



HAL
open science

New dicynodonts (Therapsida, Anomodontia) from near the Permo-Triassic boundary of Laos: implications for dicynodont survivorship across the Permo-Triassic mass extinction and the paleobiogeography of Southeast Asian blocks

Chloe Olivier, Bernard Battail, Sylvie Bourquin, Camille Rossignol,
J.-Sébastien Steyer, Nour-Eddine Jalil

► To cite this version:

Chloe Olivier, Bernard Battail, Sylvie Bourquin, Camille Rossignol, J.-Sébastien Steyer, et al.. New dicynodonts (Therapsida, Anomodontia) from near the Permo-Triassic boundary of Laos: implications for dicynodont survivorship across the Permo-Triassic mass extinction and the paleobiogeography of Southeast Asian blocks. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*, 2019, 39 (2), pp.e1584745. 10.1080/02724634.2019.1584745 . insu-02106957

HAL Id: insu-02106957

<https://insu.hal.science/insu-02106957>

Submitted on 16 Nov 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



New dicynodonts (Therapsida, Anomodontia) from near the Permo–Triassic boundary of Laos: implications for dicynodont survivorship across the Permo–Triassic mass extinction and the paleobiogeography of Southeast Asian Blocks

Journal:	<i>Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology</i>
Manuscript ID	JVP-2017-0053.R3
Manuscript Type:	Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Olivier, Chloé; Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle; Sorbonne Université Battail, Bernard; Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle Bourquin, Sylvie; Université de Rennes 1 Rossignol, Camille; Universidade Federal de Ouro Preto Steyer, Jean-Sébastien; Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle Jalil, Nour-Eddine; Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle; Université Cayi Ayyad
Key Words:	Dicynodontia, Laos, Paleobiogeography, Paleogeography, Permo–Triassic boundary

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 New dicynodonts (Therapsida, Anomodontia) from near the
4
5
6 Permo–Triassic boundary of Laos: implications for dicynodont
7
8
9 survivorship across the Permo–Triassic mass extinction and the
10
11
12 paleobiogeography of Southeast Asian Blocks
13

14 CHLOE OLIVIER, *,¹ BERNARD BATTAIL, ¹ SYLVIE BOURQUIN, ² CAMILLE

15 ROSSIGNOL, ³ J. -SEBASTIEN STEYER, ¹ and NOUR-EDDINE JALIL^{1,4}

16 ¹ CR2P -Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie –Paris, MNHN –Sorbonne Université

17 –CNRS, 57 rue Cuvier, CP 38, F-75005, Paris, France, chloe.olivier@mnhn.fr,

18 bernard.battail@mnhn.fr, jean-sebastien.steyer@mnhn.fr, nour-eddine.jalil@mnhn.fr;

19 ² Univ Rennes, CNRS, Géosciences Rennes, UMR 6118, 35000 Rennes, France,

20 sylvie.bourquin@univ-rennes1.fr;

21 ³ Universidade de São Paulo, Departamento de Geofísica, Instituto de Astronomia,

22 Geofísica e Ciências Atmosféricas – Rua do Matão, 1226 - Cidade Universitária,

23 Butantã – 05508-090 São Paulo – SP, Brazil

24 camil.rossignol@gmail.com;

25 ⁴ Université Cadi Ayyad, Faculté des Sciences Semlalia, Laboratoire Biodiversité et

26 Dynamique des Ecosystèmes, Boulevard Prince My Abdellah, 40000 Marrakech,

27 Maroc.

28 *Corresponding author

29
30
31 OLIVIER ET AL.–NEW DICYNODONTS FROM NEAR THE PERMO-TRIASSIC
32
33 BOUNDARY OF LAOS
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 ABSTRACT—The dicynodonts are an emblematic group of herbivorous therapsids,
4
5 which survived the Permo–Triassic (P–Tr) crisis. Laotian dicynodonts from
6
7 stratigraphically constrained beds, recently dated using the U–Pb zircon method,
8
9 yield new insights into terrestrial faunas of Southeast Asia during latest Permian and
10
11 the earliest Triassic. Summarily described, they were attributed to the genus
12
13 *Dicynodon*. We provide a new phylogenetic analysis for Laotian dicynodonts, based
14
15 on three well-preserved skulls indicating that they belong to two new species:
16
17 *Counillonia superoculis* gen. et sp. nov. and *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp.
18
19 nov. Our phylogenetic analysis within Dicynodontia indicate that 1) *Counillonia* is
20
21 closely related to some “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa; and 2) *Repelinosaurus* is a
22
23 kannemeyeriiform. The phylogenetic affinities of these new Laotian dicynodonts allow
24
25 discussing the survivorship of multiple lineages (Kannemeyeriiformes and
26
27 “*Dicynodon*”-grade dicynodontoids) across the P–Tr crisis. The Laotian dicynodonts
28
29 also shed new light on the paleobiogeography of the Southeast Asia from the late
30
31 Paleozoic to the early Mesozoic, particularly about the timing of collisions between
32
33 the Indochina, the South China and the North China blocks. The presence of
34
35 dicynodonts in Laos most likely in the Early Triassic thus implies that the connection
36
37 between the Indochina Block and South China Block occurred no later than the latest
38
39 Permian or earliest Triassic (i.e., when the dicynodonts provide direct evidence for a
40
41 connection).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INTRODUCTION

The dicynodonts are emblematic Permian and Triassic (P–Tr) therapsids. They constitute an important component of the terrestrial P–Tr fauna and were the dominant herbivores in their ecosystems (Cluver and King, 1983). As such, dicynodonts represent a key group for understanding the impact of the P–Tr crisis on terrestrial environments. Known Early Triassic dicynodont genera include the cosmopolitan speciose *Lystrosaurus*, the small-bodied emydopoids *Myosaurus* from South Africa/Antarctica and *Kombuisia* from Antarctica, and the Chinese kannemeyeriiform *Sungeodon* (Fröbisch et al., 2010; Maisch and Matzke, 2014).

In North China, Liu et al. (2013) used U–Pb zircon method (based on zircon U–Pb sensitive high-resolution ion microprobe [SHRIMP] dating) within the Ermaying and Tongchuan dicynodont-bearing formations (with the kannemeyeriiform genera *Shansiodon* and *Sinokannemeyeria*) and dated them to Early to Middle Triassic. More recently, the higher-resolution chemical abrasion-thermal ionization mass spectrometry (CA–TIMS) dated these formations as Middle Triassic (Anisian–Ladinian) (Liu et al., 2018). Thus, the main kannemeyeriiform radiation seems to have occurred after the beginning of the Triassic, with roughly 40 species known by the Middle Triassic (Fröbisch, 2008).

The first record of dicynodonts in Laos (Southeast Asia) dates back to the 19th century: Counillon (1896) mentioned a poorly-preserved and incomplete skull found in the Purple Claystone Formation (Fm) of the Luang Prabang Basin, northern Laos (Fig. 1A). This specimen was first studied by Repelin (1923), who assigned it to a new species of *Dicynodon*, *D. incisivum*, which he considered to be closely related to *Dicynodon orientalis* from the Panchet Fm of India. Later, Das Gupta (1922)

1
2
3 transferred *D. orientalis* to the genus *Lystrosaurus* and Woodward (1932), followed
4
5 by Yuan and Young (1934), attributed Counillon's specimen to *Lystrosaurus*.
6
7 Piveteau (1938) redescribed the specimen and brought the specimen back to
8
9 *Dicynodon*. Based on this study, Battail (2009) and Kammerer et al. (2011) also
10
11 favored this taxonomic attribution. Nevertheless this specimen continued to be
12
13 mentioned as *Lystrosaurus* without further comment (Keyser and Cruickshank, 1979;
14
15 King, 1988). The Counillon's specimen has unfortunately been lost, preventing
16
17 further investigations. The illustrations accompanying the original description cannot
18
19 be interpreted with confidence (Colbert, 1982; Kammerer et al., 2011). The taxon
20
21 "*Dicynodon incisivum*" should then be considered a nomen dubium (as pointed out by
22
23 many authors, e.g., Battail, 2009; Fröbisch, 2009; Kammerer et al., 2011).
24
25
26

27
28 Between 1993 and 2003, Franco-Laotian expeditions led by P. Taquet (MNHN,
29
30 Paris, France) collected an abundant dicynodont remains from the Purple Claystone
31
32 Fm of the Luang Prabang Basin. Among these fossils, three dicynodont skulls (LPB
33
34 1993-2, LPB 1993-3, and LPB 1995-9) were tentatively ascribed to the genus
35
36 *Dicynodon* by Battail (2009). However, no phylogenetic analysis has been performed
37
38 on these specimens and their relationships with other dicynodonts remain equivocal.
39
40

41
42 The age of these specimens, collected in the Purple Claystone Fm, has long been
43
44 a subject of debate. Indeed, this formation was first been attributed to the Early
45
46 Triassic (Counillon, 1896; Repelin, 1923; Piveteau, 1938), but was later considered to
47
48 be Late Triassic to Middle Jurassic in age (Saurin, 1962). Based on the dicynodont
49
50 skulls and their supposed attribution to the genus *Dicynodon* (Battail, 2009), this
51
52 formation was considered to be late Permian in age (Battail, 2009). Recent
53
54 geochronological analyses (based on U–Pb detrital zircons dated by Laser Ablation
55
56 Induction Coupled Plasma Mass Spectroscopy [LA ICPMS]) performed on
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 volcaniclastic rocks from the Purple Claystone Fm suggest a maximum depositional
4
5 age of 251.0 ± 1.4 Ma (Table 1) (Rossignol et al., 2016).
6
7

8 This temporal framework thus allows us to document dicynodont survivorship and
9
10 post-extinction recovery in a P–Tr basin located outside the classic extensively
11
12 studied Russian (e.g., Benton et al., 2004) and South African ones (e.g., Ward et al.,
13
14 2005; Smith and Botha-Brink, 2014; Viglietti et al., 2018). The fauna preserved in the
15
16 Luang Prabang Basin also offers new evidence concerning the paleobiogeography of
17
18 dicynodonts.
19

20
21 Here, we provide detailed description of the three Laotian skulls (LPB 1993-2, LPB
22
23 1993-3, and LPB 1995-9), which represent two new taxa. Phylogenetic analysis is
24
25 then performed to test the relationships of these new taxa within Dicynodontia.
26
27

28 **Institutional Abbreviations**—**BP**, Evolutionary Studies Institute (formerly known
29
30 as the Bernard Price Institute for Palaeontological Research and the Institute for
31
32 Human Evolution), Johannesburg, South Africa; **LPB**, Laotian specimens found in the
33
34 Luang Prabang Basin currently in the Savannakhet Dinosaur Museum, Savannakhet,
35
36 Laos; **MCZ**, Museum of Comparative Zoology, Harvard University, Cambridge,
37
38 Massachusetts, USA; **NHMUK**, Natural History Museum, London, UK.
39
40

41
42 **Anatomical Abbreviations**—**aPt**, anterior ramus of the pterygoid; **Bo**,
43
44 basioccipital; **Ch**, choana; **EcPt**, ectopterygoid; **Eo**, exoccipital; **EpiPt**, epipterygoid;
45
46 **Fm**, foramen magnum; **Fr**, frontal; **Ip**, interparietal; **Ipv**, interpterygoid vacuity; **Ju**,
47
48 jugal; **La**, lacrimal; **Laf**, lacrimal foramen; **Lbf**, labial fossa; **mPt**, median plate of the
49
50 pterygoid; **Mx**, maxilla; **Na**, nasal; **Oct**, occipital tuber; **Opt**, opisthotic; **Pa**, parietal;
51
52 **Pal**, palatine; **Pant**, pila antotica; **Pbs**, parabasisphenoid; **Pi**, pineal foramen; **Pm**,
53
54 premaxilla; **Po**, postorbital; **Pp**, preparietal; **PrF**, prefrontal; **Q**, quadrate; **Qj**,
55
56 quadratojugal; **qPt**, quadrate ramus of the pterygoid; **Smx**, septomaxillae; **So**,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 supraoccipital; **Sq**, squamosal; **T**, tusk; **Tpf**, posttemporal fenestra; **Vo**, vomer; **Va**,
4
5 vagus nerve aperture.
6
7
8
9

10 GEOLOGICAL SETTING

11
12
13

14 The Luang Prabang Basin, located in the Indochina Block (Fig. 1A), was originally
15 studied by Counillon (1896) and consists of an asymmetric NE–SW (Northeast–
16 Southwest) syncline with NE–SW thrusts separating the Purple Claystone Fm and
17 the Limestone and Sandstone Fm to the North from younger formations to the South
18 (Fig. 1B; Blanchard et al., 2013).
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 The Limestone and Sandstone Fm is made up of shallow marine deposits, dated
26 to the late Changhsingian on the basis of its ammonoid remains (Blanchard et al.,
27 2013). These marine deposits are overlain by black claystone layers, containing a
28 typical Cathaysian flora (Bercovici et al., 2012).
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The Limestone and Sandstone Fm is overlain by the Purple Claystone Fm, from
36 which various fossil remains have been excavated (dicynodonts and a
37 chroniosuchian; Steyer, 2009; Arbez et al., 2018). The Purple Claystone Fm is mainly
38 composed of homogeneous silty-claystones, silts, and more rarely clays (Bercovici et
39 al., 2012). The formation also comprises volcanoclastic siltstones and sandstones,
40 with millimetric to centimetric rounded and highly-weathered volcanoclasts (up to
41 about 20 vol.%). These volcanoclasts exhibit a variety of volcanic textures (microlithic,
42 trachytic, porphyritic), and are sometimes embedded within lithic fragments, attesting
43 to multiple reworking events for these volcanoclasts (Bercovici et al., 2012; Blanchard
44 et al., 2013). The Purple Claystone Fm also contains subordinate amounts of coarser
45 deposits, including sandstone and conglomeratic facies with 3D megaripples typical
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of braided river deposits. Conglomeratic levels consist of rounded pebbles of highly
4 fossiliferous limestones (foraminifers, corals, bryozoans), sub-angular to rounded
5 pebbles of volcanic rocks, black cherts, red quartzites, red sandstones, and
6 siltstones. Paleosols, sometimes exhibiting vertical root traces, are developed within
7 this formation (Bercovici et al., 2012). The sedimentary facies association indicates
8 braided river depositional environments, evolving vertically to alluvial plain
9 environments, probably including ponds (Bercovici et al., 2012).

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 Three samples from the Purple Claystone Fm, including one collected at the
20 dicynodont site (Fig. 1C), were dated using U–Pb geochronology on detrital zircon
21 (Rossignol et al., 2016). The sample collected at the dicynodont fossil site yielded a
22 maximum depositional age of 252.0 ± 2.6 Ma, whereas the other volcanoclastic
23 samples collected in the same formation yield maximum depositional ages of $251.0 \pm$
24 1.4 Ma and 300.5 ± 3.7 Ma (Table 1). The various volcanoclastic textures, their
25 roundness, the relatively low volcanoclast content (below 20%) implying an important
26 and protracted mixing with other detrital particles, as well as the fact that some of the
27 volcanoclasts underwent at least two sedimentary cycles (Bercovici et al., 2012;
28 Blanchard et al., 2013), suggest that these dates, obtained from zircon grains
29 interpreted as being detrital in origin, represent maximum depositional ages. The
30 actual age of deposition of the Purple Claystone Fm is therefore likely to be younger.
31 Both youngest maximum depositional ages (i.e., 252.0 ± 2.6 Ma and 251.0 ± 1.4 Ma)
32 encompass the P–Tr boundary (251.902 ± 0.024 Ma; Burgess et al., 2014) within
33 uncertainties. The consideration of a late Permian age, potentially plausible, would
34 nonetheless imply that the reworking of the zircon grains took place within an unlikely
35 brief time span. Given the age of the overlying formation (224.9 ± 1.0 Ma; Blanchard
36 et al., 2013), an age up to the Carnian could be proposed as the theoretical upper
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 age limit for the Purple Claystone Fm. However, the occurrence of a regional Middle
4
5 Triassic unconformity (e.g., Racey, 2009), probably superimposed onto the reverse
6
7 fault separating the Purple Claystone Fm from other sedimentary units to the SE (Fig.
8
9 1B), reduces the likely time span for the deposition of the Purple Claystone Fm. As a
10
11 consequence, an Early Triassic age for the Purple Claystone Fm and its enclosed
12
13 fossils is considered as the most likely.
14
15
16
17

18 SYSTEMATIC PALEONTOLOGY 19

20
21
22
23
24 The interpretation of the cranial bone contacts is based either on direct observations
25
26 of the scarce preserved sutures or on relief differences. When possible, some
27
28 sutures were deduced from the contacts between the surrounding bones.
29
30
31

32
33 THERAPSIDA Broom, 1905

34
35 ANOMODONTIA Owen, 1860

36
37 DICYNODONTIA Owen, 1860

38
39 DICYNODONTOIDEA Olson, 1944

40
41
42 *COUNILLONIA* gen. nov.
43
44
45
46

47 **Type Species**—*Counillonia superoculis* gen. et sp. nov., monotypic.

48
49 **Etymology**—In honour of the French geologist Jean-Baptiste-Henri Counillon,
50
51 member of the Pavie Missions, who was the first to mention the occurrence of
52
53 dicynodonts in the Luang Prabang Basin (Counillon, 1896; see Steyer, 2009 for a
54
55 biography).
56
57

58 **Diagnosis**—See diagnosis of the type species.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

COUNILLONIA SUPEROCULIS gen. et sp. nov.

(Fig. 2)

Etymology—From the Latin *oculis* (dative plural of *oculus*, eye) and *super* (upwards), referring to its largely dorsally opening orbits due to an especially narrow interorbital bar.

Holotype—LPB 1993-3, a skull without mandible (basal length: 16.02 cm, maximum width: 13.41 cm). The posterior side of the left orbit, the quadrates, and the stapes are missing. The dorsal surfaces of the premaxilla, nasals, prefrontals, and frontals are partially eroded. The preparietal, prootic, and epipterygoid are poorly preserved.

