

RH: Cretaceous-Palaeogene extinction does not affect mammalian disparity.

**Cretaceous-Palaeogene extinction does not affect
mammalian disparity. DISCLAIMER: THIS DRAFT IS
NOT FULLY COMPLETED AND HAS NOT BEEN
PROOF READ.**

THOMAS GUILLERME^{1,2*}, AND NATALIE COOPER^{1,2,3}

¹*School of Natural Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.*

²*Trinity Centre for Biodiversity Research, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.*

³*Department of Life Sciences, Natural History Museum, Cromwell Road, London, SW7 5BD, UK.*

***Corresponding author.** *Zoology Building, Trinity College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland; E-mail: guillert@tcd.ie; Fax: +353 1 6778094; Tel: +353 1 896 2571.*

Abstract

1

2

3 (Keywords: disparity, diversity, punctuated equilibrium, gradualism, time slicing)

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, life on Earth has suffered a series of mass extinction events resulting in drastic declines in global biodiversity (e.g. Raup, 1979; Benton and Twitchett, 2003; Renne et al., 2013; Brusatte et al., 2015). However, the long-term effects of mass extinctions are more varied (Erwin, 1998), and include species richness increases in some clades (Friedman, 2010) or declines in others (Benton, 1985), changes in morphological diversity (Ciampaglio et al., 2001; Ciampaglio, 2004; Korn et al.) and shifts in ecological dominance (e.g. Brusatte et al., 2008b; Toljagic and Butler, 2013; Benson and Druckenmiller, 2014). These shifts are characterized by the decline of one clade that is replaced by a different unrelated clade with a similar ecological role (e.g. Brachiopoda and Bivalvia at the end Permian extinction; Sepkoski 1981; Clapham et al. 2006 but see Payne et al. 2014). Shifts in ecological dominance are of particular interest because they are a fairly common pattern observed in the fossil record (e.g. Foraminifera; D'Hondt et al. 1996; Coxall et al. 2006; Ichtyosauria; Thorne et al. 2011; Plesiosauria; Benson and Druckenmiller 2014) and are often linked to major macroevolutionary processes such as adaptive (Losos, 2010) or competitive radiations (Brusatte et al., 2008b).

One classical example of a shift in ecological dominance is at the Cretaceous-Palaeogene (K-Pg) mass extinction 66 million years ago (Renne et al., 2013), where the non-avian dinosaurs went extinct, potentially leading to the “rise of the age of the mammals” (Archibald, 2011; Lovegrove et al., 2014). This is based on the idea

that placental mammals were able to diversify after the extinction of many terrestrial vertebrates at the K-Pg boundary (including the dominant non-avian dinosaur group; Luo 2007; Archibald 2011; O’Leary et al. 2013; Brusatte et al. 2015). Some authors suggest this reflects placental mammals filling the “empty” niches left after the K-Pg event (Archibald, 2011), others suggest it reflects a release from predation and/or competition (Lovegrove et al., 2014). However, evidence for the diversification of placental mammals after the K-Pg event is mixed. Thorough analysis of the fossil record (e.g. Goswami et al., 2011; O’Leary et al., 2013) supports the idea that placental mammals diversified after the K-Pg event as there are no undebated placental mammal fossils before the K-Pg event and many afterwards (Archibald, 2011; Goswami et al., 2011; Slater, 2013; O’Leary et al., 2013; Wilson, 2013; Brusatte et al., 2015). Conversely, evidence from molecular data suggests that the diversification of placental mammals started prior to the K-Pg extinction event without being drastically affected by it (e.g. Douady and Douzery 2003; Bininda-Emonds et al. 2007; Meredith et al. 2011; Stadler 2011 or Beck and Lee 2014 using morphological data as well). Therefore, whether the diversification of placental mammals began before the K-Pg event, or in response to the extinctions at the K-Pg event, is a matter of great debate (dos Reis et al., 2012; O’Leary et al., 2013; Springer et al., 2013; O’Leary et al., 2013; dos Reis et al., 2014).

There are two main reasons why there is still debate about the timing of the diversification of placental mammals. In this paper we focus on solving these issues as follows:

1. **Palaeontological and neontological data show different patterns.** As mentioned above, conclusions about when placental mammals diversified tend to be split depending on what kind of data are used: palaeontological data generally suggest that placental mammals diversified post K-Pg (e.g. O’Leary et al., 2013), whereas neontological data suggest that K-Pg event had little to no effect on mammalian diversification (Bininda-Emonds et al., 2007; Meredith et al., 2011; Stadler, 2011). Fortunately a recently successfully implemented method allows to use cladistic data for both living and fossil taxa along with molecular data for living taxa (the Total Evidence method; Eernisse and Kluge, 1993; Ronquist et al., 2012). This method can also be combined with the tip-dating method (Ronquist et al., 2012; Wood et al., 2013) to get more accurate estimates of diversification times for both fossil and living species (but see Arcila et al., 2015). Recently, two study have been published using the Total Evidence and tip-dating methods to study (1) variation in mammalian body mass (Slater, 2013) and (2) diversification rates (Beck and Lee, 2014) around the K-Pg boundary. Slater (2013) found good support for a shift in mammalian body mass evolution pattern before and after the K-Pg boundary suggesting a clear effect of the K-Pg boundary on mammalian body mass diversification. Whereas, Beck and Lee (2014) found mixed result on diversification rates supporting both a diversification of placental mammals before (“ancient dates” hypothesis) or after (“accelerated rates” hypothesis) the K-Pg boundary.

2. **Diversity can be defined in different ways.** Diversity is a difficult concept to define. In many studies it is measured as phylogenetic diversity or species richness (Stadler, 2011; Meredith et al., 2011; O’Leary et al., 2013), but often the more interesting aspect of diversity is related to the ecological niches the species occupy (Wesley-Hunt, 2005; Brusatte et al., 2008b; Toljagic and Butler, 2013), particularly if we want to make hypotheses about macroevolutionary processes (Pearman et al., 2008; Olson and Arroyo-Santos, 2009; Losos, 2010; Glor, 2010). Sometimes phylogenetic diversity is used as a proxy for other kinds of diversity, however, species richness can be decoupled from morphological diversity (Slater et al., 2010; Ruta et al., 2013; Hopkins, 2013), so phylogenetic diversity may not be the best proxy for ecological diversity. For example in Slater (2013), the diversity of mammalian body mass is studied instead as the sheer number of species. In this particular case, body mass diversity rather than species diversity can be a better proxy for describing mammalian diversity. One can also use morphological diversity, also known as disparity (e.g. Wills et al., 1994; Erwin, 2007; Hughes et al., 2013), as a way to quantify changes in mammalian diversity that should relate to the ecology of the species. However some methods form measuring disparity are outdated and make inappropriate assumptions. Many studies quantifying changes in morphological diversity were proposed > 20 years ago (Foote, 1994; Wills et al., 1994) and are sometimes used without modifications (e.g., Brusatte et al., 2008a,b; Cisneros and Ruta, 2010; Thorne et al., 2011; Prentice

et al., 2011; Brusatte et al., 2012; Toljagic and Butler, 2013; Ruta et al., 2013; Benton et al., 2014; Benson and Druckenmiller, 2014), even when the statistical assumptions of the methods are violated (see Methods). Additionally, previous methods are based on an underlying assumption that changes in disparity occur by punctuated evolution (e.g. Wesley-Hunt, 2005) which is not always the case (Hunt et al., 2015). Finally, most studies of disparity through time use unequal time units based on biostratigraphy (Brusatte et al., 2008b, 2012; Toljagic and Butler, 2013). This can be tautological as biostratigraphy is already based on changes in fossil assemblages and morphology through time.

