglione, 1979; Patterson and Wood, 1982; Vucetich, 1991; Vucetich *et al*., 1993b; Bond *et al*., 1998; Vucetich and Ribeiro, 2003; Frailey and Campbell, 2004; Antoine *et al*., 2012). An unidentified species of *Acarechimys* was mentioned for the late early Miocene of Chucal, northern Chile (~18° S; Croft *et al*., 2007), and the genus has been recorded at the late middle Miocene of La Venta, Colombia (~3° N; Walton, 1997), Quebrada Honda, Bolivia (~22° S; Croft *et al*., 2011), and the Fitzcarrald Arch in Peruvian Amazonia (~11° S; Tejada-Lara *et al*., 2015: fig. 9N) (Fig. 2). Other early and middle Miocene localities have yielded remains of caviomorphs, but there is no record of *Acarechimys* (*e.g*., Madre de Dios Subandean Zone, Peru; Antoine *et al*., 2013). For the late Miocene, Campbell *et al*. (2006) mentioned the possible presence of *Acarechimys* in the Madre de Dios Formation in the Amazonia region, and Antoine *et al*. (2016) did the same for the Pebas Formation of Peru. Based on our firsthand study of the material of the Madre de Dios Formation and examination of photos of specimens from the Pebas Formation, we do not believe *Acarechimys* occurs at these sites. Instead, the specimens from the Amazonia region represent a new caviomorph species that is broadly represented in southwest Amazonia (Brazil and Peru) during the late Miocene (Vucetich *et al*., in prep). The phylogenetic relationships of this new taxon relative to *Acarechimys* will be the subject of future research.

Based on available evidence, *Acarechimys* was apparently not present in lower latitudes of the continent (north of 35° S) before the early Miocene; the factors favoring its dispersal after this time remain to be elucidated. The change in its distribution toward low latitudes after the early middle Miocene is broadly reminiscent of a pattern of range contraction seen in several other groups of mammals including vermilinguan xenarthrans, platyrrhine primates, and astrapothere ungulates (Pascual *et al*., 1996;Ortiz Jaureguizar and Cladera, 2006; Croft *et al*., 2016), and it raises the possibility of a common environmental or ecological cause. Paleoecological studies of *Acarechimys* are necessary to provide additional insights into how and why this tiny caviomorph was able to achieve the widest temporal and geographic distribution of any caviomorph genus, while retaining a persistently brachydont dentition.

AKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to A. Kramarz (MACN), M. Reguero, M. De los Reyes, and A. Sacarano (MLP-PV), F. Anaya (UATF), and Dirección de Patrimonio Cultural and MPM-PV for providing access to specimens under their care; the photographer of the MLP, B. Pianzola, for assistance photographing specimens; to M. Reguero and E. Tonni (MLP) for discussion of possible locations of Ameghino's fossils; to D. Brinkman and N. Upham, Division of Vertebrate Paleontology of the Peabody Museum of Natural History, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA for kindly providing photographs of YPM-VPPU 15806(photographed by Jamie Henderson); to M. E. Pérez, L. Marivaux, and A. Otero for their valuable comments that improved the final version of the manuscript. This is a contribution to the projects PICT 2014-2734 (MA), PICT 2012-1483 and UNLP 11/N674 (MGV), NSF EAR 958733 and EAR 1423058 (DAC), PIP 781 and UNLu CCD-CD: 054/12 (JCF), PICT 2013-0389 and UNLP 11/N750 (SFV).

REFERENCES

Ameghino, F. 1887. Enumeración sistemática de las especies de mamíferos fósiles coleccionadas por Carlos Ameghino en los terrenos eocenos de la Patagonia austral. *Boletín del Museo de La Plata* 1: 1–26.

Ameghino, F. 1889. Contribución al conocimiento de los mamíferos fósiles de la República Argentina. *Actas de la Academia Nacional de Ciencias en Córdoba* 6: 1–1027.

Ameghino, F. 1891. Nuevos restos de mamíferos fósiles descubiertos por Carlos Ameghino en el Eoceno inferior de la Patagonia austral. Especies nuevas, adiciones y correcciones. *Revista Argentina de Historia Natural* 1: 289–328.

Ameghino, F. 184. Enumération synoptique des espéces des mammiferes fósiles des formations éocenes de Patagonie. *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Ciencias de Córdoba* 13: 259–452.

Ameghino, F. 1902. Première contribution à la connaissance de la faune mammalogique des couches à *Colpodon*. *Boletín de la Academia Nacional de Ciencias en Córdoba* 17: 71–138.

Antoine, P.-O., Marivaux, L., Croft, D.A., Billet, G., Ganerod, M., Grégory Fanjat, C., Rousse, S., and Salas-Gismondi, S. 2012. Middle Eocene rodents from Peruvian Amazonia reveal the pattern and timing of caviomorph origins and biogeography. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 279: 1319–1326.

Antoine, P.-O., Roddaz, M., Brichau, S., Tejada-Lara, J., Salas-Gismondi, R., Altamirano, A., Louterbach, M., Lambs, L., Otto, T., and Brusset, S. 2013. Middle Miocene vertebrates from the Amazonian Madre de Dios Subandean Zone, Perú. *Journal of South American Earth Sciences* 42: 91–102.

Antoine, P.-O., Abello, M.A., Adnet, S., Altamirano Sierra, A.J., Baby, P., Billet, G., Boivin, M., Calderón, Y., Candela, A., Chabain, J., Corfu, F., Croft, D.A., Ganerod, M., Jaramillo, C., Klaus, S., Marivaux, L., Navarrete, R.E., Orliac, M.J., Parra, F., Pérez, M.E., Pujos, F., Rage, J.-C., Ravel, A., Robinet, C., Roddaz, M., Tejada-Lara, J., Vélez-Juarbe, J., Wesselingh, F.P., and Salas-Gismondi, R. 2016. A 60-million-year history of western Amazonian ecosystems in Contamana, eastern Peru. *Gondwana Research* 31: 30–59.

Arnal, M. 2012. [Sistemática, filogenia e historia evolutiva de roedores Octodontoidea (Caviomorpha, Hystricognathi) del Oligoceno tardío–Mioceno medio vinculados al origen de la familia Octodontidae. Tesis doctoral, Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, La Plata, 317 p. Unpublished.].

Arnal, M., and Kramarz, A.G. 2011. First complete skull of an octodontoid (Rodentia, Caviomorpha) from the early Miocene of South America and its bearing in the early evolution of Octodontoidea. *Geobios* 44: 435–444.

Arnal, M., and Perez, M.E. 2013. A new acaremyid rodent (Hystricognathi, Octodontoidea) from the middle Miocene of Patagonia (South America) and considerations on the early evolution of Octodontoidea. *Zootaxa* 3616: 119–134.

Arnal, M., Kramarz, A.G., Vucetich, M.G., and Vieytes, C.E. 2014. A new early Miocene octodontoid rodent (Hystricognathi, Caviomorpha) from Patagonia (Argentina) and a reassessment of the early evolution of Octodontoidea. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 34: 397–406.

Arnal, M., and Vucetich, M.G. 2015. Main radiation events in Pan-Octodontoidea (Rodentia, Caviomorpha). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 175: 587–606.

Bond, M., López. G., Reguero, M., Scillato-Yané, G.J., and Vucetich, M.G. 1998. Los mamíferos de la Fm. Fray Bentos (Oligoceno superior?) de las provincias de Corrientes y Entre Ríos, Argentina. *Asociación Paleontológica Argentina, Publicación Especial* 5: 41–50.

Bondesio, P., Rabassa, J., Pascual, R., Vucetich, M.G., and Scillato-Yané, G.J. 1980. La Formación Collón Curá de Pilcaniyeu Viejo y sus alrededores (Río Negro, República Argentina). Su antigüedad y las condiciones ambientales según su distribución, su litogénesis y sus vertebrados. *2º Congreso Argentino de Paleontología y Bioestratigrafía y 1º Congreso Latinoamericano de Paleontología* (Buenos Aires), *Actas* 3: 85–99.

Bowdich, T.E. 1821. An analysis of the natural classifications of Mammalia for the use of students and travelers. Smith p. 115.

Bremer, K. 1994. Branch support and tree stability. *Cladistics* 10: 295–304.

Cadena, E.A., Anaya, F., and Croft, D.A. 2015. Giant fossil tortoise and freshwater chelid turtle remains from the middle Miocene, Quebrada Honda, Bolivia: Evidence for lower paleoelevations for the southern Altiplano. J*ournal of South American Earth Sciences* 64: 190–198.

Campbell Jr., K.E., Frailey, C.D., and Romero-Pittman, L. 2006. The Pan-Amazonian Ucayali Peneplain, late Neogene sedimentation in Amazonia, and the birth of the modern Amazon River system. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 239: 166–219.

Candela, A.M. 2003. A new porcupine (Rodentia, Hystricognthi, Erethizontidae) from the early and Middle Miocene of Patagonia. *Ameghiniana* 40: 483–494.

Candela, A.M., and Rasia, L.L. 2012. Tooth morphology of Echimyidae (Rodentia, Caviomorpha): homology assessments, fossils and evolution. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 164: 451–480.

Catena, A.M., Saylor, B., and Croft, D.A. 2016. Using ichnofossils and paleosols to reconstruct the middle Miocene paleoenvironment of Quebrada Honda, Bolivia. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology, SVP Program and Abstracts Book* 2016: 112–113.

Chew, A.E. 2015. Mammal faunal change in the zone of the Paleogene hyperthermals ETM2 and H2. *Climate of the Past* 11: 1223–1237.

Croft, D.A., Flynn J.J., and Wyss, A.R. 2007. A new basal glyptodontid and other Xenarthra of the early Miocene Chucal fauna, northern Chile. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 27: 781–797.

Croft, D.A., Chick, J.M.H, and Anaya, F. 2011. New middle Miocene caviomorph rodents from Quebrada Honda, Bolivia. *Journal of Mammalian Evolution* 18: 245–268.

Croft, D.A., Carlini, A.A, Ciancio, M.R., Brandoni, D., Drew, N.E., Engelman, R.K., and Anaya, F. 2016. New mammal faunal data from Cerdas, Bolivia, a middle-latitude Neotropical site that chronicles the end of the Middle Miocene Climatic Optimum in South America. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*. DOI: 10.1080/02724634.2016.1163574.

Dozo, M.T., Bouza, P., Monti, A., Palazzesi, L., Barreda, V., Massaferro, G., Scasso, R.A., and Tambussi, C.P. 2010. Late Miocene continental biota in Northeastern Patagonia (Península Valdés, Chubut, Argentina). *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 297: 100–109.

Dunn, R.E., Strömberg, C.A.E., Madden, R.H., Kohn, M.J., and Carlini, A.A. 2015. Linked canopy, climate, and faunal change in the Cenozoic of Patagonia. *Science* 347: 258–261.

Esteban, G., Nasif, N., and Georgieff, S.M. 2014. Cronobioestratigrafía del Mioceno tardío–Plioceno temprano, Puerta de Corral Quemado y Villavil, provincia de Catamarca, Argentina. *Acta Geológica Lilloana* 26: 165–192.

Fernicola, J.C. 2011. Implicancias del conflicto Ameghino-Moreno sobre la colección de mamíferos fósiles realizada por Carlos Ameghino en su primera exploración al río Santa Cruz, Argentina. *Revista del Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales* 13: 41–57.

