

Accepted Manuscript

Modeling lineage and phenotypic diversification in the New World monkey (Platyrrhini, Primates) radiation


Leandro Aristide, Alfred L. Rosenberger, Marcelo Tejedor, S. Ivan Perez

PII: S1055-7903(13)00423-5

DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2013.11.008>

Reference: YMPEV 4757

To appear in: *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*



Please cite this article as: Aristide, L., Rosenberger, A.L., Tejedor, M., Ivan Perez, S., Modeling lineage and phenotypic diversification in the New World monkey (Platyrrhini, Primates) radiation, *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* (2013), doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ympev.2013.11.008>

This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

1 **Modeling lineage and phenotypic diversification in the New World monkey**
2 **(Platyrrhini, Primates) radiation**

3

4 **Leandro Aristide¹, Alfred L. Rosenberger², Marcelo Tejedor^{3,4} and S. Ivan Perez^{1*}**

5 ¹*División Antropología, Museo de La Plata, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, Paseo*
6 *del Bosque s/n, 1900, La Plata, Argentina. CONICET*

7 ²*Department of Anthropology and Archaeology, Brooklyn College, CUNY, 2900*
8 *Bedford Ave., Brooklyn, New York, USA*

9 ³*Centro Nacional Patagonico, Bvd. Brown 2915, Puerto Madryn, Argentina*

10

11 *Corresponding author. Address: *División Antropología, Museo de La Plata,*
12 *Universidad Nacional de La Plata, CONICET, Paseo del Bosque s/n, 1900, La Plata,*
13 *Argentina. Fax: +542214257744. E-mail address: iperez@fcnym.unlp.edu.ar ;*
14 *ivanperezmorea@gmail.com (S. Ivan Perez)*

15

16

17 Short title: Modeling platyrrhine diversification

18

19

1 ABSTRACT

2 Adaptive radiations that have taken place in the distant past can now be more
3 thoroughly studied with the availability of large molecular phylogenies and comparative
4 data drawn from extant and fossil species. Platyrrhines are a good example of a major
5 mammalian evolutionary radiation confined to a single continent, involving a relatively
6 large temporal scale and documented by a relatively small but informative fossil record.
7 Here, we present comparative evidence using data on extant and fossil species to
8 explore alternative evolutionary models in an effort to better understand the process of
9 platyrrhine lineage and phenotypic diversification. Specifically, we compare the
10 likelihood of null models of lineage and phenotypic diversification versus various
11 models of adaptive evolution. Moreover, we statistically explore the main ecological
12 dimension behind the platyrrhine diversification. Contrary to the previous proposals,
13 our study did not find evidence of a rapid lineage accumulation in the phylogenetic tree
14 of extant platyrrhine species. However, the fossil-based diversity curve seems to show a
15 slowdown in diversification rates toward present times. This also suggests an early high
16 rate of extinction among lineages within crown Platyrrhini. Finally, our analyses support
17 the hypothesis that the platyrrhine phenotypic diversification appears to be characterized
18 by an early and profound differentiation in body size related to a multidimensional
19 niche model, followed by little subsequent change (*i.e.*, stasis).

20 *Keywords:* body size; adaptive radiation; fossil record; niche-filling

21

22

23

24

25

26

1 **1. Introduction**

2 The study of lineage and phenotypic diversification in living clades with
3 relatively recent divergences has supported models of adaptive radiation (Simpson,
4 1953; Schluter, 2000) that predict selective influences arising from ecological
5 opportunity and circumstances (Gavrilets and Losos, 2009; Losos and Mahler, 2010).
6 This process frequently results in great phenotypic variation and species richness
7 relative to a short time frame of phylogenetic divergence (Schluter, 2000; Gavrilets and
8 Losos, 2009; Losos and Mahler, 2010). It is also suspected that similar processes of
9 adaptive radiation have driven the initial diversification of clades that originated in the
10 distant past, for example, at the ordinal and subordinal levels in mammalian clades
11 (Gavrilets and Losos, 2009; Losos and Mahler, 2010). In such cases, ecological
12 opportunity may decrease during the radiation as niches are filled, leading to stasis.

13 Several evolutionary radiations have been carefully studied with recently
14 developed mathematical models applied to molecular phylogenies and comparative data
15 from extant species (Nee, 2006; Gavrilets and Losos, 2009; Losos and Mahler, 2010).
16 However, it is becoming clear that our capacity to successfully model and understand
17 the diversification processes of ancient clades is limited when only neontological data
18 are considered (Quental and Marshall, 2010; Slater et al., 2012). New World monkeys
19 (Parvorder Platyrrhini), one of the three major groups of living and fossil primates, are a
20 good example of a major mammalian evolutionary radiation that occupies a large
21 temporal scale (*i.e.*, 20-40 million years ago or megannums [Ma] in Central and South
22 America), exhibits a remarkable phenotypic variation (*e.g.*, a body mass spanning two
23 orders of magnitude, from 0.1 to more than 10 kg) and presents a relatively small but
24 informative fossil record (Fleagle, 1999; Fleagle & Tejedor, 2002; Tejedor, 2008).

1 Morphological and phylogenetic studies have hypothesized that the diversification of
2 this monophyletic group was mainly linked to the action of deterministic-selective
3 factors related to ecological variables (Rosenberger, 1992; Marroig and Cheverud, 2001;
4 Rosenberger et al., 2009). However, there is no general agreement about the main
5 ecological dimension —*e.g.*, diet, locomotion or a multidimensional niche— behind the
6 platyrrhine diversification (Rosenberger, 1992; Allen and Kay, 2011; Youlatos and
7 Meldrum, 2011; Perez et al., 2011). It has also been suggested that the marked
8 phenotypic diversification of platyrrhines occurred relatively quickly during the initial
9 branching process of the main extant clades in connection with ecological niche
10 opportunity (*i.e.*, an early-burst platyrrhine radiation), followed by a slowdown in
11 evolutionary rates which resulted in the widespread retention of the formative patterns
12 that are characteristic of these lineages (*i.e.*, evolutionary stasis; Rosenberger, 1992;
13 Rosenberger et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2011).

14 Although some recent studies of evolutionary radiations have included
15 information from the fossil record along with phylogenies and comparative data of
16 extant species in a mathematical modeling framework (Slater et al., 2010, 2012; Etienne
17 et al., 2011), such approach to the study of the dynamic processes of lineage origin and
18 extinction, and phenotypic diversification, has not been applied to explore the
19 platyrrhine evolutionary radiation. Here, we present comparative evidence using data on
20 extant and fossil species to explore alternative evolutionary models in an effort to better
21 understand the process of platyrrhine lineage and phenotypic diversification.

22 Specifically, we compare the likelihood of null models of lineages and phenotypic
23 diversification versus various models of adaptive evolution. Moreover, we explore the
24 main ecological dimension behind the platyrrhine diversification. If the platyrrhine

1 diversification conforms to the adaptive radiation theory, we expect that differentiation
2 of the major extant platyrrhine lineages was concentrated relatively early in the history
3 of the clade and that phenotypic variation —measured as body size— was partitioned
4 among subclades early in their phylogenetic history as well, as a major driver or
5 consequence of ecological niche partitioning and niche-filling. As a starting point, we
6 first estimate a chronophylogenetic tree for most extant platyrrhine species using
7 molecular data and Bayesian methods (Drummond et al., 2006). Then, using this tree
8 and comparative statistical methods we explore the pattern of lineage diversification
9 through time (Nee et al., 1992; Harmon et al., 2003; Ricklefs, 2007; Stadler, 2011a),
10 investigate the pattern of body size diversification through time and the fit of a series of
11 evolutionary models (Harmon et al., 2003; Butler and King, 2004). Finally, given that
12 the inference of the tempo and mode of diversification of a clade using only extant
13 species can be biased (Quental and Marshal, 2010; Slater et al., 2012), we compare the
14 results based on extant species with the estimated body masses and number of lineages
15 inferred from the platyrrhine fossil record. Summarizing, our work contributes to the
16 discussion of platyrrhine evolution and diversification in three different ways: 1) we
17 present one of the most complete molecular phylogenies of extant platyrrhine species to
18 date, sampling published data on 108 taxa and estimating a chronophylogenetic tree for
19 78 putative “good” species; 2) we mathematically model the pattern of lineage and
20 phenotypic diversification of the platyrrhine clade; and 3) we combine data about extant
21 and fossil species in a novel way not employed before in studies of the platyrrhines to
22 better understand the process of their diversification.