Here, we propose an updated approach to test whether mammals diversified before or after K-Pg, using morphological disparity, measured as cladistic disparity (see Methods), as our proxy for diversity. We measured the disparity of living and fossil mammals taken from two previously published studies (Slater, 2013; Beck and Lee, 2014). Using a novel time-slicing approach we produce fine-grain estimates of disparity through time under two different models of morphological character evolution (either gradual or punctuated). Finally, to test whether mammals display significant changes in disparity after the K-Pg boundary, we tested whether there is significant changes in disparity through time. When an effect of time was detected, we ran post-hoc tests to measure if there is any significant difference between the disparity at the end of the Cretaceous and the disparity throughout the Cenozoic. We found no significant changes in mammalian disparity between the end of the Cretaceous and any time

during the Cenozoic. These results suggest that the extinction of non-avian dinosaurs
any many other terrestrial vertebrate clades at the end of the Cretaceous did not affect
mammalian evolution.

METHODS

Cladistic data and phylogenies

We used the cladistic morphological matrices and the Total Evidence tip-dated trees
(Ronquist et al., 2012) from Slater (2013, 103 taxa with 446 morphological characters)
and Beck and Lee (2014, 102 taxa with 421 morphological characters). We chose these
two data sets because they have a similar number of taxa and morphological characters.
Slater (2013) ranges from 310 million years ago (Mya; Late Carboniferous) to the
present and focuses on the clade Mammaliaformes at the family-level. Beck and Lee
(2014) ranges from 170 Mya (Middle Jurassic) to the present and focuses on Eutherians
at the genus-level. We used the first and last occurrences reported in Slater (2013) and
Beck and Lee (2014) as the temporal range of each taxon in our analysis. Both
phylogenies are illustrated in the supplementary material (see Figure S1 and S2 @@@).

Estimating ancestral character states

For both datasets we used the re-rooting method (Yang et al., 1996; Garland and Ives,
2000) to get Maximum Likelihood estimates of the ancestral states for each character at

every node in the tree, using the `rerootingMethod` function from the R package `phytools` (version 0.4-45; Revell, 2012; R Core Team, 2015). Where there was missing character data for a taxon we followed the method of Lloyd (2015) and treated missing data as any possible observed state for each character. For example, if a character had two observed states (0 and 1) across all taxa, we attributed the multi-state “0&1” value to the taxon with missing data, representing an equal probability of being either 0 or 1. This allows the ancestral node of a taxon with missing data to be estimated with no assumptions other than that the taxon has one of the observed character states. To prevent poor ancestral state reconstructions from biasing our results, especially when a lot of error is associated with the reconstruction, we only included ancestral state reconstructions with a scaled Likelihood ≥ 0.95 . Ancestral state reconstructions with scaled Likelihoods below this threshold were replaced by missing data (“?”).

Building the cladisto-space

To explore variations in mammalian disparity through time (defined here as the variation in morphologies through time), we use a cladisto-space approach (e.g. Foote, 1994, 1996; Wesley-Hunt, 2005; Brusatte et al., 2008b; Friedman, 2010; Toljagic and Butler, 2013; Hughes et al., 2013). This approach is similar to constructing a morphospace based on continuous morphological data (e.g. Friedman, 2010), except a cladisto-space is an approximation of the morphospace based on cladistic data (i.e. the discrete morphological characters used to build a phylogenetic tree). Mathematically, a cladisto-space is an n dimensional object that summarizes the cladistic distances

between the taxa present in a cladistic matrix (see details below). Hetherington et al. (2015) have empirically shown inter-taxon distances are not different in a morphospace or a cladisto-space. However, we prefer referring to this object as a cladisto-space to make it clear that this space is estimated using cladistic data and not morphometric data and because both objects have slightly different properties. In fact, because of its inherent combinatory properties, a cladisto-space is a finite theoretical object limited by the product of the number of character states (c.f. the morphospace that is an infinite theoretical object). Thus a cladisto-space will be overloaded if the number of taxa is higher than the product of the number of character states, although this is rarely an issue with empirical data (our cladisto-spaces have maximal capacities of 1.9×10^{181} taxa; Slater, 2013, and 4.5×10^{159} taxa; Beck and Lee, 2014).

To estimate the cladisto-spaces for each of our datasets we first constructed pairwise distance matrices of length k , where k is the total number of taxa in the dataset. For each dataset separately, we calculated the $k \times k$ distances using the Gower distance (Gower, 1971), i.e. the Euclidean distance between two taxa divided by the number of shared characters. This allows us to correct for distances between two taxa that share many characters and could be closer to each other than to taxa with fewer characters in common (i.e. because some pairs of taxa share more characters in common than others, they are more likely to be similar). For cladistic matrices, using this corrected distance is preferable to the raw Euclidean distance because of its ability to deal with discrete or/and ordinated characters as well as with missing data

(Anderson and Friedman, 2012). However, the Gower distance cannot calculate distances when taxa have no overlapping data. Therefore, we used the `TrimMorphDistMatrix` function from the `Claddis` R package (Lloyd, 2015) to remove pairs of taxa with no cladistic characters in common. This led us to remove 11 taxa from Slater (2013) but none from Beck and Lee (2014).

After calculating our distance matrices we transformed them using classical multidimensional scaling (MDS; Torgerson, 1965; Gower, 1966; Cailliez, 1983). This method (also referred to as PCO; e.g. Brusatte et al. 2015; or PCoA; e.g. Paradis et al. 2004) is an eigen decomposition of the distance matrix. Because we used Gower distances instead of raw Euclidean distances, negative eigenvalues can be calculated. To avoid this problem, we first transformed the distance matrices by applying the Cailliez correction (Cailliez, 1983) which adds a constant c^* to the values in a distance matrix (apart from the diagonal) so that all the Gower distances become Euclidean ($d_{Gower} + c^* = d_{Euclidean}$; Cailliez 1983). We were then able to extract n eigenvectors for each matrix (representing the n dimensions of the cladisto-space) where n is equal to $k - 2$, i.e. the number of taxa in the matrix (k) minus the two last eigenvector which are always null after applying the Cailliez correction. Contrary to previous studies (e.g. Brusatte et al., 2008a; Cisneros and Ruta, 2010; Prentice et al., 2011; Anderson and Friedman, 2012; Hughes et al., 2013; Benton et al., 2014), we use all n dimensions of our cladisto-spaces and not a sub-sample representing the majority of the variance in the distance matrix (e.g. selecting only m dimensions that represent up to 90% of the

variance in the distance matrix; Brusatte et al. 2008b; Toljagic and Butler 2013).

Note that our cladisto-spaces represent an ordination of all possible mammalian morphologies coded in each study through time. It is unlikely that all morphologies will co-occur at each time point, therefore, the disparity of the whole cladisto-space is expected to be \geq the disparity at any specific point in time.