Geographic Distribution and Stratigraphic Range—The specimen LPB 1993-3 (19° 55' 59" N, E 102° 07' 41" E) was discovered in the Purple Claystone Fm, Luang Prabang Basin (Laos). This formation was initially attributed to the Early Triassic by Counillon (1896) then to the late Permian by Battail (2009). Recent geochronological (U–Pb on detrital zircon; Rossignol et al., 2016) analyses suggest a maximum depositional age of 251.0 ± 1.4 Ma (see “Geological setting” above).

Diagnosis—Medium-sized dicynodontoid characterized by the unique combination of the following character states: a reduced premaxillary secondary palate; a naso-frontal suture with a distinct posterior process; a narrow intertemporal bar; a reduced temporal fenestra; a pineal foramen located in the posterior quarter of the dorsal skull length; an acute angle of the squamosal wings in lateral view; zygomatic squamosal rami posteriorly inserted at mid-height of the occiput; a relatively large median pterygoid plate; high-angled posterior pterygoid rami; anterior

1
2
3 rami of the pterygoids ventrally highly expanded; a long interpterygoid vacuity; no
4
5 intertuberal ridge; distinct exoccipital and basioccipital contributions to the occipital
6
7 condyle; a very sharp and posteriorly directed lateral edge of the paroccipital
8
9 process, which is distinctly offset from the surface of the occipital plate. The naso-
10
11 frontal suture with a distinct posterior process distinguishes *Counillonia* from the
12
13 Laotian *Repelinosaurus* and “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa. Further distinguished from
14
15 closely related “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa by a pineal foramen located far posteriorly
16
17 and a large median pterygoid plate. Further distinguished from *Repelinosaurus* by an
18
19 anteriorly-directed caniniform process, a narrow interorbital bar, a triangular occiput,
20
21 and zygomatic squamosal rami posteriorly inserted at mid-height of the occiput.
22
23
24

25
26 **Description**—The skull is slender and short, with a short preorbital region and a
27
28 narrow snout. In dorsal view, the skull is relatively broad with zygomatic arches
29
30 laterally expanded. The combination of the laterally bowed zygomatic arches and
31
32 narrow interorbital result in notably dorsally-directed orbits (Fig. 2A). The surfaces of
33
34 the premaxilla, the maxillae, the nasals, the frontals, and the postorbitals are
35
36 weathered. Because of this, the mid-nasal, naso-premaxillary, preparieto-frontal, and
37
38 postorbital-parietal sutures are not visible (Fig. 2A). The absence of visible sutural
39
40 contacts in the weathered narial region precludes determination of the possible
41
42 presence of the septomaxillae (Fig. 2B). It is thus not clear whether the septomaxillae
43
44 form part of the ventrolateral margin of the nares, which seem to be formed only by
45
46 the premaxilla anteriorly, the nasals dorsolaterally, and the maxillae ventrolaterally. In
47
48 addition, the bone contacts cannot be discerned on the occiput, nor along the medial
49
50 partition of the temporal and orbital fossae (Fig. 2B, D).
51
52
53
54

55
56 The short premaxilla is fused and forms the anterior portion of the snout that
57
58 constricts and ends in a squared tip. The tip of the snout shows weak ventral
59
60

1
2
3 curvature in anterior view (not figured here) as in *Tropidostoma* and *Aulacephalodon*
4
5 (Kammerer and Smith, 2017). However, this curvature and possible ridges or
6
7 rugosities cannot be confirmed due to the poor preservation of the dorsal surface of
8
9 the premaxilla. The premaxilla contributes to the external anterior edge of the naris.
10
11 The large narial opening is situated near the anterior and ventral edges of the snout,
12
13 and contributes to more than a third of the surface of the snout (Fig. 2B). The
14
15 external ventral margin of the naris is visible in dorsal view (Fig. 2A). The premaxilla
16
17 contacts the nasals posterodorsally and the maxilla posterolaterally at the level of the
18
19 anterior third of the nares. In ventral view, the premaxilla bears two thin parallel
20
21 longitudinal ridges (the anterior palatal ridges) that surround a wide, median
22
23 longitudinal depression and extend beyond the anterior third of the palatal surface
24
25 (Fig. 2C). This depression turns posteriorly into a sharp crest (the median palatal
26
27 ridge), which extends to the vomer posteriorly and is flanked on either side by flat
28
29 depressions. The height of this longitudinal ridge increases posteriorly. On the palatal
30
31 surface, the premaxilla contacts the maxillae laterally. The absence of visible sutures
32
33 between the premaxilla and the palatines yields no information about a potential
34
35 contact (Fig. 2C). The nasals bear a median, rugose and well-developed boss, which
36
37 extends onto the bones bordered by two wide elongated depressions that broaden
38
39 posteriorly and terminate on the frontals (Fig. 2A). However, as mentioned above, the
40
41 poor preservation of the snout surface precludes firm conclusions to be reached
42
43 about the original external relief of the nasals. The nasals are surrounded by the
44
45 frontals and the prefrontals posteriorly, the premaxilla anteriorly, and the maxillae and
46
47 lacrimals laterally (Fig. 2A, B).

48
49 The prefrontals form the anterodorsal edge of the orbits. On the external surface of
50
51 the skull, they contact the frontals medially, the lacrimals laterally, and the nasals
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 anteriorly (Fig. 2A). A single rugose boss is visible on each prefrontal. However, as
4
5 already noted for the nasals, there is no reliable information about the original relief
6
7 of the bones due to the poor preservation of their external surfaces.
8

9
10 The frontals form the major part of the skull roof (Fig. 2A). The sutures of the
11
12 frontals can be discerned along their contact with the postorbitals, the prefrontals,
13
14 and the nasals, as well as the interfrontal one (Fig. 2A). The external surface of the
15
16 skull roof is poorly preserved; the presence of postfrontals cannot be confirmed in
17
18 LPB 1993-3. The naso-frontal suture has a distinct posterior process. The dorsal
19
20 margin of the orbits seems to be largely made up of the frontals. Apart from a small
21
22 chip of bone missing on the right dorsal margin of the orbit, the rest of its margin
23
24 appears to be preserved, with a symmetry of the lateral margins of the orbits and
25
26 continuous lateral borders. The interorbital region is broader than the intertemporal
27
28 bar (Fig. 2A).
29
30
31

32
33 The preparietal is strongly weathered and its anterior part is missing. However, its
34
35 posterior region displays a small bulge anterior to the pineal foramen, the relief
36
37 possibly being due to its poor preservation (Fig. 2A). The contact between the
38
39 preparietal and the nearby bone (the postorbitals, the frontals, and the preparietal)
40
41 cannot be determined.
42

43
44 The dorsal exposure of the parietals is limited to a midline groove between the
45
46 posterior postorbital processes (Fig. 2A). The parietals then contact the postorbitals
47
48 laterally and dorsally. External sutural contacts between the parietals and the frontals
49
50 are invisible due to the poor preservation of the preparietal and the eroded external
51
52 surface of the skull roof. The pineal foramen is surrounded by the parietals
53
54 posteriorly, and by the preparietal anteriorly. The oval pineal foramen, with a length of
55
56 1.36 cm and a width of 0.96 cm (Table 2), has its long axis perpendicular to the axis
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of the intertemporal bar. It is located in the posterior quarter of the skull roof
4
5 (continuous character 7, Appendix 1).
6
7

8 The slender postorbitals have lateral and posterior processes. The posterior
9
10 postorbital process merges along the intertemporal bar, posterior to the pineal
11
12 foramen (Fig. 2A). The temporal portion of the postorbitals appears to be oblique with
13
14 a dorsolateral orientation. However, the poor preservation of the external surface of
15
16 the postorbital does not allow confirmation of this orientation with certainty. The
17
18 posterior postorbital region is thinner than the preorbital one (Fig. 2A). The
19
20 postorbitals extend along almost the entire intertemporal bar, bordering the temporal
21
22 fossae medially and anteriorly (Fig. 2A). They thus constitute the posterior margin of
23
24 the orbits. On their external surface, the posterior postorbital processes contact
25
26 mainly the squamosals and to a lesser degree the interparietal posteriorly, the
27
28 parietals medially, and the frontals anteriorly. As mentioned above, no reliable
29
30 information can be provided on the contact between the postorbitals, the frontals, and
31
32 the preparietal. The lateral postorbital processes have a sutural contact with the
33
34 jugals anteroventrally and the zygomatic squamosal processes posteroventrally (Fig.
35
36 2B).
37
38
39
40

41 The maxillae form the largest part of the lateral surface of the snout. They contact
42
43 the premaxilla anteriorly, the lacrimals and the nasals dorsally (Fig. 2B). The maxillo-
44
45 nasal suture lies on the dorsal edge of the nares. There is no sutural contact between
46
47 the maxillae and the prefrontals due to the anterior expansion of the lacrimals that
48
49 contacts the nasals. The maxillary zygomatic process is posteriorly pointed, and
50
51 contacts the squamosal posteriorly and the jugal dorsally (Fig. 2B). The maxillae bear
52
53 short caniniform processes housing tusks. The dorsal edge of the erupted portion of
54
55 the tusk is anterior to the anterior edge of the orbits. The caniniform processes and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the tusks face anteriorly. The tusks have a sub-circular basal section (Fig. 2C; Table
4 2). On the ventral surface, no maxillary teeth are observed except the tusks (Fig. 2C).

5
6
7
8 The maxillae contact the anterior rami of the pterygoids and the ectopterygoids
9 posteriorly, and the jugals and the squamosals laterally. No boundaries are visible in
10 front of the palatines, and nothing can be confirmed about the extension of medial
11 maxillary processes posterior to the premaxilla. In *Lystrosaurus* (e.g., Cluver, 1971)
12 and *Kannemeyeria lophorhinus* (e.g., the holotype, BP/1/3638, and the specimen
13 formerly referred to *Rechnisaurus cristarhynchus*, NHMUK R11955 [Renaut et al.,
14 2003; C. Olivier, pers. obs., 2018]), these processes exclude the contact between the
15 premaxilla and the palatines. A depression lies on the suture between the maxillae
16 and the pterygoids (Fig. 2B). A broad labial fossa opens posterior to the tusk (Fig.
17 2C). Its boundaries cannot be discerned; however, it is usually surrounded by the
18 maxillae ventrally, the jugals dorsolaterally, and the palatines medially (e.g., Cluver
19 1971). It is therefore not certain whether *Counillonia* has a true labial fossa
20 (circumscribed by the maxillae, the palatines, and the jugals) or a comparable
21 structure to the foramen in dicynodonts such as *Diictodon*, *Endothiodon* or
22 *Dicynodontoides* (e.g., Angielczyk and Kurkin, 2003).
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The lacrimals are relatively triangular in lateral view (Fig. 2B). They contact the
44 nasals and prefrontals dorsally, the maxillae ventrally, and the jugals posteriorly.
45 Their anterior well-developed expansions exclude a maxillo-prefrontal sutural contact.
46 Their sutures within the orbits are not visible. The lacrimals constitute the anterior
47 margin of the orbits with the jugals anteroventrally and the prefrontals anterodorsally
48 (Fig. 2B). Within the orbit, each lacrimal is perforated by a single foramen (Fig. 2A).
49
50
51
52
53
54
55

56 The jugals are longitudinally elongated and form the ventral edge of the orbits (Fig.
57 2B). However, their expansion within the orbits and their natural limits cannot be
58
59
60

1
2
3 discerned due to the absence of visible sutures, as noted above. Visible sutures on
4
5 the lateral side of the skull show a long scarf joint with the maxillae ventrally, a jugal
6
7 posterior process contacting the postorbitals posteriorly, and a small contact with the
8
9 zygomatic squamosal processes ventroposteriorly and the lacrimals anterodorsally
10
11 (Fig. 2B).
12

13
14 The squamosals are triradiate with zygomatic, temporal, and quadrate rami. The
15
16 zygomatic ramus shapes the posterior region of the zygomatic arch (Fig. 2B). In
17
18 dorsal view (Fig. 2A), it widens posteriorly into a wing-shaped structure without a
19
20 folded edge. It becomes narrow in the pointed anterior region, without dorsoventral
21
22 expansion posterior to the postorbital bar (Fig. 2B). The squamosal zygomatic
23
24 processes contact the jugals, the postorbitals, and the maxillae anteriorly (Fig. 2B).
25
26 They circumscribe laterally and partly posteriorly the temporal fossae. The zygomatic
27
28 squamosal rami show a relatively ventral insertion on the back of the skull, at mid-
29
30 height on the occiput (Fig. 2D). On the lateral side, they do not reach the dorsal
31
32 region of the occiput. The temporal processes delimit the temporal fossae
33
34 posteromedially. On their external surface, they contact the postorbitals dorsally. On
35
36 their occipital side, no contact between bones is visible (Fig. 2D). The absence of the
37
38 limits of the tabulars does not allow us to determine whether the squamosals are
39
40 separated from supraoccipitals by the tabulars. The steep angle between the
41
42 temporal and zygomatic processes of the squamosal slightly exceeds 90° (Fig. 2D).
43
44 The wide lateral extensions of the squamosal make an angle of less than 90° with the
45
46 occipital side. A part of the lateral edge of the occiput is thus hidden. The squamosals
47
48 extend posterior to the occipital condyle (Fig. 2C).
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 The lateral surface of the braincase is strongly eroded but bone structures can be
57
58 noted. Although the sutural contacts of the prootics are not visible, the basal part of
59
60

1
2
3 the left pila antotica (not figured here) is preserved. Only the dorsal region of the long
4 and narrow epipterygoids, which contacts the ventral process of the parietals, is
5 preserved. A strong anteroventral depression in the squamosals indicates the
6 connection with the missing quadrates (Fig. 2B).
7
8
9
10

11 The vomer displays a tuberosity turning into a vertical blade, which narrows
12 posteriorly and separates the two choanae (Fig. 2C). The width of the median blade
13 is constant along its length. The vomer contacts the premaxilla anteriorly and the
14 pterygoids posteriorly. It forms the anterior margin of an elongated and ovoid
15 interpterygoid vacuity (Fig. 2C).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24 The palatines border the choanae anterolaterally. The anterior palatine expansions
25 form rugose and textured pads indicating a keratinized covering (Fig. 2C). They
26 narrow posteriorly to form relatively smooth processes. The palatines contact the
27 anterior rami of the pterygoids along their entire lateral scarf joint and are anteriorly
28 bordered by the maxillae. However, as mentioned above, due to the uncertainties
29 about their anterior sutural contact, it is not clear whether they contact the premaxilla.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38 A lateral palatine foramen is present alongside each anterior expanded pad (Fig. 2C).
39

40 Each pterygoid has an anterior ramus and a posterior (or quadrate) ramus. A
41 single median plate connects the two bones and links the four rami. The pterygoids
42 contact the secondary palate and the basicranium (Fig. 2C). Their ventral projections
43 extend strongly anteroventrally, such that they form an anterior depression with the
44 maxillae (Fig. 2B). These anterior pterygoid keels extend along most of the length of
45 the anterior rami. Nevertheless, this extension cannot be precisely measured
46 because the sutures are not visible laterally (Fig. 2B). The anterior rami of the
47 pterygoids merge from the median plate, posterior to the interpterygoid vacuity. The
48 interpterygoid vacuity is thus bordered by the pterygoids posteriorly and the vomer
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 anteriorly. The posterior margin of the vacuity rises flush with the median plate of the
4
5 pterygoids. The ventral surface of the narrow median plate bears a thin crista
6
7 oesophagea (Fig. 2C). The median plate of the pterygoids contacts the
8
9 parabasisphenoid posteriorly and the vomer anteriorly. In addition, a possible
10
11 contribution of the parabasisphenoid to the interpterygoid vacuity cannot be proved.
12
13
14 Two posterior rami of the pterygoids contact the squamosal fossa posteriorly and
15
16 probably the medial condyles of the quadrates laterally.
17

18
19 Despite the absence of visible sutural contacts on the lateral side of the skull, the
20
21 presence of the ectopterygoids is indicated by a variation in bone texture on the
22
23 lateral border of the anterior rami of the pterygoids (Fig. 2B). The ectopterygoids
24
25 have a slender leaf shape and expand laterally along the anterior rami of the
26
27 pterygoids. They do not expand posterior to the palatines in palatal view (Fig. 2C).
28
29
30

31
32 The crista oesophagea continues onto the parabasisphenoid and then diverges
33
34 posteriorly to form the ridges leading to the basitubera (Fig. 2C). The contribution of
35
36 the parabasisphenoid to the fenestra ovalis of the tubera is considerably restricted in
37
38 comparison with the basioccipital. The stapedial facet is ventrolaterally directed and
39
40 its narrow margin mostly extends anteroposteriorly. The paired carotid canals,
41
42 located in the anterior region of the parabasisphenoid in many dicynodonts (e.g.,
43
44 Maisch, 2002; Surkov and Benton, 2004), are not visible here. No intertuberal ridge is
45
46 visible. The basioccipital extends onto the occipital plate and with the exoccipitals
47
48 forms a tripartite occipital condyle (Fig. 2D). The exoccipitals and the basioccipital
49
50 appear not to be fused in the condyle. A circular central depression is located
51
52 between the three occipital sub-condyles. Medially, the exoccipitals border the
53
54 aperture of the vagus nerves (Dutuit, 1988).
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The contacts between the interparietal and the other bones, forming the occipital
4 side and the posterior region of the skull roof, cannot be discerned (Fig. 2D). Despite
5 the eroded surface of the posterior postorbital processes, the interparietal does not
6 seem to contribute to the skull roof (Fig. 2A).
7

