MASTOZOOLOGÍA NEOTROPICAL JOURNAL OF NEOTROPICAL MAMMALOGY Mastozoología Neotropical ISSN: 0327-9383 ulyses@cenpat.edu.ar Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos Argentina

Pardiñas, Ulyses F. J.; Teta, Pablo; Salazar-Bravo, Jorge A NEW TRIBE OF SIGMODONTINAE RODENTS (CRICETIDAE) Mastozoología Neotropical, vol. 22, núm. 1, 2015, pp. 171-186 Sociedad Argentina para el Estudio de los Mamíferos Tucumán, Argentina

Available in: http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=45739766018

How to cite

Complete issue

More information about this article

Journal's homepage in redalyc.org



Scientific Information System Network of Scientific Journals from Latin America, the Caribbean, Spain and Portugal Non-profit academic project, developed under the open access initiative Mastozoología Neotropical, 22(1):171-186, Mendoza, 2015

Versión impresa ISSN 0327-9383 Versión on-line ISSN 1666-0536



Nota

A NEW TRIBE OF SIGMODONTINAE RODENTS (CRICETIDAE)

Ulyses F. J. Pardiñas¹, Pablo Teta^{1*}, and Jorge Salazar-Bravo²

¹Instituto de Diversidad y Evolución Austral (IDEAus-CONICET), CC 128, 9120 Puerto Madryn, Chubut, Argentina. [Correspondencia: Ulyses F. J. Pardiñas<ulyses@cenpat-conicet.gob.ar>]

² Department of Biological Sciences, Texas Tech University, Lubbock, TX-79409, USA.

* Present address: División de Mastozoología, Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales "Bernardino Rivadavia," Avenida Ángel Gallardo 470, C1405DJR Buenos Aires, Argentina.

ABSTRACT. Phylogenetic hypotheses based on molecular markers indicate that the so-called *Reithrodon* group, including the extant genera *Euneomys*, *Neotomys*, and *Reithrodon*, formerly within the tribe Phyllotini, is not monophyletic. In turn, a new clade of tribal rank is recovered constituted by *Euneomys*, *Irenomys*, and *Neotomys*, comprising a small, mostly Andean sigmodontine radiation. Within the new clade, here named and diagnosed, *Irenomys* appears as a taxon with many specialized traits, which suggests an early divergence associated with the exploitation of *Nothofagus* forests. The living members of the new tribe are characterized by several morphological features including grooved upper incisors, narrow and parallel-sided interorbital regions, enlarged interparietals, and simplified and hypsodont molars. This new phylogenetic scenario implies a high degree of craniodental convergence among several lineages of sigmodontine rodents. The tribal position of several high-crowned extinct forms of sigmodontine rodents (e.g., *Panchomys*, *Tafimys*), formerly allocated to the *Reithrodon* group, is in need of revision.

RESUMEN. Una nueva tribu de roedores Sigmodontinae (Cricetidae). Hipótesis filogenéticas basadas en marcadores moleculares indican que el denominado grupo *Reithrodon*, incluyendo los géneros vivientes *Euneomys*, *Neotomys* y *Reithrodon*, anteriormente dentro de la tribu Phyllotini, no es monofilético. En cambio, un nuevo clado de rango tribal es recuperado, constituido por *Euneomys*, *Irenomys* y *Neotomys*, comprendiendo una pequeña radiación de sigmodontinos mayormente andinos. Dentro de este nuevo clado, aquí nominado y diagnosticado, *Irenomys* emerge como un taxón con varios rasgos especializados que sugieren una temprana divergencia en el marco de la explotación del bosque de *Nothofagus*. Los miembros vivientes de la nueva tribu están caracterizados por varios rasgos morfológicos, incluyendo incisivos superiores surcados, regiones interorbitarias angostas y de bordes paralelos, interparietales agrandados y molares simplificados e hipsodontes. Este nuevo escenario filogenético implica un alto grado de convergencia en la morfología cráneo-dentaria entre varios linajes de roedores sigmodontinos. La posición tribal de varias formas extintas de roedores sigmodontinos de coronas altas (e.g., *Panchomys, Tafimys*), anteriormente ubicadas en el grupo *Reithrodon*, necesita ser revisada.

Key words: Andean Region. Euneomys. Irenomys. Neotomys. Reithrodon.

Palabras clave: Euneomys. Irenomys. Neotomys. Región Andina. Reithrodon.

The advent of DNA sequence methodology has changed earlier systematic hypotheses, mostly based on morphological features, of mammalian classification (e.g., Meredith et al., 2011). While changes within the Mammalia are perhaps not as impressive as those in other groups of vertebrates (e.g., amphibians; see Frost et al., 2006), many unexpected linkages among taxa have been corroborated leading to new classificatory hypotheses based on molecular markers.

Within the amazingly diverse Sigmodontinae radiation (Patton et al., 2015), the case of the Reithrodon group, an assemblage of medium-sized, stout-bodied, herbivorous rodents previously grouping the living genera Euneomys, Neotomys, and Reithrodon, emerged as paradigmatic. First recognized by Olds and Anderson (1989) as a clade within the tribe Phyllotini, this group was formally diagnosed and strongly supported by the cladistic morphological analyses conducted by Steppan (1993, 1995; see also Braun, 1993). By this time, several extinct species-including, in order of discovery, Panchomys steppani, Ichthyurodon ameghinoi, and Tafimys powelli-were placed within the Reithrodon group, augmenting its known diversity and past distribution (Pardiñas, 1997; Steppan and Pardiñas, 1998; Ortiz et al., 2000). However, only a few years later, several molecular studies questioned both the monophyly of this clade as well as the inclusion of these genera within the tribe Phyllotini. Successive works employing mitochondrial and/or nuclear markers consistently pointed to Reithrodon as a unique linage within Sigmodontinae (e.g., Engel et al., 1998; Smith and Patton, 1999), while Euneomys was recovered as neither close to Reithrodon, nor Phyllotini (e.g., D'Elía, 2003). As a partial result of this changing scenario, Reithrodontini was expanded to include Euneomys and Neotomys plus Reithrodon (Musser and Carleton, 2005). More refined analyses based on interphotoreceptorretinoid binding protein sequences (hereafter IRBP) retrieved a close relationship between Euneomys and the long-tailed, scansorial mouse Irenomys, endemic to the Nothofagus forests of southwestern South America (D'Elía et al., 2006; see also Fabre et al., 2012). Finally, the