Fernicola, J.C., Cuitiño, J.I., Vizcaíno, S.F., Bargo, M.S., and Kay, R.F. 2014. Fossil localities of the Santa Cruz Formation (Early Miocene, Patagonia, Argentina) prospected by Carlos Ameghino in 1887 revisited and the location of the Notohippidian. *Journal of South American Earth Sciences* 52: 94–107.

Flynn, J.J., Novacek, M.J., Dodson, H.E., Frassinetti, D., McKenna, M.C, Norell, M.A., Sears, K.E., Swisher III, C.C., and Wyss, A.R. 2002. A new fossil mammal assemblage from the southern Chilean Andes: implications for geology, geochronology, and tectonics. *Journal of South American Earth Sciences* 15: 285–302.

Flynn, J.J., Charrier, R., Croft, D.A., Gans, P.B., Herriot, T.M., Wertheim, J.A., and Wyss, A.R. 2008. Chronologic implications of new Miocene mammals from the Cura-Mallín and Trapa-Trapa formations, Laguna del Laja area, South Chile. *Journal of South American Earth Sciences* 26: 412–423.

Frailey, C.D., and Campbell, K.E.2004. Paleogene rodents from Amazonian. In: K.E. Campell Jr. (Ed.), *The Paleogene Mammalian Fauna of Santa Rosa, Amazonian Peru*. Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County, p. 71–130.

Gingerich, P.D. 2003. Mammalian responses to climate change at the Paleocene–Eocene boundary: Polecat Bench record in the northern Bighorn Basin, Wyoming. *Geological Society of America Special Paper*369: 463–478.

Goloboff, P.A., and Farris, J.S. 2001. Methods for quick consensus estimation. *Cladistics* 17: 25–34.

Goloboff, P.A., and Catalano, S.A. 2016. TNT version 1.5, including a full implementation of phylogenetic morphometrics. *Cladistics* 32: 221–238.

Kay, R.F., Vizcaíno, S.F., and Bargo, M.S. 2012. A review of the paleoenvironment and paleoecology of the Miocene Santa Cruz Formation. In: S.F. Vizcaíno, R.F. Kay, and M.S. Bargo (Eds.), *Early Miocene Paleobiology in Patagonia: High-Latitude Paleocommunities of the Santa Cruz Formation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. p. 331–365.Kraglievich, L. 1930. La Formación Friaseana del río Frías, río Fénix, Laguna Blanca, etc. y su fauna de mamíferos. *Physis* 10: 127–161.

Kraglievich, J. L. 1965. Speciation phyletique dans les rongeurs fossiles du genre *Eumysops* Ameghino (Echimyidae, Heteropsomyinae). *Extrait de Mammalia* 29: 258–267.

Kramarz, A.G. 2001. Un nuevo roedor Adelphomyinae (Hystricognathi, Echimyidae) del Mioceno medio inferior de Patagonia, Argentina. *Ameghiniana* 38: 163–168.

Kramarz, A.G. 2004. Octodontoids and erethizontoids (Rodentia, Hystricognathi) from the Pinturas Formation, Early–Middle Miocene of Patagonia, Argentina. *Ameghiniana* 41: 199–216.

Kramarz, A.G., and Bellosi, E.S. 2005. Hystricognath rodents from the Pinturas Formation, Early–Middle Miocene of Patagonia, biostratigraphic and paleoenviromental implications. *Journal of South American Earth Sciences* 18: 199–212.

Kramarz, A.G., Bellosi, E.S., Ribeiro, A.M., and Ortiz, R. 2004. Nuevos registros de vertebrados fósiles de la Formación Chichinales, Mioceno Temprano de la provincia de Río Negro, Argentina. *Ameghiniana* 41: 53R.

Lavocat, R. 1976. Rongeurs caviomorphes de l'Oligocene de Bolivia. II, Rongeurs du bassin Deseadien de Salla-Luribay. *Palaeovertebrata* 7: 15–90.

Lovegrove, B.G., and Mowoe, M.O. 2013. The evolution of mammal body sizes: responses to Cenozoic climate change in North American mammals. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* 26: 1317–1329.

Marivaux, L., Vianey-Liaud, M., Welcomme, J.-L., and Jaeger, J.-J. 2002. The role of Asia in the origin and diversification of histricognathous rodents. *Zoologica Scripta* 31: 225–239.

Mones, A., and Castiglioni, 1979. Addition to the knowledge on fossil rodents of Uruguay (Mammalia, Rodentia). *Palaeöntologische Zeitschrift* 53: 77–87.

Negri, F.R., Bocquetin-Villaneuva, J., Ferigolo, J., and Antoine, P.-O. 2010. Cenozoic development of terrestrial and aquatic biota: insights from the fossil record. In: C. Hoorn, and F.P. Wesselingh (Eds.), *A review of Tertiary mammal faunas and birds* *from western Amazonia*. *Amazonia, Landscape and Species Evolution, A Look into the Past*. Blackwell Publishing, Chichester, UK, p. 245–258.

Olson, E.C. 1985. Bryan Patterson March10, 1909–December 1, 1979. *Biogeographical Memoirs National Academy of Sciences*. 55: 435–450.

Ortiz Jaureguizar, E. and Cladera, G.A. 2006. Paleoenvironmental evolution of southern South America during the Cenozoic. *Journal of Arid Environments* 66: 498–532.

Palazzesi, L., and Barreda, V. 2012. Fossil pollen records reveal a late rise of open-habitat ecosystems in Patagonia. *Nature communications* 3: 1294.

Pascual, R. 1967. Los roedores Octodontoidea (Caviomorpha) de la Formación Arroyo Chasicó (Plioceno inferior) de la provincia de Buenos Aires. *Revista del Museo de La Plata* 35: 259–282.

Pascual, R., and Bondesio, P. 1985. Mamíferos terrestres del Mioceno medio-tardío de las cuencas de los ríos Colorado y Negro (Argentina): evolución ambiental. *Ameghiniana* 22: 133–145.

Pascual, R., and Odreman Rivas, O.E. 1971. Evolución de las comunidades de los vertebrados del Terciario argentino; los aspectos paleozoogeográficos y paleoclimáticos relacionados. *Ameghiniana* 8: 372–412.

Pascual, R., and Ortiz-Jaureguizar, E. 1990. Evolving climates and mammal faunas in Cenozoic South America. *Journal of Human Evolution* 19: 23–60.

Pascual, R., Ortiz-Jaureguizar, E., and Prado, J.L. 1996. Land mammals: paradigm of Cenozoic South American geobiotic evolution. In: G. Arratia (Ed.), *Contribution of Southern South America to Vertebrate Paleontology*. Müncher Geowissenschaftliche Abhandlungen (A), p. 265–319.

Pascual, R., Ortega Hinojosa, E.J., Gondar, D., and Tonni, E. 1965. Las edades del cenozoico mamalífero de la Argentina, con especial atención en aquellas del territorio Bonaerense. *Anales de la Comisión de Investigaciones de Ciencias de Buenos Aires* 6: 165–193.

Patterson, B. (unpublished) Echimyidae y Octodontidae del Santacrucense (sin título definitivo).

Patterson, B., and Wood, A.E. 1982. Rodents from the Deseadan Oligocene of Bolivia and the relationships of the Caviomorpha. *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology* 149: 370–543.

Pérez, M. E. 2010. A new rodent (Cavioidea, Hystricognathi) from the middle Miocene of Patagonia, mandibular homologies, and the origin of the crown group Caviodea sensu stricto. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 30: 1848–1859.

Pérez, M. E., and Vucetich, M.G. 2012. A revision of the fossil genus *Phanomys* Ameghino, 1887 (Rodentia, Hystricognathi, Cavioidea) from the early Miocene of Patagonia (Argentina) and the acquisition of euhypsodonty in Cavioidea sensu stricto. *Paläntologische Zeitschrift* 86: 187–204.

Perkins, M.E., Fleagle, J.G., Heizler, M.T., Nash, B., Bown, T.M., Tauber, A.A., and Dozo, M.T. 2012. Tephnochronology of the Miocene Santa Cruz and Pinturas formations, Argentina. In: S.F. Vizcaíno, R.F. Kay, and M.S. Bargo (Eds.), *Early Miocene Paleobiology in Patagonia: High-Latitude Paleocommunities of the Santa Cruz Formation*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, p. 23–40.

SAS Institute. 2013. JMP Pro for Mac OS X, version 11.2.1. Cary, North Carolina.

Scott, W.B. 1905. Mammalia of the Santa Cruz beds. In: Reports of the Princeton University Expeditions to Patagonia 1896-1899. Part III, Glires. 39: 348–487.

Tejada-Lara, J., Salas-Gismondi, R., Pujos, F., Baby, P., Benammi, S.B., De Franceschi, D., Espurt, N., Urbina, M., and Antoine, P.-O. 2015. Life in proto-Amazonia: Middle Miocene mammals from the Fitzcarrald Arch (Peruvian Amazonia). *Palaeontology* 58: 341–378.

Tullberg, T. 1899. Über das System der Nagertiere: eine phylogenetische Studie. *Nova Acta Regiae Societatis Scientiarium Upsaliensis* 3: 1–514.

Verzi, D.H., Olivares. A.I., and Morgan, C.C. 2016. Systematics and evolutionary significance of the small Abrocomidae from the early Miocene of southern South America. *Historical Biology* doi: 10.1080/08912963.2016.1168410

Villafañe, A., Pérez, M.E., Abello, A., Bedatou, E., and Bond, M. 2008. Nueva Localidad Fosilífera del Mioceno Medio en el Noroeste de la Provincia del Chubut. *3º Congreso Latinoamericano de Paleontología de Vertebrados* (Neuquén), Actas, 265.

Vizcaíno, S.F., Kay, R.F., and Bargo, M.S. 2012. Background for a paleoecological study of the Santa Cruz Formation (late Early Miocene) on the Atlantic coast of Patagonia. In: S.F. Vizcaíno, R.F. Kay, and M.S. Bargo (Eds.), *Early Miocene Paleobiology in Patagonia*. Cambridge University Press, UK, p. 1–22.

Vizcaíno, S.F., Bargo, M.S., and Fernicola, J.C. 2013. Expediciones paleontológicas durante los siglos XIX y XX a la Formación Santa Cruz (Mioceno Inferior, Patagonia) y destino de los fósiles. *3º Congreso Argentino de Historia de la Geología* (Salta), Actas, 231–246.

Vucetich, M.G. 1986. Historia de los roedores y primates en Argentina: su aporte al conocimiento de los cambios ambientales durante el Cenozoico. *4º Congreso Argentino de Paleontología y Bioestratigrafía*, Actas, 2: 157–165.

Vucetich, M.G. 1991. Los roedores de Salla y Lacayani (Bolivia) y su correlación con los de otras faunas de edad Deseadense (Oligoceno). In: R. Suárez-Soruco (Ed.), *Fósiles y Facies de Bolivia-Vol. I Vertebrados*. Yacimientos Petrolíferos Fiscales Bolivianos, Santa Cruz, Bolivia, p. 625–629.

Vucetich, M.G., and Ribeiro, A.M. 2003. A new and primitive rodent from the Tremembé Formation (Late Oligocene) of Brazil, with comments on the morphology of the lower premolars of Caviomorph rodents. *Revista Brasileira de Paleontología* 5: 73–82.

Vucetich, M.G., and Pérez, M.E. 2011. The putative cardiomyines (Rodentia, Cavioidea) of the middle Miocene of Patagonia (Argentina) and the differentiation of the Family Hydrochoeridae. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 31: 1382–1386.