8
9
10
11 The occiput is triangular in posterior view (Fig. 2D). Although sutures are not
12 clearly preserved, the overall similarity of the occiputs of the *Counillonia* type
13 specimens to those of other dicynodonts (Cluver, 1971: *Lystrosaurus*; Cluver &
14 Hotton III, 1981: *Dicynodon* and *Diictodon*) suggests that they shared a similar
15 construction of the occiput. The teardrop-shaped foramen magnum may be laterally
16 bordered by the exoccipitals, which overhang the basioccipital as in other
17 dicynodonts. They would also contact the supraoccipital dorsally, the opisthotics
18 laterally, and the basioccipital ventrally. A central depression on the supraoccipitals
19 overhangs the foramen magnum and is dorsally bordered by a weak transverse
20 nuchal crest, which extends upwards towards the interparietal. The extent of the
21 tabulars cannot be determined. The broad oval post-temporal fenestrae are located
22 dorsal to the level of the occipital condyle, at the transverse level of the mid-height of
23 the foramen magnum (Fig. 2D). They are oriented in the ventromedial-dorsolateral
24 axis and would be delimited by the squamosal laterally, the supraoccipital
25 dorsomedially, and the opisthotic ventromedially as in most dicynodonts. An oblique
26 ridge on the supraoccipital extends over the fenestra. This ridge continues, below the
27 fenestra, on the opisthotics and terminates in a sharp tuberosity.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 KANNEMEYERIFORMES Maisch, 2001

55 *REPELINOSAURUS* gen. nov.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Type Species**—*Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov., monotypic.
4

5 **Etymology**— In honour of the French geologist Joseph R epelin, member of the
6
7 Pavi e Missions, who described and named Counillon’s dicynodont skull “*Dicynodon*
8
9 *incisivum*” (R epelin, 1923; see Steyer, 2009 for a biography). Also from the latinized
10
11 Greek saurus (a lizard) often used for non-mammalian synapsids, colloquially known
12
13 as ‘mammal-like reptiles’.
14

15
16
17 **Diagnosis**—See diagnosis of the type species
18
19

20
21 *REPELINOSAURUS ROBUSTUS* gen. et sp. nov.
22

23
24 (Figs. 3–5)
25
26
27

28 **Etymology**—From the Latin robustus (robust) referring to its robust cranial
29
30 appearance.
31

32 **Holotype**—LPB 1993-2, a partial skull without mandible (basal length: 19 cm).
33
34 The left postorbital bar, the zygomatic arch, the dorsolateral wing of the squamosal,
35
36 the left quadratojugals, the quadrates, more than half of the left part of the occipital
37
38 side, the external portion of the tusks, and the stapes are missing. The palatal
39
40 surface is strongly eroded: most of the sutures cannot be made out and some bones
41
42 are poorly preserved or are missing.
43
44
45

46
47 **Referred Material**—LPB 1995-9 is a skull (basal length: 15.72 cm) lacking the
48
49 mandible, the right quadrate ramus of the pterygoid, the left stapes, the quadrates,
50
51 and the left quadratojugal. The right stapes and the epipterygoids are poorly
52
53 preserved. The specimen was subjected to lateral compression. However, the left
54
55 orbit seems to have maintained its original shape.
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Geographic Distribution and Stratigraphic Range**—Same as for *Counillonia*
4
5 (see above), LPB 1993-2 (19° 55' 59" N, 102° 07' 41" E) and LPB 1995-9 (19° 55'
6
7 16" N, 102° 06' 27" E) were collected in the Purple Claystone Fm, Luang Prabang
8
9 Basin (Laos).
10

11 **Diagnosis**—Medium-sized dicynodontoid characterized by the unique
12
13 combination of the following character states: a reduced preorbital region; a notch on
14
15 the dorsal edge of the narial opening; nasal bosses present as a median swelling
16
17 with a continuous posterior margin; a straight fronto-nasal suture; parietals exposed
18
19 in midline groove; a relatively flat temporal portion of the postorbital, so that most of
20
21 the exterior surface of the bone faces dorsally; a vertical caniniform process; high
22
23 insertion of the zygomatic squamosal rami on the occiput posteriorly. Distinguished
24
25 from all dicynodontoids by a very small preorbital region. Further distinguished from
26
27 all kannemeyeriiforms by a median nasal swelling with a continuous posterior margin
28
29 and a flat temporal portion of the postorbital. Further distinguished from the Laotian
30
31 *Counillonia* by a wide interorbital bar, a straight fronto-nasal suture, a vertical
32
33 caniniform process, a rectangular occiput, and a high insertion of the zygomatic
34
35 squamosal rami on the occiput posteriorly.
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Remarks**—Some differences distinguish LPB 1993-2 and LPB 1995-9 such as (1)
42
43 the position of the pineal foramen on the skull roof more posterior in LPB 1993-2
44
45 (continuous character 6, Appendix 1); (2) a higher angulation between the occiput
46
47 and the palate in LPB 1993-2 (continuous character 13, Appendix 1); (3) a relatively
48
49 flat palatal surface of the premaxilla in LPB 1993-2 or with marked depressions on
50
51 either side of the median crest in LPB 1995-9 (discrete character 29, Appendix 1); (4)
52
53 a sutural contact between the maxillae and the prefrontals present in LPB 1995-9
54
55 and absent in LPB 1993-2 (discrete character 49, Appendix 1); (5) a preparietal
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 depressed in LPB 1993-2 or flush with the skull roof in LPB 1995-9 (discrete
4
5 character 68, Appendix 1); (6) a bigger pineal foramen in LPB 1995-9 (Table 2); (7) a
6
7 tusk basal section compressed mediolaterally in LPB 1995-9 and anteroposteriorly in
8
9 LPB 1993-2 (Table 2); and (8) more-developed ornamentation on the frontals in LPB
10
11 1993-2. However, each character state variation noted could be due to taphonomic
12
13 deformation, ontogeny, sexual dimorphism or other intraspecific variability (discussed
14
15 below). Moreover, LPB 1995-9 and LPB 1993-2 were found in the same geological
16
17 formation, suggesting conspecificity.
18
19

20
21 **Description**—The skulls are narrow and robust with a wide and short snout that
22
23 narrows slightly anteriorly, and terminates in a squared tip. *Repelinosaurus* has a
24
25 wider interorbital region (Figs. 3A; 4A) than *Counillonina* (Fig. 2A). The orbits are thus
26
27 open mainly laterally. The dorsal surfaces of the premaxilla, maxillae, and nasals of
28
29 LPB 1995-9 are weathered, but the preservation of these surfaces in LPB 1993-2
30
31 displays strong rugosities on the snout (Figs. 3A; 4A). Nevertheless, the naso-
32
33 premaxillary and the mid-nasal sutures cannot be traced in LPB 1993-2. The
34
35 septomaxilla is well preserved in LPB 1995-9 unlike LPB 1993-2 where the poor
36
37 preservation of the naris does not yield information about this bone (Figs. 3B; 4B; 5).
38
39 Sutures are not visible on the occiput of either specimen, except for the connection of
40
41 the right quadrate in LPB 1995-9. The scarf joints also cannot be discerned on the
42
43 medial portion of the temporal and orbital fossae, but the dorsal head of the
44
45 epipterygoid and the basal region of the pila antotica are preserved in LPB 1995-9
46
47 (Fig. 4B). The palatal surface of LPB 1993-2 is poorly preserved; few sutures are
48
49 thus visible.
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 As mentioned above, lots of pits and strong rugosities mark the dorsal surface of
57
58 the premaxilla in LPB 1993-2 and extend onto the nasals before stopping abruptly at
59
60

1
2
3 the naso-prefrontal and naso-frontal sutures (Fig. 3A). These rugosities are thought
4
5 to indicate a keratinized covering (e.g., Angielczyk et al., 2018). The premaxilla
6
7 contributes to the external anterior edge of the nares. In lateral view, the well-
8
9 developed nares of both LPB 1995-9 and 1993-2 represent more than half of the
10
11 length of the snout (Figs. 3B; 4B). Their ventral edges are close to the ventral border
12
13 of the snout. The premaxilla is toothless and anteriorly bears two short parallel
14
15 longitudinal ridges, which are separated by a shallow depression and overlie the
16
17 anterior quarter of the premaxilla (Figs. 3C; 4C). An anterior rounded pit of medium
18
19 size in LPB 1993-2, visible posterior to the premaxillary longitudinal crest, could be of
20
21 taphonomic origin (Fig. 3C). Posterior to this depression, a sharp median ridge
22
23 extends onto two-thirds of the premaxilla. In LPB 1993-2, the premaxilla is relatively
24
25 flat. However, this median ridge is surrounded by two depressions, which deepen in
26
27 the posterior region of the secondary palate in LPB 1995-9. These depressions may
28
29 be caused by taphonomic lateral compression (discussed below). The premaxilla
30
31 contacts the nasals posterodorsally and the maxillae posterolaterally at the level of
32
33 the anterior third of the nares in LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 3B; 4B). However, the sutures of
34
35 the premaxilla with the nasals and maxillae are not visible in LPB 1993-2. In both
36
37 LPB 1995-9 and 1993-2, on the palatal surface, the premaxilla contacts the maxillae
38
39 and their caniniform processes laterally. However, the suture between the premaxilla,
40
41 maxillae, and palatines are not clearly preserved (Figs. 3C; 4C).
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 The well-developed nasal bosses terminate laterally in a posterodorsal notch at
50
51 the dorsal edge of the nares, and are separated from the frontals and prefrontals by a
52
53 shallow depression (Figs. 3B; 4B). The notch on the posterodorsal edge of the naris
54
55 is formed by a thick expansion of the nasal bosses, which hides the external ventral
56
57 narial edge in dorsal view. The bosses form a median swelling that is more marked in
58
59
60

1
2
3 LPB 1993-2 than in LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 3B; 4B). The nasals are bordered by the
4
5 frontals and the prefrontals posteriorly, the premaxilla anteriorly, and the maxillae
6
7 laterally. However, the nasals do not contact the lacrimals in LPB 1995-9, in contrast
8
9 to LPB 1993-2 (Figs. 3B; 4B; 5).

10
11
12 The prefrontals form the edge of the orbits with the lacrimals anteriorly, the jugals
13
14 ventrally, the postorbitals posteriorly, and the frontals dorsally (Figs. 3A, B; 4A, B). As
15
16 for the nasals, the prefrontal extension is broader in dorsal than in lateral view. The
17
18 prefrontals bear a weak boss, distinct from the nasals. The prefrontals contact the
19
20 maxillae ventrally in LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 4B; 5).

21
22
23 The interorbital region of *Repelinosaurus* (Figs. 3A; 4A) is clearly wider than that of
24
25 *Counillonia* (Fig. 2A). In *Repelinosaurus*, it is mainly formed by the frontals
26
27 constituting the dorsal margin of the orbits, which rise slightly laterally. In addition, as
28
29 mentioned above, the prefrontals bear bosses in both specimens. The interorbital
30
31 region obscures the orbits in dorsal view, their orientation is thus mainly lateral while
32
33 it is dorsolateral in *Counillonia*. In LPB 1993-2, the frontals are separated by a sharp
34
35 median ridge bordered by two deep depressions (Fig. 3A). In LPB 1995-9 the
36
37 preparietal, the parietals, and the posterior region of the frontals show a depression.
38
39 The frontals contact the nasals anteromedially, the prefrontals laterally, the
40
41 postorbitals posterolaterally, and the preparietal posteromedially (Figs. 3A; 4A). The
42
43 naso-frontal suture is relatively straight in *Repelinosaurus* (Figs. 3A; 4A), whereas it
44
45 has a distinct posterior process in *Counillonia* (Fig. 2A). No postfrontals are observed
46
47 in LPB 1995-9 (Fig. 4A) but as in *Counillonia*, we cannot determine whether they
48
49 were absent or present in LPB 1993-2 because of the eroded external bone surface
50
51 (Figs. 2A; 3A).
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In LPB 1993-2, the preparietal is depressed and bordered anteriorly by a ridge
4 (Fig. 3A), which continues into the median frontal ridge. The surface of the preparietal
5 is flush with the depressed surface of the frontals in LPB 1995-9 (Fig. 4A). The
6 preparietal contacts the postorbitals posterolaterally, the short parietals posteriorly,
7 and the frontals anteriorly (Figs. 3A; 4A).
8
9
10
11
12

13
14 The parietal contribution of the skull roof in LPB 1993-2 is limited to a midline
15 groove between the posterior postorbital processes (Fig. 3A). These posterior
16 parietal processes are thus slender. Noticeable lateral compression has modified the
17 angulation of the postorbitals in LPB 1995-9. This taphonomic deformation may have
18 resulted in artificial contact of the postorbitals in the midline of the intertemporal bar
19 (Fig. 4A). The posterior expansion of the parietals is dorsally hidden by the posterior
20 processes of the postorbitals or cannot be determined due to the lack of a clear
21 suture between the parietal and interparietal. However, the anterior part of the
22 parietals is preserved. In both specimens of *Repelinosaurus*, the anterolateral
23 processes of the parietals, bordering the pineal foramen, are more anteroposteriorly
24 elongate than broad (Figs. 3A; 4A), but their posterior end is not visible. The external
25 dorsal surface of the parietals contacts the interparietal posteriorly, the postorbitals
26 posterolaterally, and the preparietal anteriorly. The parietals surround the pineal
27 foramen posteriorly with the preparietal anteriorly. The oval pineal foramen is clearly
28 smaller in LPB 1993-2 (0.96 cm of length and 0.66 cm of width) than in LPB 1995-9
29 (1.33 cm of length and 0.87 cm of width) (Table 2). In both specimens, the foramen is
30 perpendicular to the intertemporal bar and flush with the skull roof. The pineal
31 foramen is also more anterior in LPB 1995-9 than in LPB 1993-2 (continuous
32 character 6, Appendix 1). In ventral view, the preservation of the specimens of
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Repelinosaurus* does not allow observation of the sutural contact between the
4
5 parietals and the prootic (Figs. 3B; 4B).
6
7

8 The lateral postorbital bars possess tuberosities in LPB 1993-2, in contrast to LPB
9
10 1995-9 (Figs. 3A, B; 4A, B). The posterior postorbital processes of *Repelinosaurus*
11
12 extend over the entire narrow intertemporal bar as in *Counillonia* (Figs. 2D; 3B; 4B).
13

14 The temporal portion of the postorbitals is flat and dorsally directed in LPB 1993-2
15
16 (Fig. 3A). We consider that its slightly oblique direction in LPB 1995-9 is due to lateral
17
18 compression (Fig. 4A). This horizontal expansion of the posterior processes of the
19
20 postorbitals in *Repelinosaurus* is linked to a large fossa formed by the postorbitals
21
22 and the parietals below the intertemporal bar. The posterior processes of the
23
24 postorbitals, widened in both LPB 1993-2 and LPB 1995-9, contact the squamosals
25
26 and the interparietal posteriorly. Anteriorly, they are separated from the preparietal
27
28 and the parietals by a sharp ridge in LPB 1995-9 (Fig. 4A). The postorbital surface
29
30 has a triangular depression between the posterior and lateral processes (Figs. 3A;
31
32 4A). The lateral process of the postorbitals constitutes the posterior margin of the
33
34 orbits. They are wider in LPB 1993-2 than in LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 3B; 4B). In LPB
35
36 1995-9, they have a sutural contact with the jugals anteroventrally and the zygomatic
37
38 squamosal processes posteroventrally (Fig. 4A). The state of preservation of the
39
40 zygomatic arches of LPB 1993-2 does not provide information about the location of
41
42 the scarf joints. In dorsal view, the lateral expansion of the postorbital bars is smaller
43
44 in *Repelinosaurus* than in *Counillonia*, giving the skull of *Repelinosaurus* a narrower
45
46 appearance (Figs. 2A; 3A; 4A).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 The lateral surface of the maxilla displays stronger rugosities in LPB 1993-2 than
55
56 in LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 3B; 4B), but it is difficult to determine the degree to which these
57
58 rugosities are a real feature. In both skulls, the maxillae contact the premaxilla
59
60

1
2
3 anteriorly, and the lacrimals and nasals dorsally. However, in LPB 1993-2, the
4
5 maxillae do not contact the prefrontals because the anterior process of the lacrimals
6
7 intervenes, in contrast to LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 3B; 4B; 5). In LPB 1993-2, a notch on the
8
9 palatal rim is visible on the right side of the skull but not on its left, suggesting a
10
11 taphonomic origin. The poor preservation of the lateral surface of LPB 1993-2 does
12
13 not provide information about the sutures in the zygomatic arch. Nevertheless, these
14
15 contacts are visible in LPB 1995-9 (Fig. 4B). The zygomatic processes of the
16
17 maxillae comprise a bifid tip embedded in the squamosals and dorsally bordered by
18
19 the jugals. The maxillae are relatively robust, especially in LPB 1993-2. In addition,
20
21 the caniniform process is more developed in LPB 1993-2 than in 1995-9 (Figs. 3B;
22
23 4B). In *Repelinosaurus* (Figs. 3B; 4B), the caniniform process is vertical, whereas it is
24
25 anteriorly directed in *Counillonia* (Fig. 2B). The external part of the tusks is missing in
26
27 LPB 1993-2 but the tusk roots are anteroposteriorly flattened, while they are
28
29 mediolaterally compressed in LPB 1995-9 (Table 2). In LPB 1995-9, the tusks are
30
31 posteriorly directed and turn medially, forming a medial concavity (Fig. 4B). The lack
32
33 of fractures and the direction of the main taphonomic distortion (see above) suggest
34
35 that the tusks have not been deformed, but the space left between the tusks would
36
37 not be sufficient to insert a jaw (J. Camp, pers. comm., 2017). Moreover, the distinct
38
39 wear facet (formed as the mandible slides, e.g., Cluver, 1971; K. Angielczyk, pers.
40
41 comm., 2018) observed on the inner surface of the left tusk, is backwardly directed,
42
43 indicating distortion. The distal part of the right tusk is too eroded to reach any
44
45 conclusion. On the ventral orbital edge, a rounded labial fossa is visible posterior to
46
47 the caniniform process (Figs. 3C; 4C). Nevertheless, as noted in *Counillonia*, the
48
49 sutural contacts cannot be discerned; therefore, we cannot conclude whether
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Repelinosaurus* has a true labial fossa (circumscribed by the maxillae, palatines, and
4
5 jugals) or just a labial foramen (e.g., Angielczyk and Kurkin, 2003).
6
7