Calculating disparity

Disparity can be estimated in many different ways (e.g. Wills et al., 1994; Ciampaglio, 2004; Thorne et al., 2011; Hopkins, 2013; Huang et al., 2015), however most studies estimate disparity using four metrics: the sum and products of ranges and variances, each of which gives a slightly different estimate of how the data fits within the cladisto-space (Foote, 1994; Wills et al., 1994; Brusatte et al., 2008a,b; Cisneros and Ruta, 2010; Thorne et al., 2011; Prentice et al., 2011; Brusatte et al., 2012; Toljagic and Butler, 2013; Ruta et al., 2013; Benton et al., 2014; Benson and Druckenmiller, 2014). The sum and products of ranges and variances are based on the ranges and variances of the eigenvectors calculated from a distance matrix. However, these metrics do not take into account the covariance among eigenvectors. This is only statistically valid if the eigenvectors are independent. In multidimensional scaling, all n eigenvectors are calculated from the same distance matrix and are therefore not independent, thus covariances among eigenvectors should be included when estimating disparity. In addition, because we include all n dimensions in the analysis (see above), the products of ranges and variances will tend towards zero since the scores of the last dimension

are usually really close to zero themselves. These features make using the sum and products of ranges and variances unfeasible in our study. Instead, we use a different metric that comes with no statistical assumptions for measuring the dispersion of the data in the cladisto-space: the distance from centroid (similar but not equivalent to Wills et al. 1994; Korn et al.; Huang et al. 2015) calculated as:

$$Disparity = \frac{\sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{v}_{n_i} - Centroid_n)^2}}{k} \quad (1)$$

where:

$$Centroid_n = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^k (\mathbf{v}_{n_i})}{k} \quad (2)$$

k is the size of the distance matrix (i.e. the total number of taxa), \mathbf{v}_n is any of the n eigenvectors (i.e. any of the n dimension of the cladisto-space), and $Centroid_n$ is the centroid euclidean distance of the n^{th} eigenvector (equation 2). Note that we also calculated the sum and products of ranges and variances in the supplementary material (@@@).

Estimating disparity through time

Changes in disparity through time are generally investigated by calculating the disparity of taxa that occupy the cladisto-space during specific time intervals (e.g Cisneros and Ruta, 2010; Prentice et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2013; Hopkins, 2013; Benton et al., 2014; Benson and Druckenmiller, 2014). These time intervals are usually

defined based on biostratigraphy (e.g. Cisneros and Ruta, 2010; Prentice et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2013; Benton et al., 2014) but can also be arbitrarily chosen time periods of equal duration (Hopkins, 2013; Benson and Druckenmiller, 2014). However, this approach suffers from two main biases. First, if biostratigraphy is used to determine the time intervals, disparity may be distorted towards higher differences between time intervals because biostratigraphical periods are geologically defined based on differences in the morphology of fossils found in the different strata. Second, this approach assumes that all characters evolve following a punctuated equilibrium model, because disparity is only estimated once for each interval resulting in all changes in disparity occurring between intervals, rather than also allowing for gradual changes within intervals (Hunt et al., 2015).

To address these issues, we use a “time-slicing” approach that considers subsets of taxa in the cladisto-space at specific equidistant points in time, as opposed to considering subsets of taxa between two points in time. This results in even-sampling of the cladisto-space across time and permits us to define the underlying model of character evolution (such as punctuated or gradual). In practice, time-slicing considers the disparity of any element present in the phylogeny (branches, nodes and tips) at any point in time. When the phylogenetic elements are nodes or tips, the eigenvector scores for the nodes (estimated using ancestral state reconstruction as described above) or tips are directly used for estimating disparity. When the phylogenetic elements are branches we chose the eigenvector score for the branch using one of two evolutionary models:

1. **Punctuated evolution.** This model selects the eigenvector score from either the ancestral node or the descendant node/tip of the branch regardless of the position of the slice along the branch. Similarly to the time interval approach, this reflects a model of punctuated evolution where changes in disparity occur either at the start or at the end of a branch over a relatively short time period and clades undergo a long stasis period during their evolution (Gould and Eldredge, 1977; Hunt, 2007). We applied this model in three ways:

(i) selecting the eigenvector score of the ancestral node of the branch

(ii) selecting the eigenvector score of the descendant node/tip of the branch

(iii) randomly selecting either the eigenvector score of the ancestral node or the descendant node/tip of the branch

Method (i) assumes that changes always occurs early on the branch (accelerated transition, ACCTRAN) and (ii) assumes that changes always occur later (delayed transition, DELTRAN). We prefer not to make either assumption so we report the results from (iii), although the ACCTRAN and DELTRAN results are available in the Supplementary Information @@@.

2. **Gradual evolution.** This model also selects the eigenvector score from either the ancestral node or the descendant node/tip of the branch, but the choice depends on the distance between the sampling time point and the end of the branch. If the sampling time point falls in the first half of the branch length the eigenvector

score is taken from the ancestral node, conversely, if the sampling time point falls in the second half of the branch length the eigenvector score is taken from the descendant node/tip. This reflects a model of gradual evolution where changes in disparity are gradual and cumulative along the branch. Under this model, the gradual changes could be either directional or random, however, directional evolution have been empirically shown to be rare (only 5% of the time Hunt, 2007). We therefore considered that changes from a character state A to B where just dependant on the branch length.

We applied our time-slicing approach to the two cladisto-spaces calculated from Slater (2013) and Beck and Lee (2014), time-slicing the phylogeny every five million years from 170 Mya to the present resulting in 35 sub-samples of the cladisto-space. For each sub-sample, we estimated its disparity assuming punctuated (ACCTRAN, DELTRAN and random) and gradual evolution as described above. To reduce the influence of outliers on our disparity estimates, we bootstrapped each disparity measurement by randomly re-sampling with replacement a new sub-sample of taxa from the observed taxa in the sub-sample 1000 times. We then calculated the median disparity value for each sub-sample along with the 50% and the 95% confidence intervals.

We also reported the number of phylogenetic elements (branches, nodes and tips) in each sub-sample representing the observed taxonomic diversity. Disparity may be higher in sub-samples with more phylogenetic elements simply because there are more taxa represented. To test whether our analyses were biased in this way, we

289 rarefied our sub-samples during the bootstrap procedure by randomly re-sampling a
290 fix number of taxa across each sub-sample. In Slater (2013), the minimum number of
291 taxa in each sub-sample from 170 to present was 8. In Beck and Lee (2014), the
292 minimum number of taxa however was 3, however, from 150 Mya until the present, the
293 minimum number of taxa is 8. To make both data sets comparable, we used 8 as a
294 minimum number of taxa for the rarefied bootstrap measurements in Beck and Lee
295 (2014) ignoring therefore the sub-sample between 170 and 150 Mya. We report both
296 results of the bootstrapped measurements and the rarefied bootstrap measurements.

297 To compare our results to previous studies we also repeated our analyses using
298 the time interval approach based on biostratigraphy (e.g. Cisneros and Ruta, 2010;
299 Prentice et al., 2011; Hughes et al., 2013; Benton et al., 2014) using each geological stage
300 from the Middle Jurassic to the present. We report the results of these analyses in the
301 Supplementary Materials (@@@).

302 Finally, to assess if the K-Pg boundary had a significant effect on mammals
303 disparity, we performed Anderson (2001)'s Permutational Analysis of Variance (also
304 referred to as PERMANOVA or NPANOVA; e.g. Brusatte et al., 2008a; Ruta et al., 2013)
305 to test whether there was a significant effect of time on our calculated disparity. We
306 calculated the euclidean distance of the ordinated data with 1000 permutations on both
307 data sets and on both evolutionary scenario using the `adonis` function from the R
308 package `vegan` (Oksanen et al., 2015). When a significant effect of time on disparity was
309 measured, we ran a series of *post-hoc* t-test between the time sub-samples (Anderson

and Friedman, 2012; Zelditch et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2014) to test whether there was a significant effect between of the K-Pg boundary. We measured the difference between the last sub-sample of the Cretaceous (65 Mya) to all the slices of the Cenozoic to test whether there was either:

1. no effect of the K-Pg event: no significant difference between the last Cretaceous sub-sample and any of the Cenozoic sub-samples.
2. a direct effect of the K-Pg event: significant difference between the last Cretaceous sub-sample and the first Cenozoic sub-sample.
3. a lag effect of the K-Pg event: a significant difference between the last Cretaceous sub-sample and some sub-samples during the Cenozoic.