remaining member of the original Reithrodon group (sensu Olds and Anderson, 1989), the Andean rat Neotomys was recovered as the sister taxa to the Euneomys-Irenomys clade (Martínez et al., 2012; Salazar-Bravo et al., 2013). The close relationship between the terrestrial, stout bodied Euneomys and Neotomys and the forest specialist Irenomys is now well established as a unique branch of the sigmodontine radiation (e.g., Martínez et al., 2012; Salazar-Bravo et al., 2013; Parada et al., 2013; Ventura et al., 2013; Schenk et al., 2013; Pardiñas et al., 2014; see also D'Elía, 2015). This group, however, lacks a formal designation, an issue that we now resolve with the definition and diagnosis of a new tribe of Sigmodontinae (see below).

To assess the definition and diagnosis of the new tribe presented here we follow the concepts portrayed by Reig (1987). In this context we worked based on the extensive morphological revisions produced for several groups of sigmodontine rodents during the last decades (e.g., Voss, 1988; Steppan, 1993, 1995; Pacheco, 2003; Weksler, 2006; Teta, 2013). Several specimens of Euneomys, Irenomys, and Neotomys (see Appendix I) were examined for selected anatomical traits (largely following the characters lists compiled by Weksler [2006]). The obtained product is a combination of morphological traits that is unique to this assemblage, although not formally tested with a cladistic approach. This combination is sufficient to conform an intentional meaning of the polythetic concept of the new clade (Reig, 1987:364). This method was successfully employed in the definition of several tribes recently proposed (e.g., Baiomyini, see Musser and Carleton, 2005; Abrotrichini, see D'Elía et al., 2007) and has the aggregate value of allowing a coordinate advancement of classification and nomenclature, abjuring the claim that this feat is only possible by the identification of unequivocal synapomorphies (a task surely desirable but still under construction). The anatomical terminology used in this contribution-regarding osteological, dental, and soft anatomy—follows that employed by the sources previously mentioned, plus Reig (1977), Carleton (1980), and Hume (1994).

Phylogenetic analyses were conducted with Maximum Likelihood (ML) and Bayesian Inference (BI) on a matrix of 4 nuclear (BRAC1, IRBP, GHR and RAG1) and 1 mitochondrial (Cytochrome b gene; Cytb, thereafter) marker for members of the Sigmodontinae and outgroups (Appendix II). Because the original datasets (as deposited in GenBank) sampled different species of some genera, our dataset included chimeric sequences for some taxa; the effort was made to include data from closely related (in some instances sister taxa) in our alignments; 4 of the 71 ingroup taxa (Sigmodontinae) were represented by chimeric sequences (see Appendix II). Partitioning schemes and substitution models were selected using the Bayesian information criterion in PartitionFinder (Lanfear et al., 2012). The following schemes and substitution models were implemented in the BI analyses: F81+G for GHR_pos2; GTR+G for BRAC1_pos1, BRAC1_ pos2 and RAG1_pos3; GTR+I for GHR_pos3; GTR+I+G for Cytb_pos1, Cytb_pos2, Cytb_ pos3, IRBP_pos1, IRBP_pos2, RAG1_pos1 and RAG1_pos2; K80+G for BRAC1_pos3 and SYM+I+G for GHR_pos1 and IRBP_pos3. Bayesian analyses (100 million generations) were conducted with MrBayes 3.2.2 (Ronquist et al., 2012) on the CIPRES Science gateway (Miller et al., 2010) and with the concatenated dataset. Convergence of the BI analyses was assessed with Tracer v1.6 (Rambaut et al., 2014) to estimate the effective sample sizes for molecular evolutionary parameters (all reached well above 200), and AWTY (Wilgenbusch et al., 2004) to compare posterior probabilities for independent runs (they were, with a correlation coefficient = 0.997) and to test whether 10 subsamples of the chains sampled trees in proportion to their posterior probabilities with the Slide analysis (clade frequencies were very similar). Maximum Likelihood analyses were run with RAxML (Stamatakis et al., 2008) on CIPRES (Miller et al., 2010) under GTR+Gfor all partitions identified by PartitionFinder (see above); invariable sites parameter was not included in any of the analyses as per RaxML manual; the number of alternative runs on distinct starting trees was set to 25 in order to avoid entrapment in local maxima.

173

Euneomyini, new tribe

Type genus.— Euneomys Coues, 1874.

Contents.— *Euneomys* Coues, 1874, *Irenomys* Thomas, 1919, and *Neotomys* Thomas, 1894

Definition.— The clade composed of the last common ancestor of *Euneomys*, *Irenomys*, and *Neotomys* and all of its descendants.

Diagnosis.— A tribe of the subfamily Sigmodontinae (sensu Reig, 1980), clade Oryzomyalia (sensu Steppan et al., 2004) grouping medium-sized rodents (head and body length 100-160 mm) characterized by the following combination of characters: narrow and parallel-sided interorbital region; well-developed interparietal; distally spatulated hamular processes directly applied on the auditory bullae dorsal borders; enlarged parapterigoyd plates; well excavated sphenopalatine vacuities; short palates; open lacerate foramina; molar toothrows posteriorly divergent; upper incisors grooved by folded enamel/dentine; labial root on M1/m1 absent; internal carotid canal entirely bounded (or nearly so) by the petrosal and ectotympanic portions of the auditory bulla; hypsodont and simplified laminated molars; planar coronal surfaces; procingulum of m1 typically isolated from the remainder portion of the molar; gall bladder present; large caecum (after Sanborn, 1947; Hershkovitz, 1962; Olds and Anderson, 1989; Steppan, 1995; Voss, 1991; Fig. 1 and 2).

Etymology.— The tribal name is formed by adding to the stem of the name of the type genus (ICZN, Article 29.3), *Euneomys*, the suffix ini (Article 29.2); thus, the family-group name becomes Euneomy + ini = Euneomyini.