23

24

1 **2. Materials and methods**

2 *2.1. Molecular divergence among species and phylogenetic inference*

3 Phylogenetic trees are used in almost every branch of evolutionary biology. In
4 particular, in comparative analyses they are needed to avoid misinterpreting historical
5 contingencies as causal relationships and to understand the patterns of diversification
6 (Nee, 2006; Losos, 2011; Yang and Rannala, 2012). In our study, the phylogenetic tree
7 itself is not of direct interest but it is a necessary first step for the following statistical
8 comparative analyses. Previous phylogenetic studies have estimated the platyrrhine
9 phylogenetic tree using ca. 50% (58 species, Chatterjee et al., 2009; or 64 species,
10 Perelman et al., 2011) or 60% (73 species, Fabre et al., 2009) of species recognized by
11 Groves (2005). However, most of the methods in comparative analyses assume that a
12 large fraction of the extant species in the clade under study are included in the dataset
13 (Pybus and Harvey, 2000; Ricklefs, 2007; Cusimano et al., 2012). On the other hand,
14 the use of many different definitions of species in primate systematics has led to a
15 fluctuating taxonomy in platyrrhines (e.g. Groves, 2004, Rylands et al., 2011) and
16 concerns on taxonomic inflation have arisen (Rosenberger, 2012). Since speciation
17 events are not instantaneous, the decision on to how finely distinguish lineages is rather
18 arbitrary (Ricklefs, 2007). For this reason, we decided to set up a reproducible criterion
19 for distinguishing species based on a minimum molecular divergence threshold. A total
20 of 108 platyrrhine species and subspecies were initially considered for analysis based on
21 the availability of DNA sequences on the Genbank database (Supplementary Table A.1).
22 Cytochrome *b* (CytB) DNA sequences were downloaded from Genbank for 90
23 specimens (based on availability) that were previously accepted as valid species or
24 subspecies in the platyrrhine literature (Groves, 2005). We estimated molecular distance

1 among the 90 specimens within each genus using Mega 5 (Tamura et al., 2011) and
2 established a likely point (3%) of minimum divergence among species (Fouquet et al.,
3 2007; Clemente-Carvalho et al., 2010). After this procedure, we excluded taxa with low
4 molecular divergence (mainly subspecies) and considered as full species those taxa
5 previously regarded as subspecies that were above the distance threshold. Specifically,
6 26 taxa were excluded from analysis based on the existence of a low molecular distance,
7 because they probably represent geographic variants of other species included in the
8 dataset (Supplementary Table A.1). The final dataset included 78 species, as 14 taxa
9 from the Perelman et al. (2011) dataset that did not have an available CytB sequence
10 were included based on the fact that they are broadly recognized as full species. Another
11 four species were excluded because their large proportion of missing data could hinder
12 the analysis. Thus, our dataset comprised a great percentage (*ca.*, 80%) of the likely
13 extant platyrrhine species.

14 To estimate the chronophylogenetic tree for the 78 platyrrhine species we
15 analyzed the dataset obtained for the platyrrhine species and three outgroups (*Macaca*
16 *mulatta*, *Pan troglodytes*, *Homo sapiens*) from GenBank (see Wildman et al., 2009, and
17 Perelman et al., 2011). The analyzed dataset is a DNA concatenated matrix for 81
18 species with a total of 25,361 bp, including 15 selected nuclear genes from Perelman et
19 al. (2011) with few missing data, and 11 non-coding sequences from Wildman et al.
20 (2009) (Supplementary Table A.2). The dataset also includes IRBP and ξ -globin genes
21 and four mitochondrial sequences (CytB, 16s, 12s and COxII). Several available gene
22 sequences (*e.g.* from Perelman et al., 2011) were not included in our phylogenetic
23 estimation because a great number of species lacked data for those genes. The
24 sequences of each gene were aligned using ClustalW and manually corrected with

1 BioEdit 7.0.0 software (Hall, 2004). Accession numbers for the mitochondrial, IRBP
2 and ξ -globin sequences are shown in Supplementary Table A.1.

3 We performed a concatenated Bayesian analysis based on the molecular dataset
4 to estimate chronophylogenetic relationships among the 81 primate species. jModelTest
5 0.1 (Posada, 2008) was employed to determine the most appropriate model of sequence
6 evolution for each analyzed gene sequences estimated under the Akaike Information
7 Criterion with correction for sample size (AICc). The best fit models for studied genes
8 are shown in the Supplementary Table A.2. The Bayesian chronophylogenetic analysis
9 was performed using BEAST v1.6.1 (Drummond and Rambaut, 2007). The analysis was
10 carried out using Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) simulations for 200,000,000
11 generations and a sample frequency of 20,000. The convergence was determined using
12 the program Tracer v1.5 (Rambaut and Drummond, 2007) and the first 1,250 sampled
13 trees were excluded. We used a relaxed molecular clock model, which allows
14 substitution rates to vary across branches according to an uncorrelated lognormal
15 distribution (Drummond et al., 2006; Drummond and Rambaut, 2007). Six fossil
16 calibrations were selected (see Perez et al., 2013). Fossil calibration for *Homo-Pan*
17 divergence (minimum time 5.7 Ma, maximum time 10 Ma; LogNormal distribution
18 with offset 5.7, mean 0.5 and standard deviation 0.5) and Anthroidea (minimum time
19 33.70 Ma, maximum time 65.80 Ma; LogNormal distribution with offset 33.7, mean 2.4
20 and standard deviation 0.55) were obtained from Benton et al. (2009). Minimum
21 divergence time of Alouattinae, Cebinae and Aotinae were set at 12.5 Ma, based on
22 *Stirtonia*, *Neosaimiri* and *Aotus dindensis*, three fossils attributable to Alouattinae,
23 Cebinae and Aotinae, respectively (Kay et al., 2008; Tejedor, 2008). We used a
24 LogNormal distribution with offset 12.5, mean 1.8 and standard deviation 0.4 for the

1 Alouattinae, Cebinae and Aotinae constraints. Minimum divergence time of Pitheciidae
2 was set at 15.7 Ma (LogNormal distribution with offset 15.7, mean 1.5 and standard
3 deviation 0.5), based on *Proteropithecia neuquenensis*, a fossil attributable to
4 Pitheciidae (Kay et al., 1998). Maximum divergence time was set at 26 Ma, based on
5 the absence of Pitheciidae, Alouattinae, Cebinae and Aotinae fossils in or previous to
6 the Deseadan fauna of Salla, Bolivia, and other South American formations of the same
7 age. Both minimum and maximum calibration bounds were set to the probability that
8 the true divergence time outside the bounds is small, but non-zero (dos Reis et al., 2012;
9 Perez et al., 2013). Although a calibrated tree could be important for discussing some
10 aspects of the results, the following analyses are insensitive to the total length of the
11 tree, *i.e.* based on relative times (see discussion below). We computed the maximum
12 clade credibility (MCC) tree in TreeAnnotator 1.4.8 (Drummond and Rambaut, 2007).
13 FigTree v1.3.1 was used to plot the phylogenetic tree.

14

15 2.2. Lineage diversification pattern analysis

16 The number of species in a clade is the result of speciation and extinction
17 processes acting since the origin of that clade. The most direct way of studying this
18 diversity dynamic is to analyze the fossil record. However, the information contained in
19 molecular phylogenetic trees of extant species allow us to estimate speciation and
20 extinction rates in the absence of an appropriate fossil record (Harvey et al, 1994; Nee et
21 al, 1994; Ricklefs 2007; Stadler, 2011a). This information can be recovered by
22 analyzing the fit of different mathematical models of diversification to the reconstructed
23 phylogeny.

24 Following this approach, we first quantitatively tested, using the widely used γ

1 statistic (Pybus and Harvey, 2000), whether the pattern of lineage diversification in the
2 platyrrhine tree departs from what is expected under the most simple model, Pure-Birth
3 (PB), in which each species has a constant probability λ (speciation rate) of generating
4 another species in each point in time and there is no extinction (Nee, 2006). Under this
5 model, the number of species $N(t)$ after t units of time, starting from $N(o)$ species is
6 expected to grow exponentially: $N(t) = N(o)e^{\lambda t}$. The γ statistic measures the difference
7 between the average sum of branch lengths between each internal node and the root and
8 the midpoint of the tree (Pybus and Harvey, 2000). This statistic has mean of 0 for trees
9 generated under a PB process, and significant negative values indicate a decelerating
10 lineage accumulation rate toward present times, or, in other words, that branching
11 events are concentrated disproportionately early in the phylogeny, as is expected in
12 scenarios of adaptive radiation (Gavrilets and Losos, 2009).