Because these *post-hoc* t-tests involve multiple p-values (13 comparisons), we corrected each p-value by multiplying them by the number of comparisons (Holm-Bonferonni correction; Holm, 1979).

RESULTS

Both data sets do not display a change in species richness after and before the K-Pg boundary (Figure 1): respectively a decrease in Eutherians (data from Beck and Lee, 2014) and an increase in Mammaliaformes (data from Slater, 2013). However, this variations in species richness are not linked with changes in disparity (Figure 2). We measured a significant effect of time on disparity in Eutherians under both gradual and

329 punctuated evolution model and in Mammaliaformes only under the gradual evolution
330 model (table 1). Regarding the effect of the K-Pg boundary, we detected a lag effect on
331 disparity in Eutherians under both gradual and punctuated evolution model (table 2)
332 but not any more after taking species richness into account (i.e. rarefaction; table 3). For
333 the Mammaliaformes under gradual evolution model, there was no effect of the K-Pg
334 boundary in both the raw and the rarefied data (table 4).




Figure 1: Observed variations of disparity through time among Eutherian and Mammaliaformes with a punctuated or gradual evolution model. The x axis represents the time in Million of years ago (Mya). The y axis represents the disparity measured as the median distance from centroid per sub-sample. The solid black lines is the mean disparity; the confidence intervals (CI) are represented by the grey polygons (50% CI in dark grey and 95% CI in light grey). The dashed line represent the species richness in each sub-sample (values are reported on the right hand side of each graphs). The red vertical




Figure 2: Rarefied variations of disparity through time among Eutherian and Mammaliaformes with a punctuated or gradual evolution model. The x axis represents the time in Million of years ago (Mya). The y axis represents the disparity measured as the median distance from centroid per sub-sample. The solid black lines is the mean disparity; the confidence intervals (CI) are represented by the grey polygons (50% CI in dark grey and 95% CI in light grey). The dashed line represent the species richness in each sub-sample (values are reported on the right hand side of each graphs). The red vertical line

Table 1: Permanova results of testing the effect of time on the ordinated distance matrix with 1000 permutations based on euclidean distance. Data: Eutherian (data from Beck and Lee, 2014); Mammaliaformes, (data from Slater, 2013). Model: evolutionary model. Significant effects are highlighted in bold: one star (*) signifies a p-value between 0.05 and 0.005; two stars between 0.005 and 0.0005 and three stars < 0.0005 .

	Data	model	terms	Df	Sum of squares	Mean sum of squares	F Model	R^2	p-value	
22	Eutherian	gradual	time	34	1825.92	53.703	1.5784	0.0769	0.0009	***
			residuals	644	21911.65	34.024		0.9231		
		punctuated	time	34	1597.07	46.973	1.3693	0.0674	0.0009	***
			residuals	644	22092.28	34.305		0.9326		
	Mammaliaformes	gradual	time	34	6525.61	191.930	1.1660	0.0663	0.0009	***
			residuals	558	91852.55	164.610		0.9337		
		punctuated	time	34	5741.25	168.860	1.0167	0.0583	0.2248	
			residuals	558	92672.75	166.080		0.9417		

DISCUSSION

Our results show that there is a significant effect of time on changes in disparity under the assumption of gradual evolution in Mammaliaformes and Eutherians as well as under the assumption of punctuated evolution for Eutherians (table 1). However, regardless the taxonomic level (i.e. family *vs.* genus) and regardless the evolutionary model (i.e. gradual or punctuated evolution), there is no effect of the K-Pg event on mammalian disparity (Figure 2). In fact, after correcting for species richness, we did not detect any significant difference between the last sub-sample of the Cretaceous and any of the sub-samples of the Cenozoic. This shows that, within the frame of our data set, there is no significant changes in mammalian disparity across the K-Pg boundary. In fact the disparity seems to reach a plateau at the end of the Jurassic (150 Mya) for Eutherians and during the late Triassic (Norian; 220 Mya) for the Mammaliaformes (see figure S4 @@@). Therefore, we did not find any significant evidence that the extinction of the dominant terrestrial vertebrates at the K-Pg boundary affected Cenozoic mammals evolution.

Effect of the K-Pg boundary on mammalian disparity

These results are consistent with previous studies on mammalian disparity and on disparity in metazoans in general. In fact, as previously shown, both focal taxonomic levels (i.e. family *vs.* genus) reaches maximal disparity early in their history (Hughes et al., 2013). The patterns of disparity seems to plateau at their maximum

disparity early in their history (approximately after 25% and 12% of their history in respectively Mammaliaformes and Eutherians). Additionally, disparity display a pattern clearly decoupled from taxonomic diversity (Slater et al., 2010; Ruta et al., 2013; Hopkins, 2013). The results for the Mammaliaformes data-set disparity variation are in accordance with a recent study from Close et al. (2015) showing a peak of Mammalian disparity during the Early to Middle Jurassic. However, our results differ from Grossnickle and Polly (2013) that showed a significant decrease in disparity during the late Cretaceous (but see Wilson et al., 2012). These differences can be due to the different input data to calculate disparity (morphometric data in Grossnickle and Polly 2013; and cladistic data in the present study; but see Hetherington et al. 2015), the different method to calculate disparity through time (time bin in Grossnickle and Polly 2013; and time slicing in the present study) or the different focal morphological aspect (dental morphology in Grossnickle and Polly 2013; and goba - including dental - morphology in the present study). Furthermore, we found a fundamental difference with Slater (2013) which shows solid evidences for a change in mode of body mass evolution at the K-Pg boundary. This difference can be due to the number of traits used in Slater (2013) and the present study. In this study we look at an aggregate of discrete traits (the 446 morphological characters) in opposition of one continuous trait (body mass in Slater, 2013). However, when using the two independent data sets with two focal taxonomic level, we still find no evidences for a significant effect of the K-Pg boundary on changes in mammalian disparity through time.

Few caveats can be underlined however. Firstly, both our data sets are limited and do not represent the full known mammalian taxonomic diversity, especially in the Neogene (23 Mya) where no fossils were represented in our data set. However, this might not cause a serious under-sampling problem since Mammaliaformes diversity has been shown to peak at the latest Cretaceous (Newham et al., 2014). Additionally Raia et al. (2012) have shown that mammalian diversification rates declined throughout the whole Cenozoic. In our study, these findings could suggest that an effect of the K-Pg boundary would be more likely detected during the Palaeogene when mammalian diversification rates were still high.

Secondly, the core of the debate in mammalian evolution is whether placental mammals originated before or after the K-Pg boundary (dos Reis et al., 2012; O’Leary et al., 2013; Springer et al., 2013; O’Leary et al., 2013; dos Reis et al., 2014). The traditional definition of the infraclass Placentalia is “the least inclusive clade that includes all extant placentals” (Beck and Lee, 2014). However, part of the dating debate might be due to the lack of clear characters that can be used to define early placental mammals (Bininda-Emonds et al., 2012; Beck and Lee, 2014). Cartmill (2012) also argues that the use of higher taxa definition in general might be obsolete since “there is only a long, geologically slow cascade of accumulating small apomorphies”. Therefore, in this study, we made the deliberate choice to focus on the taxonomic levels (genus *vs.* family) rather than on the higher clades definitions. We argue that if a significant change in disparity occurred at the K-Pg boundary in any of such infraclass (Placentalia,

Marsupialia, etc...) it would be detectable even at a higher level (i.e. changes in Placentalia correspond by definition to changes in Eutheria and Mammaliaformes). Also, using Total Evidence tip-dated trees provides more accurate estimates of diversification times (Ronquist et al. 2012; Wood et al. 2013; Beck and Lee 2014; but see Arcila et al. 2015) and allows the opportunity to look at changes in disparity for both living and fossil species.