Known distribution.— Euneomyini rodents are distributed along the Andes and peri-Andean ranges, including Puna and adjacent lowlands, from central Perú (ca. 10° S) to southernmost South America, reaching Cape Horn islands (ca. 55° 30' S; Musser and Carleton, 2005). By current understanding, there are no areas of sympatry between the genera of Euneomyini. While the range of *Euneomys* includes both Patagonian lowlands and Andean habitats from southernmost South America to at least 3500 m, *Irenomys* is mainly confined to the *Nothofagus* forest. Although *Neotomys* is also an Andean form (Sanborn, 1947), there is a gap of about 2° in the central Andes where neither *Euneomys* nor *Neotomys* have been recorded (**Fig. 3**).

Biochron.— Late Pleistocene (*Euneomys*; see Tammone et al., 2014; *Neotomys*; see Pardiñas and Ortiz, 2001) to Recent. The Pleistocene *Euneomys catenatus*, a name combination proposed by Hershkovitz (1962) based on *Bothriomys catenatus*



Fig. 1. Views of different morphological traits among representative Euneomyini: A. Groove [marker] on incisors (*Euneomys mordax*; MVZ 183288). B. Narrow and parallel-sided interorbital region (*E. mordax*; MVZ 183288). C. Internal carotid canal bounded by the petrosal and ectotympanic portions of the auditory bulla (*E. chinchilloides*; CNP 3641). D. Molar toothrow posteriorly divergent and short palate (*Irenomys tarsalis*;UACH 2179). E. Well excavated sphenopalatine vacuities and enlarged parapterigoyd plates (*E. mordax*; MVZ 183288). F. Enlarged interparietal (*I. tarsalis*;UACH 2179). G. distally spatulated hamular processes directly applied on the auditory bullae dorsal border (*E. mordax*; MVZ 183288). Abbreviations: as = alisphenoid strut, cc = carotid canal, et = ectotympanic, f = frontal, lf = lacerate foramen, h = hamular process, i = incisor, ip = interparietal, p = palate, pet = pteriotic or petrosal, pp = parapterygoid plate, stf = stapedial foramen, sv = sphenopalatine vacuity.

Ameghino, 1889, is a junior synonym of *Graomys* griseoflavus (cf. Pardiñas, 1995).

Phylogenetic relationships.— The monophyletic group that includes *Euneomys*, *Irenomys*, and *Neotomys* has been recovered with high bootstrap and posterior probability values in all analyses to date. These include the combined analyses of single mitochondrial (Cytb) and nuclear (IRBP) genes (e.g., Martínez et al., 2012; Salazar-Bravo et al., 2013; Parada et al., 2013; Ventura et al., 2013) as well as the combined analyses of multiple nuclear (Schenk et al., 2013) and multiple nuclear and mitochondrial loci (J. Salazar-Bravo, unpublished data); in each of these analyses the topology of this clade is the same: (*Irenomys, (Euneomys, Neotomys*)).

There remains substantial disagreement as to which taxon (or group) is most closely related to

Euneomyini; analyses that include only Cytb and IRBP sequence data tend to suggest that this tribe forms a group (in some cases, with strong Bayesian but poor bootstrap support) with Chinchillula, followed by a clade that includes Andinomys and Punomys (e.g., Salazar-Bravo et al., 2013; Pardiñas et al., 2014) or as a clade within a polytomy that also includes Chinchillula and Reithrodon (see Carrizo and Catalano, in press). Other analyses recover Juliomys as the sister group to Euneomyini (e.g., Ventura et al., 2013: fig. 1), again, often with poor support. Likewise, analyses of 4 nuclear loci suggest that a clade formed by Andinomys and Punomys is the sister group to Euneomyini, although with very low posterior probability and bootstrap below 50% (Schenk et al., 2013); in this topology Chinchillula is recovered as the sister group to the remainder of Oryzomyalia with strong support.



Fig. 2. Morphology of upper (above) and lower (below) molar occlusal surfaces in Euneomyini: from left to right, *Irenomys tarsalis* (UACH 2179), *Euneomys chinchilloides* (CNP 3641), and *Neotomys ebriosus* (uncatalogued specimen).

Our own analyses of molecular markers confirm with strong support the position of *Chinchillula* as the sister group to Oryzomyalia (**Fig. 4**). In addition, it recovers a polytomy near the base of the Oryzomyalia, with apparent independent origins of the Euneomyini and *Andinomys* + *Punomys* clades. Therefore, it appears that, at least for now, the best course of action is to treat each of these clades as independent from each other. It is important to note that a coordinate treatment of the clade composed by *Andinomys* and *Punomys* regarding Euneomyini promotes the recognition of a new tribe to contain these 2 Andean genera (Salazar-Bravo et al., in preparation).



Fig. 3. Generalized distributions of the three genera of Euneomyini.

Remarks.— The phylogenetic scenario proposed by us and previous workers (e.g., Martínez et al., 2012; Salazar-Bravo et al., 2013; Parada et al., 2013; Schenk et al., 2013) implies a high degree of morphologic convergence among several lineages of sigmodontine rodents. This is particularly evident taking in mind that associations among several of the genera discussed here, including Euneomys, Irenomys, Neotomys, Reithrodon, and Sigmodon, have been repeatedly advanced or discarded (Sanborn, 1947; Hershkovitz, 1962; Pearson and Patton, 1976; Olds and Anderson, 1989). Molecular-based phylogenies are consistent in identifying that at least 4 major groups of tribal rank are necessary to accommodate these genera (Martínez et al., 2012; Salazar-Bravo et al., 2013). Renewed morphological analyses will be required to place correctly the fossil genera Panchomys, Ichthyurodon, and Tafimys.