8 In LPB 1995-9, the well-preserved septomaxillae form with the maxillae the
9
10 posteroventral part of the margin of the nares with nasals dorsally, and the premaxilla
11
12 anteriorly, where they bear a sharp ridge, which partly divides the nares (Figs. 4B; 5).
13

14 The lacrimals are limited by the nasals anteriorly, the prefrontals dorsally, the
15
16 maxillae anteroventrally, and the jugals posterolaterally in LPB 1993-2 (Fig. 3B).
17
18 Their anterior well-developed expansion does not allow a sutural contact between the
19
20 maxillae and the prefrontals. On the lateral surface of LPB 1995-9, the lacrimals are
21
22 only limited by the maxillae anteriorly and slightly by the jugals posterolaterally (Fig.
23
24 4B). A sutural contact between the maxillae and the prefrontals is also reported in
25
26 some dicynodonts such as *Kombuisia* (e.g., Fröbisch, 2007) or *Kannemeyeria* (e.g.,
27
28 Renault, 2000). Nevertheless, the antorbital margin formed by the prefrontals, the
29
30 lacrimals, and the maxillae (Figs. 4B; 5) seems to be unique in LPB 1995-9 within
31
32 dicynodonts. We cannot therefore rule out the possibility that the limits of the
33
34 lacrimals may be inaccurate due to taphonomic deformation. Additionally, the left
35
36 lateral side of the skull is too eroded and this particular bone contact cannot be
37
38 confirmed. On both skulls of *Repelinosaurus*, the bone sutures of the orbits are not
39
40 visible (Figs. 3A; 4A). In LPB 1995-9, the lacrimals show a tuberosity on the antorbital
41
42 rim, which forms the anterior border of the lacrimal foramen.
43
44
45
46
47

48 The jugals make a small contribution to the lateral surface of the skulls (Figs. 3B;
49
50 4B). In LPB 1993-2, their sutures with the other bones on the zygomatic arches
51
52 (except the maxillae and lacrimals) cannot be determined because of poor
53
54 preservation. The zygomatic arches of LPB 1995-9 show a sutural contact between
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the jugals and the postorbitals posteriorly, and the squamosals posteroventrally (Fig.
4
5 4B).
6
7

8 The zygomatic squamosal processes form the posterior regions of the zygomatic
9 arches, and circumscribe the temporal fossae laterally and partly posteriorly. They
10 widen posteriorly into a wing-shaped processes and become narrow, without
11 dorsoventral expansion posterior to the postorbital bar (Fig. 3A, B). The right
12 zygomatic arch of LPB 1993-2 presents a ventral expansion at the intersection
13 between the descending bar of the postorbital and the zygomatic arch (Fig. 3B),
14 somewhat reminiscent of the ventrally directed convexity of the squamosal in
15 *Aulacephalodon* (e.g., Tollman et al., 1980). However, the lack of the left zygomatic
16 arch and of visible sutures in the right zygomatic arch does not permit us to conclude
17 whether it is of natural or taphonomic origin. LPB 1995-9 does not exhibit this type of
18 ventral expansion on its zygomatic arches (Fig. 4B). The edge of the zygomatic
19 squamosal wing is flat and straight in LPB 1993-2 (Fig. 3B). The lateral compression
20 affecting LPB 1995-9 has distorted the edge of the zygomatic arch. The squamosal
21 zygomatic processes of LPB 1995-9 contact the jugals and the postorbitals dorsally,
22 and the maxillae in the pointed anterior region (Fig. 4B). In contrast to *Counillonia*
23 (Fig. 2D), the squamosal zygomatic processes of *Repelinosaurus* are inserted
24 dorsally on the back of the skull, well above the dorsal edge of the foramen magnum
25 (Figs. 3D; 4D). They extend slightly onto the dorsal region of the occiput in LPB
26 1993-2 but not in LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 3B; 4B) because of lateral compression. This
27 compression also raised the intertemporal region and crushed the zygomatic
28 squamosal processes in LPB 1995-9. The temporal squamosal processes of
29 *Repelinosaurus*, delimiting the temporal fossae posteromedially, are shorter than in
30 *Counillonia*. They contact the postorbitals dorsally and the interparietal medially. As
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 already noted, the bone contact on the occipital side cannot be traced (Figs. 3D; 4D).
4
5 No conclusion is thus possible concerning the limits of the tabulars and the potential
6
7 separation of the squamosals and supraoccipitals. The quadrate rami of the
8
9 squamosals are laterally expanded in *Repelinosaurus*. Compared to *Counillonia* (Fig.
10
11 2D), they are in the same plane as the occiput surface in LPB 1993-2 (Fig. 3D). This
12
13 structure cannot be compared in LPB 1995-9 because of deformation and because of
14
15 the left quadrate ramus of the squamosal is missing.
16
17

18
19 The lateral surface of the skulls is eroded but some structures can be made out: a
20
21 deep anteroventral depression in the squamosal may indicate their contact with the
22
23 missing quadrate in LPB 1993-2 and in the left side in LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 3B; 4B). In
24
25 addition, the dorsal head of the epipterygoid contacting the parietals and the basal
26
27 region of the pila antotica are preserved in LPB 1995-9 (Fig. 4B).
28
29
30

31
32 The vomer is missing in LPB 1993-2 but its poorly-preserved anterior region can
33
34 be observed (Fig. 3C). It displays a median blade separating the choanae in LPB
35
36 1995-9 (Fig. 4C). The width of this blade is constant throughout its length. Anteriorly,
37
38 the vomer shows a tuberosity following the posteromedial ridge of the premaxilla
39
40 (Figs. 3C; 4C). The vomer is divided posteriorly and delimits the anterior edge of the
41
42 interpterygoid vacuity, where it contacts the median plate of the pterygoids (Fig. 4C).
43
44

45
46 The palatines are bordered by the anterior rami of the pterygoids laterally (Figs.
47
48 3C; 4C) and the maxillae anteriorly. Because of the poor preservation, the
49
50 morphology of the palato-premaxillary contact is uncertain. Only the wide anterior
51
52 region of the palatines is preserved in LPB 1993-2 (Fig. 3C), but their poor
53
54 preservation does not provide relevant information about their texture. In LPB 1995-
55
56 9, the palatines widen anteriorly, forming a rugose textured pad (Fig. 4C). No
57
58 foramen is observed within the palatines, and we cannot determine whether there is
59
60

1
2
3 a foramen between these palatines and the anterior rami of the pterygoids because
4
5 of lateral compression of the palate.
6
7

8 Due to the multiple breaks and the missing bone in some areas, nothing can be
9
10 said about the presence of pterygoid keels in LPB 1993-2 (Fig. 3B). The ventral
11
12 projection of the anterior rami of the pterygoids does not strongly extend ventrally in
13
14 LPB 1995-9 (Fig. 4B), in contrast to *Counillonia* (Fig. 2B) where this extension
15
16 projects strongly ventrally. However, as in *Counillonia*, the absence of sutures in
17
18 lateral view prevents measurements of the ventral expansion of the pterygoid keel
19
20 from being taken. The thin anterior rami of the pterygoids contact the ectopterygoids
21
22 anterolaterally, in the form of a slender leaf in LPB 1995-9. The ectopterygoids do not
23
24 expand further posterior to the palatines in palatal view. In LPB 1993-2, they are not
25
26 preserved but a shallow depression on the anterolateral edge of the pterygoids
27
28 marks their presence. In LPB 1995-9, the teardrop-shaped interpterygoid vacuity is
29
30 bordered by the median plate of the pterygoids posteriorly and the vomer anteriorly
31
32 (Fig. 4C). The anterior margin of the interpterygoid vacuity is not defined in LPB
33
34 1993-2 because the major portion of the vomer is missing. As in *Counillonia*, the
35
36 ventral surface of the median plate bears a thin crista oesophagea in LPB 1995-9,
37
38 which turns into two ridges posteriorly on the parabasisphenoid (Fig. 4C). However,
39
40 the bone surface of LPB 1993-2 is eroded. The preservation of the two skulls of
41
42 *Repelinosaurus* excludes any comments about a potential contribution of the
43
44 parabasisphenoid to the interpterygoid vacuity. The posterior rami of the pterygoids
45
46 are poorly preserved in LPB 1993-2 and are missing in LPB 1995-9 (Figs. 3C; 4C).
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Two ridges extend onto the parabasisphenoid, from the crista oesophagea, and
55
56 widen posteriorly (Figs. 3C; 4C). They delimit a broad triangular intertuberal
57
58 depression. The parabasisphenoid is mainly vertical and makes less contribution to
59
60

1
2
3 the fenestra ovalis than the basioccipital. The stapedial facet in LPB 1993-2 is
4
5 exposed ventrolaterally and its narrow margin extends anteroposteriorly (Fig. 3C). In
6
7 LPB 1995-9, the structure of the parabasisphenoid-basioccipital tubera is distorted,
8
9 probably because of taphonomic deformation. As in *Counillonia*, the paired carotid
10
11 canals, located in the anterior region of the parabasisphenoid, are not visible in either
12
13 of the specimens of *Repelinosaurus*. No intertuberal ridge is visible. In LPB 1993-2,
14
15 the basioccipital extends onto the occipital plate and with the exoccipital forms a
16
17 tripartite occipital condyle (Fig. 3D). The occipital condyle is too poorly preserved in
18
19 LPB 1995-9 to be precisely described (Fig. 4D).
20
21
22
23

24 Only the right quadrate is preserved in LPB 1995-9 (Fig. 4C, D). It is ventrally bifid,
25
26 with lateral and medial condyles separated by a median groove. The lateral condyle
27
28 is more anteroposteriorly elongated than the medial one. However, the dorsal lobe
29
30 was laterally crushed.
31
32

33 The contact between the interparietal and the other bones forming the occiput and
34
35 the posterior region of the skull roof cannot be discerned (Figs. 3D; 4D). However, it
36
37 seems that the interparietal does not contribute to the skull roof. In both LPB 1993-2
38
39 and LPB 1995-9, the interparietal seems to form a deep longitudinal notch, which is
40
41 mainly overhung by the postorbitals dorsally. However, the interparieto-parietal
42
43 suture is not clearly visible.
44
45
46

47 The occiput is rectangular in LPB 1993-2 (Fig. 3D) but distorted in LPB 1995-9
48
49 (Fig. 4D). The insertion of the squamosals on the occiput makes an obtuse angle in
50
51 LPB 1993-2 (Fig. 3D): most of the lateral squamosal expansion is thus visible in
52
53 occipital view, in contrast to *Counillonia* (Fig. 2D). The lateral compression of LPB
54
55 1995-9 may explain the sharper angle of the lateral squamosal expansions and their
56
57 asymmetry. As mentioned above, sutures are not clearly preserved. Nevertheless, as
58
59
60

1
2
3 in *Counillonia*, the overall similarity of the occiputs of *Repelinosaurus* (Figs. 3D; 4D)
4
5 to *Lystrosaurus* (Cluver, 1971), *Dicynodon* or *Diictodon* (Cluver & Hotton III, 1981)
6
7 suggests that they shared a similar construction of the occiput. However, the
8
9 dorsoventral expansion of the tabular cannot be determined. In LPB 1995-9, a short
10
11 nuchal crest, which is ventrally bordered by a depression, extends onto the most
12
13 dorsal region of the supraoccipital (Fig. 4D). No nuchal crest is visible in LPB 1993-2.
14
15 A very wide triangular depression extends laterally to the foramen magnum and
16
17 surrounds the posttemporal fenestrae (Figs. 3D; 4D). The anterior tip of this
18
19 depression is located near the junction between the root of the squamosal wings and
20
21 the supraoccipital. Its ventral base extends between the basal tubera and the oblique
22
23 opisthotic crest, which turns into a sharp process.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32

33 PHYLOGENETIC ANALYSIS

34 35 36 37 **Methodology**

38
39 A phylogenetic analysis is used to test the systematic position of the three Laotian
40
41 dicynodont specimens. This analysis is based on an augmented version of the matrix
42
43 of Angielczyk and Kammerer (2017), which is one of the most recent and
44
45 comprehensive analyses of dicynodonts. Our final data set thus includes 106
46
47 operational taxonomic units and 194 characters: 171 discrete characters (treated as
48
49 of equal weight and as unordered, except for characters 81, 84, 102, 163, 173, and
50
51 174 following Angielczyk and Kammerer, 2017), and 23 continuous characters
52
53 (Supplementary Data 1–2). All new measurements and codings, made for the Laotian
54
55 specimens studied (Appendix 1), are defined using procedures mentioned in
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kammerer et al. (2011) and personal comments from C. F. Kammerer (2017) and K.
4
5 D. Angielczyk (2017). The treatment of the continuous characters is additive,
6
7 following Goloboff et al. (2006). Unknown and/or inapplicable states of discrete and
8
9 continuous characters are coded as “?” (Strong and Lipscomb, 1999). In order to
10
11 treat the continuous characters with a continued and ordered evolution permitted by
12
13 Goloboff’s algorithm (Goloboff et al., 2006), we analyzed the data set using TNT 1.1
14
15 (December 2013 version) (Goloboff et al., 2008). We performed two analyses: a new
16
17 technology search that analyzes different parts of the tree separately (Goloboff,
18
19 1999) and a traditional search. In the first case, we did a driven search with the initial
20
21 search level set checked every three hits. One hundred replications were chosen as
22
23 a starting point for each hit and we required to search to find the most parsimonious
24
25 trees twenty times. We did the phylogenetic analysis using sectorial search (default
26
27 settings) and tree-drifting (default settings but the number of cycles was 3) to produce
28
29 a nearly optimal tree, which could be used for tree-fusing (default settings but a
30
31 global fuse every 3 hits was input; Goloboff, 1999). In the second search, we used a
32
33 traditional search of TBR branch swapping with 11,111 replications and 9 trees saved
34
35 per replications. *Biarmosuchus* was used as an outgroup. We obtained the same
36
37 most parsimonious tree with both methods (1156.346 steps, CI = 0.236, RI = 0.712)
38
39 (Fig. 6). We indicate the Bremer values as a node support index (Fig. 6; Bremer,
40
41 1988). According to the recommendations of Goloboff et al. (2008), we performed
42
43 successive traditional searches using the most parsimonious trees as a starting point.
44
45 We increased the value of suboptimal trees each step to avoid overestimation of the
46
47 value of the Bremer support. We saved successively larger sets of suboptimal trees
48
49 (“stop when maxtrees hit” ticked on). The resulting trees were checked to discard
50
51 duplicate cladograms each search. Once the optimal and suboptimal trees stored
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (99,999 unique cladograms), we tested the score differences to lose each node using
4
5 “Bremer support” function.
6
7
8
9

10 **Results and Comparisons with Previous Dicynodont Phylogenies**

11 The most parsimonious tree obtained (Fig. 6) is completely resolved. The clade
12
13 Dicynodontoidea is weakly supported. However, some clades within Dicynodontoidea
14
15 are well supported, such as Rhachiocephalidae and Lystrosauridae (Fig. 6).
16
17

18 We hereafter follow the comprehensive taxonomy of Kammerer and Angielczyk
19
20 (2009). Our results are in accordance with the strict consensus cladogram of
21
22 Angielczyk and Kammerer (2017), except for some relationships within
23
24 Dicynodontoidea. Our phylogenetic analysis indicates that Pylaecephalidae are
25
26 distinct from Emydopoidea, not recovered within Therochelonia, and placed in a
27
28 comparable position to that proposed by Angielczyk and Kurkin (2003), Fröbisch
29
30 (2007), Angielczyk and Rubidge (2013), Boos et al. (2016), Angielczyk and
31
32 Kammerer (2017) and Angielczyk et al. (2018). Additionally, the Kingoriidae are here
33
34 included in the Kistecephalia within Emydopoidea as previously proposed (e.g.,
35
36 Angielczyk and Kurkin, 2003; Angielczyk and Rubidge, 2013; Castanhinha et al.,
37
38 2013; Cox and Angielczyk, 2015; Angielczyk et al., 2016; Angielczyk and Kammerer,
39
40 2017; Kammerer and Smith, 2017; Angielczyk et al., 2018). Within dicynodontoids,
41
42 the relationships within Cryptodontia (here compositionally equivalent to
43
44 Oudenodontidae), Rhachiocephalidae, and Lystrosauridae are consistent with the
45
46 results of Angielczyk and Kammerer (2017). In contrast to previous studies (e.g.,
47
48 Angielczyk and Rubidge, 2013; Castanhinha et al., 2013; Kammerer et al., 2013; Cox
49
50 and Angielczyk, 2015; Kammerer and Smith, 2017), Rhachiocephalidae and
51
52 Geikiidae are not included in Cryptodontia, but in Dicynodontoidea (as defined by
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Kammerer and Angielczyk, 2009) as proposed by Boos et al. (2016), Angielczyk and
4
5 Kammerer (2017), and Angielczyk et al. (2018).