13 To further assess the diversification model that best explains the observed
14 diversity pattern and to estimate possible changes in diversification rates across the
15 platyrrhine tree we compared the fit, using the Akaike Information Criterion (AIC), of
16 the observed branching sequence to various models of lineage accumulation. AIC is
17 calculated as $-2\ell + 2K$ where ℓ is the maximum likelihood value of the data and K is the
18 number of parameters in the model. AIC represents a compromise between fit and
19 complexity of the model (Burnham and Anderson, 2002). The tested models were the
20 following: (i) PB and birth-death (BD; with parameters λ and μ [extinction rate]), as
21 constant-rates lineage accumulation models (although some of these models allow for
22 discrete λ shifts at specific points in time), and (ii) linear (DDL) and exponential (DDX)
23 density-dependent processes (as variable λ models with no extinction) (Rabosky and
24 Lovette, 2008a). Because the importance of extinction in shaping lineage origination

1 curves may be underestimated in the DDX and DDL models, we also included a
2 density-dependent model with a non-zero μ (DDD+E; Etienne et al., 2011). Density-
3 dependent models assume that the diversification rate ($\lambda - \mu$) decreases as the lineage
4 population reaches some threshold density. If there are ecological limits to diversity, a
5 slowdown in lineage diversification rate would be expected in an adaptive radiation
6 scenario, since ecological opportunity may decrease as niches are filled (Rabosky and
7 Lovette, 2008b; Gavrilets and Losos, 2009; Etienne et al., 2011). Also, since λ and μ
8 may have changed through time in response to different external factors, we also
9 included the recently proposed birth-death-shift (BDS) method by Stadler (2011b),
10 which can estimate whether and when a shift in rates occurred in the tree.

11 To account for incomplete sampling in our tree, we added the missing splitting
12 events to the analyzed tree, using the maximum likelihood λ and μ estimations from the
13 MCC tree, assuming that they occurred between 1 and 5 Ma. Using this approach, we
14 simulated 200 completely sampled trees and repeated the γ test and the model fitting
15 analyses (Cusimano et al., 2012). To also account for uncertainty in phylogenetic
16 reconstruction, analyses were repeated over a random sample of 100 trees drawn from
17 the post-burn in set of the BEAST analysis.

18 Finally, we visually inspected the time pattern of lineage accumulation by
19 plotting the number of ancestral lineages in our phylogenetic tree (in a log scale) versus
20 time (lineage-through-time plot, LTT; Ricklefs 2007), and compared it, using
21 simulations, to the expected pattern under the PB and BD (keeping track of extinct
22 lineages) models of diversification.

23 All analyses were conducted with the LASER (Rabosky, 2006), TreePar and
24 TreeSim (Stadler, 2011b,2011c), and APE (Paradis et al. 2004) packages for R 2.15.1

1 (R-Development Core Team, 2012).

2 In order to develop a generic origination trajectory for the fossil record, we
3 assembled geochronologic ages from the literature for 23 fossil platyrrhine genera
4 ranging from the Deseadan South American Land Mammal Age (SALMA) to the
5 Laventan SALMA, spanning from 26 to 11.8 Ma (Fleagle and Tejedor, 2002; Tejedor,
6 2008; Rosenberger et al., 2009). This data was then used to build origination estimates
7 (as numbers of genera confined to an interval plus those that cross the top boundary of
8 the interval; Foote, 2000) for each SALMA. To test for possible biases due to a poor
9 sampling of the fossil record, we applied the Spearman's rank correlation test as
10 described in Barrett et al. (2009). Briefly, the number of genera for each time slice (as
11 SALMAs) is expected to be positively correlated with the number of sampled
12 geological formations if sampling is affecting the shape of the origination curve.

14 2.3. Phenotypic diversification analyses

15 Platyrrhine monkeys are one of the most phenotypically diverse groups of living
16 primates. In particular, body size can range from roughly 100 grams in *Cebuella*
17 *pygmaea* to more than 10 kg in some atelids, with hypothesized ecological and
18 functional correlates. Thus, size, with all its intrinsic biological attributes, represents a
19 good example of the significant phenotypic diversity found in platyrrhines. We obtained
20 body mass data from the literature for the 78 extant species in our phylogeny and 15
21 fossil species (estimated from dental measurements and regression formulae;
22 Supplementary Table A.3). As male and female body mass were highly correlated ($R^2 =$
23 0.986) among the living, species average body mass were used in the analyses. Male
24 and female data were pooled and log-transformed for all analyses.

1 To explore the time pattern of body mass variation, we first calculated a mean
2 relative disparity-through-time (DTT) plot for our phylogeny as described by Harmon et
3 al. (2003). Disparity is measured as $D = \Sigma(d_i)/n-1$ where d_i is pairwise Euclidean
4 distance between species and n is the number of species. First, disparity was calculated
5 for the entire platyrrhine clade, and then for each subclade. Disparity of each subclade
6 was standardized by dividing it by the disparity of the entire clade (relative disparity;
7 Harmon et al., 2003). Finally, the mean relative disparity for each point in time is
8 calculated for all subclades present at that time. Then we compared the observed body
9 mass disparity through time to that expected if character evolution had followed a
10 Brownian motion (random) model of diversification by simulating body size evolution
11 1,000 times across our tree. Disparity values near 0 imply that most of the phenotypic
12 variation is partitioned among subclades rather than within each subclade (*e.g.* among
13 families, subfamilies, etc. rather than within each family, subfamily, etc.), whereas
14 values near 1 imply the opposite, indicating that subclades have independently evolved
15 to occupy similar places of morphological space (Harmon et al., 2003). Phenotypic
16 disparity is expected to be partitioned among subclades early in an early niche-filling
17 scenario of adaptive radiation. We also calculated the morphological disparity index
18 (MDI, Harmon et al., 2003), which quantifies the overall difference between the
19 observed and expected curves of disparity through time. Negative values are expected
20 under an adaptive radiation scenario, indicating lower subclade disparity than in the
21 random evolution model. The DTT analysis is implemented in the GEIGER package
22 (Harmon et al., 2008) for R.

23 Body mass is proposed to be strongly related to diet among platyrrhines
24 (Rosenberger, 1980, 1992; Marroig and Cheverud, 2001; Perez et al., 2011). To explore

1 this hypothesis, we applied the model selection approach of Butler and King (2004) to
2 compare the relative fit (measured with Akaike Information Criterion, AIC; see above)
3 of a stochastic model (Brownian motion, BM; Felsenstein, 1985) vs. seven models of
4 adaptive evolution (Ornstein-Uhlenbeck, OU; Hansen, 1997) to the body size variation.
5 In the BM model, body size evolves up the phylogeny via random walk and disparity
6 accumulates over time (Felsenstein, 1985). To model adaptive evolution in platyrrhine
7 size variation, we implemented seven Ornstein-Uhlenbeck models (OU; Hansen, 1997)
8 with either one, three, four or five optima. Particularly, we implemented a random walk
9 with a single stationary peak modeled as an Ornstein-Uhlenbeck process (OU1), such
10 that the size have a tendency to return to a median value (Hansen, 1997; Butler and
11 King, 2004), and six OU models with several optima formulated based on previous
12 hypotheses about the main ecological dimension behind the platyrrhine diversification.
13 The parameters of the evolutionary models were estimated by maximum likelihood: σ
14 (the intensity of the random changes in body size), α (the rate of changes toward an
15 optimum, or the strength of selection), θk (optimal value for the body size in each niche
16 optimum k).