Vucetich, M.G., Mazzoni, M.M., and Pardiñas, U.F.J. 1993a. Los roedores de la Formación Collón Cura (Mioceno medio) y la Ignimbrita Pilcaniyeu. *Ameghiniana* 30: 361–381.

Vucetich, M.G., Souza Cunha, F.L., and Ferraz de Alvarenga, H.M. 1993b. Un roedor Caviomorpha de la Formación Tremembé (Cuenca de Taubaté), Estado de Sao Paulo, Brasil. *Anales de la Academia Brasilera de Ciencias* 65: 247–251.

Vucetich, M.G., Deschamps, C.M., Olivares, and A.I., and Dozo, M.T. 2005. Capybaras, size, time and shape: a model kit. *Acta Paleontologica Polonica* 50: 259–272.

Vucetich, M.G., Kramarz, G.A., and Candela, M.A. 2010. Colhuehuapian rodents from Gran Barranca and other Patagonian localities: the state of the art. In: R.H. Madden, A.A. Carlini, M.G. Vucetich, and R.F. Kay (Eds.), *The Paleontology of Gran Barranca Evolution and Environmental Change through the Middle Cenozoic of Patagonia*. Cambridge University Press, New York, p. 202–219.

Vucetich, M.G., Dozo, M.T., Arnal, M., and Pérez, M.E. 2015a. New rodents (Mammalia) from the late Oligocene of Cabeza Blanca (Chubut) and the first rodent radiation in Patagonia. *Historical Biology* 27: 236–257.

Vucetich, M.G., Arnal, M., Deschamps, C.M., Pérez, M.E., and Vieytes, C.E. 2015b. A brief history of Caviomorph rodents as told by the fossil record. In: A. Vassallo, D. Antonucci (Eds.), *Biology of Caviomorh rodents: Diversity and Evolution*. SAREM series A: Investigaciones Mastozoológicas, Mastozoological Research, p. 11–62.

Walton, A.H. 1990. [*Rodents of the La Venta fauna, Miocene, Colombia: Biostratigraphy and paleoenvironmental implications*. Ph.D. dissertation, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, USA, 159 p. Unpublished.].

Walton, A. 1997. Rodents. In: R.F. Kay, R.H. Madden, R.H. Cifelli, and J.J. Flynn (Eds.), *Vertebrate Paleontology in the Neotropics: The Miocene fauna of La Venta, Colombia*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C. p. 499–519.

Waterhouse, G.E. 1839. Observations on the Rodentia, with a view to point out the groups, as indicated by the structure of the crania in this order of Mammals. *Magazine of Natural History* 3: 90–96.

Wible, J.R., Yuanqing, W., Chuankui, L., and Dawson, M.R. 2005. Cranial anatomy and relationships of a new tenodactyloid (Mammalia, Rodentia) from the early Eocene of Hubei Province, China. *Annals of the Carnegie Museum* 74: 91–150.

Wood, A.E., and Patterson, B. 1959. The rodents of the Deseadan Oligocene of Patagonia and the beginnings of the South American rodent radiation. *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology* 120: 282–428.

Woods, C.A. and Howland, E.E. 1979. Adaptative radiation of capromyid rodents: anatomy of the masticatory apparatus. *Journal of Mammalogy* 60: 95–116.

Zachos, J.C., Dickens, G.R., and Zeebe, R.E. 2008. An early Cenozoic perspective on greenhouse warming and carbon-cycle dynamics. *Nature* 451: 279–283.

Figure 1. Dental and mandibular nomenclature used in this work. **1**, upper cheek teeth: **Al,** anteroloph; **anterofl,** anteroflexus; **H,** hypocone; **M,** metacone; **Mel,** metaloph; **Mr,** mure; **P,** protocone; **Pa,** paracone; **Prl,** protoloph; **Psl,** posteroloph; **2,** lower cheek teeth: **ac,** accessory cusp; **ecd,** ectolophid; **et,** entoconid; **hd,** hypoconid; **hld,** hypolophid; **md,** metaconid; **med I,** metalophulid I; **med II,** metalophulid II; **msd,** mesolophid; **pamd,** posterior arm of the metaconid; **pemed,** posterior extension of the metalophulid I; **prd,** protoconid; **psd,** posterolophid; **3,** mandible: **cor,** coronoid process; **d,** diastema; **mac,** masseteric crest; **maf,** masseteric fossa; **mf,** mental foramen; **nmmpio,** notch for the insertion of the masseter muscle, *pars infraorbitalis*.

Figure 2. Map showing fossil localities where *Acarechimys* has been found or mentioned; **1,** Cabeza Blanca, Chubut, Argentina; **2,** Gran Barranca, Chubut, Argentina; **3,** Río Pinturas Valley, Santa Cruz, Argentina; **4,** coastal localities of the Santa Cruz Formation, Santa Cruz, Argentina; **5,** localities at the cliffts of the Río Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, Argentina; **6,** Pampa Castillo, Región XI, Chile; **7,** Chucal Formation, Región XV, Chile; **8,** Laguna del Laja (Curá Mallín Formation), Región VIII, Chile; **9,** Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén, Argentina; **10,** El Petiso, Chubut, Argentina; **11,** Huemules River (Río Mayo Formation), Chubut, Argentina; **12,** Quebrada Honda, Bolivia; **13,** La Venta, Colombia; **14,** Fitzcarrald Arch, Peru; **15,** Puerta de Corral Quemado y Villavil (Andalhuala and Chiquimil formations), Argentina. A, B, and C refer to dismissed mentions of *Acarechimys* (**A,**

Chichinales Formation, Río Negro, Argentina; **B;** Madre de Dios Formation, Peru; **C;** Pebas Formation, Peru).

Figure 3. ***Acarechimys minutus***; **1, MPM-PV** 15088, left DP4-M3 (reversed); **2,YPM-VPPU** 15806, right lateral view of the skull; **3,MACN-A** 237, right dp4-m3(paralectotype); **4, MLP** 91-IX-1-97, right dp4; **5, MPM-PV** 15089, external view of right mandible. **Abbreviations**: **dzr**, dorsal root of the zygoma; **hramus**, horizontal ramus of the zygoma; **pmx-mx**, premaxillary-maxillary; **mx-j**, maxillary-jugal; **rmf**, rostral masseteric fossa; **vramus**, vertical ramus of the zygoma; **vrz**, ventral root of the zygoma. Scale bars = 2mm.

Figure 4. 1–4, ***Acarechimys constans***; 1–**2,** MPM-PV 15002, palatal fragment with left and right DP4-M2; 2, left DP4-M2 (reversed); **3,** MLP 15-391, right dp4-m3 (lectotype); **4,** MACN-A 4064, external view of left mandible (reversed); **5–6,** ***Acarechimys gracilis*** MACN-A 52-128; **5,** right dp4-m3; **6,** external view of the right mandible. Anterior to the right, except Figure 4.1. **Abbreviations**: **ac,** accessory cusp; **Al,** anteroloph; **maf,** masseteric fossa; **med II,** metalophulid II; **Mel,** metaloph; **mf,** mental foramen; **msd,** mesolophid; **nmmpio,** notch for the insertion of the masseter muscle, *pars infraorbitalis*; **pamd,** posterior arm of the metaconid; **Prl,** protoloph. Scale bars = 2mm.

Figure 5. 1, ***Acarechimys leucotheae***, MPEF-PV 10677, left mandible with dp4-m3 (holotype; reversed); **2–4,** ***Acarechimys minutissimus***; **2,** MACN-A 4076, right dp4-m3;**3,** MACN-A 258, right mandible with dp4-m3 (paralectotype;); **4,** MACN-A 4093, left mandible. Anterior to the right. **Abbreviations**: **ac,** accessory cusp; **Al,** anteroloph; **M,** metacone; **maf,** masseteric fossa; **med II,** metalophulid II; **Mel,** metaloph; **msd,**

mesolophid; **nmmpio,** notch for the insertion of the masseter muscle, *pars infraorbitalis*; **Pa,** paracone; **Prl,** protoloph; **Psl,** posteroloph. Scale bars = 1mm.

Figure 6. Bivariate plot showing the relationship between m1 and m2 length (measured in mm) of the five species of *Acarechimys*.

Figure 7. Consensus tree of 12 MPTs showing the phylogenetic relationships of *Acarechimys* species (highlighted in green). Numbers at nodes separated by slash refer to absolute (anterior) and relative (posterior) Bremer supports values. Numbers in circles are nodes: 1- Pan Octodontoidea, 2- Basal octodontoid clade.


1
anterior lobe
posterior lobe
Pa
M
Psl
Al
Prl
Mel
P
Mr
H
2
prd
ecd
hd
med I
med II
psd
pemed I
ac
md
pamd
msd
et
hld
anterior
lingual
3
furrow
cor
d
mf
nmmpio
mac
maf



75°
60°
45°
10°
0°
10°
20°
30°
40°
50°
Colombia
13
Peru
C
14
B
Brazil
Bolivia
7
12
Chile
15
Pacific Ocean
Argentina
Uruguay
8
A
9
10
11
1
2
6
3
5
4
Atlantic Ocean
0 200 1000km
late Oligocene (Deseadan SALMA)
early Miocene (Colhuehuapian SALMA)
late early Miocene (Santacrucian SALMA and Pinturan Age)
middle Miocene (Colloncuran SALMA)
middle Miocene (Laventan SALMA)
late Miocene/ early Pliocene
dismissed mentions of *Acarechimys*


1
hypofossette
Psl
Prl
Mel
Al
2
vramus
drz
rmf
pmx-mx suture
hramus
mx-j
suture
vrz
diastema
3
pamd
ac
pemed I
spur of med II
4
med II
5
nmmpio
maf
mac


1
foramen of uncertain homologies
diastemal furrows
posterior palatine foramen
2
metafossette
Al
Mel
Prl
3
4
maf
nmmpio
mf
5
padm
ac
med II
msd
med II
6
base of the incisor
furrow



1
spur of the med II
ac
med II
msd
2
M
Pa
Psl
Prl
Mel
Al
3
antero + mesoflexid
ac
msd
med II
4
nmmpio
base of the incisor
maf


A. constans
A. gracilis
A. leucotheae
A. minutissimus
A. minutus
Quebrada Honda
m2 length
m1 length
2.50
2.25
2.00
1.75
1.50
1.25
1.00
1.25
1.50
1.75
2.00
2.25
2.50


Bugtimys zafarullahi
Phiomys andrewsi
Metaphiomys schaubi
Cachiyacuy contamanensis
Draconomys verai
Canaanimys maquiensis
Erethizontoidea
Changquin woodi
Dasyprocta azarae
Cephalomys arcidens
Chinchilloidea
Eosallamys simpsoni
Sallamys pascuali
Plesiacarechimys koenigswaldi
Leucokephalos zeffiae
Migraveramus beatus
Llitun notuca
Paulacoutomys paulista
Eoespina woodi
Sallamys? minutus
Eosachacui lavocati
Deseadomys arambourgi
Acaremyidae
Caviocricetus lucasi
Dudumus ruigomezi
Protacaremys? adilos
Protacaremys prior
Prospaniomys priscus
Acarechimys minutus
Acarechimys gracilis
Acarechimys constans
Acarechimys minutissimus
Acarechimys leucotheae
Neophanomys biplicatus
Chasichimys bonaerense
Chasicomys octodontiforme
Abrocoma cinerea
Octodontidae
Ctenomys australis
Proechimys poliopus
Eumysops laeviplicatus
Kannabateomys amblyonyx
Echimys chrysurus
Eodelphomys almeidacomposi
Ethelomys loomisi
Stichomys regularis
Myocastor coypus
Spaniomys riparius
Adelphomys candidus
Xylechimys obliquus
4/80
/10
2/67
2/75
/8
2/14
/14
/13
3/60
/9
2/25
/33
3/15
2/15
2/33
/12
crown Octodontoidea