6
7
8 As mentioned by Kammerer and Angielczyk (2009), no consensus exists about a
9
10 taxonomic definition of Kannemeyeriiformes, probably because the alpha taxonomy
11
12 of the Triassic forms is still unresolved. If we consider the definition of
13
14 Kannemeyeriiformes sensu Maisch (2001) as the clade of Triassic non-lystrosaurid
15
16 dicynodontoids, in our current results, the Laotian *Repelinosaurus* may thus be
17
18 considered as a kannemeyeriiform. However, the other Laotian Triassic genus
19
20 *Counillonia* is a non-kannemeyeriiform dicynodontoid, closely related to Permian
21
22 “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa (i.e., most taxa previously attributed to *Dicynodon* before the
23
24 taxonomic revision by Kammerer et al., 2011): *Daptocephalus*, *Peramodon*,
25
26 *Dinanomodon*, *Turfanodon*, *Euptychognathus*, *Sintocephalus*, *Jimusaria*, *Gordonia*,
27
28 *Delectosaurus*, *Vivaxosaurus*, and the two valid species of *Dicynodon* (Fig. 6;
29
30 Kammerer et al. 2011). The stratigraphic definition of Kannemeyeriiformes sensu
31
32 Maisch (2001) is thus challenged by the phylogenetic position of *Counillonia*. We
33
34 therefore follow the phylogenetic definition of Kannemeyeriiformes sensu Kammerer
35
36 et al. (2013) as the clade comprising *Kannemeyeria simocephalus* and all taxa more
37
38 closely related to it than to *Lystrosaurus murrayi* or *Dicynodon lacerticeps*. Under this
39
40 definition, *Repelinosaurus* is recovered as a kannemeyeriiform. In contrast to recent
41
42 studies, our phylogeny recovers a large clade of “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa uniting
43
44 *Daptocephalus*, *Peramodon*, *Dinanomodon*, *Turfanodon*, *Euptychognathus*,
45
46 *Sintocephalus*, *Jimusaria*, *Gordonia*, *Delectosaurus*, *Vivaxosaurus*, and the two valid
47
48 species of *Dicynodon* (Kammerer et al. 2011). These “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa and
49
50 *Counillonia* form a clade with Kannemeyeriiformes characterized by two non-
51
52 ambiguous synapomorphies: (1) a lacrimal not in contact with the septomaxilla
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (60(0)) and (2) a dorsal process on the anterior end of the epipterygoid footplate
4
5 (127(1)). The results of Angielczyk and Kurkin (2003) also recovered *Peramodon* and
6
7 *Vivaxosaurus* as more closely related to Kannemeyeriiformes than to *Lystrosaurus*.
8
9 Within Kannemeyeriiformes, our phylogenetic results indicate that *Repelinosaurus* is
10
11 sister to the rest of kannemeyeriiform, which is divided into three relatively well-
12
13 supported clades: Shansiodontidae, Kannemeyeriidae, and Stahleckeriidae.
14
15 Shansiodontidae, as defined by Maisch (2001), includes *Shansiodon*, *Vinceria*,
16
17 *Rhinodicynodon*, and *Tetragonias*. They are sister group to all other
18
19 kannemeyeriiforms but *Repelinosaurus*, a position previously recovered by
20
21 Castanhinha et al. (2013), Kammerer et al. (2013), Cox and Angielczyk (2015), Boos
22
23 et al. (2016), and Kammerer and Smith (2017). Despite the fact that Shansiodontidae
24
25 sensu Maisch (2001) are paraphyletic in the analyses of Kammerer and Angielczyk
26
27 (2017) and Angielczyk et al. (2018), *Shansiodon*, *Vinceria*, *Rhinodicynodon*, and
28
29 *Tetragonias* are also more basal than all other kannemeyeriiforms in their studies.
30
31 The compositions of the clades Kannemeyeriidae and Stahleckeriidae are similar in
32
33 the current analysis to those of Kammerer and Angielczyk (2017) and Angielczyk et
34
35 al. (2018). Stahleckeriidae, as the last common ancestor of *Placerias hesternus* and
36
37 *Stahleckeria potens*, and all of its descendants, excluding *Shansiodon wangi* or
38
39 *Kannemeyeria simocephalus* (Kammerer et al., 2013), are characterized by six non-
40
41 ambiguous synapomorphies: (1) a short interpterygoid vacuity (continuous character
42
43 10); (2) a very reduced minimum width of the scapula (continuous character 17); (3) a
44
45 very long anterior iliac process (continuous character 21); (4) a smooth and flat
46
47 median pterygoid plate (115(1)); (5) the presence of six sacral vertebrae (165(3));
48
49 and (6) the *M. latissimus dorsi* inserted on a rugose tuberosity on the posteroventral
50
51 surface of the humerus (175(0)). Kannemeyeriidae may therefore be defined here as
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 the clade comprising *Kannemeyeria simocephalus* and all taxa more closely related
4 to it than to *Stahleckeria potens*, *Placerias hesternus*, or *Shansiodon wangi*. This
5
6
7
8 clade is supported by six non-ambiguous synapomorphies: (1) a high preorbital
9
10 region (continuous character 1); (2) a high trochanteric crest on the femur
11
12 (continuous character 22); (3) a very narrow scapula (the narrowest in
13
14 dicynodontoids; continuous character 23); (4) a dorsal edge of the erupted portion of
15
16 the canine tusk anterior to the anterorbital margin (55(0)); (5) a temporal portion of
17
18 the skull roof angled dorsally with a strong break in slope near its anterior end
19
20 (67(1)); and (6) a lateral edge of the paroccipital process distinctly offset from the
21
22 surface of the occipital plate (135(1)).
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Positions of the three Laotian specimens**

29
30
31 Our results indicate that the Laotian specimens LPB 1993-2 and LPB 1995-9 form
32
33 a relatively well-supported clade, characterized by five non-ambiguous
34
35 synapomorphies: (1) the most reduced preorbital region in dicynodontoids
36
37 (continuous character 1); (2) a notch on the dorsal edge of the narial opening (41(1));
38
39 (3) nasal bosses present as a median swelling with a continuous posterior margin
40
41 (57(1)); (4) parietals exposed in the midline groove (72(1)); and (5) a relatively flat
42
43 temporal portion of the postorbitals, so that most of the external surface of the bone
44
45 faces dorsally (74(0)). This supports our attribution of these Laotian specimens to the
46
47 single new taxon *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. erected above. This
48
49 Laotian clade is included in Kannemeyeriiformes, which are thus defined by three
50
51 derived character states: (1) the absence of postfrontal (64(1)); (2) no converging
52
53 ventral keels on the posterior portion of the anterior pterygoid rami (114(0)); and (3)
54
55 the absence of the intertuberal ridge (126(0)).
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 As already mentioned, the third Laotian specimen LPB 1993-3 is close to some
4
5 “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa: *Daptocephalus*, *Peramodon*, *Dinanomodon*, *Turfanodon*,
6
7 *Euptychognathus*, *Sintocephalus*, *Jimusaria*, *Gordonia*, *Delectosaurus*,
8
9 *Vivaxosaurus*, and the two valid species of *Dicynodon* (Kammerer et al. 2011). All
10
11 these taxa form a clade supported by four non-ambiguous synapomorphies: (1) the
12
13 highest temporal fenestra within dicynodontoids (continuous character 5); (2) a
14
15 weakly-developed distal end of the radius in contrast to the other dicynodontoids
16
17 (continuous character 19); (3) a rounded anterior tip of the snout (35(0)); and (4) a
18
19 raised circumorbital rim (62(1)). Within this clade, LPB 1993-3 is sister to the clade
20
21 formed by the late Permian South Gondwanan *Daptocephalus* and *Dinanomodon*,
22
23 Chinese *Turfanodon*, and Russian *Peramodon* (Fröbisch, 2009).
24
25
26
27

28 Battail (2009) previously compared the three Laotian specimens with *Lystrosaurus*
29
30 and *Dicynodon*. Based on a morphological study, he attributed them to *Dicynodon* as
31
32 previously defined by Cluver & Hotton III (1981), before the taxonomic revision of
33
34 *Dicynodon* by Kammerer et al. (2011). Our phylogenetic results do not contradict this
35
36 preliminary assignment because the Laotian specimens show closer affinities with
37
38 “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa and the two valid species of *Dicynodon* (Kammerer et al.
39
40 2011) than with *Lystrosaurus*.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 DISCUSSION

51 Morphological Variation in *Repelinosaurus robustus*

52
53 LPB 1995-9 and LPB 1993-2 are found in the same clade as *Repelinosaurus*,
54
55 which is an early kannemeyeriiform (Fig. 6). As noted above, a variety of features
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 distinguishes these two specimens. However, these differences could be related to
4
5 postmortem distortions, ontogeny, sexual dimorphism or other intraspecific variation.
6
7

8 LPB 1995-9 is distinguished by well-defined depressions lateral to the median
9
10 ridge of the premaxilla in contrast to the flat surface in LPB 1993-2 (discrete
11
12 character 29, Appendix 1). Nevertheless, it is clear that LPB 1995-9 was affected by
13
14 lateral compression, as indicated by the lack of symmetry in ventral view, the tusks
15
16 turned inward, the more anterior position of the left tusk with respect to the right one,
17
18 and breaks in the compressed zygomatic arches. In addition, the angulation between
19
20 the occipital plate and the palate is less in LPB 1995-9 than in LPB 1993-2
21
22 (continuous character 13, Appendix 1) and could be linked to taphonomic distortion.
23
24 This latter could also explain other differences such as (1) the direction of the
25
26 posterior processes of the postorbitals (slightly oblique in LPB 1995-9 but horizontal
27
28 in LPB 1993-2); (2) the insertion of the squamosal wings in the occipital plate
29
30 (reaching the dorsal margin of the occiput in LPB 1993-2 but not in LPB 1995-9); and
31
32 (3) the dorsal expansion of the parietals in the intertemporal bar (as a midline groove
33
34 in LPB 1993-2 but mostly overlapped by the postorbitals in LPB 1995-9). In addition,
35
36 although only two specimens of *Repelinosaurus* are currently known, it cannot
37
38 excluded that the other morphological differences between the two specimens could
39
40 be related to ontogenetic, dimorphic or other intraspecific variation.
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Indeed, the negative allometry measured in the length of the pineal foramen
48
49 versus skull size in *Repelinosaurus* (Table 2) could be interpreted as ontogenetic
50
51 variability, as observed in *Colobodectes cluveri* (Angielczyk and Rubidge, 2009). In
52
53 this taxon, Angielczyk and Rubidge (2009) also noted well-developed caniniform
54
55 processes with a disappearance of the palatal rim notch in the largest skull. Here, the
56
57 large LPB 1993-2 shows a deeper lateral convexity of the caniniform processes, yet
58
59
60

1
2
3 no palatal rim notch is present. A greater length of the intertemporal bar posterior to
4
5 the pineal foramen is also noted in the smaller LPB 1995-9 (continuous character 6,
6
7 Appendix 1), as is the case in the Middle Triassic *Dolichuranus primaevus* (C. Olivier,
8
9 pers. obs., 2018, on BP/1/4570 vs. BP/1/4573). This could suggest that the position
10
11 of the pineal foramen may be related to ontogeny.
12

13
14 LPB 1995-9 is less robust than LPB 1993-2, which bears more developed
15
16 ornamentations: (1) its frontals bear a sharp frontal ridge; (2) high rugosities are
17
18 noted on its premaxilla, maxillae, lateral processes of the postorbitals, and the
19
20 squamosal zygomatic arch; and (3) its nasal bosses are more laterally developed.
21
22 Variations in width, depth, and rugosity of skulls of the Middle–Late Triassic
23
24 *Dinodontosaurus turpior* appear to be related to ontogeny (e.g., C. Olivier, pers. obs.,
25
26 2018; Lucas and Harris, 1996): the large specimen MCZ 1679 bears frontal,
27
28 prefrontal, and postorbital bosses, which contrast with the smaller MCZ 1677 (C.
29
30 Olivier, pers. obs., 2018). The development of cranial ridges and ornamentations are
31
32 indeed related to skull size in *Lystrosaurus*, but only up to a size threshold (Grine et
33
34 al., 2006). In addition, the size variation of ridges and ornamentations differs
35
36 according to the species of *Lystrosaurus* (Grine et al., 2006). More developed
37
38 ornamentations are also observed in the largest skulls of *Lystrosaurus*, but Ray
39
40 (2005) supposed a sexually dimorphic variation, with inferred male individuals more
41
42 ornamented than females. In addition, a more developed cranial ornamentation in
43
44 adult males has been evidenced in *Diictodon* (Sullivan et al., 2003) and in
45
46 *Pelanomodon*, which may be linked to the ‘armament’ in the context of sexual
47
48 selection (Kammerer et al., 2016). The relative form and size of the nasal bosses
49
50 also appears to be related to sexual dimorphism in the Permian *Aulacephalodon*
51
52 (e.g., Keyser, 1969; Tollman et al., 1980). However, the quantitative analyses of
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Tollman et al. (1980) indicated a positive allometry in the width of the nasal bosses,
4
5 instead suggesting an ontogenetic effect on it in *Aulacephalodon*. Moreover, as seen
6
7 in LPB 1993-2, a ventrally directed convexity of the squamosal zygomatic arch in
8
9 large specimens of *Aulacephalodon* are observed only in males (e.g., Tollman et al.,
10
11 1980).
12

13
14 The basal section of the tusk of LPB 1993-2 (anteroposteriorly compressed) is
15
16 different from that of LPB 1995-9 (mediolaterally compressed) (Table 2). Angielczyk
17
18 and Rubidge (2009) noted the fact that the smallest specimen of *Colobodectes*
19
20 *cluveri* has less-developed and newly erupted tusks, is related to ontogeny. In
21
22 *Repelinosaurus*, the tusks of LPB 1995-9 are well erupted and in the same proportion
23
24 as in the larger LPB 1993-2. This variation in the basal section of the tusk thus
25
26 appears unlikely to be linked to ontogeny. The mediolateral compression of the tusks
27
28 in LPB 1995-9 could not be explained by lateral postmortem compression because of
29
30 the excellent preservation of the tusks. Another intraspecific variation (i.e. related
31
32 neither to sex nor to ontogeny) may thus explain the differences in tusk basal
33
34 sections. This may also be the case for the preparietal depressed or flush with the
35
36 skull roof (discrete character 68, Appendix 1) and for the maxillo-prefrontal suture,
37
38 which is either present only in some of the specimen (discrete character 49,
39
40 Appendix 1).
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Most morphological variation within *Repelinosaurus robustus* may therefore be
48
49 related to ontogeny and/or sexual dimorphism demonstrated to occur in other
50
51 dicynodonts (e.g., Keyser, 1969; Tollman et al., 1980; Ray, 2005; Angielczyk and
52
53 Rubidge, 2009), taphonomic distortion or other intraspecific variation. Nevertheless,
54
55 as mentioned above, the number of specimens of *Repelinosaurus* is too low to
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 assess which kind of intraspecific variation (sexual dimorphism, ontogeny, etc.) is
4
5 present.
6
7
8
9

10 **Taxonomic validity of *Repelinosaurus* and *Counillonia***

11 Phylogenetic affinities are found between the Laotian *Counillonia* and the late
12 Permian *Peramodon*, *Delectosaurus*, *Vivaxosaurus*, *Turfanodon*, *Jimusaria*,
13
14 *Gordonia*, *Euptychognathus*, *Daptocephalus*, *Dinanomodon*, *Sintocephalus*, and the
15
16 two valid species of *Dicynodon* (Fig. 6; Kammerer et al. 2011). Within the clade
17
18 formed by *Counillonia* and these “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa, the following
19
20 autapomorphies distinguish the Laotian dicynodont: (1) a relatively large median
21
22 pterygoid plate (continuous character 8, Appendix 1), (2) the absence of an
23
24 intertuberal ridge; and (3) opisthotics with distinct posteriorly-directed processes
25
26 (Figs. 2C–D). As in *Delectosaurus*, the occipital condyle of *Counillonia* is not fused,
27
28 while the other cited “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa have a co-ossified single unit. The naso-
29
30 frontal suture is either straight, as in *Dicynodon huenei* and *Jimusaria*, or has an
31
32 anterior process in the other cited “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa, unlike the clear posterior
33
34 process in *Counillonia* (Fig. 2A). Overall, most morphological characters distinguish
35
36 *Counillonia* from its closely related “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa. If we focus on the
37
38 geographically close taxa such as the Russian *Peramodon*, *Delectosaurus* and
39
40 *Vivaxosaurus*, and the Chinese *Turfanodon* and *Jimusaria*, other differences can be
41
42 highlighted. *Peramodon* and *Turfanodon* have a rounded dorsal margin of the
43
44 squamosal wings in lateral view (Kammerer et al., 2011), while it is more acute in
45
46 *Counillonia* because of a lower lateral opening (Fig. 2B). The interorbital region in
47
48 *Turfanodon* is wider than in *Counillonia* (Fig. 2A; Kammerer et al., 2011). *Counillonia*
49
50 also has an interpterygoid vacuity and temporal squamosal processes longer than in
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 *Jimusaria* (Kammerer et al. 2011); the squamosals therefore do not reach the dorsal
4 region of the occiput in this Laotian genus (Fig. 2B). In contrast to *Vivaxosaurus*, the
5 caniniform processes are less anteriorly projected in *Counillonia*, and its maxillae do
6 not bear a rounded boss anterior to the tusks (Fig. 2B; Kammerer et al., 2011). In
7
8 *Counillonia*, the anterior rami of the pterygoids are ventrally highly expanded and
9 therefore not in the same plane as the more dorsal palatines (Fig. 2C), in contrast to
10
11 *Delectosaurus*.