17 To build the ecological models, or adaptive evolution hypotheses, we first
18 assigned each extant species to an ecological niche according to published works
19 (Rosenberger, 1992; Norconk et al., 2009; Youlatos and Meldrum, 2011; Allen and Kay,
20 2011), which describe different ecological groups. For uni-dimensional niche
21 hypotheses, data concerning diet composition (i.e., average annual percentages of plant
22 parts and insects in the diets of platyrrhine genera), diet quality (i.e., percentage of
23 structural plant parts [leaves and stems], reproductive plant parts [fruits, seeds, flowers,
24 nectar and gums] and animal matter in the diet) and locomotion (i.e., percentages of

1 arboreal quadrupedal walk, clamber and bridge, clawed locomotion and suspensory
2 locomotion) of platyrrhine genera and species were taken from Norconk et al. (2009),
3 Allen and Kay (2011) and Youlatos and Meldrum (2011), respectively. We then
4 calculated the principal component (PC) scores for each data set to reduce the number
5 of ecological variables and avoid multicollinearity; these PCs describe broad variation
6 in ecology (i.e., diet composition, diet quality and locomotion PCs) and were used to
7 group species in the different ecological niches (see below). It is important to remark
8 that although these niche models are based on real datasets, they are hypotheses
9 modelling the ancestral partition of platyrrhine niches. OU processes model the effect of
10 different selective regimes (ecological niches in this case) acting along the branches of a
11 phylogenetic tree and thus can be used to test for phenotypic diversification related to
12 ecological factors (Buttler and King, 2004), using data that is strongly phylogenetically
13 structured. In our analyses, character states for all internal branches were estimated
14 using a maximum likelihood approach. Finally, we explored body mass variation for the
15 ancient Patagonian and younger La Ventan (Colombia) fossil species in relation with the
16 best supported model. The OU analysis is implemented in the OUCH package (Buttler
17 and King, 2004) for R and was performed using the function OUaverage from Jaffe et
18 al. (2011).

19 To account for uncertainty in phylogenetic reconstruction, DTT and OU analyses
20 were performed over a random sample of 100 trees drawn from the post-burn in set of
21 the BEAST analysis.

22

23 **3. Results**

24 Our chronophylogenetic tree of platyrrhines is in general agreement with other

1 recent relationship estimations (Fig. 1; Opazo et al., 2006; Wildman et al., 2009;
2 Perelman et al., 2011; Perez et al., 2012), which supports the division of platyrrhines
3 into three monophyletic families (Atelidae, Cebidae and Pitheciidae) and suggests a
4 sister-group phylogenetic relationship between Atelidae and Cebidae (Opazo et al.,
5 2006; Wildman et al., 2009). We found *Aotus* to be phylogenetically related to
6 Callitrichinae, as did Perelman et al. (2011), but with low node support. The affinities of
7 *Aotus* are contentious as several molecular and morphological studies do not align
8 (Perez et al., 2012; Rosenberger and Tejedor, 2013). Because of this controversy, we
9 repeated all the statistical analyses varying the phylogenetic position of *Aotus* (as a
10 sister clade of Cebidae or Cebinae, as most studies report). The results were almost
11 identical (data not shown). Our results are also consistent with other molecular
12 assessments, which indicate the branches connecting the main platyrrhine lineages are
13 short, suggesting that the diversification of the main living platyrrhine clades could
14 indeed represent a rapid sequential radiation (but see below; Fig. 1; Opazo et al., 2006;
15 Wildman et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2012). The divergence time estimation suggest that
16 the last common ancestor (LCA) of extant platyrrhine primates existed at *ca.* 25 Ma,
17 with the 95% confidence limit for the node ranging from *ca.* 22.5–29 Ma. This result is
18 in contrast with other recent estimations, mainly to the influential Hodgson et al. (2009)
19 study, which suggested a LCA for crown platyrrhines at *ca.* 19 Ma.

20 Based on the γ statistic over 100 random trees drawn from the post-burn in set,
21 we found no evidence of a decelerating lineage accumulation rate toward present times
22 in the overall origination pattern of the platyrrhine clade (mean $\gamma = 0.493$, $p = 0.679$).
23 This result is robust to incomplete sampling (mean $\gamma = 0.290$, $p = 0.612$). Moreover, the
24 best supported model of lineage diversification was a pure-birth model with one rate

1 shift: an abrupt slowdown in speciation rates at 0.42 Ma (Table 1). Such recent rate
2 shifts may not be significant since incomplete species sampling and taxonomic inflation
3 can affect the shape of the most recent portion of the tree; however, when accounting for
4 incomplete sampling, a slowdown is also recovered at similar dates (Supplementary
5 Table A.4). Overall, this result shows, based on the extant species tree, that through
6 more than 99% of the time since its origins, crown platyrrhines diversified at a constant
7 rate. On the other hand, for the BD models, the maximum likelihood extinction rate is
8 probably underestimated, an acknowledged issue of diversification models. The absence
9 of an evident early pulse of lineage origination is also visually seen in the LTT plot for
10 extant species (Fig. 2). However, the fossil lineages origination curve seems to show a
11 different picture: a relatively rapid increase in the number of species followed by an
12 apparent slowdown in the origination rate, a pattern reminiscent of a density-dependent
13 diversification trajectory (Fig. 2, blue dashed line). This pattern is even stronger when
14 compared to simulated trees under the PB and BD models, even considering that the BD
15 curve includes extinct lineages (Fig. 2). Furthermore, this minimum estimated diversity
16 through time is likely to be very conservative, since it lacks a large fossil record from
17 the early Miocene of Amazonia, an area that was certainly populated with platyrrhine
18 representatives. The Spearman's correlation coefficient between genera per SALMAs
19 and the sampled geological formations showed a non-significant value ($r=0.286$, $p =$
20 0.65), suggesting that the observed increase in fossil genera over time is not due to
21 sampling bias.

22 Figure 3 shows the DTT plot for the body mass data. Average subclade disparity
23 along the entire history of the group is lower than expected under a BM model of mass
24 evolution. Values drop near 0 since the early divergence of the platyrrhines, and show

1 little variation over time. An MDI value of -0.255 also confirms quantitatively this
2 result. This outcome indicates a strong pattern where most size variation occurs among
3 the main platyrrhine subclades, which tend to occupy more isolated regions of body
4 mass morphospace, consistent with an early radiation and niche-filling scenario.

5 The PCs scores displayed in the figure 4 were used to group species in the
6 different ecological niches. Particularly, we defined 4 and 3 niches for diet composition
7 (OU-dietC4 and OU-dietC3, respectively); 5 and 4 niches for diet quality (OU-dietQ5
8 and OU-dietQ4, respectively); and 3 niches for locomotion (OU-Loc3; Fig. 4). Finally, a
9 multidimensional niche model was built based on the Rosenberger (1992) hypothesis;
10 this hypothesis is mainly a combination of diet composition and locomotion niche
11 dimensions and defines 5 broad ancestral ecological niches (OU-MD5; Fig. 4). The
12 overall fit of the models of body mass evolution to these hypothetical niches is shown in
13 Table 2. The OU model with 5 body mass optima (OU-MD5), following the
14 multivariate niche hypothesis of Rosenberger (1980, 1992), was the best supported, with
15 an Akaike weight well above the other candidate models, which performed poorly in
16 comparison. Taking into consideration the proposed phylogenetic relationships of the
17 fossils with extant clades (Rosenberger, 1992; Fleagle, 1999; Fleagle and Tejedor, 2002;
18 Rosenberger et al., 2009), body mass estimates for fossil platyrrhines, particularly La
19 Venta genera, show a similar pattern of variation to that observed for each of the
20 ecological categories of the OU-MD5 model (Fig. 5).

21

22 **4. Discussion**

23 The process of diversification of the platyrrhines has been investigated
24 phylogenetically and morphologically (*e.g.*, Rosenberger, 1992; Fleagle, 1999; Marroig

1 and Cheverud, 2001; Hodgson et al., 2009; Wildman et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2011,
2 2012, 2013). Many of these studies have interpreted the diversification of extant New
3 World monkeys as an adaptive radiation in which the major lineages diversified early
4 and into various alternative ecological niches that continue to exist today (see
5 discussion in Rosenberger 1992; Rosenberger *et al.* 2009; Tejedor, 2012). In all cases,
6 the initial time of the diversification process of extant platyrrhine species is emphasized
7 (*e.g.*, Kay et al., 2008; Hodgson et al., 2009; Rosenberger, 2012; Perez et al., 2013).
8 Previous works suggest that diversification of platyrrhines conforms to key expectations
9 of a model of adaptive radiation —diversity or time-dependent lineage origination
10 associated with phenotypic diversification of ecologically relevant traits such as body
11 size. However, to our knowledge, this is the first statistical effort to model the
12 phenotypic and lineage diversification of platyrrhines using a large and representative
13 species sample and combining molecular phylogenies, fossil data and a comparative
14 phylogenetic approach. In the following sections, we discuss our results on the pattern
15 of lineage branching and phenotypic diversification, its relationships with previously
16 hypothesized ecological variables and the importance of the previously suggested initial
17 times of branching to understand this diversification process.