Table 1. *Acarechimys* dental measurements. Abbreviations: apl, antero-posterior length; mw, maximum width

A. minutus	MACN-A 237		MACN-A 4070		MACN-A 4073		MLP 15-410a		MPM-PV 15039	
	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw
dp4	1.62	1.30			1.56	1.18	-	-	1.44	1.22
m1	1.57	1.52			1.46	1.39	-	1.58	1.48	1.40
m2	1.58	1.48			1.50	1.49	1.62	1.62	1.42	1.38
m3	1.24	1.40			-	-	1.56	1.58	-	-
DP4-M3			6.92	-						
DP4			1.62	1.90						
M1			1.84	2.06						
M2			1.90	2.10						
M3			1.56	1.84						

A. constans	MLP 15-391		MACN A 247a		MACN A 247b		MPM-PV 15002		MPM-PV 15092	
	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw
dp4	2.22	1.64	-	-	2.36	1.64	-	1.56	2.33	1.53
m1	2.00	1.88	2.20	2.01	2.30	2.08	2.12	1.82	1.97	1.67
m2	2.01	1.94	2.36	2.16	2.20	2.16	-	-	1.94	1.96
m3	1.92	1.76	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
DP4-M2							5.04	-		
DP4							1.46	1.78		
M1							1.78	2.01		
M2							1.80	2.20		

A. leucotheae	MPEF-PV 10677	
	apl	mw
dp4	-	1.02
m1	1.38	1.34
m2	1.48	1.34
m3	1.20	1.18

A. minutissimus	MACN-A 258		MACN-A 1894		MACN-A 12683				MLP 15-1	
	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw
dp4	1.22	1.11	1.51	1.12			1.41	1.19	1.32	1.12
m1	1.25	1.26	1.41	1.30			1.43	1.34	1.26	1.28
m2	1.46	1.46	1.43	1.31			1.40	1.32	1.30	1.30
m3	1.28	1.21	1.20	1.20			-	-	1.00	1.12
DP4-M2					3.96	-				
DP4					1.30	1.30				
M1					1.28	1.46				
M2					1.38	1.53				

A. gracilis	MACN-A 52-128		MACN-A 4060		MACN-A 4263		MLP 15-391a		MPM-PV 17430	
	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw	apl	mw
dp4	1.88	1.54	2.32	1.70	1.76	1.48	1.90	1.59	2.08	1.54
m1	1.96	1.74	2.10	1.98	1.91	1.89	1.81	1.84	2.15	1.87
m2	2.01	1.89	2.34	2.10	1.93	1.79	1.98	1.96	2.10	2.03
m3	1.82	1.68	2.16	1.78	-	-	-	-	1.86	1.57

Table 2. Results of Tukey's HSD tests of mean m1 length (to left of diagonal) and mean m2 length (right of diagonal) among* Acarechimys *samples. Only p-values for significant differences (p < 0.01) are listed. Abbreviations: N = number of specimens.

	A. constans *(N = 11)*	**A. gracilis** *(N = 13)*	**A. leucotheae** *(N = 1)*	**A. minutissimus** *(N = 14)*	**A. minutus** *(N = 9)*	*Quebrada Honda (N = 14)*
A. constans *(N = 15)*	-	*(none)*	*0.0170*	*< 0.0001*	*< 0.0001*	*(none)*
A. gracilis *(N = 14)*	*(none)*	-	*0.0143*	*< 0.0001*	*< 0.0001*	*(none)*
A. leucotheae *(N = 1)*	*0.0004*	*0.0014*	-	*(none)*	*(none)*	*(none)*
A. minutissimus *(N = 15)*	*< 0.0001*	*< 0.0001*	*(none)*	-	*0.0346*	*< 0.0001*
A. minutus *(N =11)*	*< 0.0001*	*< 0.0001*	*(none)*	*0.0042*	-	*0.0017*
Quebrada Honda (N = 13)	*0.0047*	*(none)*	*0.0345*	*< 0.0001*	*0.0080*	*n/a*

Table 3. Main dental and mandibular characters of **Acarechimys***. Abbreviations: see Figure 1.*

	A. minutus	**A. constans**	**A. gracilis**	**A. leucotheae**	**A. minutissimus**
dp4					
Metalophulid II	*Variably-developed (usually reduced)*	*Variably-developed (conspicuous or reduced)*	*Well-developed*	*Reduced*	*Reduced to a spur*
Mesolophid	*Usually reduced*	*Well-developed*	*Reduced*	*Well-developed*	*Well-developed*
m1					
Metalophulid II	*Reduced*	*Variably developed (usually conspicuous)*	*Variably developed*	*Reduced*	*Reduced to a spur or absent*
Pamd	*Present*	*Absent*	*Present*	*Absent*	*Absent*
Pemed I	*Variably Present*	*Variably present*	*Variably-developed*	*Absent*	*Absent*
Accessory cusp	*Present*	*Variably present*	*Present*	*Present*	*Present/ absent*
m2					
Metalophulid II	*Reduced*	*Reduced*	*Reduced*	*Reduced*	*Absent*
Pamd	*Present*	*Absent*	*Present*	*Absent*	*Absent*
Pemed I	*Variably present*	*Variably present*	*Variably present*	*Absent*	*Absent*
Accessory cusp	*Present*	*Variably present*	*Present*	*Present*	*Present/absent*
m3					
Metalophulid II	*Absent*	*Reduced*	*Reduced/ absent*	*Reduced*	*Absent*
Pamd	*present*	*Absent*	*present*	*Absent*	*Absent*
Pemed I	*Absent*	*absent*	*Variably present*	*Absent*	*Absent*
Accessory cusp	*Absent*	*Variably present*	*Present*	*present*	*Present*
Lower incisor					
Laterally compress	*yes*	*no*	*no*	*-*	*yes*
Mandible					
Anterior border nmmpio	*Below dp4*	*Below dp4-m1*	*Below dp4-m1*	*Below dp4*	*Below dp4*
Mental foramen	*Absent*	*Usually absent*	*Usually absent*	*Absent*	*Absent*

Supplementary Appendix 1. List of specimens assigned to *Acarechimys*. Abbreviations: CL, coastal localities; CSCr, cliffs of the Santa Cruz river; Fm, Formation; Mb, Member; SCP, Santa Cruz Province. Within parentheses are previous systematic assignations. For the ‘old collections' localities we translate what is written in the collection labels. For a discussion about the localities names see Vizcaíno *et al*. (2012) and Fernicola *et al*. (2014).

Acarechimys minutus	Description	Locality	Horizon
MACN-A 237 (syntype of *Acaremys minutus*)	Right mandible with dp4-m3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 238 (syntype of *Acaremys minutus*)	Right mandible with dp4(broken)-m3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4070	Left maxilla with DP4-M3	Seuhen, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4071	Right mandible with dp4-m3 and incisor	Seuhen, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4072a	Right mandible with dp4-m3	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4073	Left mandible with dp4-m2	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4082	Right mandible with dp4-m3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4264	Left mandibular fragment with dp4	Sehuen, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-PV SC4098	Right mandible with dp4-m1	Karaiken, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm?, late early Miocene
MLP 15-410a (syntype of *Acaremys minutus*)	Left mandibular fragment with m1-m3	CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 82-XII-1-31	Right mandible with m1	Santa Cruz Province	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 91-IX-1-199a	Right m1 or m2	Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén Province	Collon Curá Fm, middle Miocene
MLP 91-IX-1-200	Left m1 or m2	Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén Province	Collon Curá Fm, middle Miocene
MMP-PV 4193	Left mandible with dp4-m3	Puesto La Costa, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MMP-PV 15039	Right mandible with dp4-m2	Cañadón Silva, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15087	Right m2	Estancia el Tordillo, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15088	Left maxilla with DP4-M3	Estancia el Tordillo, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15089	Right mandible with dp4-m3 and incisor	Rincón del Buque, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15090	Right mandible with dp4-m3	Rincón del Buque, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17435	Right mandible with m1-m2	Rincón del Buque, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17436	Right mandibular fragment with dp4	Estancia El Tordillo, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17437	Left dp4	Estancia El Tordillo, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17440	Right maxilla with DP4	Rincón del Buque2, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
UATF-V-001262	Skull with left and right DP4-M3	Quebrada Honda, Bolivia	Unnamed Fm, middle Miocene

YPM-PU 15806	Skull with left and right DP4-M3 and incisors	Killik Aike, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
Acarechimys cf. *A. minutus*			
MLP 91-IV-1-15	Left mandible with m1-m2	Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén Province	Collón Curá Fm, middle Miocene
UATF-V-000934	Right mandible with dp4-m2 and incisor	Quebrada Honda, Bolivia	Unnamed Fm, middle Miocene
UATF-V-000935	Right mandible with dp4-m3	Quebrada Honda, Bolivia	Unnamed Fm, middle Miocene
UATF-V-000950	Right mandible with dp4(broken)-m3	Quebrada Honda, Bolivia	Unnamed Fm, middle Miocene
Acarechimys constans			
MACN-A 247 (syntype of *Stichomys constans*)	Left mandible with m1-m2 and right mandible with dp4-m2	SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4058	Right mandible with dp4-m1	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4061	Left mandible with dp4-m3	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4064	Left mandible with dp4-m2 and broken incisor	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4074	Left mandible with dp4-m1	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4075 (syntype of *Acaremys minutus*)	Right mandible with dp4-m1	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-57 (syntype of *Stichomys constans*)	Right mandible with m1 (broken)-m3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm?, late early Miocene?
MLP 15-200 (syntype of *Stichomys constans*)	Right mandible with dp4-m2 (lost specimen)	CSCr	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-319	Right mandible with m1-m3	CSCr	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-391 (syntype of *Stichomys constans*)	Right mandible with dp4-m3	CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-391c (syntype of *Stichomys constans*)	Left mandible with broken dp4-m1	Suppose 'curso inferior del río Santa Cruz'	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 4223	Right mandible with dp4-m2	Puesto Estancia La Costa, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15002	Broken right mandible with dp4-m1, palatal fragment with both DP4-M2, and isolated vertebra	Puesto Estancia La Costa, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15091	Right mandible with dp4-m2	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15092	Right mandible with dp4-m2 and incisor	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15093	Right mandible with dp4-m2	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15094	Left mandible with dp4-m1	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15095	Right mandible with m1-m3	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15096	Left mandible with dp4-m2	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15097	Right mandible with m2-m3	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
Acarechimys gracilis			
MACN-A 52-128 (holotype of *Protacaremys pulchellus*)	Left mandible with dp4-m3	Barranca sur del Colhue Huapí Lake, Chubut	Sarmiento Fm, Colhue Huapi Mb, early