12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 *Repelinosaurus* is recovered as a kannemeyeriiform. Only one genus of
20 kannemeyeriiform was previously known near the Permo–Triassic boundary: the
21 Early Triassic *Sungeodon* (Maisch & Matzke, 2014). *Repelinosaurus* differs from all
22 kannemeyeriiforms by the strong reduction of the preorbital region (Figs. 3A; 4A).
23 This character state is shared to a lesser degree with *Counillonia* (Fig. 2A) and the
24 kistecephalian *Kombuisia* (Fröbisch, 2007). As in the Early Triassic *Kombuisia* and
25 *Myosaurus*, the nasal bosses of *Repelinosaurus* form a single median swelling in
26 dorsal view (Figs. 3A; 4A), in contrast to currently known kannemeyeriiforms that
27 have a pair of bosses. In *Repelinosaurus*, the parietals, weakly exposed on the skull
28 roof, are inserted between the two wide posterior processes of the postorbitals (Figs.
29 3A; 4A), in contrast with the majority of kannemeyeriiforms except *Sangusaurus*,
30
31 *Uralokannemeyeria*, and *Rechnisaurus*. Kannemeyeriiformes are known for their
32 temporal crest, generally associated with laterally-directed posterior processes of the
33 postorbitals. This is not the case in *Repelinosaurus* (Figs. 3A–B; 4A–B), where the
34 postorbitals mainly face dorsally.

35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56 **New Data Supporting the Survivorship of Multiple Lineages across the P–Tr**
57
58 **Boundary?**
59
60

1
2
3 The latest Permian terrestrial biomes were dominated by herbivorous
4
5 pareiasaurs and dicynodonts, and carnivorous gorgonopsians and therocephalians
6
7 (e.g., Steyer, 2012; Benton and Newell, 2014). A recent study (Bernardi et al., 2017)
8
9 evidenced a link between the distribution of herbivore tetrapods, phytoprovinces and
10
11 latitudinal climatic zonation. More specifically, dicynodonts were predominant only in
12
13 high paleolatitudes biomes. The dicynodonts were strongly affected by the P–Tr crisis
14
15 (e.g., Fröbisch, 2007). The lystrosaurids are the emblematic clade to have survived
16
17 the P–Tr event (e.g., Fröbisch, 2007; Botha-Brink et al., 2016). However, as indicated
18
19 by the dicynodont phylogenetic relationships recovered herein (e.g., Angielczyk,
20
21 2001; Fröbisch, 2007, 2010; Kammerer et al., 2011), other lineages also appear to
22
23 cross the end-Permian boundary. Fröbisch (2007) previously highlighted the
24
25 interesting phylogenetic position of the Triassic *Kombuisia*, belonging to kingoriids
26
27 and closely related to the Permian *Dicynodontoides*. *Kombuisia* is known from the
28
29 probable Middle Triassic of South Africa and also the Early Triassic of Antarctica
30
31 (e.g., Fig. 6; Fröbisch, 2007, 2010). The stratigraphic positions of the two *Kombuisia*
32
33 species imply lengthy ghost lineages, stretching back into the Permian. The Early
34
35 Triassic *Myosaurus* is also closely related to Permian dicynodonts and is sister taxon
36
37 to the cistecephalids (e.g., Fig. 6; Fröbisch, 2007). In addition, most previous studies
38
39 assumed a ghost lineage for Kannemeyeriiformes (e.g., Fröbisch, 2007, 2010;
40
41 Kammerer et al., 2011). Kammerer et al. (2011) indeed inferred Permian forms (such
42
43 as lystrosaurids or “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxa) as sister groups to the
44
45 kannemeyeriiforms. They thus assumed a ghost lineage for the kannemeyeriiforms
46
47 that spans at least part of the late Permian and the earliest Triassic.

48
49 Most previous studies noted the impact of a potential geographic bias on the
50
51 presence of ghost lineages in dicynodonts (e.g., Angielczyk, 2001; Fröbisch et al.,
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2010; Kammerer et al., 2011). Their hypothesis was supported by the discovery of
4
5 specimens of *Kombuisia* (formerly known from the Karoo Basin in South Africa, dated
6
7 to the Middle Triassic) from the Early Triassic Fremouw Fm in Antarctica (Fröbisch,
8
9 2010). In addition, the assumption of Kammerer et al. (2013) that supposed the
10
11 occurrence of kannemeyeriiforms in the Early Triassic gained support by the recent
12
13 description of *Sungeodon* from the Junggar Basin in China (Maisch & Matzke, 2014).
14
15 Despite relatively weak node supports, the phylogenetic position of the Laotian
16
17 *Repelinosaurus* also helps to shorten the ghost lineage between the
18
19 kannemeyeriiforms and the other dicynodontoids, extending the first appearance of
20
21 Kannemeyeriiformes to near the P–Tr boundary. In addition, the discovery of the
22
23 earliest kannemeyeriiforms in an understudied geographic area such Laos, with
24
25 *Repelinosaurus* and China, with *Sungeodon* (Maisch & Matzke, 2014), strengthens
26
27 these suggestions, underlining a geographic bias in dicynodont sampling. The
28
29 phylogenetic position of *Counillonia* makes it the first known “*Dicynodon*”-grade
30
31 dicynodontoid that could have survived the P–Tr extinction (maximum depositional
32
33 age of 251.0 ± 1.4 Ma). This supports the survivorship of multiple dicynodont lineages
34
35 across the P–Tr event, as previously suggested (e.g., Angielczyk, 2001; Fröbisch,
36
37 2007, 2010; Kammerer et al., 2011).
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 The dicynodont post-extinction recovery was thought to be have been relatively
45
46 delayed (e.g., Sahney and Benton, 2008; Chen and Benton, 2012), starting in the
47
48 Middle Triassic when the kannemeyeriiforms underwent a large adaptive radiation
49
50 (Fröbisch, 2009). Sun et al. (2012) described an “equatorial tetrapod gap” and
51
52 attributed the delayed recovery to excessive paleotemperatures during the Early
53
54 Triassic, especially at the warmer equatorial paleolatitudes. However, other studies
55
56 have supported a rapid recovery (e.g., Botha and Smith, 2006; Maisch and Matzke,
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 2014). The occurrence in the Early Triassic of the kannemeyeriiform *Sungeodon*
4
5 (Maisch and Matzke, 2014) and potentially of a new Laotian kannemeyeriiform
6
7 *Repelinosaurus* (maximum depositional age of 251.0 ± 1.4 Ma; Rossignol et al.,
8
9 2016) would support a rapid recovery of the group after the P–Tr mass extinction
10
11 event. In addition, Bernardi et al. (2018) explained the “equatorial tetrapod gap”
12
13 defined by Sun et al. (2012) by invoking a northwards tetrapod distribution shift
14
15 during the Induan. Besides, as for Antarctica (Fröbisch et al., 2010), the presence of
16
17 dicynodonts (*Repelinosaurus* and *Counillonia*) and a chroniosuchian (*Laosuchus*
18
19 *naga*, Arbez et al., 2018) in Laos near the Permo–Triassic boundary may also
20
21 indicate a refuge zone where the dicynodont and chroniosuchian (and possibly other
22
23 tetrapod faunas) were not strongly affected by the P–Tr crisis. However, the available
24
25 data on the Laotian fauna of the Permo–Triassic period is not yet sufficient to draw
26
27 firm conclusions on this point.
28
29
30
31

32
33 As mentioned above, Bernardi et al. (2017) demonstrated a significant correlation
34
35 between the distribution of the dicynodonts and phytoprovinces, indicating that the
36
37 resilience and survivorship of dicynodonts after the crisis may be linked to plant
38
39 diversity. Indeed, Gastaldo et al. (2017) described an uninterrupted plant cover of
40
41 glossopterids and sphenophytes in the *Lystrosaurus* Assemblage zone, across the
42
43 P–Tr boundary. A full recovery of plants is also attested from the Middle Triassic
44
45 (e.g., Benton and Newell, 2014). An Early Triassic flora is well documented in South
46
47 China, combining the late Permian relic *Gigantopteris* and pioneer taxa dominated by
48
49 the lycopsid *Annalepsis* (Yu et al., 2015). This Chinese paleoflora has been shown to
50
51 be stable across the P–Tr boundary, with the highest turnover rates occurring during
52
53 the Induan (Xiong and Wang, 2011). Even if documented in a distinct and somewhat
54
55 remote area from the Luang Prabang Basin at that time (Fig. 1), a rich and diversified
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 paleoflora (Bercovici et al., 2012) has been evidenced above the strata correlated to
4
5 the late Changhsingian (Blanchard et al., 2013) and below the Purple Claystone Fm
6
7 (Rossignol et al., 2016). The occurrence of paleosols with root traces (Bercovici et
8
9 al., 2012) attests to the presence of plants during the deposition of the Purple
10
11 Claystone Fm.
12

13 14 15 16 17 18 **Paleobiogeographical Implications of the Two Laotian Dicynodonts**

19
20 The occurrence of new dicynodonts in the Luang Prabang Basin (Laos), located
21
22 in the Indochina Block (e.g., Fig. 1A; Cocks and Torsvik, 2013), provides interesting
23
24 new insights on the controverted paleogeography of Southeast Asia.
25

26
27 Like all the other East and Southeast Asian continental blocks, the Indochina
28
29 Block originates from the Eastern Gondwana margin (e.g., Metcalfe, 2013; Burrett et
30
31 al., 2014). The separation of this block from the Gondwana mainland, by the opening
32
33 of the Paleotethyan Ocean, is dated from the Early Ordovician (e.g., Cocks and
34
35 Torsvik, 2013) or the Devonian (e.g., Metcalfe, 2011, 2013; Thanh et al., 2011; Lai et
36
37 al., 2014). The collision between the Indochina and South China blocks has been
38
39 variously dated: Silurian to Devonian (e.g., Thanh et al., 2011), Carboniferous (e.g.,
40
41 Metcalfe, 2011; Vư֏ng et al., 2013; Zhang et al., 2014), late Permian to Early
42
43 Triassic (Halpin et al., 2016), Early Triassic (e.g., Lepvrier et al., 2004; Kamvong et
44
45 al., 2014), Middle Triassic (e.g., Nakano et al., 2008; Zhang et al., 2013, 2014; Faure
46
47 et al., 2014; Rossignol et al., 2018) or even Late Triassic (e.g., Liu et al., 2012).
48
49
50
51

52
53 Microanatomical studies, analyzing the distribution of the bone tissues,
54
55 morphological and taphonomic evidence, support an essentially terrestrial lifestyle for
56
57 most of dicynodonts (e.g., Ray et al., 2005, 2010; 2012; Wall 1983; King and Cluver,
58
59 1990; Botha-Brink and Angielczyk, 2010). *Lystrosaurus* is one of the rare dicynodonts
60

1
2
3 supposed to be semi-aquatic based on its microanatomy, morphology, and
4
5 taphonomic preservation (e.g., Germain and Laurin, 2005; Ray, 2006). However,
6
7 these conclusions have been questioned, and a terrestrial lifestyle has been
8
9 proposed for *Lystrosaurus* based on its microanatomy, associated faunas, and
10
11 paleoenvironment (e.g., King and Cluver, 1990; Botha-Brink and Angielczyk, 2010).

12
13 The bone microstructure in *Lystrosaurus* is similar to that of *Placerias*, *Wadisasaurus*,
14
15 and *Kannemeyeria* (Ray *et al.*, 2005, 2012; Wall 1983). However, whilst a semi-
16
17 aquatic lifestyle based on microanatomy is proposed for *Placerias* (Green *et al.*,
18
19 2010), *Kannemeyeria*, and *Wadisasaurus* were supposed to be terrestrial (Ray *et al.*,
20
21 2010, 2012). Evidence for dicynodont lifestyle remains equivocal, but even if some
22
23 taxa did have a semi-aquatic but freshwater lifestyle, this would be unlikely to allow
24
25 dispersal across a wide oceanic domain.
26
27
28
29
30

31 The presence of dicynodonts in Laos highlights a connection between the
32
33 Indochina Block and South China Block (SCB). U–Pb geochronology on detrital
34
35 zircon suggested that the connection may occur not later than 251.0 ± 1.4 Ma, the
36
37 maximum depositional age. Two different hypotheses can be proposed to account for
38
39 such a connection.
40

41 Firstly, the Indochina Block could have been connected with the North China
42
43 Block (NCB), via the SCB. This hypothesis requires that the contact between the
44
45 NCB and the SCB was effective at 251.0 ± 1.4 Ma, i.e, slightly before the Middle to
46
47 Late Triassic age generally considered plausible for the collision between these
48
49 blocks (Li, 1994; Weislogel *et al.*, 2006; Chang and Zhao, 2012; Torsvik and Cocks,
50
51 2017). It also implies a connection between the Indochina Block and the SCB before
52
53 or during the latest Permian or earliest Triassic, as proposed by Lepvrier *et al.*
54
55 (2004), Metcalfe (2011), Kamvong *et al.* (2014), Scotese (2014), and Halpin *et al.*
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (2016). However, other interpretations support a continental connection between the
4
5 SCB and the Indochina Block later than the Early Triassic (see references above). A
6
7 diachronous continental collision between the SCB and the Indochina Block (Halpin
8
9 et al., 2016), beginning during the late Permian to the East (present day coordinates)
10
11 and continuing toward the West up to the Middle Triassic, has recently been put
12
13 forward. Such a hypothesis reconciles an Early to Middle Triassic collision between
14
15 the SCB and the Indochina Block with the paleobiogeographic distribution of
16
17 dicynodonts. This is further corroborated with the discovery of a new chroniosuchian
18
19 in non-marine rocks in the Purple Claystone Fm (Arbez et al., 2018), which is inferred
20
21 to have had an amphibious lifestyle (e.g., Buchwitz et al, 2012; Golubev, 2015; Arbez
22
23 et al., 2018) and which supports a connection between Eurasia and the Indochina
24
25 Block at that time.
26
27
28
29
30

31 Secondly, another hypothesis to account for the presence of dicynodont remains
32
33 in the Indochina Block consists of an indirect connection with other landmasses via a
34
35 string of microcontinents. Indeed, a connection between Pangea and the Indochina
36
37 Block, involving the western Cimmerian continental strip before or during the Early
38
39 Triassic, was also suggested (Buffetaut, 1989; Metcalfe, 2006, 2011). Laos is
40
41 characterized by a Cathaysian flora, also found in China, Korea, Japan, Thailand,
42
43 Indonesia, and Malaysia (e.g., Bernardi et al., 2017). The high affinities between
44
45 Cathaysian and Cimmerian faunas and floras suggest geographical proximity (Wang
46
47 and Sugiyama, 2002; Torsvik and Cocks, 2017). Nevertheless, this proximity is
48
49 based on plants and marine faunas (Wang and Sugiyama, 2002; Ueno, 2003; Shen
50
51 et al., 2013; Torsvik and Cocks, 2017), which are less constrained for dispersion by
52
53 oceanic barriers than terrestrial faunas are. Moreover, the presence of marine faunas
54
55 and a majority of limestone deposits during the late Permian in the Sibumasu Block
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (e.g., Ueno, 2003; Chaodumrong et al., 2007; Shen et al., 2013; Wang et al., 2013),
4
5 indicate a largely submerged land (Metcalf, 2011). Furthermore, the collision
6
7 between the Sibumasu or Simao blocks with the Indochina Block is considered to
8
9 have occurred after the Norian (e.g., Metcalfe, 2011; Rossignol et al., 2016). The
10
11 Cimmerian option also supposes proximity between the Cimmerian blocks and
12
13 Pangea. The collision between Iran and Eurasia is latest Triassic–Jurassic in age
14
15 (e.g., Wilmsen et al., 2009; Zanchi et al., 2009). However, Zanchi et al. (2015)
16
17 suggest an affinity and probable proximity between Eurasia and Central Iran as early
18
19 as late Paleozoic. These uncertainties render difficult the involvement of the
20
21 Cimmerian blocks during the Permian–Triassic in the role of an indirect connection,
22
23 and suggest the existence of other microcontinents to explain this second
24
25 hypothesis.
26
27
28
29
30

31 The aforementioned two hypotheses are based on a maximum depositional
32
33 age of 251.0 ± 1.4 Ma for the Laotian dicynodonts. Such a maximum depositional
34
35 age is also compatible with a deposition of the Purple Claystone Fm in the Middle
36
37 Triassic (Rossignol et al., 2016). This maximum depositional age is therefore
38
39 consistent with paleogeographic results indicating collisions between NCB and SCB
40
41 (Li, 1994; Weislogel et al., 2006; Chang and Zhao, 2012; Torsvik and Cocks, 2017) in
42
43 the Middle Triassic, and between the Indochina Block and SCB in the Middle to Late
44
45 Triassic (e.g., Liu et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2013; Faure et al., 2014; Rossignol et al.,
46
47 2018). This implies the survival of a “*Dicynodon*”-grade taxon *Counillonia superoculis*
48
49 to the P–Tr crisis. This work brings new insights to ongoing debates about the
50
51 paleobiogeographic and geodynamic evolution of Southeast Asia from the late
52
53 Paleozoic to the early Mesozoic. It warrants further field expeditions in late Permian
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and Early Triassic formations in the former indochina block to confirm or reject our
4
5 hypotheses.
6
7
8
9

10 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

11
12
13
14
15 We thank the Minister of Information and Culture of Lao PDR and the Savannakhet
16
17 Dinosaur Museum (Laos) for their authorization to study the material. We also thank
18
19 C. Bouillet and P. Richir (CR2P, MNHN, Paris, France) for their help during the
20
21 preparation of the material, S. Fernandez (MNHN) for the drawings, T. Arbez (CR2P,
22
23 MNHN) for his comments on the Laotian chroniosuchian, B. Khalloufi (CR2P, MNHN)
24
25 and R. Zaragüeta (ISYEB, MNHN) for their discussion on paleobiogeographic issues,
26
27 and R. R. Allain, V. Barriel, O. Bethoux, G. Billet, M. Laurin (CR2P, MNHN), A. K.
28
29 Huttenlocker (University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, U.S.A.), C.
30
31 Kammerer (North Carolina Museum of Natural Sciences, Raleigh, North Carolina,
32
33 U.S.A.), K. D. Angielczyk (Field Museum of Natural History, Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.),
34
35 J. Camp (University of California, Riverside, County California, U.S.A.), and an
36
37 anonymous reviewer for their relevant and constructive remarks, and M. Pickford
38
39 (CR2P, MNHN) and M. Laurin (CR2P, MNHN) for improving the English. C.O.
40
41 benefited from the financial support of the GDRI PalBioDiv SEA project, which
42
43 allowed her to consult the dicynodonts material in Savanaketh (Laos). C.R.
44
45 acknowledges the financial support of the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP
46
47 - Fundação Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo; processo 2018/02645-2
48
49 and processo 2015/16235-2).
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