Methodology improvements for measuring disparity

Additionally, throughout this paper, we propose several incremental changes to the classic ways to measure disparity. This is how we believe they improve disparity through time analysis.

- 1. Using all the axis of the cladisto-space** Previous studies focusing on disparity have used various ways to select a subsample of the the full cladisto-space (i.e. a sub-sample of the ordinated distance matrix) arguing that the m first axis of the cladisto-space bear most of the variance (e.g Brusatte et al., 2008a; Cisneros and Ruta, 2010; Prentice et al., 2011; Anderson and Friedman, 2012; Butler et al., 2012; Hughes et al., 2013; Benton et al., 2014). For example in Brusatte et al. (2008b) and Toljagic and Butler (2013), the authors decided to select only the m first dimensions that represent up to 90% of the variance in the distance matrix. The cut-off value is either given arbitrary or by visually detecting a substantial break in the slop of a scree plot of the variance per axis (Wills et al., 1994). We argue that

even if the last dimensions of the cladisto-space bear a trivial amount of variance, there is no statistical justification to exclude them. However, by doing so, we included dimensions of the cladisto-space with a near to 0 variance and range, making the calculation of certain disparity metrics impossible (see below). An alternative and successful method to avoid this n dimensional axis variance problem is to not ordinated the data and measure disparity just from the k distance matrix (Benson and Druckenmiller, 2014; Close et al., 2015).

2. Using the median centroid distance as disparity metric As stated above (see methods section), we deliberately chose to use the median distance from centroid as a metric from measuring disparity among many other (e.g. Wills et al., 1994; Ciampaglio, 2004; Thorne et al., 2011; Hopkins, 2013; Huang et al., 2015). Using this metric gave use several advantages upon the four classic sum and products of ranges and variance. First, this metric comes with no special statistical assumptions (c.f. sum and products of variance *and* covariance). Secondly, this metric is not affected by the last dimensions of the cladisto-space problem (see above). And thirdly, this metric seems less coupled with taxonomic diversity (especially for the products of ranges and variance and the sum of ranges, see supplementary figures @@@).

3. Using time slicing method Contra to numerous studies focusing on disparity, we chose not to bin our data in time intervals but rather to look it as a continuous process. We argue that by doing so, we can avoid two caveats of such method:

(i) firstly, using time intervals based on biostratigraphy is tautologic. In fact, such method is likely to artefactually emphasize disparity differences between time intervals because the same time intervals are based on notable differences in fossil fauna and flora (see supplementary figures @@@ where differences in disparity through time are much more contrasted in the interval methods than in the slicing methods). However, not all studies use biostratigraphy and sometimes arbitrarily time bins of equal duration are used (Hopkins, 2013; Benson and Druckenmiller, 2014).

(ii) secondly, in both cases (time bins based on biostratigraphy or arbitrary durations), such method does not allow to specify assumptions on the evolutionary model. In fact, the underlying assumption to such method is that changes in disparity occur between the time intervals in a punctuated evolutionary model fashion. Although directional gradual evolution has been shown to be rare, punctuated (i.e. stasis) and gradual (i.e. random walk) evolution have been shown to be both relatively common Hunt (2007); Hunt et al. (2015). Therefore, assuming that evolution is only punctual might be erroneous in some cases and for some traits.

4. Allowing to choose the evolutionary model Finally, using the time slicing method, allows use to crudely specify the evolutionary model for changes in disparity. Within Eutherians, we showed both support for an effect of time on disparity under both models of evolution. This can reflect the complex

combination between the two modes of evolution where morphology (i.e. as inferred from the cladistic data) varies stochastically through time with a mix of random walks (i.e. gradual model) for certain set of characters and stasis (i.e. punctuated model) for others. These results are consistent with previous findings Hunt (2007); Hunt et al. (2015). It is also encouraging to see that the distinction between the two modes of evolution can help understanding the patterns of changes in disparity at a finer scale. In fact, for Mammaliaformes, there is no significant effect of time on disparity under the assumption of a punctuated model of evolution but a clear effect of time when evolution is assumed to be gradual (see Table 1@@@). When looking at the details of this results, the same data sets shows also no significant effect of time when using the time bin method (including nodes) or when assuming that disparity evolves under an ACCTRAN model. (see supplementary permanova results @@@). This suggests that an effect of time on Mammaliaformes a mix between punctuated delay evolution (DELTRAN) and gradual evolution (random walk) meaning that when a particular morphology (i.e. a set of particular states for cladistic characters) is observed within a clade, this particular morphology will be likely conserved through time.

Two major caveats, however, arise from using such a method. First, this method relies on good estimates of characters states at the nodes of the phylogeny. Estimating discrete ancestral characters can sometimes be tricky and can lead to low scaled

likelihood values supporting any states of a particular character, especially when data is missing in the observed cladistic matrix. However, in this particular study, we made the methodological choice to select only characters with a high scaled likelihood support (> 0.95). Additionally, using trees containing fossil taxa also improves the ability to correctly estimate ancestral characters (David Polly, 2001; Finarelli and Flynn, 2006; Albert et al., 2009; Slater, 2013). Finally, because, this method samples every phylogenetic element (tip, node or edge) through time, disparity calculated close to the root of the tree can exhibit result with large confidence intervals (e.g. when only three phylogenetic elements are sampled see Figure S3 @@@). However, it is encouraging to note that measuring disparity from time-slices is decoupled from taxonomic diversity at least after a minimal number of taxa (Slater et al., 2010; Ruta et al., 2013; Hopkins, 2013)

In summary, the majority attempts to solve the debate on whether placental mammals diversified after or before the K-Pg boundary is based on taxonomic diversity and shows unclear evidences (O’Leary et al., 2013; dos Reis et al., 2014; Beck and Lee, 2014). In this study, we proposed a different approach looking at morphological diversity (i.e. disparity) through time using a continuous time sampling approach that allows use to specify assumption on the mode of evolution (i.e. punctuated or gradual). We based our analysis on the palaeontological discoveries of the last decade showing an unprecedented and unexpected taxonomic and morphological diversity prior to the Cenozoic (Luo, 2007; Close et al., 2015). We found no evidences for an effect of the K-Pg boundary on mammalian disparity at both the family and the genus level and under

both assumption of gradual or punctual evolution. We therefore suggest that, contra to popular believe, the extinction of many terrestrial vertebrates (namely the dominant non-avian dinosaurs) did not significantly affect the evolution of mammals throughout the Cenozoic.

DATA AVAILABILITY AND REPRODUCIBILITY

Data will be available on Dryad or Figshare. Code for reproducing the analysis is available on GitHub ([ithub.com/TGuillerme/SpatioTemporal_Disparity](https://github.com/TGuillerme/SpatioTemporal_Disparity)).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Thanks to Graeme Lloyd, Andrew Jackson, Gavin Thomas and Sive Finlay.

FUNDING

This work was funded by a European Commission CORDIS Seventh Framework Programme (FP7) Marie Curie CIG grant (proposal number: 321696).

*

References

Albert, J. S., D. M. Johnson, and J. H. Knouft. 2009. Fossils provide better estimates of ancestral body size than do extant taxa in fishes. *Acta Zoologica* 90:357–384.