Within Euneomyini, the genus *Irenomys* has many specialized traits that appear related to an adaptive exploitation of the *Nothofagus* forest biome. Paleontological data indicate that the expansion of Nothofagaceae and bamboo (*Chusquea*), as well as associated micro- to mesothermal families such as Podocarpaceae





NEW SIGMODONTINE TRIBE



Thalpomys cerradensis

Fig. 4. Results of the Bayesian analysis of the combined matrix for members of the Sigmodontinae and outgroups. Numbers indicate posterior probability (left of the diagonal) and ML bootstrap values (right of the diagonal) of adjacent nodes. Dashes indicate nodes that were not recovered in the Maximum Likelihood topology (= -79444.242902). Asterisks represent chimeric sequences (see Appendix II).

and Araucariaceae, in Patagonia date from the Middle Eocene-Early Oligocene (cf. Barreda and Palazzesi, 2007). Southern Nothofagus forest, currently restricted to a narrow band in the Andean piedmont between 35° to 55°S (Ward, 1965), was in the past well represented across interior Patagonia. In addition, molecular data suggest that the genus Irenomys originated between 6.5 Mya (Parada et al., 2013) and 4 Mya (Schenk et al., 2013), which suggests an early and potentially long association with this particular biome. Phenetically, Irenomys is quite divergent with respect to Euneomys and Neotomys. The general bauplan of this Nothofagus endemic shows some convergence with both oryzomyine and some thomasomyine representatives, in particular with those specialized for arboreal life (for example, cladistic analyses based solely on postcranial characters placed Irenomys in the same clade that the arboreal Rhipidomys and Juliomys [Carrizo and Catalano, in press]). Irenomys is a long-tailed form, a trenchant difference to the short-tailed Euneomys and Neotomys, although the 3 share thick, wellhaired tails (Fig. 5). A contrasting pattern is also observed in the pes morphology, from the long, narrow and covered by protruding plantar pads in Irenomys to the powerful broad, densely squamated, and long clawed structure in the remainder Euneomyini. Irenomys is an arboreal specialist (Pearson, 1983; Formoso and Sánchez, 2014), although cursoriality is not uncommon in this rat, as the species is readily trapped on the ground (Pearson, 1983). The combined mechanical advantage provided by a long tail and feet covered with fleshy plantar pads to facilitate movements along Nothofagus branches appear to be unequivocal (Carrizo et al., 2013). Differences between Irenomys and the Euneomys-Neotomys pair are not restricted to external traits: the 3 Euneomyini share a well-developed caecum, but that of Irenomys has external taeniae and more complex, pouched structure, not the simple caecum of Euneomys and Neotomys. Cranially, Irenomys lacks the premaxillo-maxillary suture with an acutely angled bend that Olds and Anderson (1989:64) and Steppan (1995:91) identified as synapomorphic for the Reithrodon group.



Fig. 5. External views of Euneomyini representatives, from top to bottom: *Euneomys chinchilloides* (photo UFJP), *Irenomys tarsalis* (photo D. Podestá), and *Neotomys ebriosus* (photo H. Zeballos).

There are a number of character states shared by these genera (Table 1); for example: Irenomys and Euneomys share narrow and high zygomatic plates, which almost completely lack an upper free border, and similar incisive foramina extending to M1 protocones. The "diamond" dental morphology (an example of "transverse lamination" according to Hershkovitz 1962:94) is unique to Irenomys, but a persistent posterofossette on M3 (Fig. 2) is one dental trait shared between Irenomys and Euneomys. An additional dental trait connecting these genera is a lingually displaced anteromedian flexid, notably evident in Irenomys and Neotomys, on the procingulum of the m1; these structures are typically associated with a persistent anteromedian fossetid in Euneomys (Fig. 2). Persistent interfrontal fontanelles

Character	Irenomys	Euneomys	Neotomys
Tail length	>HBL	<hbl< td=""><td><hbl< td=""></hbl<></td></hbl<>	<hbl< td=""></hbl<>
Palate topography	flat, uncomplicated	ridged, foraminated	ridged, foraminated
Premaxillo-maxillary suture	dorso-ventrally oriented	sharply angled	sharply angled
Spinous process on zygomatic plate	absent	absent	present
Interfrontal fontanelles	present	absent	present
Alisphenoid strut	present	presentª	absent
Facial circulation	complete	complete	incomplete
Caecum	complex	single	single
Cornified stomach epithelium	extensive	extensive	reduced
2n (FN)	64 (98) ^b	34-36-42 (62 to $66)^{\circ}$	70 (68) ^d

 Table 1

 Morphological character variation among 3 Euneomyini genera.

^a Contrary to the condition noted by Steppan (1995:40), we recorded the alisphenoid strut in *Euneomys* as present and bony.

^b After Ojeda et al. (2004).

^c After Ojeda et al. (2014).

^d After Pearson and Patton (1976).

have been noted for *Irenomys* and *Neotomys* (Gardner and Anderson, 2001), but not in *Euneomys*. The 3 Euneomyini also share a unilocular-hemiglandular stomach, but this is a widespread condition among sigmodontine rodents (Carleton, 1973). In *Neotomys*, the cornified portion of the stomach is mostly restricted to the fornix ventricularis while in *Irenomys* and *Euneomys* there is more equal distribution between glandular and cornified squamous epithelial portions of the stomach (cf. Carleton, 1973:fig. 3).

With the erection of the tribe Euneomyini, incisor grooves acquire a new significance in sigmodontine systematics. The interpretation of this easily diagnostic character was traditionally hampered by poorly resolved phylogenies. Micro-CT scans of upper incisors in *Euneomys*, *Irenomys* and *Neotomys* (see Ohazama et al., 2010:fig. 3) revealed that grooves are caused by folded enamel/ dentine; the same is true for the remainder sigmodontine taxa examined, including living (e.g., *Reithrodon, Auliscomys sublimis*) and fossil (e.g., *Tafimys*) representatives (**Fig. 6**). Although incisor grooves are present in 1 or a few genera in 3 other sigmodontine tribes (Sigmodontini, Reithrodontini, and Phyllotini), their presence characterizes all 3 members of the Euneomyini. Thus, the retention of this trait appears as a signature of the clade and invites further exploration of a potential adaptive role.