		Province	Miocene
MACN-A 4060	Left mandible with dp4-m3 and incisor	Monte Observación, Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late Early Miocene
MACN-A 4068	Right mandible with dp4-m2	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late Early Miocene
MACN-A 4263 (holotype of *Stichomys gracilis*)	Left mandible with dp4-m2	Seuhen, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late Early Miocene
MLP 15-39 (syntype of *Stichomys constans*)	Left mandible with m1-m3	CSCr	Santa Cruz Fm, late Early Miocene
MLP 15-346 (syntype of *Stichomys constans*)	Left mandible with dp4-m2	Santa Cruz river?	Santa Cruz Fm?, late early Miocene
MLP 15-391a (syntype of *Stichomys constans* and holotype of *Acarechimys pascuali*)	Right mandible with dp4-m2	Suppose 'curso inferior del río Santa Cruz'	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-391b (syntype of *Stichomys constans*)	Right mandible with m1-m3	Suppose 'curso inferior del río Santa Cruz'	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17430	Left mandible with dp4-m3	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17431	Right mandible with m1-m3	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17432	Right mandible with dp4(broken)-m3	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17433	Left mandible with m1-m2	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17434	Left mandible with dp4-m2	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17439	Left m1 in mandibular fragment	Estancia El Tordillo, Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
Acarechimys leucotheae			
MPEF-PV 10677	Left mandible with dp4-m3 and incisor	Cabeza Blanca, Chubut Province	Sarmiento Fm, late Oligocene
Acarechimys minutissimus			
IGM 184229	Left mandible with dp4-m3	La Venta, Colombia	Villa vieja Fm, middle Miocene
MACN-A 256 (syntype of *Acaremys minutissimus*)	Left mandible with dp4-m3	SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 257 (syntype of *Acaremys minutissimus*)	Left mandible with dp4-m3	SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 258 (syntype of *Acaremys minutissimus*)	Right mandible with dp4-m3 and incisor	SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 1894	Right mandible with dp4-m3	Exact provenance unknown	
MACN-A 1896	Left mandible with dp4-m3	Exact provenance unknown	
MACN-A 1897	Right mandible with m1-m2	Exact provenance unknown	
MACN-A 1898	Left mandible with m2	Exact provenance unknown	
MACN-A 4072b	Right mandible with dp4-m2	Monte Observación, Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4076	Right mandible with dp4-m3 and incisor	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4077	Mandíbula izquierda casi	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late

	completa con m1-m3 e incisivo		early Miocene
MACN-A 4079	Right mandible with m1-m3 and incisor	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4080	Right mandible with dp4-m3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A4081	Right mandible with dp4-m1	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4083	Left mandible with dp4-m2	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4084	Edentulous left mandible with incisor	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4085	Right edentulous mandible and a m1 or m2 stick on the mandible	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4086	Left mandible with m1-m2 and a m3 stick on the mandible	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4087	Right mandible with dp4-m2 and incisor	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4088	Left mandible with m1-m3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4089	Left mandible with m1-m3	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4090	Right mandible with m1-m3 and incisor	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4091	Left mandible with dp4-m1 and incisor	Territorio de Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4092	Right mandible with dp4-m2 and incisor	Territorio de Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4093	Left mandible with m1-m3	Territorio de Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4094	Right mandible with dp4-m2 and incisor	Territorio de Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4145 (syntype *Sciamys tenuissimus*)	Right maxillary fragment with DP4	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4146 (syntype *Sciamys tenuissimus*)	Left mandibular fragment with dp4 and right mandibular fragment with m2	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4265 (holotype *Stichomys diminutus*)	Right dp4-m1	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4266	Fragmento mandibular derecho con dp4-m1	Monte Observación, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A10093	Fragmento mandibular derecho con dp4-m2	Yacimiento Dipilus 1897-98, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 12683	Right mandible with dp4-m2; right maxilla with DP4-M2	Santa Cruz Province?	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-PV SC2158	Right mandible with dp4 and incisor	Portezuelo Sumich Norte, SCP	Pinturas Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-PV SC2589	Right dp4-m2	Toldos Sur, SCP	Pinturas Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-PV SC2590	Right maxillary with DP4-M1	Toldos Sur, SCP	Pinturas Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-PV SC4045	Right mandible with m1-m3	Gobernador Gregores, SCP	Pinturas Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-PV SC4091	Left mandible with dp4-m1	Lago Cardiel, SCP	Pinturas Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-1	Left mandible with dp4-m3 and	Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm?, late

	incisor		early Miocene?
MLP 15-188 (syntype of *Acaremys minutissimus*)	Left mandible with dp4-m3	CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-188a	Right mandible with dp4-m2 and incisor	CSCr	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-398	Left mandible with dp4-m2	CSCr	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 15-408	Left mandible with m1-m3	CSCr	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MLP 91-IX-1-95	Left dp4	Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén Province	Collon Curá Fm, middle Miocene
MLP 91-IX-1-199b	Right m3	Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén Province	Collon Curá Fm, middle Miocene
MLP 91-IX-1-201a	Right dp4	Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén Province	Collon Curá Fm, middle Miocene
MLP 91-IX-1-201b	Right m1-m2	Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén Province	Collon Curá Fm, middle Miocene
MLP 91-IX-1-201c	Left M1 or M2	Cañadón del Tordillo, Neuquén Province	Collon Curá Fm, middle Miocene
MLP 91-IX-2-168	Left dp4	Estancia Collon Curá, Neuquén Province	Collon Curá Fm, middle Miocene
MPM-PV 15098	Left mandible fragment with dp4 and incisor	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15099	Left mandible with m1-m2 and incisor	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15100	Right mandible with dp4(broken)-m2	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15101	Right mandible with dp4-m2	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 15102	Left mandible with m1	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17426	Right mandible with dp4-m1	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17427	Right mandible with dp4-m2 and incisor	Estancia Cordón Alto, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17438	Left mandible with dp4-m2	Estancia El Tordillo, CSCr, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17429	Left mandible with dp4-m2	Rincón del Buque 2, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MPM-PV 17441	Left dp4	Rincón del Buque 2, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
YPM-PU 15178	Partially preserved skull with right DP4-M2 and left DP4-M1	10 miles South of the Coy Inlet, SCP	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
Acarechimys cf. *A. minutissimus*			
UATF-V-000960	Right mandibular fragment with dp4-m1	Quebrada Honda, Bolivia	Unnammed fm, middle Miocene
Acarechimys sp.			
MACN-A 1895	Left mandible with m1	Santa Cruz Province?	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4062	Left mandible with dp4-m3	Monte Observación, Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene
MACN-A 4067	Left mandible with dp4-m3	Monte Observación, Santa Cruz	Santa Cruz Fm, late early Miocene

Supplementary appendix 2. List of characters used in the phylogenetic analysis: an expanded version of the data matrix used by Arnal and Vucetich (2015). New characters are at the end of the list (168–186) and those from Verzi *et al*. (2016) are indicated as such; characters marked with an asterisk are modified with respect to the original version. The following characters are treated as ordered: 3, 14, 15, 22, 31, 38, 39, 44, 52, 54, 55, 59, 61, 67, 69, 75, 80, 83, 84, 99, 103, 104, 107, 109, 113, 118, 119, 128, 148, 161, and 164.

(1) P3/DP3: present (0), absent (1).

(2) Cingula: present (0), absent (1).

(3) Hypsodonty: brachydont (0), mesodont (1), protohypsodont (2), euhypsodont (3).

(4) Roots number on upper molars: three (0), four (1).

(5) Tooth row: straight (0), convex (1).

(6) Tooth rows: parallel (0), anteriorly slightly convergent (1), anteriorly very convergent (2), anteriorly slightly divergent (3).

(7) Crest thickness in occlusal view: slenderer than flexi/ids (0), equal or broader than flexi/ids (1).

(8) Deciduous premolars (Marivaux *et al*., 2004): normal replacement (0), retention (1).

(9) Terraced occlusal surface: present (0), absent (1).

(10) Cusp differentiation: yes, labial cusps of upper molars and lingual cusps of lower molars wider than their associated crests (0), no, cusps indistinct, entirely submerged in their associated crests (1).

(11) Enamel on upper molars: complete and uniformly distributed (0), complete and not uniformly distributed (1), interrupted on the labial side (2), interrupted on the posterior wall of the posterior lobe (3).

(12) Mesolophule on DP4: present (0), absent (1).

(13) Metaloph on DP4: present and joined lingually to the anterior arm of the hypocone (0), present and joined lingually to the posteroloph (1), indistinct, probably fused to the posteroloph (2), connected to the metaconule (3).

(14) Anterior arm of the metacone on DP4 (Antoine *et al*., 2012): absent (0), weakly pronounced (1), high (2).

(15) Mesostyle on DP4 (Antoine *et al*., 2012): indistinct or absent (0), moderate (1), strong (2).

(16) Hypocone on DP4: small (0), moderate (as large as the protocone) (1).

(17) Size of P4 respect M1: P4 >or = M1 (0), P4 < M1 (1).

(18) Crown outline of P4: transverse (0), oval (1), heart shape (2), quadrangular (3), reversed heart shape (4), subtriangular (5).

(19) Anterocingulum on P4: small, short (0), long (1).

(20) Anterocingulum on P4 (Antoine *et al*., 2012): low (0), high (anteroloph) (1).

(21) Anterocingulum (or anteroloph) – paracone connection (Antoine *et al*., 2012): absent (0), present (via a parastyle or not) (1).

(22) Mesolophule on P4 (Antoine *et al*., 2012): absent (0), short (1), reaches the buccal side (2).

(23) Metaloph on P4: present (0), absent (1).

(24) Metaloph on P4: connected to the metaconule (0), connected to the anterior arm of the hypocone (1), connected to the posteroloph (2).

(25) Metacone on P4: small (0), strong (1).

(26) Hypocone on P4: absent (0), present (1).

(27) Hypocone on P4: labial to protocone (0), lingually aligned to protocone (1).

(28) Anterior arm of the hypocone on P4 (Antoine *et al.*, 2012): absent (0), present (1).

(29) Posteroloph – metacone connection on P4 (Antoine *et al.*, 2012): absent (0), present (1).

(30) Hypoflexus on P4: absent (0), present (1).

(31) Hypoflexus on P4: as a superficial lingual groove (0), as a moderately deep lingual groove separating protocone and hypocone, less penetrating than in molars (1), very deep, as in molars (2).

(32) Endoloph on P4: absent (0), present (1).

(33) Figure eight dental pattern in upper molars: absent (0), present (1).

(34) Crest obliquity on M1-M3: transversal to the anteroposterior axis of the teeth (0), anterolabially-posterolingually oblique (1). All crests should be oblique to consider character state 1.

(35) Anteroloph on M1-M3: moderately high (0), high (1).

(36) Anteroloph on M1-M3: short, not reaching the paracone (0), reaches the paracone (1), long, reaches the labial border of the crown but not connected to the paracone (2).

(37) Paracone on M1-M3: larger than metacone (0), equal to metacone (1).

(38) Posterior arm of the paracone (Antoine *et al.*, 2012): absent (0), weakly pronounced (1), strong and high (2).

(39) Paracone – metacone position on M2 (Antoine *et al.*, 2012): mesiodistally opposed (0), metacone slightly lingual (1); metacone strongly lingual (2).

(40) Anterolingual angle of the tooth on M1-M3: rounded or forming an obtuse angle (0), forming a right angle (1).

(41) Mesolophule on M1-M3: present (0), absent (1).

(42) Direction of the mesolophule: straight (transverse) (0), slightly oblique (distobuccally oriented) (1).

(43) Metaloph on M1-M3: lingually joined to the anterior arm of the hypocone (0), lingually joined to the posteroloph (1), indistinct, probably fused to the posteroloph (2), lingually joined to the mesolophule (3).

(44) Anterior arm of the metacone: absent (0), weakly pronounced (1), high (2).

(45) Hypocone on M1: labial to protocone (0), lingually aligned to protocone (1).

(46) Hypocone on M2: labial to protocone (0), lingually aligned to protocone (1).