LITERATURE CITED

- 1
2
3
4
5 Angielczyk, K. D. 2001. Preliminary phylogenetic analysis and stratigraphic
6
7
8 congruence of the dicynodont anomodonts (Synapsida: Therapsida).
9
10 *Palaeontologica Africana* 37:53–79.
- 11
12
13 Angielczyk, K. D., and C. F. Kammerer. 2017. The cranial morphology, phylogenetic
14
15 position and biogeography of the upper Permian dicynodont *Compsodon helmoedi*
16
17 van Hoepen (Therapsida, Anomodontia). *Papers in Palaeontology* 3:513–545.
- 18
19
20 Angielczyk, K. D., and A. A. Kurkin. 2003. Phylogenetic analysis of Russian Permian
21
22 dicynodonts (Therapsida: Anomodontia): implications for Permian biostratigraphy
23
24 and Pangaeen biogeography. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 139:157–
25
26
27 212.
- 28
29
30 Angielczyk, K. D., and B. S. Rubidge. 2009. The Permian dicynodont *Colobodectes*
31
32 *cluveri* (Therapsida, Anomodontia), with notes on its ontogeny and stratigraphic
33
34 range in the Karoo Basin, South Africa. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*
35
36
37 29:1162–1173.
- 38
39
40 Angielczyk, K. D., and B. S. Rubidge. 2013. Skeletal morphology, phylogenetic
41
42 relationships and stratigraphic range of *Eosimops newtoni* Broom, 1921, a
43
44 pylaecephalid dicynodont (Therapsida, Anomodontia) from the Middle Permian of
45
46 South Africa. *Journal of Systematic Palaeontology* 11:191–231.
- 47
48
49 Angielczyk, K. D., B. S. Rubidge, M. O. Day, and F. Lin. 2016. A Reevaluation of
50
51 *Brachyprosopus broomi* and *Chelydontops altidentalis*, Dicynodonts (Therapsida,
52
53 Anomodontia) from the Middle Permian *Tapinocephalus* Assemblage Zone of the
54
55 Karoo Basin, South Africa. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 36:e1078342.
- 56
57
58 Angielczyk, K. D., P. J. Hancox, and A. Nabavizadeh. 2018. A redescription of the
59
60 Triassic kannemeyeriiform dicynodont *Sangusaurus* (Therapsida, Anomodontia),

1
2
3 with an analysis of its feeding system. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 37:189–
4
5 227.

6
7
8 Arbez, T., C. A. Sidor, and J. S. Steyer. 2018. *Laosuchus naga* gen. et sp. nov., a
9
10 new chroniosuchian from South-East Asia (Laos) with internal structures revealed
11
12 by micro-CT scan and discussion of its palaeobiology. *Journal of Systematic*
13
14 *Palaeontology*: 10.1080/14772019.2018.1504827.

15
16
17 Battail, B. 2009. Late Permian dicynodont fauna from Laos. Geological Society,
18
19 London, Special Publications 315:33–40.

20
21
22 Bernardi, M., F. M. Petti, and M. J. Benton. 2018. Tetrapod distribution and
23
24 temperature rise during the Permian–Triassic mass extinction. *Proceedings of the*
25
26 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 285:20172331.

27
28
29 Bernardi, M., F. M. Petti, E. Kustatscher, M. Franz, C. Hartkopf-Fröder, C. C.
30
31 Labandeira, T. Wappler, J. H. A. van Konijnenburg-van Cittert, B. R. Peacock, and
32
33 K. D. Angielczyk. 2017. Late Permian (Lopingian) terrestrial ecosystems: A global
34
35 comparison with new data from the low-latitude Bletterbach Biota. *Earth-Science*
36
37 *Reviews* 175:18–43.

38
39
40 Benton, M. J., and A. J. Newell. 2014. Impacts of global warming on Permo–Triassic
41
42 terrestrial ecosystems. *Gondwana Research* 25:1308–1337.

43
44
45 Benton, M. J., V. P. Tverdokhlebov, and M. V. Surkov. 2004. Ecosystem remodelling
46
47 among vertebrates at the Permian–Triassic boundary in Russia. *Nature* 432:97–
48
49 100.

50
51
52 Bercovici, A., S. Bourquin, J. Broutin, J. -S. Steyer, B. Battail, M. Véran, R. Vacant, B.
53
54 Khenthavong, and S. Vongphamany. 2012. Permian continental
55
56 paleoenvironments in Southeastern Asia: New insights from the Luang Prabang
57
58 Basin (Laos). *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences* 60:197–211.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Blanchard, S., C. Rossignol, S. Bourquin, M. -P. Dabard, E. Hallot, T. Nalpas, M.
4
5 Poujol, B. Battail, N. -E. Jalil, J.-S. Steyer, R. Vacant, M. Véran, A. Bercovici J. B.
6
7 Diez, J. -L. Paquette, B. Khenthavong, and S. Vongphamany. 2013. Late Triassic
8
9 volcanic activity in South-East Asia: New stratigraphical, geochronological and
10
11 paleontological evidence from the Luang Prabang Basin (Laos). *Journal of Asian*
12
13 *Earth Sciences* 70–71:8–26.
14
15
16 Boos, A. D. S., C. F. Kammerer, C. L. Schultz, M. B. Soares, and A. L. R. Ilha. 2016.
17
18 A New Dicynodont (Therapsida: Anomodontia) from the Permian of Southern
19
20 Brazil and Its Implications for Bidentalian Origins. *PLoS One* 11:e0155000.
21
22
23 Botha, J. and R. M. H. Smith. 2006. Rapid vertebrate recuperation in the Karoo Basin
24
25 of South Africa following the End-Permian extinction. *Journal of African Earth*
26
27 *Sciences* 45:502–514.
28
29
30 Botha-Brink, J., and K. D. Angielczyk. 2010. Do extraordinarily high growth rates in
31
32 Permo–Triassic dicynodonts (Therapsida, Anomodontia) explain their success
33
34 before and after the end-Permian extinction ? *Zoological Journal of the Linnean*
35
36 *Society* 160:341–365.
37
38
39 Botha-Brink, J., D. Codron, A. K. Huttenlocker, K. D. Angielczyk, and M. Ruta. 2016.
40
41 Breeding Young as a Survival Strategy during Earth’s Greatest Mass Extinction.
42
43 *Scientific Reports* 6:24053.
44
45
46 Bremer, K. 1988. The limits of amino acid sequence data in angiosperm phylogenetic
47
48 reconstruction. *Evolution* 42:795–803.
49
50
51 Broom, R. 1905. On the use of the term Anomodontia. *Albany Museum Records*
52
53 1:266–269.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Buchwitz, M., F. Witzmann, S. Voigt, and V. Golubev. 2012. Osteoderm
4
5 microstructure indicates the presence of a crocodylian-like trunk bracing system in
6
7 a group of armoured basal tetrapods. *Acta Zoologica* 93:260–280.
8
9
10
11 Buffetaut, E. 1989. The contribution of vertebrate palaeontology to the geodynamic
12
13 history of South East Asia; pp. 645–653 in A.M.C. Şengör (ed.), *Tectonic Evolution*
14
15 *of the Tethyan Region*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
16
17
18 Burgess, S. D., S. A. Bowring, and S. -Z. Shen. 2014. High-precision timeline for
19
20 Earth's most severe extinction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
21
22 111:3316–3321.
23
24
25 Burrett, C., K. Zaw, S. Meffre, C. K. Lai, S. Khositanont, P. Chaodumrong, M.
26
27 Udchachon, S. Ekins, and J. Halpin. 2014. The configuration of Greater
28
29 Gondwana—Evidence from LA ICPMS, U–Pb geochronology of detrital zircons
30
31 from the Palaeozoic and Mesozoic of Southeast Asia and China. *Gondwana*
32
33 *Research* 26:31–51.
34
35
36 Castanhinha, R., R. Araújo, L. C. Júnior, K. D. Angielczyk, G. G. Martins, R. M. S.
37
38 Martins, C. Chaouiya, F. Beckmann, and F. Wilde. 2013. Bringing Dicynodonts
39
40 Back to Life: Paleobiology and Anatomy of a New Emydopoid Genus from the
41
42 Upper Permian of Mozambique. *PLoS ONE* 8:e80974.
43
44
45 Chang, K. -H., and X. Zhao. 2012. North and South China suturing in the east end:
46
47 What happened in Korean Peninsula? *Gondwana Research* 22:493–506.
48
49
50 Chaodumrong, P., X. -D. Wang, and S. -Z. Shen. 2007. Permian lithostratigraphy of
51
52 the Shan–Thai Terrane in Thailand: revision of the Kaeng Krachan and Ratburi
53
54 groups; pp. 229–236 in *GEOTHAI'07 International Conference on Geology of*
55
56 *Thailand: Towards Sustainable Development and Sufficiency Economy*, Bangkok.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Chen, Z. -Q., and M. J. Benton. 2012. The timing and pattern of biotic recovery
4 following the end-Permian mass extinction. *Nature Geoscience* 5:375–383.
5
6
7 Cluver, M. A. 1971. The cranial morphology of the dicynodont genus *Lystrosaurus*.
8 *Annals of South African Museum* 56:155–274.
9
10 Cluver, M. A., and N. Hotton III. 1981. The genera *Dicynodon* and *Diictodon* and their
11 bearing of classification of the Dicynodontia (Reptilia, Therapsida). *Annales of the*
12 *South African Museum* 83:99–146.
13
14 Cluver M. A., and G. M. King. 1983. A reassessment of the relationships of Permian
15 Dicynodontia (Reptilia, Therapsida) and a new classification of dicynodonts.
16 *Annals of the South African Museum* 91:195–273.
17
18
19 Cocks, L. R. M., and T. H. Torsvik. 2013. The dynamic evolution of the Palaeozoic
20 geography of eastern Asia. *Earth-Science Reviews* 117:40–79.
21
22
23 Colbert, E. H. 1982. The distribution of *Lystrosaurus* in Pangaea and its implications.
24 *Geobios* 15:375–383.
25
26
27 Counillon, H. 1896. Documents pour servir à l'étude géologique des environs de
28 Luang–Prabang (Cochinchine). *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences*
29 123:1330–1333.
30
31
32
33 Cox, C. B., and K. D. Angielczyk. 2015. A New Endothiodont Dicynodont
34 (Therapsida, Anomodontia) from the Permian Ruhuhu Formation (Songea Group)
35 of Tanzania and Its Feeding System. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology*
36 35:e935388.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51 Das Gupta, H. C. 1922. Notes on the Panchet Reptile; pp. 237–241, Sir Asutosh
52 Mukherjee Silver Jubilee Volumes, Volume 2. University Press, Calcutta.
53
54
55
56 Dutuit, J. M. 1988. Ostéologie crânienne et ses enseignements, apports géologique
57 et paléoécologique, de *Moghreberia nmachouensis*, Dicynodonte (Reptilia,
58
59
60

1
2
3 Therapsida) du Trias supérieur marocain. Bulletin du Muséum national d'histoire
4 naturelle, Section C, Sciences de la terre, paléontologie, géologie, minéralogie
5
6 10:227–285.
7

8
9
10 Faure, M., C. Lévrier, V. V. Nguyen, T. V. Vu, W. Lin, and Z. Chen. 2014. The South
11 China block-Indochina collision: Where, when, and how? Journal of Asian Earth
12 Sciences 79:260–274.
13

14
15
16 Fröbisch, J. 2007. The cranial anatomy of *Kombuisia frerensis* Hotton (Synapsida,
17 Dicynodontia) and a new phylogeny of anomodont therapsids. Zoological Journal
18 of the Linnean Society 150:117–144.
19

20
21
22 Fröbisch, J. 2008. Global Taxonomic Diversity of Anomodonts (Tetrapoda,
23 Therapsida) and the Terrestrial Rock Record Across the Permian-Triassic
24 Boundary. PLoS ONE 3:e3733.
25

26
27
28 Fröbisch, J. 2009. Composition and similarity of global anomodont-bearing tetrapod
29 faunas. Earth-Science Reviews 95:119–157.
30

31
32
33 Fröbisch, J., K. D. Angielczyk, and C. A. Sidor. 2010. The Triassic dicynodont
34 *Kombuisia* (Synapsida, Anomodontia) from Antarctica, a refuge from the terrestrial
35 Permian-Triassic mass extinction. Naturwissenschaften 97:187–196.
36

37
38
39 Gastaldo, R. A., J. Neveling, C. V. Looy, M. K. Bamford, S. L. Kamo, and J. W.
40 Geissman. 2017. Paleontology of the Blaauwater 67 and 65 farms, South Africa:
41 testing the *Daptocephalus/Lystrosaurus* biozone boundary in a stratigraphic
42 framework. Palaios 32:349–366.
43

44
45
46 Germain, D., and M. Laurin. 2005. Microanatomy of the radius and lifestyle in
47 amniotes (Vertebrata, Tetrapoda). Zoologica Scripta 34:335–350.
48

49
50
51 Goloboff, P. A. 1999. Analyzing large data sets in reasonable times: solutions for
52 composite optima. Cladistics 15:415–428.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Goloboff, P. A., C. I. Mattoni, and A. S. Quinteros. 2006. Continuous characters
4 analyzed as such. *Cladistics* 22:589–601.
5
6
7
8 Goloboff, P. A., J. S. Farris, and K. C. Nixon. 2008. TNT, a free program for
9 phylogenetic analysis. *Cladistics* 24:774–786.
10
11
12 Golubev, V. K. 2015. Dinocephalian stage in the history of the Permian tetrapod
13 fauna of Eastern Europe. *Paleontological Journal* 49:1346–1352.
14
15
16 Green, J. L., M. H. Schweitzer, and E. -T. Lamm. 2010. Limb bone histology and
17 growth in *Placerias hesternus* (Therapsida: Anomodontia) from the Upper Triassic
18 of North America. *Palaeontology* 53:347–364.
19
20
21
22
23
24 Grine, F. E., C. A. Forster, M. A. Cluver, and J. A. Georgi. 2006. Cranial variability,
25 ontogeny and taxonomy of *Lystrosaurus* from the Karoo Basin of South Africa; pp.
26 432–503 in *Amniote Paleobiology: Perspectives on the Evolution of Mammals,*
27 *Birds, and Reptiles*, University of Chicago Press. Carrano M. T., Gaudin T. J., Blob
28 R. W. & Wible J. R., Chicago.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 Halpin, J. A., H. T. Tran, C. -K. Lai, S. Meffre, A. J. Crawford, and K. Zaw. 2016. U–
36 Pb zircon geochronology and geochemistry from NE Vietnam: A “tectonically
37 disputed” territory between the Indochina and South China blocks. *Gondwana*
38 *Research* 34:254–273.
39
40
41
42
43
44 Kammerer, C. F., and K. D. Angielczyk. 2009. A proposed higher taxonomy of
45 anomodont therapsids. *Zootaxa* 2018:1–24.
46
47
48
49 Kammerer, C. F., and R. M. H. Smith. 2017. An early geikiid dicynodont from the
50 *Tropidostoma* Assemblage Zone (late Permian) of South Africa. *PeerJ* 5:e2913.
51
52
53
54 Kammerer, C. F., K. D. Angielczyk, and J. Fröbisch. 2011. A comprehensive
55 taxonomic revision of “*Dicynodon*” (Therapsida, Anomodontia) and its implications
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 for dicynodont phylogeny, biogeography, and biostratigraphy. *Journal of*
4
5 *Vertebrate Paleontology* 31:1–158.

6
7
8 Kammerer, C. F., J. Fröbisch, and K. D. Angielczyk. 2013. On the Validity and
9
10 Phylogenetic Position of *Eubrachiosaurus browni*, a Kannemeyeriiform Dicynodont
11
12 (Anomodontia) from Triassic North America. *PLoS ONE* 8:e64203.

13
14 Kammerer, C. F., K. D. Angielczyk, and J. Fröbisch. 2016. Redescription of the
15
16 geikiid *Pelanomodon* (Therapsida, Dicynodontia), with a reconsideration of
17
18 ‘*Propelanomodon*.’ *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 36:e1030408.

19
20
21 Kamvong, T., K. Zaw, S. Meffre, R. Maas, H. Stein, and C. -K. Lai. 2014. Adakites in
22
23 the Truong Son and Loei fold belts, Thailand and Laos: Genesis and implications
24
25 for geodynamics and metallogeny. *Gondwana Research* 26:165–184.

26
27
28 Keyser, A. W. 1969. A re-evaluation of the systematics and morphology of certain
29
30 anomodont Therapsida. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand,
31
32 Johannesburg, South Africa, 325 pp.

33
34
35 Keyser, A. W., and A. R. I. Cruickshank. 1979. The origins and classification of
36
37 Triassic dicynodonts. *Transactions of the Geological Society of South Africa*
38
39 82:81–108.

40
41
42 King, G. M. 1988. Anomodontia; pp. 1–174 in G. Fisher (ed.) *Handbuch Der*
43
44 *Paläoherpetologie*, 17. G. Fischer Verlag, Stuttgart.

45
46
47 King, G. M., and M. A. Cluver. 1990. The aquatic *Lystrosaurus*: an alternative
48
49 lifestyle. *Historical Biology* 4:323–341.

50
51
52 Kurkin, A. A. 2010. Late Permian dicynodonts of Eastern Europe. *Paleontological*
53
54 *Journal* 44:672–681.