We are at a turning point on the study of the systematics of the Sigmodontinae, as more taxa are incorporated in molecular phylogenetic analyses, although it is also true that key taxa are only recently being included as the result of continuous field work (e.g., Pardiñas et al., 2014). We can expect, therefore, that additional studies will further resolve large parts of the tree, especially with respect to poorly known groups. Nonetheless, we predict that the resolution of the polytomy at the base of the Oryzomyalia will require sequences from many additional loci, perhaps hundreds. This is because gene tree discordance is the expected null when many short branches are combined with large ancestral population sizes (Edwards et al., 2007) such as those that very likely characterized the evolutionary history of the Sigmodontine radiation.



Fig. 6. Folding enamel/dentin in sigmodontine rodent incisors: 3-dimensional reconstructions (frontal and lateral views) and cross-section based on micro-CT scans.

Acknowledgments. Several of the ideas contained in this note were discussed along many years with G. D'Elía, C. Galliari and P. Ortiz. Micro-CT were kindly and freely processed by J. Blackburn (Dental Institute, Kings College London). D. Podestá and H. Zeballos contributed with photographs of live animals. J. Patton (MVZ) allowed longterm loans of specimens from their collection; D. Flores and M. Gallardo granted the access to MACN and UACH material, respectively. J. Patton acting as reviewer genuinely improved the quality of this manuscript; an anonymous referee also provided some helpful comments. Economic support from Agencia PICT 2008-547 (to UFJP) and the American Philosophical Society and the Systematics Research Fund of the Systematics Association (to JSB) are acknowledged. To the people and institutions herein mentioned goes our deep gratitude. This is the Grupo de Estudio de Mamíferos Australes (GEMA) contribution #14.

LITERATURE CITED

- BARREDA V and L PALAZZESI. 2007. Patagonian vegetation turnovers during the Paleogene-Early Neogene: Origin of arid-adapted floras. The Botanical Review 73:31-50.
- BRAUN JK. 1993. Systematic relationships of the tribe Phyllotini (Muridae: Sigmodontinae) of South America. Oklahoma Museum of Natural History, Special Publication, 50 pp.
- CARLETON MD. 1973. A survey of gross stomach morphology in New World Cricetinae (Rodentia, Muroidea), with comments on functional interpretations. Miscellaneous Publications, Museum of Zoology, University of Michigan 146:1-43.
- CARRIZO LV and SA CATALANO. In press. First phylogenetic analysis of the tribe Phyllotini (Rodentia: Sigmodontinae) combining morphological and molecular data. Cladistics; DOI: 10.1111/cla.12109.
- CARRIZO LV, M TULLI, D DOS SANTOS and V ABDALA. 2013. Interplay between postcranial morphology and locomotor types in Neotropical sigmodontine rodents. Journal of Anatomy doi:10.1111/joa.12152.
- D'ELÍA G. 2003. Phylogenetics of Sigmodontinae (Rodentia, Muroidea, Cricetidae), with special reference to the akodont group, and with additional comments on historical biogeography. Cladistics 19:307-323.
- D'ELÍA G. 2015. Sigmodontinae incertae sedis. Pp. 70-73 in Mammals of South America, Volume 2 – Rodents (JL Patton, UFJ Pardiñas and G D'Elía, eds.). The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- D'ELÍA G, L LUNA, EM GONZÁLEZ, and BD PATTERSON. 2006. On the Sigmodontinae radiation (Rodentia, Cricetidae): An appraisal of the phylogenetic position of *Rhagomys*. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 38:558-564.
- D'ELÍA G, UFJ PARDIÑAS, P TETA, and JL PATTON. 2007. Definition and diagnosis of a new tribe of sigmodontine rodents (Cricetidae: Sigmodontinae), and a revised classification of the subfamily. Gayana 71:187-194.

- EDWARDS S, L LIU, and D PEARL. 2007. High-resolution species trees without concatenation. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science USA. 104:5936–5941.
- ENGEL SR, KM HOGAN, JF TAYLOR, and SK DAVIS. 1998. Molecular systematics and paleobiogeography of the South American sigmodontine rodents. Molecular Biology and Evolution 15:35-49.
- FABRE PH, L HAUTIER, D DIMITROV, and E DOUZERY. 2012. A glimpse on the pattern of rodent diversification: A phylogenetic approach. BMC Evolutionary Biology 12:88 doi:10.1186/1471-2148-12-88.
- FORMOSO A and J SÁNCHEZ. 2014. First description of the breeding nest of *Irenomys tarsalis*, a sigmodontine rodent endemic to southern Andean forests. Revista Mexicana de Biodiversidad 85:987-989.
- FROST DR et al. 2006. The amphibian tree of life. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 297:1-370.
- GARDNER SL and S ANDERSON. 2001. Persistent fontanelles in rodent skulls. American Museum Novitates 3327:1-15.
- HERSHKOVITZ P. 1962. Evolution of Neotropical cricetine rodents (Muridae) with special reference to the phyllotine group. Fieldiana, Zoology 46:1-524.
- HUME ID. 1994. Gut morphology, body size and digestive performance in rodents. Pp. 315-323, in: The digestive system in mammals: Food, form and function (DJ Chivers and P Langer, eds). Cambridge University Press, New York.
- ICZN. 1999. International Code of Zoological Nomenclature, Fourth edition. London: International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, 117 p.
- LANFEAR R, B CALCOTT, SY HO, and S GUINDON. 2012. PartitionFinder: Combined selection of partitioning schemes and substitution models for phylogenetic analyses. Molecular Biology and Evolution 29:1695-1701
- MARTÍNEZ JJ, LI FERRO, MI MOLLERACH, and RM BARQUEZ. 2012. The phylogenetic relationships of the Andean swamp rat genus *Neotomys* (Rodentia, Cricetidae, Sigmodontinae) based on mitochondrial and nuclear markers. Acta Theriologica doi:10.1007/ s13364-011-0070-9.
- MEREDITH RW et al. 2011. Impacts of the Cretaceous terrestrial revolution and KPg extinction on nammal diversification. Science 334 (6055):521-524.
- MILLER MA, W PFEIFER, and T SCHWARTZ. 2010. Creating the CIPRES Science Gateway for inference of large phylogenetic trees. Pp. 1-8, in: Proceedings of the Gateway Computing Environments Workshop (GCE). New Orleans, LA.
- MUSSER GM and MD CARLETON. 2005. Superfamily Muroidea. Pp. 894-1531, in: Mammal species of the world: A taxonomic and geographic reference (DE Wilson and DM Reeder, eds.). 3rd ed, Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.
- OHAZAMA A et al. 2010. A role for suppressed incisor cuspal morphogenesis in the evolution of mammalian heterodont dentition. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences 107:92-97.
- OJEDA AA, A NOVILLO, RJ OVEJERO, PA CUELLO, C LANZONE, AV BORISENKO, JK BRAUN, MA MARES and RA OJEDA. 2014. A cytogenetic,

molecular genetic and morphological study of Patagonian chinchilla mice *Euneomys* (Rodentia, Cricetidae) in the Southern Central Andes. Mammal Research doi:10.1007/s13364-014-0200-2.