- 517 Anderson, M. J. 2001. A new method for non-parametric multivariate analysis of
518 variance. *Austral Ecology* 26:32–46.
- 519 Anderson, P. S. and M. Friedman. 2012. Using cladistic characters to predict functional
520 variety: experiments using early gnathostomes. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*
521 32:1254–1270.
- 522 Archibald, J. D. 2011. Extinction and radiation: how the fall of dinosaurs led to the rise
523 of mammals. JHU Press.
- 524 Arcila, D., R. A. Pyron, J. C. Tyler, G. Ort, and R. Betancur-R. 2015. An evaluation of
525 fossil tip-dating versus node-age calibrations in tetraodontiform fishes (teleostei:
526 Percomorphaceae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 82, Part A:131 – 145.
- 527 Beck, R. M. and M. S. Lee. 2014. Ancient dates or accelerated rates? Morphological
528 clocks and the antiquity of placental mammals. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
529 *Biological Sciences* 281:1–10.
- 530 Benson, R. B. J. and P. S. Druckenmiller. 2014. Faunal turnover of marine tetrapods
531 during the JurassicCretaceous transition. *Biological Reviews* 89:1–23.
- 532 Benton, M. J. 1985. Mass extinction among non-marine tetrapods. *Nature* 316:811–814.
- 533 Benton, M. J., J. Forth, and M. C. Langer. 2014. Models for the rise of the dinosaurs.
534 *Current biology : CB* 24:R87–R95.

Benton, M. J. and R. J. Twitchett. 2003. How to kill (almost) all life: the end-permian extinction event. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* 18:358 – 365.

Bininda-Emonds, O., R. Beck, and R. D. MacPhee. 2012. Rocking clocks and clocking rocks: a critical look at divergence time estimation in mammals. From bone to clone: the synergy of morphological and molecular tools in paleobiology Pages 38–82.

Bininda-Emonds, O. R., M. Cardillo, K. E. Jones, R. D. MacPhee, R. M. Beck, R. Grenyer, S. A. Price, R. A. Vos, J. L. Gittleman, and A. Purvis. 2007. The delayed rise of present-day mammals. *Nature* 446:507–512.

Brusatte, S., R. J. Butler, A. Prieto-Márquez, and M. A. Norell. 2012. Dinosaur morphological diversity and the end-Cretaceous extinction. *Nature Communications* 3:804–804.

Brusatte, S. L., M. J. Benton, M. Ruta, and G. T. Lloyd. 2008a. The first 50 Myr of dinosaur evolution: macroevolutionary pattern and morphological disparity. *Biology Letters* 4:733–736.

Brusatte, S. L., M. J. Benton, M. Ruta, and G. T. Lloyd. 2008b. Superiority, competition, and opportunism in the evolutionary radiation of dinosaurs. *Science* 321:1485–1488.

Brusatte, S. L., R. J. Butler, P. M. Barrett, M. T. Carrano, D. C. Evans, G. T. Lloyd, P. D. Mannion, M. A. Norell, D. J. Peppe, P. Upchurch, and T. E. Williamson. 2015. The extinction of the dinosaurs. *Biological Reviews* 90:628–642.

554 Butler, R. J., S. L. Brusatte, B. Andres, and R. B. J. Benson. 2012. How do geological
555 sampling biases affect studies of morphological evolution in deep time? a case study
556 of pterosaur (reptilia: Archosauria) disparity. *Evolution* 66:147–162.

557 Cailliez, F. 1983. The analytical solution of the additive constant problem.
558 *Psychometrika* 48:305–308.

559 Cartmill, M. 2012. Primate origins, human origins, and the end of higher taxa.
560 *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews* 21:208–220.

561 Ciampaglio, C. N. 2004. Measuring changes in articulate brachiopod morphology
562 before and after the permian mass extinction event: do developmental constraints
563 limit morphological innovation? *Evolution & Development* 6:260–274.

564 Ciampaglio, C. N., M. Kemp, and D. W. McShea. 2001. Detecting changes in
565 morphospace occupation patterns in the fossil record: characterization and analysis
566 of measures of disparity. *Paleobiology* 27:695–715.

567 Cisneros, J. C. and M. Ruta. 2010. Morphological diversity and biogeography of
568 procolophonids (amniota: Parareptilia). *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology*
569 8:607–625.

570 Clapham, M. E., D. J. Bottjer, C. M. Powers, N. Bonuso, M. L. Fraiser, P. J. Marenco,
571 S. Q. Dornbos, and S. B. Pruss. 2006. Assessing the ecological dominance of
572 phanerozoic marine invertebrates. *PALAIOS* 21:431–441.

Close, R., M. Friedman, G. Lloyd, and R. Benson. 2015. Evidence for a mid-jurassic adaptive radiation in mammals. *Current Biology* Pages –.

Coxall, H. K., S. D'Hondt, and J. C. Zachos. 2006. Pelagic evolution and environmental recovery after the cretaceous-paleogene mass extinction. *Geology* 34:297–300.

David Polly, P. 2001. Paleontology and the comparative method: Ancestral node reconstructions versus observed node values. *The American Naturalist* 157:pp. 596–609.

D'Hondt, S., T. D. Herbert, J. King, and C. Gibson. 1996. Planktic foraminifera, asteroids, and marine production: Death and recovery at the cretaceous-tertiary boundary. *Geological Society of America Special Papers* 307:303–317.

dos Reis, M., P. C. J. Donoghue, and Z. Yang. 2014. Neither phylogenomic nor palaeontological data support a palaeogene origin of placental mammals. *Biology Letters* 10.

dos Reis, M., J. Inoue, M. Hasegawa, R. J. Asher, P. C. J. Donoghue, and Z. Yang. 2012. Phylogenomic datasets provide both precision and accuracy in estimating the timescale of placental mammal phylogeny. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* .

Douady, C. J. and E. J. Douzery. 2003. Molecular estimation of eulipotyphlan divergence times and the evolution of insectivora. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 28:285 – 296.

593 Eernisse, D. and A. Kluge. 1993. Taxonomic congruence versus total evidence, and
 594 amniote phylogeny inferred from fossils, molecules, and morphology. *Molecular*
 595 *Biology and Evolution* 10:1170–1195.

596 Erwin, D. H. 1998. The end and the beginning: recoveries from mass extinctions. *Trends*
 597 *in Ecology and Evolution* 13:344 – 349.

598 Erwin, D. H. 2007. Disparity: Morphological pattern and developmental context.
 599 *Palaeontology* 50:57–73.

600 Finarelli, J. A. and J. J. Flynn. 2006. Ancestral state reconstruction of body size in the
 601 caniformia (carnivora, mammalia): The effects of incorporating data from the fossil
 602 record. *Systematic Biology* 55:301–313.

603 Foote, M. 1994. Morphological disparity in ordovician-devonian crinoids and the early
 604 saturation of morphological space. *Paleobiology* 20:320–344.

605 Foote, M. 1996. Ecological controls on the evolutionary recovery of post-paleozoic
 606 crinoids. *Science* 274:1492–1495.

607 Friedman, M. 2010. Explosive morphological diversification of spiny-finned teleost
 608 fishes in the aftermath of the end-Cretaceous extinction. *Proceedings of the Royal*
 609 *Society B: Biological Sciences* 277:1675–1683.

610 Garland, J., Theodore and A. R. Ives. 2000. Using the past to predict the present:
 611 Confidence intervals for regression equations in phylogenetic comparative methods.
 612 *The American Naturalist* 155:346–364.