(47) Posteroloph – metacone connection (Antoine *et al.*, 2012): absent (0), present (1).

(48) Mure in juveniles/sub-adults: absent (0), present (1).

(49) Mure connection (Antoine *et al.*, 2012): on the protoloph (central to the tooth) (0), on the protoloph more lingually (1).

(50) Metacone size on M3 (Antoine *et al.*, 2012): distinct cusp (as large as the paracone) (0), reduced but distinct (1), crestiform (2).

(51) Hypocone position in relation to the protocone on M3: more labial (0), strongly more labial (1), at the same level (2).

(52) Hypoflexus orientation on M1-M3: anteriorly oblique (0), slightly anteriorly oblique or transverse to the anteroposterior axis of the tooth (1), posteriorly oblique (2).

(53) Mesoflexus groove respect metaflexus groove in M1-M2: mesoflexus groove deeper than metaflexus groove (0), mesoflexus groove equal than metaflexus groove (1).

(54) Size of M1 / M2: M1 < M2 (0), M1 = M2 (1), M1 > M2 (2).

(55) Size of M3 / M2 (Antoine *et al*., 2012): M3 < M2 (0), M3 = M2 (1), M3 > M2 (2).

(56) M1 length / width proportions: length = width (0), length < width (1), length > width (2).

(57) M2 length / width proportions: length = width (0), length < width (1), length > width (2).

(58) Upper incisors: laterally compressed (0), laterally no compressed (1).

Laterally compressed when anteroposterior diameter / transverse diameter ≥ 1.5.

(59) Posterior arm of the metaconid (metastylar fold) on dp4 (Marivaux *et al*., 2004): absent (0), weak and low (1), well-developed and high (2).

(60) Anteroconid on dp4 (Marivaux *et al*., 2004): present (0), absent (1).

(61) Metaconid position respect protoconid on dp4: anterior (0), aligned (1), posterior (2).

(62) Metalophulid I on dp4: present (0), absent (1).

(63) Metalophulid II on dp4: present (0), absent (1).

(64) Metalophulid II on dp4: conspicuous (0), reduced (1).

(65) Mesolophid on dp4: present (0), absent (1).

(66) Mesolophid on dp4: conspicuous (0), reduced (1).

(67) Ectolophid on dp4: absent (0), mesially interrupted (unconnected to the protoconid) (1), complete (connected to the protoconid) (2).

(68) Metaconid position respect protoconid on p4: anterior (0), aligned (1).

(69) Posterior arm of the metaconid (metastylar fold) on p4: absent (0), weak and low (1), well-developed, high, and long (2).

(70) Flexid on anterior aspect of metalophulid I on p4 (Vucetich and Kramarz, 2003): present (0), absent (1).

(71) Metalophulid II on p4: absent (0), present (1).

(72) Mesolophid on p4: absent (0), present (1).

(73) Mesolophid on p4 (Antoine *et al*., 2012): short (0), long, reaches the lingual side (1).

(74) Hypolophid on p4 (Marivaux *et al*., 2004): absent (0), present (1).

(75) Anterior arm of the hypoconid on p4 (Antoine *et al*., 2012): absent (0), thin (1), strong (2).

(76) Hypoconulid on p4 (Antoine *et al*., 2012): minute to absent (0), moderate (1).

(77) Posterolophid – entoconid connection (Antoine *et al*., 2012): absent (0), present (1).

(78) Talonid on p4: sub-equal (0), wider than the trigonid (1).

(79) Size of p4 / m1: p4 > or = m1 (0), p4 < m1 (1).

(80) Proportion of p4: length clearly > width (0), length > width (1), length > or = width (2).

(81) Enamel on lower molars: complete and uniformly distributed (0), complete and not uniformly distributed (1), interrupted on the anterior face and anterior face of hypoflexid (2).

(82) Eight occlusal pattern on upper molars: absent (0), present (1).

(83) Anterofossettid and metafossettid on lower molariforms: persistent (0), ephemeral (1), absent (2). Fossetids are considered ephemeral when they are lost in juvenile/sub-adult specimens.

(84) Metaconid position respect protoconid on m1-m3: anterior (0), aligned (1), posterior (2).

(85) Metalophulid II on m1-m2: present (0), absent (1).

(86) Metalophulid II on m1-m2: complete (0), reduced (1).

(87) Metalophulid II connection: mesiobuccally to the metaconid (0), distolingually to the metaconid, on the posterior arm of the metaconid (1), distolingually to the metaconid, on the mesostylid (2), do not contact neither (3).

(88) Metalophular spur : absent (0), short (1).

(89) Entoconid position respect hypoconid on m1-m3: aligned (0), anterior (1).

(90) Posterolophid on m1-m2: short (0), long (1).

(91) Posterolophid – entoconid connection (Antoine *et al*., 2012): absent (0), present (1).

(92) Crest obliquity on m1-m3: transversal to the anteroposterior axis of the teeth (0), anterolabially-posterolingually oblique (1). All crests should be oblique to consider character state 1.

(93) Anterior arm of the hypoconid: absent in unworn or little worn teeth (0), present in all stages (1).

(94) Mesiodistal pinch of the hypoconid (Antoine *et al*., 2012): absent (0), present (1).

(95) Hypoconulid on m1-m3: recognizable (0), indistinct (1).

(96) Spur of the posterior margin of metalophulid I on m1-m2: present (0), absent (1).

(97) Accessory cusp posterior to metalophulid I on m1-m2: present (0), absent (1).

(98) Posterior arm of metaconid on m1-m2: present (0), absent (1).

(99) Hypoflexid orientation on m1-m3: posteriorly oblique, or opposed to the metaflexid or hypolophid (0), transverse or opposed to the hypolophid or mesoflexid (1) anteriorly oblique or opposed to the anteroflexid (2).

(100) Size of m3 / m2 (Marivaux *et al*., 2004): m3 = m2 (0), m3 < m2 (1).

(101) Lower incisors: laterally compressed (0), laterally no compressed (1).

Laterally compressed when anteroposterior diameter is at least 1.5 the width.

(102) Anterior face of lower incisors: curve (0), forming a right lingual border and a curved labial one (1), plane (2).

(103) Lower incisors: long, passing beneath m3 (0), the base reaching m3 (1), short, the base does not reaches m3 (2).

(104) Lower incisors enamel microstructure: multiserial HSB with acute IPM (0), multiserial HSB with transitional IPM (1), multiserial HSB with rectangular IPM (2).

(105) Diastema length: shorter than the p4(dp4)-m1 distance (0), equal or larger than the p4(dp4)-m1 distance (1).

(106) Mental foramen: present (0), absent (1).

(107) Development of the mental foramen: small (0), conspicuous (1), large (2).

(108) Orientation of the mental foramen: externally oriented (0), anteriorly oriented (1), dorso-anteriorly oriented (2).

(109) Position of the mental foramen: anterior to the lowest part of the diastema (0), at the lowest part of the diastema (1), beneath p4/dp4 (2).

(110) Position of the anterior border of notch for the masseter muscle pars infraorbitalis (nmmpio): beneath m1 (0), anterior to m1 (1).

(111) Position of the nmmpio respect mandible high: above the mid high (0), at the middle of the mandible high (1).

(112) Origin of the masseteric crest: includes the notch for the masseter muscle pars infraorbitalis (0), does not include the notch for the masseter muscle pars infraorbitalis (1).

(113) Depth of the anterior portion of the masseteric fossa: shallow or flat (0), moderately deep (1), deep (2).

(114) Anterior margin of the coronoid process: convex (0), straight (1), concave (2).

(115) Mandibular notch: conspicuous (0), poorly developed or absent (1).

(116) High of the coronoid process respect the mandibular condyle: same high (0), ventral to the condyle (1).

(117) High of the mandibular condyle: higher than the occlusal surface (0), as the occlusal surface (1).

(118) Posterior border of the mandibular symphysis: anterior to the premolars (0), at the level of the premolars (1), posterior to the premolars (2). It is measure with the tooth row horizontal to the floor.

(119) Posterior extension of the premaxillaries related to nasals: shorter (0), equal (1), longer (2).

(120) Frontal extension between nasals and premaxillaries: absent (0), present (1).

(121) Nasals shape: parallel lateral margins (0), lateral margins wider anteriorly (1).

(122) Incisor included into the rostral masseteric fossa: no (0), yes (1).

(123) Incisor foramina: length (0), short (1). They are considered long when its length is equal or larger than the half of the length of the diastema.

(124) Incisor foramina shape: laterally narrow (0), anteriorly narrow (1), posteriorly narrow (2), both extremes acute (3). They are considered narrow when they are equally wide along the length of the foramina.

(125) Premaxillary-maxillay suture: at the posterior border of the incisor foramina (0), at the middle length of the incisor foramina (1); posterior to the incisor foramina (2).

(126) Diastemal ridges: absent (0), present (1).

(127) Diastemal ridges: poorly developed (0), conspicuous (1).

(128) Frontals: wider anteriorly than posteriorly (0), straight lateral margins (1), narrower anteriorly than posteriorly (2); concave lateral margins (3).

(129) Post-orbital process: absent (0), present (1).

(130) Post-orbital process: small (0), conspicuous (1).

(131) Conformation of the post-orbital process: build only by the frontal (0), build by the frontal and parietal (1).

(132) Post-orbital constriction: absent (0), present (1).

(133) Post-orbital constriction: small (0), conspicuous (1).

(134) Position of the zygomatic dorsal root (ZDR): anterior to M1 (0), at the level of M1 or M1-M2 (1).

(135) Exposition of the lacrimal onto the vertical or ZDR: little exposed (0), conspicuous (1), no exposed (2).

(136) Ventral root of the zygomatic arch: similar anteroposterior and dorsoventral diameters (0), anteroposterior diameter twice dorsoventral or more (1).

(137) ZVR respect the palatal level: at the same level (0), ZVR dorsal (1).

(138) ZDR respect ZVR: aligned (0), posterior (1).

(139) Groove for the infraorbitalis nerve within the infraorbital foramen: absent (0), present (1).

(140) Groove for the passage of the infraorbitalis nerve within the infraorbital foramen: present with a small lateral rim (0), present with a large lateral rim (1).

(141) Masseteric tuberosity (for the insertion of the masseteric superficial muscle): poorly developed (0), well developed (1).

(142) Paraorbital process: present (0), absent (1).

(143) Paraorbital process: build by the jugal and squamosal (0), build by the squamosal (1), build by the jugal (2).

(144) Jugal fossa: present (0), absent (1).

(145) Depth of the jugal fossa: superficial (0), deep (1).

(146) High of the jugal fossa: low (0), high (1).

(147) Length of the jugal fossa: antero posteriorly short (0), antero posteriorly long (1). It is considered long when its length is equal or longer than the length of the horizontal ramus of the zygoma.

(148) Etmoidal foramen: at the level of M3 (0), at the level of M2-M3 (1), at the level of the M2-M1 (2); at the level of the M2 (3).

(149) Sphenopalatine foramen: anterior to the M1 (0), at the level of M1 (1), posterior to M1 (2), groove located at the DP4-M1 level (3), groove located at the M1-M2 level (4).

(150) Posterior palatine foramina: between palatines and Mx at the M1 (0), into the Mx at the level of the premolar (1), into the Mx at the level of M1.

(151) Posterior palatine foramina: small (0), conspicuous (1).

(152) Posterior nares: at the level of M3 (0), at the level of M2 (1).

(153) Spheno-palatine vacuities: absent (0), present (1).