- OJEDA AA, CA RÍOS, and MH GALLARDO. 2004. Chromosomal characterization of *Irenomys tarsalis* (Rodentia, Cricetidae, Sigmodontinae). Mastozoología Neotropical 11:95-98.
- OLDS N and S ANDERSON. 1989. A diagnosis of the tribe Phyllotini (Rodentia, Muridae). Pp. 55-73, in: Advances in Neotropical Mammalogy (KH Redford and JF Eisenberg, eds.). Sandhill Crane Press, Inc., Gainesville, Florida.
- ORTIZ PE, UFJ PARDIÑAS, and SJ STEPPAN. 2000. A new fossil phyllotine (Rodentia: Muridae) from Northwestern Argentina and relationships of the *Reithrodon* group. Journal of Mammalogy 81:37-51.
- PACHECO V. 2003. Phylogenetic analyses of the Thomasomyini (Muroidea: Sigmodontinae) based on morphological data. Doctoral thesis, The City University of New York, New York, USA.
- PARDIÑAS UFJ. 1995. Sobre las vicisitudes de los géneros Bothriomys Ameghino, 1889, Euneomys Coues, 1874 y Graomys Thomas, 1916 (Mammalia, Rodentia, Cricetidae). Ameghiniana 32:173-180.
- PARDIÑAS UFJ. 1997. Un nuevo sigmodontino (Mammalia: Rodentia) del Plioceno de Argentina y consideraciones sobre el registro fósil de los Phyllotini. Revista Chilena de Historia Natural 70:543-555.
- PARDIÑAS UFJ and PE ORTIZ. 2001. Neotomys ebriosus, an enigmatic South American rodent (Muridae, Sigmodontinae): Its fossil record and present distribution in Argentina. Mammalia 65:244-250.
- PARDIÑAS UFJ, G D'ELÍA, G LESSA, M PASSAMANI, and P TETA. 2014. Nuevos datos morfológicos y una hipótesis filogenética para *Phaenomys* (Rodentia, Cricetidae). Mastozoología Neotropical 21:251-261.
- PARADA A, UFJ PARDIÑAS, J SALAZAR-BRAVO, G D'ELÍA, and E PALMA. 2013. Dating an impressive Neotropical radiation: Molecular time estimates for the Sigmodontinae (Rodentia) provide insights into its historical biogeography. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution 66:960-968.
- PATTON JL, UFJ PARDIÑAS, and G D'ELÍA. 2015. Mammals of South America, Volume 2 - Rodents. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- PEARSON OP. 1983. Characteristics of a mammalian fauna from forests in Patagonia, southern Argentina. Journal of Mammalogy 64:476-492.
- PEARSON OP and JL PATTON. 1976. Relationships among South American phyllotine rodents based on chromosome analysis. Journal of Mammalogy 57:339-350.
- REIG OA. 1980. A new fossil genus of South American cricetid rodents allied to *Wiedomys*, with an assessment of the Sigmodontinae. Journal of Zoology (London) 192:257-281.
- REIG OA. 1987. An assessment of the systematics and evolution of the Akodontini, with the description of new fossil species of Akodon (Cricetidae: Sigmodontinae). Pp. 347-399 in Studies in Neotropical mammalogy – Essays in honor of Philip Hershkovitz

(BD Patterson and RM Timm, eds.). Fieldiana, Zoology, New Series 39.

- RONQUIST F, M TESLENKO, P VAN DER MARK, DL AYRES, A DARLING, S HOHNA, B LARGET, L LIU, MA SUCHARD, and JP HUELSENBECK. 2012. MrBayes 3.2: Efficient Bayesian phylogenetic inference and model choice across a large model space. Systematic Biology 61:539-542.
- RAMBAUT A, MA SUCHARD, D XIE, and AJ DRUMMOND. 2014. Tracer v1.6, Available from http://beast.bio.ed.ac.uk/Tracer
- SALAZAR-BRAVO J, UFJ PARDIÑAS, and G D'ELÍA. 2013. A phylogenetic appraisal of Sigmodontinae (Rodentia, Cricetidae) with emphasis on phyllotine genera: Systematics and biogeography. Zoologica Scripta 42:250-261.
- SANBORN CC. 1947. The South American rodents of the genus *Neotomys*. Fieldiana, Zoology 31:51-57.
- SCHENK JJ, KC ROWE, and SJ STEPPAN. 2013. Ecological opportunity and incumbency in the diversification of repeated continental colonizations by muroid rodents. Systematic Biology 62:837-864.
- SMITH MF and JL PATTON. 1999. Phylogenetic relationships and the radiation of sigmodontine rodents in South America: Evidence from cytochrome b. Journal of Mammalian Evolution 6:89-128.
- STEPPAN SJ. 1993. Phylogenetic relationships among the Phyllotini (Rodentia: Sigmodontinae) using morphological characters. Journal of Mammalian Evolution 1:187–213.
- STEPPAN SJ. 1995. Revision of the tribe Phyllotini (Rodentia: Sigmodontinae), with a phylogenetic hypothesis for the Sigmodontinae. Fieldiana, Zoology, New Series 80:1-112.
- STEPPAN SJ and UFJ PARDIÑAS. 1998. Two new fossil muroids (Sigmodontinae: Phyllotini) from the Early Pleistocene of Argentina: Phylogeny and paleoecology. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 18:640-649.
- STEPPAN SJ, RM ADKINS, and J ANDERSON. 2004. Phylogeny and divergence-date estimates of rapid radiations in muroid rodents based on multiple nuclear genes. Systematic Biology 53:533-553.