- 613 Glor, R. E. 2010. Phylogenetic insights on adaptive radiation. *Annual Review of*
614 *Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* 41:251–270.
- 615 Goswami, A., G. V. Prasad, P. Upchurch, D. M. Boyer, E. R. Seiffert, O. Verma,
616 E. Gheerbrant, and J. J. Flynn. 2011. A radiation of arboreal basal eutherian mammals
617 beginning in the late cretaceous of india. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
618 *Sciences of the United States of America* 108:16333–16338.
- 619 Gould, S. J. and N. Eldredge. 1977. Punctuated equilibria: The tempo and mode of
620 evolution reconsidered. *Paleobiology* 3:pp. 115–151.
- 621 Gower, J. C. 1966. Some distance properties of latent root and vector methods used in
622 multivariate analysis. *Biometrika* 53:325–338.
- 623 Gower, J. C. 1971. A general coefficient of similarity and some of its properties.
624 *Biometrics* 27:pp. 857–871.
- 625 Grossnickle, D. M. and P. D. Polly. 2013. Mammal disparity decreases during the
626 cretaceous angiosperm radiation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B:*
627 *Biological Sciences* 280.
- 628 Hetherington, A. J., E. Sherratt, M. Ruta, M. Wilkinson, B. Deline, and P. C. Donoghue.
629 2015. Do cladistic and morphometric data capture common patterns of
630 morphological disparity? *Palaeontology* 58:393–399.
- 631 Holm, S. 1979. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian*
632 *journal of statistics* Pages 65–70.

633 Hopkins, M. 2013. Decoupling of taxonomic diversity and morphological disparity
 634 during decline of the cambrian trilobite family pterocephaliidae. *Journal of*
 635 *Evolutionary Biology* 26:1665–1676.

636 Huang, S., K. Roy, and D. Jablonski. 2015. Origins, bottlenecks, and present-day
 637 diversity: Patterns of morphospace occupation in marine bivalves. *Evolution* .

638 Hughes, M., S. Gerber, and M. A. Wills. 2013. Clades reach highest morphological
 639 disparity early in their evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
 640 110:13875–13879.

641 Hunt, G. 2007. The relative importance of directional change, random walks, and stasis
 642 in the evolution of fossil lineages. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
 643 104:18404–18408.

644 Hunt, G., M. J. Hopkins, and S. Lidgard. 2015. Simple versus complex models of trait
 645 evolution and stasis as a response to environmental change. *Proceedings of the*
 646 *National Academy of Sciences* 112:4885–4890.

647 Korn, D., M. J. Hopkins, and S. A. Walton. ????. Extinction spacea method for the
 648 quantification and classification of changes in morphospace across extinction
 649 boundaries .

650 Lloyd, G. T. 2015. *Claddis: Measuring Morphological Diversity and Evolutionary*
 651 *Tempo*. R package version 0.1.

- 652 Losos, J. B. 2010. Adaptive radiation, ecological opportunity, and evolutionary
653 determinism. *The American Naturalist* 175:pp. 623–639.
- 654 Lovegrove, B. G., K. D. Lobban, and D. L. Levesque. 2014. Mammal survival at the
655 cretaceous–palaeogene boundary: metabolic homeostasis in prolonged tropical
656 hibernation in tenrecs. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological*
657 *Sciences* 281.
- 658 Luo, Z.-X. 2007. Transformation and diversification in early mammal evolution. *Nature*
659 450:1011–1019.
- 660 KEY: luo2007
- 661 ANNOTATION: 10.1038/nature06277
- 662 Meredith, R., J. Janečka, J. Gatesy, O. Ryder, C. Fisher, E. Teeling, A. Goodbla, E. Eizirik,
663 T. L. Simão, T. Stadler, D. Rabosky, R. Honeycutt, J. Flynn, C. Ingram, C. Steiner,
664 T. Williams, T. Robinson, B. Angela, M. Westerman, N. Ayoub, M. Springer, and
665 W. Murphy. 2011. Impacts of the Cretaceous terrestrial revolution and KPg extinction
666 on mammal diversification. *Science* 334:521–524.
- 667 Newham, E., R. Benson, P. Upchurch, and A. Goswami. 2014. Mesozoic mammaliaform
668 diversity: The effect of sampling corrections on reconstructions of evolutionary
669 dynamics. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 412:32 – 44.
- 670 Oksanen, J., F. G. Blanchet, R. Kindt, P. Legendre, P. R. Minchin, R. B. O’Hara, G. L.

Simpson, P. Solymos, M. H. H. Stevens, and H. Wagner. 2015. vegan: Community Ecology Package. R package version 2.3-0.

O'Leary, M. A., J. I. Bloch, J. J. Flynn, T. J. Gaudin, A. Giallombardo, N. P. Giannini, S. L. Goldberg, B. P. Kraatz, Z.-X. Luo, J. Meng, X. Ni, M. J. Novacek, F. A. Perini, Z. S. Randall, G. W. Rougier, E. J. Sargis, M. T. Silcox, N. B. Simmons, M. Spaulding, P. M. Velazco, M. Weksler, J. R. Wible, and A. L. Cirranello. 2013. The placental mammal ancestor and the postK-Pg radiation of placentals. *Science* 339:662–667.

Olson, M. E. and A. Arroyo-Santos. 2009. Thinking in continua: beyond the adaptive radiation metaphor. *BioEssays* 31:1337–1346.

OLeary, M. A., J. I. Bloch, J. J. Flynn, T. J. Gaudin, A. Giallombardo, N. P. Giannini, S. L. Goldberg, B. P. Kraatz, Z.-X. Luo, J. Meng, X. Ni, M. J. Novacek, F. A. Perini, Z. Randall, G. W. Rougier, E. J. Sargis, M. T. Silcox, N. B. Simmons, M. Spaulding, P. M. Velazco, M. Weksler, J. R. Wible, and A. L. Cirranello. 2013. Response to comment on the placental mammal ancestor and the postk-pg radiation of placentals. *Science* 341:613.

Paradis, E., J. Claude, and K. Strimmer. 2004. APE: analyses of phylogenetics and evolution in R language. *Bioinformatics* 20:289–290.

Payne, J. L., N. A. Heim, M. L. Knope, and C. R. McClain. 2014. Metabolic dominance of bivalves predates brachiopod diversity decline by more than 150 million years. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 281.

691 Pearman, P. B., A. Guisan, O. Broennimann, and C. F. Randin. 2008. Niche dynamics in
692 space and time. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution* 23:149 – 158.

693 Prentice, K. C., P. Ruta, and M. J. Benton. 2011. Evolution of morphological disparity in
694 pterosaurs. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 9:337–353.

695 R Core Team. 2015. R: a language and environment for statistical computing. R
696 Foundation for Statistical Computing Vienna, Austria.

697 Raia, P., F. Carotenuto, F. Passaro, P. Piras, D. Fulgione, L. Werdelin, J. Saarinen, and
698 M. Fortelius. 2012. Rapid action in the palaeogene, the relationship between
699 phenotypic and taxonomic diversification in coenozoic mammals. *Proceedings of the*
700 *Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 280.

701 Raup, D. M. 1979. Size of the permo-triassic bottleneck and its evolutionary
702 implications. *Science* 206:217–218.

703 Renne, P. R., A. L. Deino, F. J. Hilgen, K. F. Kuiper, D. F. Mark, W. S. Mitchell, L. E.
704 Morgan, R. Mundil, and J. Smit. 2013. Time scales of critical events around the
705 Cretaceous-Paleogene boundary. *Science* 339:684–687.

706 Revell, L. J. 2012. phytools: An r package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and
707 other things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3:217–223.

708 Ronquist, F., S. Klopfstein, L. Vilhelmsen, S. Schulmeister, D. Murray, and A. Rasnitsyn.
709 2012. A total-evidence approach to dating with fossils, applied to the early radiation
710 of the Hymenoptera. *Systematic Biology* 61:973–999.

711 Ruta, M., K. D. Angielczyk, J. Fröbisch, and M. J. Benton. 2013. Decoupling of
 712 morphological disparity and taxic diversity during the adaptive radiation of
 713 anomodont therapsids. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological*
 714 *Sciences* 280.

715 Sepkoski, J., J. John. 1981. A factor analytic description of the phanerozoic marine fossil
 716 record. *Paleobiology* 7:pp. 36–53.