(154) Spheno-palatine vacuities: small (0), conspicuous (1).

(155) Buccinator and masticatory foramina: separated (0), fused (1).

(156) Oval foramen: bounded by the aliesfenoid (0), boumded posteriorly by the tympanic bulla (1).

(157) Ventral extension of the lateral process of the supraoccipital: exceeds the dorsal border of the bulla (0), extends until the dorsal border of the bulla (1); do not reach the dorsal border of the bulla (2).

(158) Parietals on the skull roof: reach or are close to the occiput (0), retracted and not near the occiput (1).

(159) Dorsal extension of the mastoid exposure: do not exceeds the dorsal border of the bulla (0), exceeds the dorsal border of the bulla (1), mastoid exposed on the skull roof (2).

(160) Mastoid exposure on the occiput: absent (0), present (1).

(161) Shape of the mastoid exposure: concave (0), plane (1), convex (2).

(162) Dorsal exposition of the petrosal: absent (0), present (1).

(163) Epitympanic sinus: small (0), conspicuous (1).

(164) Hypotimpanic recess: small (0), inflated (1), hypertrophied (2).

(165) Tympanic fenestra below MAE: absent (0), present (1).

(166) Tympanic fenestra below MAE: small (0), conspicuous (1).

(167) Paraoccipital process: ventrally oriented with its tip separated from the bulla and well developed (0), ventrally oriented, with its tip fused to the bulla (1), short, laterally oriented and completely fused to the bulla (2), short, ventrally oriented and completely fused to the bulla (3).

(168) Premaxillary septum separating incisive foramina (Verzi *et al*., 2016): with posterior ends of premaxillae joined medially, forming a pointed or rounded projection which may join an anterior apophysis of the maxilla (0), with posterior ends of premaxillae divergent, each one forming a small lateral apophysis (1).

(169) Lacrimal foramen (Verzi *et al*., 2016): opens into the orbital portion of the lacrimal (0); opens into the maxilla (1).

(170) Portion of maxilla surrounding foramen into nasolacrimal canal (Verzi *et al*., 2016)*: with a suture posterior to the foramen (0); continuous around the foramen (1); no portion of the mx surrounding the lacrimal foramen (2)

Character stated 2 was included in order to scored *Dasyprocta azarae*.

(171) Foramen into nasolacrimal canal (Verzi *et al*., 2016): opens into maxilla only (0); surrounded posteriorly by lacrimal (1).

(172) Relationship between zygoma and orbital region (Verzi *et al*., 2016): dorsal margin of the zygoma concave, not restricting orbital region (0), dorsal margin of the zygoma very slightly concave or straight, restricting orbital region (1).

We do not clearly understand the last part of each character state (not restricting orbital region/ restricting orbital region) since we interpreted that a concave dorsal margin of the zygoma should restrict, or delimit (if this is the sense), the orbital region. Nevertheless, we described this character as was done in Verzi *et al*. (2016) but scored them taking into account if the zygoma is concave or very slightly concave.

(173) Contact among maxilla, lateral palatine plate and alisphenoid in basitemporal region (Verzi *et al*., 2016): located posterior to the M3 alveolus (0); lateral to the M3 alveolus (1).

(174) Pterigoid fossa in ventral view (between alisphenoid bridge and anterior margin of lateral palatine plate) (Verzi *et al*., 2016)*: subcircular, with anteroposterior and transverse diameters subequal (0), suboval, with anteroposterior diameter greater than transverse one (1), suboval, with labiolingual diameter greater than anteroposterior one (2).

Character stated 2 was included in order to scored *Myocastor coypus*.

(175) Lateral margin of pterygoid fossa (Verzi *et al*., 2016): oriented posterodorsally and not forming a flange extending posteriorly (0); forming a flange level with the medial margin and extending posteriorly toward the bulla (1).

(176) Ventral margin of posterior process of squamosal (Verzi *et al*., 2016): not laterally deflected (0); laterally deflected, thus forming a shelf (1).

(177) Posterior process of squamosal (Verzi *et al*., 2016): straight and deep at its origin, with its posterior portion wide (0); lower (dorso-ventrally narrow) at its

origin and with posterior portion narrow due to development of the epitympanic recess (petrosal bulla) (1).

(178) Lateral process of supraoccipital (Verzi *et al*., 2016)*: short, located dorsal to mastoid process (0); long, ventrally extended overlapping the mastoid process or below the level of the latter (1); reaches the middle dorso-ventral length of the mastoid exposure (2).

Character stated 2 was included in order to modified some scores of Verzi *et al*., 2016.

(179) Orientation of distal portion of paroccipital process (Verzi *et al*., 2016)*: on a plane parallel or subparallel to occipital plane (0); rotated so that its external margin becomes posterolateral or posterior (1); rotated so that its external margin becomes anterolateral (2).

Character stated 2 was included in order to score *Proechimys poliopus*.

(180) Lateral crest (Verzi *et al*., 2016)*: descending toward masseteric notch following same direction as the anterior margin of coronoid apophysis, or nearly so (0); with trajectory uncoupled from that of the anterior margin of the coronoid apophysis, more ventral along the mandibular body, forming a markedly descending curve that rises at its anterior extreme, which corresponds to the anterior end of the notch (1); more ventral along the mandibular body (2).

Original character 19 of Verzi *et al*. (2016), which includes features of the lateral crest and the nmmpio, was decoupled in two characters (here characters 181 and 182).

(181) Mandibular notch for tendon of medial masseter muscle: subhorizontal (0); horizontal (1).

(182) Anterior margin of base of coronoid apophysis: close to the alveolar edge of molars (0); more lateral and ventral with respect to alveolar edge of molars, even extending anteriorly as a more or less marked rim distinct from the lateral crest (1).

(183) Lingual extreme of the protocone area (or posterior outgrowth of the protocone) in M1-2 of non-senile adults: oriented posteriorly (0); oriented more lingually (1).

(184) Anteroloph on DP4: with no inflection on anterior or anterolingual surface (0); with weak inflection on anterior or anterolingual surface, from which point the orientation of this loph changes slightly to become more anterolabial (1).

(185) Mesoflexus (or meso- + metaflexus) of M1-2: with bottom (lingual extreme) and labial extreme approximately equal in depth (0); markedly deeper at lingual extreme (1).

(186) Metalophulid II of m1-2: originating from the protoconid area (0); originating from the metalophulid I (1); originating from the anterior part of the ectolophid (2).

Supplementary appendix 3. Character taxon matrix used for the phylogenetic analysis. The letters represent polymorphic scorings (*i.e.*, A = states 0 and 1; B = states 1 and 2; C = states 1 and 3; D = 0 and 2; E = 1 and 3).

	10	20	30	40	50	60	70
Bugtimys zafarullahi	000???00?0	0031111200	110010--10	-100111200	0030001100	1001122?20	1100002120
Metaphiomys schaubi	000???0100	000101????	??????????	??00121100	00111?0101	10-0100?11	01001-2???
Phiomys andrewsi	100???0000	0?????1100	0001110101	0000001110	00111?010?	?000?11?01	1100002101
Garridomys curunuquem	11200?1011	2?????0011	1002111111	2000111000	1-101110--	2001011???	???????121
Eoviscaccia boliviana	?120??1011	2?????0011	1???111111	2100111000	1-101?10-?	0101011???	?????????1
Eoviscaccia frassinettii	?120??1011	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????????1
Dasyprocta azarae	1120031011	00122?0311	120B111111	2000111200	00C2111112	011102212?	?000002??1
Cephalomys arcidens	112???101?	?????0511	00??10--10	-?00121000	1-001?1102	?101?20???	???????101
Eosteiromys homogenidens	1110000010	0?????0311	?001010111	2000100010	0010001111	00000001?0	20000A2111
Steiromys detentus	1110000010	0010?10311	0001111111	2000110010	0010001111	00000001?1	10000021?1
Sallamys? minutus	?1????0010	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	???????120
Paulacoutomys paulista	?11???0011	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	???????100
Migraveramus beatus	?11???0011	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	???????001
Llitun notuca	?11???0011	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	???????120
Leucokephalos zeffiae	?11???0011	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	???????100
Changquin woodi	?12???0?11	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Dudumus ruigomezi	1110??0100	002001----	----------	--001000A0	0A20A11111	1000D11?00	2001002---
Prospaniomys priscus	1110000110	010001----	----------	--00101010	1-00001110	10A0000100	10A1002---
Protacaremys? adilos	?1????0???	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Protacaremys prior	1110110110	010001----	----------	--01111010	1-00111111	1001021?01	1000002---
Acarechimys minutus	1100000110	010D01----	----------	--00111010	1-00111111	1000011?21	100A0A2---
Acarechimys leucotheae	?10???0100	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	?001001---
Acarechimys minutissimus	11000?0100	010001????	??????????	??00111000	1-0011111-	-00?-11?01	10AA00B---
Acarechimys constans	1100000110	010001????	??????????	??00101000	1-0011111-	-000-11?21	100A002---
Acarechimys gracilis	?10???0110	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	????????01	1000012---
Platypittamys brachyodon	1100000000	0?????1201	001-00-010	-000100010	1-00001111	00000010??	???????001
Galilelomys baios	?1????0000	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	???????100
Galileomys antelucanus	1110??0000	0?????1401	00A1010111	1010110010	1-00111111	000?000???	???????100
Acaremys murinus	1110000010	00200114A1	00A1111111	1010111010	1-00111111	0000011001	?01-002100

Caviocricetus lucasi	1100??0100	002001----	----------	--00001010	0120111111	10000D2?01	A100012---
Plesiacarechimys koenigswaldi	11100?0110	002001----	----------	--00100010	0110101111	0000011?01	10000A2---
Stichomys regularis	1110011111	010001----	----------	--0110-001	1-00111112	010A0DD101	10001-2---
Xylechimys obliquus	?11???1?11	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Spaniomys riparius	1110001111	010001----	----------	--0012-00A	1-00100102	1100000101	00001-2---
Sallamys pascuali	?11???0010	0????1101	00A2010?10	-100101010	0AE00?1102	0000011??0	2100001100
Adelphomys candidus	1110011111	010001----	----------	-?0112-001	1-00001102	1100022?01	20??1-2---
Ethelomys loomisi	?11???0?11	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Deseadomys arambourgi	?11???0011	0????110?	001-110011	0?0010-000	1-00011112	1000002???	??????000
Draconomys verai	?100??0011	0?????????	??????????	??00121000	0011001112	100?111???	??????101
Eosallamys simpsoni	?10???00?0	0????1101	000?110?10	-100121010	01E00011A2	0000011???	?00000????
Eospina woodi	?10???0000	0????1111	000?10-??0	-100101000	1-00000112	000?0???00	1100001110
Eosachacui lavocati	?10???00?0	0????1111	1???100111	1000101000	1-00000102	200?011?01	10??002100
Eodelphomys almeidacomposi	?1????1?11	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Cachiyacuy contamanensis	010???00?0	0012210110	0202111100	-100101000	00E0A?A101	1000111?01	200000110?
Canaanimys maquiensis	?10???0??0	0?????????	??????????	??00101100	00320?A100	0000011?2?	????002???
Eumysops laeviplicatus	1120011111	001001----	----------	--0012-000	0AB0101112	200A0111?1	?0001-2---
Myocastor coipus	1120021111	010001----	----------	--0112-000	1-00001102	20001021?1	?000002---
Echimys chrysurus	1111111111	010001----	----------	--0012-000	1-0010A0-2	0100022001	0000??0---
Proechimys poliopus	1120001111	010?01----	----------	--0011-000	1-0?AA1102	00010000?1	?0001-2---
Kannabateomys amblyox	1111011111	010001----	----------	--0112-000	1-00100102	0111011101	00001-2---
Neophanomys biplicatus	?12???1111	??????----	----------	--????????	??????????	?????????1	10001-2---
Chasicomys octodontiforme	1120??1111	0????1----	----------	--1011-0?0	???00??10?	100???????	???????---
Chasichimys bonaerense	?12???1111	??????----	----------	--1???-???	??????????	??????????	?0????2---
Pithanotomys columnaris	113-02?111	0?????----	----------	--101?-??0	???11?10?	01010221??	?0????2---
Plataeomys brevis	113-02?111	0?????----	----------	--101?-??0	???11?10?	01010221??	?0????2---
Ctenomys australis	113-01?111	0?????----	----------	--0?1?-?20	???11?1??	--?20201??	?0????2---
Octomys mimax	113-00?111	0?????----	----------	--101?-?00	???11?10?	11010220??	?0????2---
Octodontomys gliroides	113-03?111	0?????----	----------	--101?-?20	???11?1??	01010220??	?0????2---
Abrocoma cinerea	113-011?11	1?????????	??????????	??101?-?1?	----10-10-	0200211??	??????????