- TAMMONE M, A HAJDUK, P ARIAS, P TETA, E LACEY, and UFJ PARDIÑAS. 2014. Last Glacial Maximum environments in northwestern Patagonia revealed by fossil small mammals. Quaternary Research 82:198-208.
- TETA P. 2013. Relaciones filogenéticas de la tribu Abrotrichini (Rodentia, Cricetidae): análisis separados y combinados de evidencias morfológicas y moleculares. Doctoral thesis, Facultad de Ciencias Naturales y Museo, Universidad Nacional de La Plata, La Plata, Buenos Aires, Argentina.
- STAMATAKIS A, P HOOVER, and J ROUGEMONT. 2008. A rapid bootstrap algorithm for the RAxML Web Servers. SystematicBiology57:758-771.
- VENTURA K, MJ SILVA, L GEISE, Y LEITE, UFJ PARDIÑAS, Y YONENAGA-YASSUDA, and G D'ELÍA. 2013. The phylogenetic position of the enigmatic Atlantic forest-endemic spiny mouse *Abrawayaomys* (Rodentia: Sigmodontinae). Zoological Studies 52:55 doi:10.1186/1810-522X-52-55.
- VOSS RS. 1988. Systematics and ecology of Ichthyomyinae rodents (Muroidea): Patterns of morphological evolution in a small adaptative radiation. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 188:259-493.
- VOSS RS. 1991. An introduction to the Neotropical muroid rodent genus *Zygodontomys*. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 210:1–113.
- WARD RT. 1965. Beech (*Nothofagus*) forests in the Andes of Southwestern Argentina. The American Midland Naturalist 74:50-56.
- WEKSLER M. 2006. Phylogenetic relationships of oryzomine rodents (Muroidea: Sigmodontinae): separate and combined analyses of morphological and molecular data. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 296:1-149.
- WILGENBUSCH JC, DL WARREN, and DL SWOFFORD 2004. AWTY: A system for graphical exploration of MCMC convergence in Bayesian phylogenetic inference. http://ceb.csit.fsu.edu/awty.

APPENDIX I

Specimens examined, including dried specimens as well as fluid preserved animals, are housed in the following mammal collections: Colección de Mamíferos del Centro Nacional Patagónico (CNP; Puerto Madryn, Chubut, Argentina), Colección de Material de Egagrópilas y Afines "Elio Massoia" (CNP-E; Puerto Madryn, Chubut, Argentina); Colección Nacional de Mastozoología, Museo Argentino de Ciencias Naturales "Bernardino Rivadavia" (MACN; Buenos Aires, Argentina), Museum of Vertebrate Zoology (MVZ; Berkeley, California, USA).

Euneomys chinchilloides (n = 27). Argentina: Chubut, cercanías de Esquel (CNP 4), Cañadón de la Madera, Sierra de Tepuel (CNP 2388, 2422-2424), Altiplanicie del Somuncura, Laguna Blanca (CNP 2406-2421); Establecimiento La Maroma (CNP 4420, 4429, 4621); Santa Cruz, nacimiento río Ecker (CNP 3674), estancia La Ensenada (CNP 2427, 3641).

Euneomys mordax (n = 2). Argentina: Neuquén, 1.5 km S Copahue (town) (MVZ 183288, 183289).

Irenomys tarsalis (n = 7). Argentina: Depto. Huiliches, Arroyo de las Tierras Coloradas, 1 km E and 2.4 km S Cerro del Chivo (MVZ 163459); Neuquén, Depto. Los Lagos, 3 km NW Confluencia (MVZ 159421), Pilolil (CNP 730) Loma Redonda, Ruca Hué, San Martín de los Andes (CNP 3642); Chubut, lago La Plata (CNP 731); Río Negro, Alto Río Villegas (CNP 778). Chile: Los Lagos, Osorno, Valle de La Picada, 715 m (UACH 2179).

Neotomys ebriosus (n = 35). Argentina: Salta, San Antonio de los Cobres (CNP 3639, 3640); San Juan, San Guillermo (30 uncatalogued from owl pellets). Perú, Puno, 13 mi ENE Crucero, Abra Aricoma (MVZ 139590); Arequipa, 2 km W Sumbay (MVZ 174043).

APPENDIX II

Taxon sampling and access codes for 4 nuclear (BRAC1, IRBP, GHR and RAG1) and 1 mitochondrial (Cytb) markers used in the phylogenetic analyses conducted in this paper.

	BRAC1	GHR	IRBP	RAG1	Cytb
Abrawayaomys ruschii			JX949185		JX949189
Abrothrix longipilis	KC953152	KC953233	KC953347	KC953469	U03530
Aegialomys xanthaeolus		KC953234	KC953349	KC953470	AY163628
Akodon boliviensis		KC953236	KC953351	AY294960	АКОМТСҮТВА
Amphinectomys savamis			AY163579		EU579480
Andalgalomys pearsoni	KC953155	KC953241	KC953355	AY963176	JQ434418
Andinomys edax	KC95315	KC953242	KC953356	AY294964	JQ434419
Arvicola terrestris		AM392380	AY277407		AY275106
Auliscomys sublimis	KC953159	KC953244	KC953359	AY294965	JQ434421
Baiomys musculus		KC953245	KC953360	KC953479	EF989933
Bibimys labiosus			AY277436		DQ444329
Blarinomys breviceps			AY277437		AY275112
Brucepattersonius igniventris	KC953162	KC953247	AY277438	KC953482	AY277486ª
Calassomys apicalis			JQ434417		JQ434425
Calomys callosus	KC953163	KC953248	AY277440	KC953483	DQ447282
Cerradomys subflavus		KC953251	AY163626	KC953486	AF181274
Chelemys macronyx		KC953252	AY277441		U03533
Chinchillula sahamae			KC953364	KC953487	JQ434422
Clethrionomys gapperi	AY295010A	F540623	AY326080	AY294952	AY309431
Cricetulus migratorius		AY294926	KC953367	AY294956	AY288508
Cricetus cricetus	KC953168	KC953253	AY277410	KC953488	AJ490302
Delomys dorsalis		KC953255	KC953369	KC953491	KF317031
Deltamys kempi			AY277444		AY195862
Drymoreomys albimaculatus			EU649042		EU579487
Eligmodontia typus			AY277445		AF108692
Euneomys chinchilloides	KC953172	KC953259	AY277446	KC953498	AY275115
Euryoryzomys macconnelli			AY163620		GU126538
Galenomys garleppi			JQ434410		JQ434423
Geoxus valdivianus			AY277448		AY275116
Graomys griseoflavus			AY277449		AY275117
Handleyomys intectus			AY163584		EU579490
Holochilus brasiliensis			AY163585		GU126517
Hylaeamys megacephalus			AY163621		AY275124
Irenomvs tarsalis	KC953182	KC953268	AY277450	AY294962	ITU03534