717 Slater, G. J. 2013. Phylogenetic evidence for a shift in the mode of mammalian body size
 718 evolution at the cretaceous-palaeogene boundary. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*
 719 4:734–744.

720 Slater, G. J., S. A. Price, F. Santini, and M. E. Alfaro. 2010. Diversity versus disparity and
 721 the radiation of modern cetaceans. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B:*
 722 *Biological Sciences* .

723 Smith, A. J., M. V. Rosario, T. P. Eiting, and E. R. Dumont. 2014. Joined at the hip:
 724 Linked characters and the problem of missing data in studies of disparity. *Evolution*
 725 68:2386–2400.

726 Springer, M. S., R. W. Meredith, E. C. Teeling, and W. J. Murphy. 2013. Technical
 727 comment on the placental mammal ancestor and the postk-pg radiation of placentals.
 728 *Science* 341:613.

729 Stadler, T. 2011. Mammalian phylogeny reveals recent diversification rate shifts.
 730 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:6187–6192.

- Thorne, P. M., M. Ruta, and M. J. Benton. 2011. Resetting the evolution of marine reptiles at the Triassic-Jurassic boundary. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 108:8339–8344.
- Toljagic, O. and R. J. Butler. 2013. Triassic-Jurassic mass extinction as trigger for the mesozoic radiation of crocodylomorphs. *Biology Letters* 9.
- Torgerson, W. S. 1965. Multidimensional scaling of similarity. *Psychometrika* 30:379–393.
- Wesley-Hunt, G. D. 2005. The morphological diversification of carnivores in north america. *Paleobiology* 31:35–55.
- Wills, M. A., D. E. G. Briggs, and R. A. Fortey. 1994. Disparity as an evolutionary index: A comparison of cambrian and recent arthropods. *Paleobiology* 20:93–130.
- Wilson, G. P. 2013. Mammals across the k/pg boundary in northeastern montana, u.s.a.: dental morphology and body-size patterns reveal extinction selectivity and immigrant-fueled ecospace filling. *Paleobiology* 39:429–469.
- Wilson, G. P., A. R. Evans, I. J. Corfe, P. D. Smits, M. Fortelius, and J. Jernvall. 2012. Adaptive radiation of multituberculate mammals before the extinction of dinosaurs. *Nature* 483:457–460.
- Wood, H. M., N. J. Matzke, R. G. Gillespie, and C. E. Griswold. 2013. Treating fossils as terminal taxa in divergence time estimation reveals ancient vicariance patterns in the palpimanoid spiders. *Systematic Biology* 62:264–284.

- 751 Yang, Z., S. Kumar, and M. Nei. 1996. A new method of inference of ancestral
752 nucleotide and amino acid sequences. *Genetics* 141:1641–50.
- 753 Zelditch, M. L., D. L. Swiderski, and H. D. Sheets. 2012. *Geometric morphometrics for*
754 *biologists: a primer*. Academic Press.

Table 2: Results of the *post-hoc* t-tests for comparing the disparity at the last sub-sample of the Cretaceous (65 Mya) to all the sub-samples of the Cenozoic for the Eutherians (data from Beck and Lee, 2014). Sub-samples: reference sample (65 Million years ago; Mya) to Cenozoic sample (from 60 Mya to present). Gradual: gradual evolution; punctuated: punctuated evolution. Difference: mean sub-sample difference; Df: degrees of freedom; T: T statistic; p-value: adjusted p-value using Holm-Bonferroni correction. Significant differences are highlighted in bold: one star (*) signifies a p-value between 0.05 and 0.005; two stars between 0.005 and 0.0005 and three stars < 0.0005.

Sub-samples (Mya)	Gradual				Punctuated			
	Difference	Df	T	p.value	Difference	Df	T	p.value
65:60	0.06	76	1.055	1	0.04	76	0.760	1
65:55	0.05	75	0.999	1	0.16	75	3.145	0.0310 *
65:50	0.15	68	2.412	0.2413	0.08	68	1.403	1
65:45	0.21	64	3.016	0.0478 *	0.18	64	2.685	0.1200
65:40	0.18	64	2.579	0.1590	0.13	64	2.173	0.4354
65:35	0.23	60	2.840	0.0800	0.21	60	2.962	0.0568
65:30	0.27	57	2.927	0.0639	0.29	57	3.810	0.0044 **
65:25	0.22	56	2.500	0.1999	0.28	56	3.544	0.0104 *
65:20	0.16	56	1.922	0.7762	0.25	56	3.117	0.0374 *
65:15	0.14	55	1.819	0.9670	0.30	55	3.567	0.0098 **
65:10	0.14	55	1.843	0.9203	0.42	55	4.540	0.0004 ***
65:5	0.14	55	1.790	1 45	0.30	55	3.377	0.0176 *
65:0	0.14	55	1.818	0.9692	0.17	55	2.250	0.3705

Table 3: Results of the *post-hoc* t-tests for comparing the disparity at the last sub-sample of the Cretaceous (65 Mya) to all the sub-samples of the Cenozoic for the rarefied Eutherians (data from Beck and Lee, 2014). Column heads explained same as given in table 2.

Sub-samples (Mya)	Gradual				Punctuated			
	Difference	Df	T	p.value	Difference	Df	T	p.value
65:60	0.04	76	0.218	1	0.01	76	0.064	1
65:55	0.04	75	0.213	1	0.14	75	0.797	1
65:50	0.11	68	0.553	1	0.04	68	0.224	1
65:45	0.15	64	0.716	1	0.13	64	0.600	1
65:40	0.11	64	0.544	1	0.07	64	0.358	1
65:35	0.15	60	0.627	1	0.12	60	0.572	1
65:30	0.15	57	0.636	1	0.17	57	0.772	1
65:25	0.10	56	0.423	1	0.16	56	0.697	1
65:20	0.03	56	0.131	1	0.13	56	0.555	1
65:15	0	55	0.005	1	0.16	55	0.674	1
65:10	-0.01	55	-0.034	1	0.27	55	1.129	1
65:5	0.01	55	0.029	1	0.15	55	0.640	1
65:0	0	55	0.005	1	0.02	55	0.071	1

Table 4: Results of the *post-hoc* t-tests for comparing the disparity at the last sub-sample of the Cretaceous (65 Mya) to all the sub-samples of the Cenozoic for the Mammaliaformes (data from Slater, 2013) under gradual evolution model. Raw data: bootstrapped data without rarefaction; Rarefied data: rarefied bootstrapped data. Other column heads explained same as given in table 2.

Sub-samples (Mya)	Raw data				Rarefied data			
	Difference	Df	T	p.value	Difference	Df	T	p.value
65:60	0.49	19	0.826	1	0.26	19	0.365	1
65:55	0.45	20	0.734	1	0.31	20	0.428	1
65:50	0.13	21	0.267	1	0.03	21	0.042	1
65:45	-0.05	24	-0.109	1	0.03	24	0.051	1
65:40	-0.22	25	-0.543	1	-0.08	25	-0.118	1
65:35	-0.33	27	-0.858	1	-0.19	27	-0.321	1
65:30	-0.37	28	-0.973	1	-0.21	28	-0.335	1
65:25	-0.48	30	-1.358	1	-0.25	30	-0.394	1
65:20	-0.69	31	-2.030	0.6625	-0.44	31	-0.711	1
65:15	-0.76	30	-2.201	0.4620	-0.53	30	-0.906	1
65:10	-0.86	30	-2.666	0.1593	-0.66	30	-1.241	1
65:5	-0.85	30	-2.668	0.1585	-0.63	30	-1.197	1
65:0	-0.86	30	-2.678	0.1548	-0.62	30	-1.133	1