	80	90	100	110	120	130	140
Bugtimys zafarullahi	1110211111	0000001110	0011011010	?0???02?10	?0????????	??????????	??????????
Metaphiomys schaubi	??????????	?000001110	0011011000	10?2001?10	001???????	??????????	?????0????
Phiomys andrewsi	10-0211111	0000013110	0011011100	0000?01?11	001???????	??????????	??????????
Garridomys curunuquem	0A01000100	1011011011	000?111001	100??02011	000????2??	??????????	?????01?0-
Eoviscaccia boliviana	?????0?100	202????011	10011???1?	?2???0??1?	??????????	??????????	??????????
Eoviscaccia frasinettii	?????0?110	102??????1	1?001???0?	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Dasyprocta azarae	1111101001	000100A001	10111A?000	1000100201	0000010201	011320-111	111010110-
Cephalomys arcidens	10-1001100	?11100?001	1011111110	1000?0??11	100???????	??????????	?????0??0-
Eosteiromys homogenidens	0111201101	0001001001	101111100?	10?0?0??10	001????11?	10??110011	1100?0010-
Steiromys detentus	0111201101	0001001001	1011111000	1200001110	001????210	0003110010	1101?0110-
Sallamys? minutus	10-10011??	0?????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Paulacoutomys paulista	10-1201101	0001001011	00111??000	?????0??01	?0????????	??????????	??????????
Migraveramus beatus	10-1200111	0001003011	001110000?	100?10211?	?00???????	??????????	??????????
Llitun notuca	1101201111	0001001001	001110000?	100?102111	?0????????	??????????	??????????
Leucokephalos zeffiae	10-1200111	0101003011	00111??001	110?102111	?00????1??	??????????	??????????
Changquin woodi	??????????	0001001001	001111100?	??0??????1	?01???????	??????????	??????????
Dudumus ruigomezi	----------	000A000010	0011111101	1102?00011	101????2??	??????????	?????00?0-
Prospaniomys priscus	----------	0001001000	0A11111011	110?000011	A011000110	000110-110	011010000-
Protacaremys? adilos	??????????	0001000001	101111110?	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Protacaremys prior	----------	0001001001	0010111001	01020A0?11	100????1??	???11?????	?????00?0-
Acarechimys minutus	----------	0001013011	00111A0001	01021A0021	10B????22?	?00?11130-	-0-0?00?10
Acarechimys leucotheae	----------	0001013011	0011110101	??0??1---1	102???????	??????????	??????????
Acarechimys minutissimus	----------	000AA13011	A01111A101	0?0211---1	102????2??	????11????	?????00?10
Acarechimys constans	----------	00010A3011	00111AA101	110?11---0	101????2??	????11????	?????00?10
Acarechimys gracilis	----------	0001A13011	00111A0001	110??A0010	?01????2??	??????????	??????????
Platypittamys brachyodon	10-0?01011	000A001010	00111A1A01	0102?0??01	00????0?00	0??????20-	-0-??0????
Galilelomys baios	?????01111	0101000000	0011????0?	010?101111	?02???????	??????????	??????????
Galileomys antelucanus	10-0?01111	01010A0010	001110010?	010??01011	003???????	??????????	?????0??10
Acaremys murinus	A0-0?01112	01A1000011	00111A1101	010?101011	00311??20?	1111111211	0111?01111
Caviocricetus lucasi	----------	000001-010	0010010101	010111---1	101????1??	??????????	?????00?0-
Plesiacarechimys koenigswaldi	----------	00010A1010	0011100001	0101?1---1	101???????	?0????????	????????10
Stichomys regularis	----------	0001A1-000	0111111111	0022100010	10020??100	1??11111?	01???00?0-

Xylechimys obliquus	??????????	0001014000	0111101111	?11??????0	?00???????	??????????	??????????
Spaniomys riparius	----------	000000-000	0111111111	0122100A11	1002???11A	011311111?	01?1?11110
Sallamys pascuali	10-1200101	00011--011	0011100101	1001?0??11	?0????????	??????????	??????????
Adelphomys candidus	----------	0001A1-000	0111111111	120201---0	100???01??	??????????	????????0-
Ethelomys loomisi	??????????	00011--00A	011111111?	112??01011	?01???????	??????????	??????????
Deseadomys arambourgi	10-1??1111	00010A0011	0011111101	111?101?10	10????????	??????????	??????????
Draconomys verai	10-1101111	0001003001	0011111001	10???02010	??????????	??????????	??????????
Eosallamys simpsoni	10-12001?1	0001001001	0011111001	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Eospina woodi	1???001112	0001001001	001111100?	??0??02?11	?0????????	??????????	??????????
Eosachacui lavocati	1101101111	000100E011	00111AA001	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Eodelphomys almeidacomposi	??????????	00011--000	111111111?	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Cachiyacuy contamanensis	10-1100112	0001002101	00111A0000	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Canaanimys maquiensis	??????????	0001012001	0011110001	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????
Eumysops laeviplicatus	----------	00011--011	00111??101	110211---1	001??11120	010111110-	-0-100010-
Myocastor coipus	----------	000200-001	0111111110	1022?1---0	1001010111	0111110110	011101110-
Echimys chrysurus	----------	00011--010	0110111121	11220A0011	1010010110	11?111120-	-0-001010-
Proechimys poliopus	----------	0001A13011	1011111121	110211---1	1020010200	010111120-	-0-121110-
Kannabateomys amblyox	----------	00011--011	0111111121	000201---1	1010010201	111101010-	-10001110-
Neophanomys biplicatus	----------	0111A13011	001111?101	0102?1---1	?01???????	??????????	??????????
Chasicomys octodontiforme	----------	01111--01?	00111???01	120???????	??1???????	??????????	??????????
Chasichimys bonaerense	----------	01111--011	001111?10?	120??1---1	101???????	??????????	??????????
Pithanotomys columnaris	----------	0121?--?0?	?01?????11	120?01---0	001?110?10	110110-111	010110110-
Plataeomys brevis	----------	0121?--?0?	?01?????11	120211---0	011?1??111	?10110-???	???1?0110-
Ctenomys australis	----------	002???????	??1??????1	120211---1	1100000210	110110-110	010001110-
Octomys mimax	----------	0121????0?	?01?????11	110211---1	0110110121	101101120-	-101001111
Octodontomys gliroides	----------	0122????0?	?01?????11	100211---1	0111110210	101111120-	-101011111
Abrocoma cinerea	??????????	102?1--?11	011?111120	?22211---1	1110010010	010011?310	00-110110-

	150	160	170	180	186
Bugtimys zafarullahi	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	???1?0
Metaphiomys schaubi	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	001112
Phiomys andrewsi	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0?1112

Garridomys curunuquem	1?????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	0?10?-
Eoviscaccia boliviana	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??10??
Eoviscaccia frasinettii	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??10??
Dasyprocta azarae	11-0101110	0010122110	1011110002	-000000010	011?02
Cephalomys arcidens	1?????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????
Eosteiromys homogenidens	???????02?	?1????????	??????????	??????????	0?1?02
Steiromys detentus	1??????042	11????1???	?00???????	??????????	011102
Sallamys? minutus	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????
Paulacoutomys paulista	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	0?1??0
Migraveramus beatus	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0????0
Llitun notuca	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0????0
Leucokephalos zeffiae	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	01???0
Changquin woodi	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0????2
Dudumus ruigomezi	1?????????	??????????	??????????	?????????0	0-1102
Prospaniomys priscus	0000001??0	1111??1111	21111120??	?????01202	101102
Protacaremys? adilos	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????0
Protacaremys prior	1?????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	101102
Acarechimys minutus	1000111??1	11????????	??????????	?????????2	111002
Acarechimys leucotheae	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	0????D
Acarechimys minutissimus	1?????????	1?????????	??????????	?????????2	111002
Acarechimys constans	1?????????	11????????	??????????	?????????2	011002
Acarechimys gracilis	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	0111?2
Platypittamys brachyodon	??????????	?1????????	??????????	??????????	0?1??2
Galilelomys baios	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	01???2
Galileomys antelucanus	0?????????	??????????	??????????	?????????0	011?12
Acaremys murinus	1????????1	00????????	???????0??	?????????2	1111?2
Caviocricetus lucasi	1?????????	??????????	??????????	?????????0	011102
Plesiacarechimys koenigswaldi	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0?1000
Stichomys regularis	0????????2	11????????	??????????	?????????2	011002
Xylechimys obliquus	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	01???0
Spaniomys riparius	???????1?2	11????????	??????????	?????????2	011000
Sallamys pascuali	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0?1?02
Adelphomys candidus	?????????2	11????????	??????????	??????????	01????
Ethelomys loomisi	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????-

Deseadomys arambourgi	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0?1?02
Draconomys verai	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0?1?02
Eosallamys simpsoni	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??1?02
Eospina woodi	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	0?1?02
Eosachacui lavocati	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??1?02
Eodelphomys almeidacomposi	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????
Cachiyacuy contamanensis	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??1102
Canaanimys maquiensis	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	??A?02
Eumysops laeviplicatus	0000111020	10???10110	00000-0010	000??10102	01100-
Myocastor coipus	0000100022	10111?0110	00000-0000	1102100112	001000
Echimys chrysurus	0000111211	100-?10010	0000110000	10?0?00100	01100-
Proechimys poliopus	0010111300	1110120110	0000100011	0101110120	00101-
Kannabateomys amblyox	0020111211	100-??0010	10000-100?	?0???00??0	11100-
Neophanomys biplicatus	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	11???-
Chasicomys octodontiforme	??????????	??????????	??????????	??????????	01???-
Chasichimys bonaerense	??????????	??????????	??????????	?????????2	A0???-
Pithanotomys columnaris	1?????????	?0????????	???1??????	?????????0	11-0--
Plataeomys brevis	1?????????	?1????????	??????????	?????????0	11-0--
Ctenomys australis	1020111130	1111110111	21000-2000	100??00200	11-0--
Octomys mimax	1020111231	1111?20111	21110-210?	?1?0001?02	11-0--
Octodontomys gliroides	1000111242	1111?20111	2111112100	1001000200	11-0--
Abrocoma cinerea	1010011341	0111?01101	21110-2010	1000001200	011???