(Append	ix II	cont.)
---------	-------	--------

	BRAC1	GHR	IRBP	RAG1	Cytb
Isthmomys pirrensis		EF989747	EF989847		DQ836298
Iuliomys pictipes	KC953183	KC953269	KC953385	KC953510	AF108688
Juscelinomys huanchacae			AY277452		AY275119
Kunsia tomentosus			KC953386	KC953511	AY275121
Lenoxus apicalis	KC953185	KC953270	KC953388	KC953512	U03541
Loxodontomys micropus		KC953273	AY277457	AY963183	AY275122
Melanomys caliginosus	KC953191	KC953275	KC953397	KC953521	EU340020
Mesocricetus auratus	AY295013	AF540632	AY163591	AY294955	AM904612
Microryzomys minutus		KC953276	AY163592	KC953522	AF108698
Microtus californicus		KC953277	KC953401	KC953523	EF506105
Myospalaxas palax	KC953192	KC953281	AY326097	KC953525	AF326272
Neacomys spinosus		KC953284	KC953406	KC953528	AF108701
Necromys amoenus	KC953193	KC953285	AY277458	KC953529	AY273911
Nectomys squamipes	KC953194	KC953287	EU273419	KC953531	GU126522
Neomicroxus latebricola			KF437367		KF437365
Neotoma floridana	KC953195	N/A ^b	KC953411	AY294959	AF294344
Neotomys ebriosus		KC953290	KC953413	KC953536	JQ434424
Nephelomys keaysi		KC953291	KC953414	KC953537	EU579505°
Nesomys rufus	KC953197	KC953292	AY326099	KC953539	AF160592
Nesoryzomys narboroughi			AY163600		GU126523
Notiomys edwardsii	KC953200	KC953294	KC953420	KC953542	U03537
Nyctomys sumichrasti	KC953201	KC953296	KC953421		AY195801
Oecomys concolor	KC953203	KC953299	KC953424	KC953545	JF693876
Oligoryzomys fulvescens	KC953204	KC953301	AY163611	KC953547	GU126529
Onychomys leucogaster		KC953303	EF989860	KC953550	EF989959
Oreoryzomys balneator			AY163617		GU126535
Oryzomys palustris	KC953205	KC953304	AY163623	KC953551	GU126539
Ototylomys phyllotis	AY295018	AY294932	KC953429	KC953553	AY009789
Oxymycterus nasutus	KC953206	KC953307	KC953431	KC953555	AF175286
Pearsonomys annectens			AY851749		AF108672
Peromyscus leucopus	AY295014	AY294927	EF989880	AY294957	EF989979
Phaenomys ferruginosus			KM065877		KM065876
Phodopus sungorus	AY295012	AF540640	KC953439	AY294954	AJ973390
Phyllotis xanthopygus	KC953208	KC953314	AY163632	KC953561	U86833
Pseudoryzomys simplex		KC953317	AY163633	KC953564	GU126547
Punomys kofordi	KC953209	KC953318	KC953445	KC953565	JQ434426
Reithrodon auritus	KC953212	AY294930	AY277472	AY294963	EU579474

	BRAC1	GHR	IRBP	RAG1	Cytb
Reithrodontomys fulvescens	AY295015	AY294928	EF989904	AY294958	EF990003
Rhagomys longilingua			DQ003723		AY206770 ^d
Rheomys thomasi		KC960491	KC953451		KJ921706 ^e
Rhipidomys macconnelli	KC953213	KC953324	AY277474	KC953573	AY275130
Salinomys delicatus			JQ434415		EU377608
Scapteromys tumidus		KC953326	AY277477	KC953576	AY275133
Scolomys juruaensis		KC953327	KC953454	KC953577	AF108696
Scotinomys teguina	KC953216	KC953328	AY277415	KC953578	AF108705
Sigmodon hispidus	AY295016	AF540641	AY277479	AY241465	AF425227
Sigmodontomys alfari	KC953219	KC953332	AY163641	KC953582	EU074635
Sooretamys angouya		KC953333	KC953456	KC953583	GU126534
Tapecomys wolffsohni	KC953223	KC953336	KC953460	AY963184	U86835
Thalpomys cerradensis			AY277480		AY273916
Thaptomys nigrita	KC953225	KC953337	AY277482	KC953588	AF108666
Thomasomys aureus	KC953226	KC953338	KC953462	KC953589	U03540
Transandinomys talamancae	KC953228	KC953341	KC953465	KC953592	GU126544
Tylomys nudicaudus	AY295019	AY294933	AY163643	KC953593	DQ179812
Wiedomys pyrrhorhinos		KC953342	AY277485	KC953595	EU579477
Zygodontomys brevicauda	KC953230	KC953344	AY163645	KC953596	GU126549

(Appendix II cont.)

^a Cytb from *Brucepattersonius soricinus*;

^b There is no access code for this marker but the sequence was obtained from Schenk et al. 2013 supplementary material deposited with Dryad (http://datadryad.org,doi:10.5061/dryad.dc34q). The access code (AY294959) entered in the appendix 1 of Schenk et al. corresponds to the recombination activating gene 1 (RAG1) for the same species;

^c Cytb from Nephelomys albigularis;

^d Cytb from *Rhagomys rufescens*;

^e Cytb from *Rheomys raptor*.