18

19 *4.1. Lineage diversification*

20 As it has been suggested often for platyrrhines (*e.g.*, Hodgson et al., 2009;
21 Wildman et al., 2009), a central prediction of the adaptive radiation model based on
22 young radiations is that a large number of lineages are accumulated during the early
23 stages of a clade's evolutionary history, followed by a slowdown in species origination
24 rates (Gavrilets and Losos, 2009; Losos and Mahler, 2010). Contrary to the previous

1 proposals, our study did not find evidence of a rapid lineage accumulation in the
2 phylogenetic tree of extant platyrrhine species. However, it has been repeatedly argued
3 that high extinction rates and other factors might erase the signal of a decrease in
4 lineage diversification rates estimated from phylogenies based on extant species, and
5 that including information from the fossil record is thus essential to account for this
6 (Pybus and Harvey, 2000; Rabosky and Lovette, 2008b; Quental and Marshall, 2010;
7 Slater et al., 2012). In this sense, in our study the fossil-based diversity curve seems to
8 show a slowdown in diversification rates toward present times (Fig. 2). When the oldest
9 known fossil lineages (mostly from Patagonia) are considered, the number of lineages
10 increases noticeably compared to those inferred to exist at that time from the molecular
11 phylogeny, and an early pulse (approximately between 20 and 15 Ma) in the origination
12 of platyrrhine lineages may become observable (Fig. 2). Moreover, diversity levels
13 through time estimated from the fossil record are likely underestimated. On the other
14 hand, the absence of a meaningful correlation between the number of fossil genera and
15 platyrrhine-bearing rock formations suggests that this pattern is paleontologically robust
16 and that the platyrrhines present a small but representative fossil record. The observed
17 pattern in the extant diversity curve may be linked to the extinction of the Patagonian
18 primates or their retraction towards the northwest after 15 Ma (Middle Miocene;
19 Tejedor, 2012). Platyrrhines are climate-sensitive mammals that certainly responded to
20 the paleoenvironmental changes in South America after the Middle Miocene, when the
21 environments shifted towards more arid and cooler conditions in Patagonia and the
22 current configuration of Andes and Amazonian originated, generating the extinction of
23 numerous lineages within (Rosenberger et al. 2009) or outside the extant main clades
24 (Kay et al., 2008). Globally, these findings may suggest that high extinction levels

1 played a key role in shaping the extant assemblage of platyrrhine species, and that the
2 observed lineage diversity pattern can be reconciled with the predictions of the adaptive
3 radiation theory only when considering that a significant part of the early platyrrhine
4 diversity became extinct. On the other hand, the observed slowdown in diversification
5 rates near present times, even when incomplete taxa sampling was considered, may be
6 linked to our inability to detect recent lineage splitting events. In this sense, this rate
7 slowdown at Pleistocene times has also been recovered in a recent analysis of a
8 phylogeny of all primates (Springer et al., 2012) in which different taxonomic
9 arrangements were considered, thus further indicating that evolutionary relevant
10 splitting events may be overlooked by our current taxonomic criteria.

11

12 *4.2. Phenotypic diversification*

13 Our results concerning the temporal pattern of body mass variation are generally
14 consistent with the expectation that the size variation was partitioned among subclades
15 early in the phylogenetic history of the platyrrhines. The plot in the Figure 3 shows how
16 size disparity is high during the early branching process, probably related to changes in
17 ecological conditions, such as ecological opportunity (Harmon et al., 2003). Strikingly,
18 the magnitude of size disparity during the early branching process of platyrrhines is
19 unusually high compared with most previous studies we are aware of (*e.g.*, Harmon et
20 al., 2003; Slater et al., 2010; Derryberry et al., 2011; Weir and Mursleen, 2012),
21 confirming the distinctiveness of the platyrrhine radiation (Delson and Rosenberger,
22 1984).

23 The AIC analysis used to test whether body mass evolved according to a
24 stochastic model or to the occupation of different ecological niches shows interesting

1 results. Particularly, Brownian motion, the non-adaptive and simplest (*i.e.*, with fewer
2 parameters) model, has limited support (Table 2). The models of phenotypic
3 diversification within each dietary and locomotion niche (OU-dietQ, OU-dietC and OU-
4 Loc3 models, Fig. 4) exhibit poor performance with respect to other models (Table 2).
5 The model of phenotypic diversification during differentiation of the main lineages and
6 subsequent evolutionary stasis within the multidimensional ecological niches (OU-MD5
7 model; Rosenberger, 1992; Rosenberger et al., 2009) has the best performance (Table
8 2). These results differ from previous works pointing out that platyrrhine size
9 diversification is mainly related to diet variation (e.g., Marroig and Cheverud, 2001;
10 Perez et al., 2011). Conversely, we show that the diet ecological dimension alone is not
11 enough to explain the platyrrhine body mass diversification. These outcomes support a
12 more complex scenario where platyrrhine evolution is likely related to size changes
13 among the main lineages linked to a multidimensional niche (Rosenberger, 1980, 1992).

14 Moreover, size variation among the platyrrhine fossil species show a similar
15 pattern of variation —particularly the most complete La Venta fossil assemblage— to
16 that obtained analyzing the extant species. This supports the notion of a niche filling at
17 La Venta times, as extant species body size partitioning is already evident in ancient
18 lineages. However, the interpretation of this result is highly dependent on the
19 assignment of fossil species to the extant platyrrhine clades (see below). Taken together,
20 this results may be suggestive of the early platyrrhine lineages diversifying in sympatry,
21 as intraclade competition probably constrained body size evolution.

22 Functional studies pointed out that there are natural size thresholds dividing the
23 platyrrhine dietary-locomotory niches (Rosenberger, 1980, 1992; Fleagle, 1999;
24 Youlatos and Meldrum, 2011). The causal relationship among these variables is debated;

1 for example, Hershkovitz (1977) suggested that the platyrrhine radiation was an
2 evolution of body size, with locomotor and dietary consequences, while other authors
3 suggested the inverse relationship (*e.g.*, Perez et al. 2011). In any case, a central
4 prediction of the adaptive radiation hypothesis is that phenotypes diversify early in the
5 branching process in connection with ecological dimensions (Schluter, 2000; Losos and
6 Mahler, 2010). Thus, the ecological opportunity that could have existed during the early
7 phylogenetic history of platyrrhines within South America probably was a very
8 important factor promoting body size changes among the main lineages; after the initial
9 great diversification, these lineages probably maintained relatively stable size classes
10 linked to their ecological niches. Although ecological opportunity might have driven the
11 early size changes, and narrowed the range of adaptive options later as niches became
12 filled via intra-clade speciation, various additional factors could have shaped subsequent
13 stasis, including stabilizing selection, genetic constraints owing to pleiotropy,
14 developmental or functional constraints and the enduring isolation of the continent
15 which lacked a diversity of other arboreal competitors, among others (Gavrilets and
16 Losos, 2009; Wiens et al., 2010).

18 *4.3. The timing of platyrrhine diversification*

19 Although obtaining absolute dates for the platyrrhine tree was not the main focus
20 of this report since most of the analyses conducted here are only concerned with relative
21 times, having an accurate estimation of the time of origin of the extant taxa is an
22 important step for incorporating the paleontological information. In a recently published
23 article (Perez et al., 2013), we used different approaches to confidently estimate the
24 absolute time of origin of extant platyrrhines and their main lineages. Results showed

1 that the most recent common ancestor of extant lineages probably existed between 21–
2 29 to 27–31 Ma, according to two different methodologies, thus indicating that the
3 oldest known Patagonian fossils fall well inside the age range of crown platyrrhines.
4 These dates are broadly concordant with previous works (*e.g.*, Opazo et al., 2006;
5 Wilkinson et al., 2011). Particularly, if we accept these dates for the initial branching of
6 extant platyrrhines, we could relate the shape of extant phylogeny and the lineages
7 diversification results to the extinction and paleoenvironmental changes in South-
8 America after the Middle Miocene, as is suggested by the analyses of extant and fossil
9 platyrrhine lineages (Fig. 2; Hoorn et al., 2010).

10 Although the question of the Patagonian forms being extinct members of extant
11 lineages or representatives of a separate radiation cannot be resolved only with dating
12 approaches, the absolute dates obtained in Perez et al. (2013), and other previous works,
13 allow for the first hypothesis to be plausible, thus linking the extant species tree with the
14 fossils' temporal distribution. It has to be noted though, that other available divergence
15 time estimations (*e.g.*, Hodgson et al., 2009; Chiou et al., 2011) support a different
16 interpretation of the relationship of the oldest fossil species with extant lineages (but see
17 Perez et al. [2013] for a discussion). In this latter case our results about the shape of
18 platyrrhine lineages and phenotypic diversification are still valid.

19

20 **5. Conclusions**

21 The temporal pattern of lineage accumulation and the mode of phenotypic
22 evolution described here based on the extant platyrrhine species might seem
23 contradictory since, as described above, one of the adaptive radiation scenarios predicts
24 an early burst of species origination accompanied by a marked phenotypic

1 diversification. Although both processes may be unlinked, when we also consider the
2 fossil record information this contradiction diminishes as a pattern of an early burst of
3 species diversification arises. This result also shows how the signature of an adaptive
4 radiation may have been erased from the phylogenetic structure of extant species —
5 perhaps by high rate of extinction among lineages after the earlier diversification—but
6 be still retained in the patterns of phenotypic variation, as recent examples have
7 suggested (*e.g.*, Slater et al., 2010; Derryberry et al., 2011). Furthermore, body mass
8 niches appear to have been filled very early in the history of the clade, with a pattern
9 that is remarkably stronger than that seen in other groups. This point also is confirmed
10 by the inclusion of information from the fossil record. Therefore, using a novel
11 approach, as well as fossil and extant species, our analyses support the hypothesis that
12 the platyrrhine tempo and mode of diversification appears to be characterized by an
13 early and profound differentiation in body size related to a multidimensional niche
14 model, followed by little subsequent change (*i.e.*, stasis) in body size. It also suggests an
15 early high rate of extinction among lineages within crown Platyrrhini.

16

17 **Acknowledgments**

18 We are sincerely grateful to S. F. dos Reis, E. Delson and two anonymous
19 reviewers for their comments on the manuscript. We thank Graham Slater for providing
20 the scripts used to run OUaverage function in R software, and Luz Arias for helping us
21 with the figures. This research is supported by Grants from the FONCyT (PICT-2011-
22 0307).

23

24

1 **References**

- 2 Barrett, P. M., McGowan, A.J., Page, V. 2009. Dinosaur diversity and the rock record.
3 Proc. R. Soc. B 276, 2667–2674.
- 4 Benton, M.J., Donoghue, P.C.J., Asher, R.J. 2009. Calibrating and constraining
5 molecular clocks. In: Hedges, S.B., Kumar, S. (Eds). The Timetree of Life.
6 Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 35–86.
- 7 Burnham, K. P. & Anderson, D. R. 2002 Model selection and multimodel inference: a
8 practical information-theoretic approach. New York, NY: Springer
- 9 Butler, M.A., King, A.A.. 2004. Phylogenetic comparative analysis: a modeling
10 approach for adaptive evolution. Am. Nat. 164, 683–695.
- 11 Chatterjee, H.J., Ho, S.Y.W., Barnes, I., Groves, C. 2009. Estimating the phylogeny and
12 divergence times of primates using a supermatrix approach. BMC Evol. Biol.
13 9:259.
- 14 Chiou, K.L., Pozzi, L., Lynch Alfaro, J.W., Di Fiore, A. 2011. Pleistocene
15 diversification of living squirrel monkeys (*Saimiri* spp.) inferred from complete
16 mitochondrial genome sequences. Mol. Phylogenet. Evol. 59:736–745.
- 17 Clemente-Carvalho, R.B.G., Alves, A.C.R., Perez, S.I., Haddad, C.F.B., dos Reis, S. F.
18 2011. Morphological and molecular variation in the Pumpkin Toadlet,
19 *Brachycephalus ephippium* (Anura: Brachycephalidae). J. Herpetol. 45, 94–99.
- 20 Cusimano, N., Stadler, T., Renner, S.S. 2012. A new method for handling missing
21 species in diversification analysis applicable to randomly or nonrandomly sampled
22 phylogenies. Syst. Biol. 61, 785–792.
- 23 Delson, E., Rosenberger, A.L. 1984. Are there any anthropoid primate "living fossils"?
24 In: Eldredge, N., Stanley, S., (Eds.), Casebook on living fossils. Fischer Publishers,

- 1 New York, pp. 50–61.
- 2 Derryberry, E.P., Claramunt, S., Derryberry, G., Chesser, R.T., Cracraft, J., Aleixo, A.,
3 Perez-Eman, J., Renssen, Jr., J. V., Brumfield, R.T. 2011. Lineage diversification and
4 morphological evolution in a large-scale continental radiation: the neotropical
5 ovenbirds and woodcreepers (Aves: Furnariidae). *Evolution* 65, 2973–2986.
- 6 dos Reis, M., Inoue, J., Hasegawa, M., Asher, R.J., Donoghue, P. C. J., Yang, Z. 2012.
7 Phylogenomic datasets provide both precision and accuracy in estimating the
8 timescale of placental mammal phylogeny *Proc. R. Soc. B* 279 1742 3491-3500;
9 published ahead of print May 23, 2012, doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.0683 1471-2954
- 10 Drummond, A.J., Rambaut, A. 2007. BEAST: Bayesian evolutionary analysis by
11 sampling trees. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 7, 214.
- 12 Drummond, A.J., Ho, S.Y.W., Phillips, M.J., Rambaut, A. 2006. Relaxed phylogenetics
13 and dating with confidence. *PLoS Biol.* 4(5), e88.
- 14 Etienne, R.S., Haegeman, B., Stadler, T., Aze, T., Pearson, P. N., Purvis, A., Phillimore,
15 A.B. 2011 Diversity-dependence brings molecular phylogenies closer to
16 agreement with the fossil record. *Proc. R. Soc. B*, 279, 1300–1309.
- 17 Fabre, P-H., Rodrigues, A., Douzery, E.J.P. 2009. Patterns of macroevolution among
18 Primates inferred from a supermatrix of mitochondrial and nuclear DNA. *Mol.*
19 *Phyl. Evol.* 53:3, 808–825.
- 20 Felsenstein, J. 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. *Am. Nat.* 125, 1–15.
- 21 Fleagle, J. G. 1999. *Primate Adaptation and Evolution*, 2nd edn. Academic Press, New
22 York.
- 23 Fleagle, J.G., Tejedor, M.F. 2002. Early platyrrhines of southern South America. In:
24 Hartwig, W.C. (Ed.), *The primate fossil record*. Cambridge University Press,

- 1 Cambridge, pp. 161-174.
- 2 Foote, M. 2000. Origination and extinction components of taxonomic diversity: general
3 problems. *Paleobiology* 26, 74–102.
- 4 Fouquet A., Gilles, A, Vences M, Marty C, Blanc M, et al. 2007. Underestimation of
5 Species Richness in Neotropical Frogs Revealed by mtDNA Analyses. *PLoS ONE*
6 2(10), e1109.
- 7 Gavrilets, S., Losos, J.B. 2009. Adaptive radiation: contrasting theory with data.
8 *Science* 323, 732–737.
- 9 Groves, C. P. 2001. *Primate Taxonomy*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington.
- 10 Groves, C. 2004. The what, why and how of primate taxonomy. *Int. J. Primatol.* 25,
11 1105–1126.
- 12 Hall, T. 2004. BioEdit 7.0.0. Available at:
13 <http://www.mbio.ncsu.edu/bioedit/bioedit.html>.
- 14 Harmon, L.J., Schulte II, J.A., Larson, A., Losos, J.B. 2003. Tempo and mode of
15 evolutionary radiation in Iguanian lizards. *Science* 301, 961–964.
- 16 Harmon, L., Weir, J., Glor, R. & Challenger, W. 2008. GEIGER: investigating
17 evolutionary radiations. *Bioinformatics* 24, 129–131.
- 18 Harvey, P.H., May, R.M., Nee, S. 1994. Phylogenies without fossils: estimating lineage
19 birth and death rates. *Evolution* 48, 523–529.
- 20 Hodgson JA, Sterner KN, Matthews LJ, Burrell A, Jani RA, Raaum RL, Stewart C-B,
21 Distotell TR. 2009. Successive radiations, not stasis, in the South American
22 primate fauna. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* 106: 5534–5539.
- 23 Hoorn C., Wesselingh, F.P., ter Steege, H., Bermudez, M.A., Mora, A., Sevink, J.,
24 Sanmartín, I., Sanchez-Meseguer, A., Anderson, C.L., Figueiredo, J.P., Jaramillo,

- 1 C., Riff, D., Negri, F.R., Hooghiemstra, H., Lundberg, J., Stadler, T., Särkinen, T.,
2 Antonelli, A. 2010. Amazonia through time: Andean uplift, climate change,
3 landscape evolution, and biodiversity. *Science* 330, 927–931. doi:
4 10.1126/science.1194585.
- 5 Jaffe, A.L., Slater, G.J., Alfaro, M.E. 2011. The evolution of island gigantism and body
6 size variation in tortoises and turtles. *Biol. Lett.* 7, 558–561.
- 7 Kay, R.F., Johnson, D., Meldrum, D.J. 1998. A new pitheciine primate from the Middle
8 Miocene of Argentina. *Am. J. Primatol.* 45, 317–336.
- 9 Kay, R.F., Fleagle, J.G., Mitchell, T.R.T., Colbert, M., Bown, T., Powers, D.W. 2008. *J.*
10 *Hum. Evol.* 54, 323–382. doi: 10.1016/j.jhevol.2007.09.002.
- 11 Losos, J.B., Mahler, D.L. 2010. Adaptive radiation: the interaction of ecological
12 diversification appears to be characterized by opportunity, adaptation, and
13 speciation. In: Bell, M.A., Futuyma, D.J., Eanes, W.F., Levinton, J.S.(Eds.),
14 *Evolution since Darwin: the first 150 Years* Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, MA,
15 pp. 381–420.
- 16 Losos J.B. 2011. The limitations of phylogenies in comparative biology. *Am. Nat.* 177:
17 709–727.
- 18 Marivaux, L., Salas-Gismondi, R., Tejada, J., Billet, G., Lauterbach, M., Vink, J.,
19 Bailleul, J., Roddaz, M., Antoine, P-O. 2012. A platyrrhine talus from the early
20 Miocene of Peru (Amazonian Madre de Dios sub-Andean Zone). *J. Hum. Evol.*, in
21 press.
- 22 Marroig, G., Cheverud, J.M. 2001. A comparison of phenotypic variation and
23 covariation patterns and the role of phylogeny, ecology and ontogeny during
24 cranial evolution of New World monkeys. *Evolution* 55, 2576–2600.

- 1 Nee, S., Mooers, A.O., Harvey, P. H. 1992. Tempo and mode of evolution revealed from
2 molecular phylogenies. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* 89, 8322–8326.
- 3 Nee S, Holmes EC, May RM, Harvey PH. 1994. Extinction rates can be estimated from
4 molecular phylogenies. *Philos`. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B Biol. Sci.* 344:77–82.
- 5 Nee S. 2006. Birth-death models in macroevolution. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Evol. Syst.* Vol.
6 37, 1-17.
- 7 Norconk, M.A., Wright, B.W., Conklin-Brittain, N.L., Vinyard, C.J. 2009. Mechanical
8 and nutritional properties of food as factors in Platyrrhine dietary adaptations. In:
9 Garber, P.A., Estrada, A., Bicca-Marques, J.C., Heymann, E.W., Strier, K.B. (Eds.),
10 South American Primates, *Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects.*
11 New York, Springer-Verlag, pp. 279–319.
- 12 Opazo, J.C., Wildman, D.E., Pritchko, T., Johnson, R.M., Goodman, M., 2006.
13 Phylogenetic relationships and divergence times among New World monkeys
14 (Platyrrhini, Primates). *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 40, 274–280.
- 15 Paradis, E., Claude, J. & Strimmer, K. 2004 APE: analyses of phylogenetics and
16 evolution in R language. *Bioinformatics* 20, 289–290.
17 (doi:10.1093/bioinformatics/btg412)
- 18 Perelman, P., Johnson, W.E., Roos, C., Seuánez, H.N., Horvath, J.E., Moreira, M.A.M.,
19 Kessing, B., Pontius, J., Roelke, M., Rumpler, Y., Schneider, M.P.C., Silva, A.,
20 O’Brien, S.J., Pecon-Slattery, J. 2011. A molecular phylogeny of living Primates.
21 *PLoS Genetics* 7(3), e1001342.
- 22 Perez, S.I., Klaczko, J., Rocatti, G., dos Reis, S.F. 2011. Patterns of cranial shape
23 diversification during the phylogenetic branching process of New World monkeys
24 (Primates: Platyrrhini). *J. Evol. Biol.* 24, 1826–1835.

- 1 Perez, S.I., Klaczko, J., dos Reis, S.F. 2012. Species tree estimation for a deep
2 phylogenetic divergence in the New World monkeys (Primates: Platyrrhini). *Mol.*
3 *Phylogenet. Evol.* 65, 621-630.
- 4 Perez, S.I., Tejedor, M.F., Novo, N., Aristide, L. 2013. Divergence times and the
5 evolutionary radiation of New World monkeys (Platyrrhini, Primates): An analysis
6 of fossil and molecular data. *PLoS ONE* 8(6): e68029.
7 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0068029.
- 8 Posada, D. 2008. jModelTest: phylogenetic model averaging. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 25,
9 1253–1256.
- 10 Pybus, O., Harvey, P. 2000. Testing macro-evolutionary models using incomplete
11 molecular phylogenies. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B* 267, 2267–2272.
- 12 Quental, T.B., Marshall, C.R. 2010. Diversity dynamics: molecular phylogenies need
13 the fossil record. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 25, 434–441.
- 14 Rabosky, D. L. & Lovette, I. J. 2008a Density-dependent diversification in North
15 American wood warblers. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 275, 2363–2371.
16 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2008.0630)
- 17 Rabosky, D. & Lovette, I. 2008b Explosive evolutionary radiations: decreasing
18 speciation or increasing extinction through time? *Evolution* 62, 1866–1875.
19 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2008.00409.x)
- 20 Rabosky, D. 2006 Laser: a maximum likelihood toolkit for detecting temporal shifts in
21 diversification rates from molecular phylogenies. *Evol. Bioinform.* 2, 247–250.
- 22 Rambaut, A., Drummond, A.J. 2007. Tracer v1.4, Available from
23 <http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/Tracer>
- 24 R-Development Core Team. 2012. R: A language and environment for statistical

- 1 computing. R Foundation for statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria.
- 2 <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- 3 Ricklefs, R.E. 2007. Estimating diversification rates from phylogenetic information.
- 4 Trends Ecol. Evol. 22, 601–610
- 5 Rosenberger, A.L. 1980. Gradistic views and adaptive radiation of platyrrhine
- 6 primates. Morphol. Anthropol. 71:157-163.
- 7 Rosenberger, A.L. 1992. The evolution of feeding niches in New World Monkeys. Am.
- 8 J. Phys. Anthropol. 88, 525–562.
- 9 Rosenberger, A.L., Tejedor, M.F., Cooke, S., Halenar, L. Pekar, S. 2009. Platyrrhine
- 10 ecophylogenetics in space and time. In: Garber, P.A., Estrada, A., Bicca-Marques,
- 11 J.C., Heymann, E.W., Strier, K.B. (Eds.), South American Primates: Comparative
- 12 Perspectives in the Study of Behavior, Ecology and Conservation. Springer, New
- 13 York, pp. 69–113.
- 14 Rosenberger, A.L. 2012. New World Monkey Nightmares: Science, Art, Use, and Abuse
- 15 (?) in Platyrrhine Taxonomic Nomenclature. Am. J. Primatol. 74, 692–695.
- 16 Rosenberger, A.L., Tejedor, M.F. 2013. The misbegotten: long lineages, long branches
- 17 and the interrelationships of *Aotus*, *Callicebus* and the saki-uakaris. In: Barnett,
- 18 A.L., Veiga, S., Ferrari, S., Norconk, M.N. (Eds.), Evolutionary biology and
- 19 conservation of Titis, Sakis and Uacaris. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge,
- 20 in press.
- 21 Rylands, A. B., Mittermeier, R. A., & Silva, J. S. (2012). Neotropical primates:
- 22 taxonomy and recently described species and subspecies. Int. Zoo Yearb. 46(1), 11-
- 23 24.
- 24 Schluter, D. 2000. The Ecology of Adaptive Radiation. Oxford University Press,

- 1 Oxford.
- 2 Simpson, G.G. 1953. *The Major Features of Evolution*. Columbia University Press, New
3 York.
- 4 Slater, G.J., Harmon, L.J., Alfaro, M.E. 2012. Integrating fossils with molecular
5 phylogenies improves inference of trait evolution. *Evolution*, 66: 3931–3944. doi:
6 10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01723.x
- 7 Springer MS, Meredith RW, Gatesy J, Emerling CA, Park J, et al. 2012.
8 Macroevo­lutionary dynamics and historical biogeography of primate
9 diversification inferred from a species supermatrix. *PLoS ONE* 7(11): e49521.
10 doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0049521
- 11 Stadler, T. 2011a. Inferring speciation and extinction processes from extant species data.
12 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 108, 16145–16146.
- 13 Stadler, T. 2011b. Mammalian phylogeny reveals recent diversification rate shifts. *Proc.*
14 *Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 108, 6187–6192.
- 15 Stadler, T. 2011c. Simulating trees with a fixed number of extant species. *Syst. Biol.*,
16 60, 676–684.
- 17 Tamura, K., Peterson, D., Peterson, N., Stecher, G., Nei, M., Kumar, S. 2011. MEGA5:
18 Molecular evolutionary genetics analysis using Maximum Likelihood,
19 evolutionary distance, and Maximum Parsimony methods. *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 28,
20 2731-2739.
- 21 Tejedor, M.F. 2008. The origin and evolution of Neotropical Primates. *Arq. Mus. Nac.*
22 66, 251–269.
- 23 Tejedor, M.F. 2012. *Sistemática, evolución y biogeografía de los primates Platyrrhini.*
24 *Revista del Museo de La Plata*, in press.

- 1 Wiens, J.J., D.D. Ackerly, A.P. Allen, B.L. Anacker, L.B. Buckley, H.V. Cornell, E.I.
2 Damschen, T.J. Davies, J.A. Grytnes, S.P. Harrison, et al. 2010. Niche
3 conservatism as an emerging principle in ecology and conservation biology. *Ecol.*
4 *Lett.* 13, 1310–1324.
- 5 Wildman, D.E., Jameson, N.M., Opazo, J.C., Yi, S.V., 2009. A fully resolved genus level
6 phylogeny of neotropical primates (Platyrrhini). *Mol. Phylogenet. Evol.* 53, 694–
7 702.
- 8 Wilkinson, R.D., Steiper, M.E., Soligo, C., Martin, R.D., Yang, Z., Tavaré, S. 2011.
9 Dating Primate divergences through an integrated analysis of palaeontological and
10 molecular data. *Syst. Biol.*, 60:16–31.
- 11 Yang Z., Rannala B. 2012. Molecular phylogenetics: principles and practice. *Nat. Rev.*
12 *Genet.* 13:303–314

13 14 **Figure Legends**

15 **Figure 1.** Maximum Clade Credibility (MCC) chronophylogenetic tree from the
16 BEAST analysis for 78 species of platyrrhine monkeys. Blue bars on the tree indicate
17 95% confidence intervals for estimated node ages. Support is indicated for nodes with <
18 0.8 posterior Bayesian probability. Shaded area shows estimated temporal range for
19 Patagonian fossil lineages.

20
21 **Figure 2.** Semi-logarithmic plots of lineage accumulation through time (LTT plot). Red
22 bold solid line: LTT plot based on the MCC tree of extant species. Dark green/light gray
23 solid and thin dashed lines: median and 95% confidence intervals for the expected
24 distribution under a PB or BD model, respectively, simulated using the maximum

1 likelihood rates estimated from the MCC tree. Extinct lineages are included in the BD
2 curve. Blue dashed line: observed fossil-based lineage origination curve. The number of
3 species in extinct taxa was estimated by applying a conservative mean species/genus
4 ratio of the living taxa (i.e., five) (Quental and Marshal, 2010). Difference between the
5 area under the MCC tree/Fossil curve and BD curve = 5.05/30.68 ; PB curve =
6 0.48/26.11. Area between Fossil and MCC curves = 25.63. For interpretation of the
7 color references in this figure, the reader is referred to the online version.

8

9 **Figure 3.** Relative disparity-through-time plot (DTT) for body mass in the 78
10 platyrrhine species. Solid red line shows disparity calculated for the MCC platyrrhine
11 tree. Black dashed line shows median expected disparity under the null hypothesis of
12 random evolution of body size (data generated by 1000 simulations). Shaded area shows
13 the 95% range for the simulations. Dark gray lines: disparity for 100 trees randomly
14 sampled from the post-burn in fraction of the BEAST analysis. For interpretation of the
15 color references in this figure, the reader is referred to the online version.

16

17 **Figure 4.** Adaptive regime models for evolution of body mass (OU models). Each
18 species was assigned a niche based on a Principal Component analysis (PC, center
19 figures) according to different hypotheses. Axes represent the principal component
20 scores used to reduce the number of variables and avoid multicollinearity. Diet
21 composition niche hypotheses: based on Norconk et al. (2009) diet data. Diet quality
22 niche hypotheses: based on Allen and Kay et al. (2011). Locomotion niche hypothesis:
23 based on Youlatos and Meldrum (2011). Multidimensional niche hypothesis: based on
24 Rosenberger (1992). Note that this hypothesis is not based on a PC analysis.


1 Ancestral states in the trees were reconstructed using a maximum likelihood criterion.
2 See text for details on each model. For interpretation of the color references in this
3 figure, the reader is referred to the online version.

4

5 **Figure 5.** Log body mass for 78 extant species and fossil genera of platyrrhine monkeys
6 following the multidimensional niche hypothesis (Rosenberger, 1992; OU-MD5, see
7 text and Fig. 4). Fossil genera were assigned to each category according to proposed
8 phylogenetic relationships based on morphology (Tejedor, 2008, 2012; Rosenberger et
9 al., 2009); however, the phylogenetic relationships of Patagonia fossils are strongly
10 discussed (Kay et al., 2008). Circles: La Venta fossils; asterisks: Patagonian fossils.


11


12







1
2


ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT







1



2

3

1 Table 1. Mean parameter estimates and comparison of the fit of different lineage
 2 diversification models to 100 trees randomly drawn from the post-burn in fraction of the
 3 BEAST analysis (numbers in parentheses are standard deviations; SD). Ma: mega
 4 annum. r: net diversification rate (speciation – extinction; per million years); a: turnover
 5 (extinction/speciation). Rates go from past to present. AIC: Akaike Information
 6 Criterion score; wAIC: akaike weights. For the BDS analysis, the best fitting model is
 7 given. *calculated only for the MCC tree.

Model	Rate shift times (Ma)	r	a	AIC	wAIC
Pure-Birth (2 rates)	0.42 (0.16)	0.17 (0.01); 0.04 (0.05)	-	-90.03 (9.26)	0.516
BDS (1 shift)	0.42 (0.16)	0.12 (0.01); 0.04 (0.05)	0.44 (0.13); 0.15 (0.16)	-88.75	0.273
Pure-Birth (1 rate)	-	0.16 (0.01)	-	-86.55 (8.69)	0.091
Birth-Death	-	0.14 (0.01)	0.22 (0.11)	-85.11 (8.83)	0.044
DDX	-	0.12 (0.02)	-	-85.05 (8.82)	0.043
DDL	-	0.16 (0.03)	-	-84.56 (8.69)	0.034
DDD+E*	-	0.52	0.34	-69.94	0.000

8

9


1 Table 2. Performance of alternative models of body mass evolution in the platyrrhine
 2 diversification. Models were fit over 100 trees randomly drawn from the post burn-in
 3 fraction of the BEAST analysis. Refer to text for description of models. AICc: Median
 4 and standard deviation (SD, in parentheses) for Akaike Information Criterion scores
 5 corrected for sample size. Δ AICc: difference between each model median AICc score
 6 and the best fitting model AICc score; wAICc: weighted AICc. α : median and SD for
 7 the strength of selection parameter estimation (see methods).

Model	AICc	Δ AICc	wAICc	α
OU-MD5	488.23 (9.58)	0	0.9988	1.91 (1.06)
OU-Loc3	503.48 (13.17)	14.24	0.0008	0.27 (0.24)
OU-DietC4	504.61 (13.44)	15.37	0.0004	0.23 (0.26)
BM	509.48 (13.48)	20.24	0	-
OU-DietC3	512.97 (12.82)	23.73	0	0.12 (0.18)
OU-DietQ4	514.14 (12.77)	24.90	0	0.13 (0.20)
OU-DietQ5	515.77 (12.85)	26.53	0	0.13 (0.20)
OU1	516.76 (12.78)	27.52	0	0.06 (0.07)

8

9

10



1

2

3 Graphical abstract

4

1 Highlights

- 2 We estimate a dated platyrrhine phylogenetic tree for ca. 80% extant species.
3 Extant lineage diversification shows a constant rate of accumulation.
4 In contrast, body size diversification shows a pattern of early niche partition
5 followed by stasis.
6 Body size evolved according to the occupation of a multidimensional niche.
7 When oldest fossils are included, an early pulse of lineage origination appears.
8
9

ACCEPTED MANUSCRIPT