- 1
2
3 Lai, C.-K., S. Meffre, A. J. Crawford, K. Zaw, C.-D. Xue, and J. A. Halpin. 2014. The
4
5 Western Ailaoshan Volcanic Belts and their SE Asia connection: A new tectonic
6
7 model for the Eastern Indochina Block. *Gondwana Research* 26:52–74.
8
9 Lepvrier, C., H. Maluski, V. Van Tich, A. Leyreloup, P. Truong Thi, and N. Van
10
11 Vuong. 2004. The Early Triassic Indosinian orogeny in Vietnam (Truong Son Belt
12
13 and Kontum Massif); implications for the geodynamic evolution of Indochina.
14
15 *Tectonophysics, Asthenosphere-Lithosphere Dynamic Responses to Tethyan*
16
17 *Plate Collisions* 393:87–118.
18
19
20
21 Li, Z. -X. 1994. Collision between the North and South China blocks: a crustal-
22
23 detachment model for suturing in the region east of the Tanlu fault. *Geology*
24
25 22:739–742.
26
27
28 Liu, J., M. -D. Tran, Y. Tang, Q. -L. Nguyen, T. -H. Tran, W. Wu, J. Chen, Z. Zhang,
29
30 and Z. Zhao. 2012. Permo-Triassic granitoids in the northern part of the Truong
31
32 Son belt, NW Vietnam: Geochronology, geochemistry and tectonic implications.
33
34 *Gondwana Research* 22:628–644.
35
36
37
38 Liu, J., L. Li, and X.-W. Li. 2013. SHRIMP U–Pb zircon dating of the Triassic
39
40 Ermaying and Tongchuan formations in Shanxi, China and its stratigraphic
41
42 implications. *Vertebrata Palasiatica* 51:162–168.
43
44
45 Liu, J., J. Ramezani, L. Li, Q.-H. Shang, G.-H. Xu, Y.-Y. Wang, and J.-S. Yang. 2018.
46
47 High-precision temporal calibration of Middle Triassic vertebrate biostratigraphy:
48
49 U-Pb zircon constraints for the *Sinokannemeyeria* Fauna and *Yonghesuchus*.
50
51 *Vertebrata Palasiatica* 56:16–24.
52
53
54 Lucas, S. G., and S. K. Harris. 1996. Taxonomic and biochronological significance of
55
56 specimens of the Triassic dicynodont *Dinodontosaurus* Romer 1943 in the
57
58 Tübingen collection. *Paläontologische Zeitschrift* 70:603–622.
59
60

- 1
2
3 Maisch, M. W. 2001. Observations on Karoo and Gondwana vertebrates. Part 2: A
4
5 new skull-reconstruction of *Stahleckeria potens* von Huene, 1935 (Dicynodon,
6
7 Middle Triassic) and a reconsideration of kannemeyeriiform phylogeny. Neues
8
9 Jahrbuch für Geologie und Paläontologie Abhandlungen, 220:127–152.
10
11 Maisch, M. W. 2002. A new basal lystrosaurid dicynodont from the Upper Permian of
12
13 South Africa. Palaeontology 45:343–359.
14
15 Maisch, M. W., and A. T. Matzke. 2014. *Sungeodon kimkraemerae* n. gen. n. sp., the
16
17 oldest kannemeyeriiform (Therapsida, Dicynodontia) and its implications for the
18
19 early diversification of large herbivores after the P/T boundary. Neues Jahrbuch für
20
21 Geologie und Paläontologie 272:1–12.
22
23
24
25 Metcalfe, I. 2006. Palaeozoic and Mesozoic tectonic evolution and palaeogeography
26
27 of East Asian crustal fragments: The Korean Peninsula in context. Gondwana
28
29 Research 9: 24–46.
30
31
32 Metcalfe, I. 2011. Tectonic framework and Phanerozoic evolution of Sundaland.
33
34 Gondwana Research 19:3–21.
35
36
37 Metcalfe, I. 2013. Gondwana dispersion and Asian accretion: Tectonic and
38
39 palaeogeographic evolution of eastern Tethys. Journal of Asian Earth Sciences
40
41 66:1–33.
42
43
44 Nakano, N., Y. Osanai, N. T. Minh, T. Miyamoto, Y. Hayasaka, and M. Owada. 2008.
45
46 Discovery of high-pressure granulite-facies metamorphism in northern Vietnam:
47
48 Constraints on the Permo–Triassic Indochinese continental collision tectonics.
49
50 Comptes Rendus Geoscience 340:127–138.
51
52
53 Olson, E. C. 1944. Origin of mammals based upon cranial morphology of the
54
55 therapsid suborders. Geological Society of America Special Papers 55:1–136.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Owen, R. 1860. On the orders of fossil and recent Reptilia, and their distribution in
4
5 time. Report of the Twenty-Ninth Meeting of the British Association for the
6
7 Advancement of Science, 1859:153–166.
8
9
10 Piveteau, J. 1938. Un Therapside d'Indochine. Remarques sur la notion de continent
11
12 de Gondwana. Annales de Paléontologie 27:137–152.
13
14
15 Racey, A. 2009. Mesozoic red bed sequences from SE Asia and the significance of
16
17 the Khorat Group of NE Thailand. Geological Society, London, Special
18
19 Publications 315:41–67.
20
21
22 Ray, S. 2005. *Lystrosaurus* (Therapsida, Dicynodontia) from India: Taxonomy,
23
24 relative growth and Cranial dimorphism. Journal of Systematic Palaeontology
25
26 3:203–221.
27
28
29 Ray, S. 2006. Functional and evolutionary aspects of the postcranial anatomy of
30
31 dicynodonts (Synapsida, Therapsida). Palaeontology 49:1263–1286.
32
33
34 Ray, S., A. Chinsamy, and S. Bandyopadhyay. 2005. *Lystrosaurus murrayi*
35
36 (Therapsida, Dicynodontia): bone histology, growth and lifestyle adaptations.
37
38 Palaeontology 48:1169–1185.
39
40
41 Ray, S., S. Bandyopadhyay, and R. Appana. 2010. Bone Histology of a
42
43 Kannemeyeriid Dicynodont *Wadiasaurus*: Palaeobiological Implications; pp. 73–89
44
45 in S. Bandyopadhyay (ed.) New Aspects of Mesozoic Biodiversity. Springer,
46
47 Heidelberg, Berlin.
48
49
50 Ray, S., J. Botha-Brink, and A. Chinsamy-Turan. 2012. Dicynodont growth dynamics
51
52 and lifestyle adaptations; pp. 121–148 in A. Chinsamy-Turan (ed.) Forerunners of
53
54 Mammals, Indiana University Press, Bloomington, Indiana.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Renaut, A. 2000. A re-evaluation of the cranial morphology and taxonomy of the
4
5 Triassic dicynodont genus *Kannemeyeria*. Ph.D. dissertation, University of the
6
7 Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa, 214 pp.
8
9
10 Renaut, A. J., R. J. Damiani, and P. J. Hancox. 2003. A taxonomic note concerning a
11
12 dicynodont (Synapsida: Anomodontia) from the Middle Triassic of East Africa. 93–
13
14 94.
15
16
17 Repelin, J. 1923. Sur un fragment de crâne de *Dicynodon*, recueilli par H. Counillon
18
19 dans les environs de Luang-Prabang (Haut-Laos). Bulletin du Service Géologique
20
21 de l'Indochine 12:1–7.
22
23
24 Rossignol, C., S. Bourquin, M. Poujol, E. Hallot, M. -P. Dabard, and T. Nalpas. 2016.
25
26 The volcanoclastic series from the Luang Prabang Basin, Laos: A witness of a
27
28 triassic magmatic arc? *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences* 120:159–183.
29
30
31 Rossignol, C., S. Bourquin, E. Hallot, M. Poujol, M.-P. Dabard, R. Martini, M.
32
33 Villeneuve, J.-J. Cornée, A. Brayard, and F. Roger. 2018. The Indosinian orogeny:
34
35 A perspective from sedimentary archives of north Vietnam. *Journal of Asian Earth*
36
37 *Sciences* 158:352–380.
38
39
40 Sahney, S., and M. J. Benton. 2008. Recovery from the most profound mass
41
42 extinction of all time. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological*
43
44 *Sciences* 275:759–765.
45
46
47 Saurin, E. 1962. Luang Prabang Est. Carte géologique du Vietnam, Cambodge, Laos
48
49 1:500,000. Service géographique national, Dalat, Vietnam.
50
51
52 Scotese, C. R. 2014. Atlas of Middle & Late Permian and Triassic Paleogeographic
53
54 Maps: Early Triassic. Paleomap Project, Department of Geology, University of
55
56 Texas at Arlington. Available at www.scotese.com. Accessed March 9, 2017.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Shen, S. -Z., H. Zhang, G. R. Shi, W. Li, J. Xie, L. Mu, and J. Fan. 2013. Early
4
5 Permian (Cisuralian) global brachiopod palaeobiogeography. *Gondwana Research*
6
7 24:104–124.
8
9
10 Smith, R. M. H., and J. Botha-Brink. 2014. Anatomy of a mass extinction:
11
12 Sedimentological and taphonomic evidence for drought-induced die-offs at the
13
14 Permo-Triassic boundary in the main Karoo Basin, South Africa.
15
16 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 396:99–118.
17
18
19 Steyer, J. -S. 2009. The geological and palaeontological exploration of Laos;
20
21 following in the footsteps of J. B. H. Counillon and A. Pavie. Geological Society,
22
23 London, Special Publications 315:25–32.
24
25
26 Steyer, J. -S. (ed.). 2012. *Earth before the dinosaurs*. Indiana University Press,
27
28 Bloomington, 182 pp.
29
30
31 Strong, E. E., and D. Lipscomb. 1999. Character Coding and Inapplicable Data.
32
33 *Cladistics* 15:363–371.
34
35
36 Sullivan, C., R. R. Reisz, and R. M. H. Smith. 2003. The Permian mammal-like
37
38 herbivore *Diictodon*, the oldest known example of sexually dimorphic armament.
39
40 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 270:173–178.
41
42 Sun, Y., M. M. Joachimski, P. B. Wignall, C. Yan, Y. Chen, H. Jiang, L. Wang, and X.
43
44 Lai. 2012. Lethally Hot Temperatures During the Early Triassic Greenhouse.
45
46 *Science* 338:366–370.
47
48
49 Surkov, M. V., and M. J. Benton. 2004. The basicranium of dicynodonts (Synapsida)
50
51 and its use in phylogenetic analysis. *Palaeontology* 47:619–638.
52
53
54 Thanh, N. X., M. T. Tu, T. Itaya, and S. Kwon. 2011. Chromian-spinel compositions
55
56 from the Bo Xinh ultramafics, Northern Vietnam: Implications on tectonic evolution
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 of the Indochina block. *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences, Suture Zones and*
4
5 *Geodynamic Processes Suture Zones and Geodynamic Processes* 42:258–267.
6
7

8 Tollman, S. M., F. E. Grine, and B. D. Hahn. 1980. Ontogeny and sexual dimorphism
9 in *Aulacephalodon* (Reptilia, Anomodontia). *Annals of the South African Museum*
10 8:159–186.
11
12

13
14 Torsvik, T. H., and J. R. M. Cocks (eds). 2017. *Earth history and palaeogeography.*
15
16 Cambridge University Press, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, 332 pp.
17

18 Ueno, K. 2003. The Permian fusulinoidean faunas of the Sibumasu and Baoshan
19 blocks: their implications for the paleogeographic and paleoclimatologic
20 reconstruction of the Cimmerian Continent. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
21 *Palaeoecology* 193:1–24.
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 Viglietti, P. A., R. M. H. Smith, and B. S. Rubidge. 2018. Changing
29 palaeoenvironments and tetrapod populations in the *Daptocephalus* Assemblage
30 Zone (Karoo Basin, South Africa) indicate early onset of the Permo-Triassic mass
31 extinction. *Journal of African Earth Sciences* 138:102–111.
32
33
34
35

36
37 Vượng, N. V., B. T. Hansen, K. Wemmer, C. Lepvrier, V. Tích, and T. Trọng Thắng.
38 2013. U/Pb and Sm/Nd dating on ophiolitic rocks of the Song Ma suture zone
39 (northern Vietnam): Evidence for upper paleozoic paleotethyan lithospheric
40 remnants. *Journal of Geodynamics* 69:140–147.
41
42
43
44
45

46
47 Wall, W. P. 1983. The correlation between high limb-bone density and aquatic habits
48 in recent mammals. *Journal of Paleontology* 57:197–207.
49

50
51 Wang, X. -D., and T. Sugiyama. 2002. Permian coral faunas of the eastern
52 Cimmerian Continent and their biogeographical implications. *Journal of Asian*
53 *Earth Sciences, Permian of Southeast Asia* 20:589–597.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Wang, X. -D., W. Lin, S. -Z. Shen, P. Chaodumrong, G. R. Shi, X. Wang, and Q.
4
5 Wang. 2013. Early Permian rugose coral *Cyathaxonia* faunas from the Sibumasu
6
7 Terrane (Southeast Asia) and the southern Sydney Basin (Southeast Australia):
8
9 Paleontology and paleobiogeography. *Gondwana Research* 24:185–191.
10
11
12 Ward, P. D., J. Botha, R. Buick, M. O. De Kock, D. H. Erwin, G. H. Garrison, J. L.
13
14 Kirschvink, and R. M. H. Smith. 2005. Abrupt and Gradual Extinction Among Late
15
16 Permian Land Vertebrates in the Karoo Basin, South Africa. *Science* 307:709–
17
18 714.
19
20
21 Weislogel, A. L., S. A. Graham, E. Z. Chang, J. L. Wooden, G. E. Gehrels, and H.
22
23 Yang. 2006. Detrital zircon provenance of the Late Triassic Songpan-Ganzi
24
25 complex: Sedimentary record of collision of the North and South China blocks.
26
27 *Geology* 34:97.
28
29
30
31 Wilmsen, M., F. T. Fürsich, K. Seyed-Emami, M. R. Majidifard, and J. Taheri. 2009.
32
33 The Cimmerian Orogeny in northern Iran: tectono-stratigraphic evidence from the
34
35 foreland. *Terra Nova* 21:211–218.
36
37
38 Woodward, A. S. 1932. Dicynodontidae; pp. 257–260 in K.A. Von Zittel (ed.)
39
40 *Textbook of Palaeontology*. Macmillan, London.
41
42 Xiong, C., and Q. Wang. 2011. Permian–Triassic land-plant diversity in South China:
43
44 Was there a mass extinction at the Permian/Triassic boundary? *Paleobiology*
45
46 37:157–167.
47
48
49 Yu, J. X., J. Broutin, Z. -Q Chen, X. Shi, H. Li, D. Chu, and Q. Huang. 2015.
50
51 *Vegetation changeover across the Permian–Triassic Boundary in Southwest*
52
53 *China: Extinction, survival, recovery and palaeoclimate: A critical review. Earth-*
54
55 *Science Reviews* 149:203–224.
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 Yuan, P. L., and C. C. Young. 1934. On the Occurrence of *Lystrosaurus* in Sinkiang.
4
5 Bulletin of the Geological Society of China 12:575–580.
6
7
8 Zanchi, A., S. Zanchetta, F. Berra, M. Mattei, E. Garzanti, S. Molyneux, A. Nawab,
9
10 and J. Sabouri. 2009. The Eo-Cimmerian (Late? Triassic) orogeny in North Iran.
11
12 Geological Society, Special Publications 312:31–55.
13
14 Zanchi, A., N. Malaspina, S. Zanchetta, F. Berra, L. Benciolini, M. Bergomi, A.
15
16 Cavallo, H. R. Javadi, and M. Kouhpeyma. 2015. The Cimmerian accretionary
17
18 wedge of Anarak, Central Iran. *Journal of Asian Earth Sciences* 102:45–72.
19
20
21 Zhang, R. Y., C. -H. Lo, S. -L Chung, M. Grove, S. Omori, Y. Iizuka, J. G. Liou, and
22
23 T. Van Tri. 2013. Origin and Tectonic Implication of Ophiolite and Eclogite in the
24
25 Song Ma Suture Zone between the South China and Indochina Blocks. *Journal of*
26
27 *Metamorphic Geology* 31:49–62.
28
29
30 Zhang, R. Y., C. -H. Lo, X. -H. Li, S. -L Chung, T. T. Anh, and T. Van Tri. 2014. U-Pb
31
32 dating and tectonic implication of ophiolite and metabasite from the Song Ma
33
34 suture zone, northern Vietnam. *American Journal of Science* 314:649–678.
35
36
37
38
39

40 Submitted May 18, 2017; accepted Month DD, YYYY
41
42
43
44

45 FIGURE AND TABLE CAPTIONS

46
47
48

49 **Figures**

50
51 FIGURE 1. Continental blocks of Southeast Asia and geological map of the Luang
52
53 Prabang Basin. **A**, Tectonic subdivisions of Southeast Asia after Metcalfe (2011); **B**,
54
55 geological map of the Luang Prabang Basin with the emplacement of fossil sites and
56
57 dated samples (modified after Blanchard et al., 2013). Sample LP03 was collected at
58
59
60

1
2
3 the dicynodont site, sample LP04 in an unfossiliferous site, and sample LP05 at the
4
5 chroniosuchian site (Arbez et al., 2018). **Abbreviations:** **AL**, Ailaoshan suture zone;
6
7 **CM**, Changning Menglian suture zone; **JH**, Jinghong suture zone; **NU**, Nan Uttaradit
8
9 suture zone; **SK**, Sra Kaeo suture zone; **LP**, emplacement of the Luang Prabang
10
11 Basin. [Intended for 2/3 of a whole page width]
12

13
14
15
16
17 **FIGURE 2.** Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1993-3, the holotype of
18
19 *Counillonia superoculis* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**, ventral;
20
21 and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold black
22
23 ones represent the relief. The dotted line represents our interpretation of sutures
24
25 based on variation in bone texture. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for whole page
26
27 width]
28
29
30
31

32
33 **FIGURE 3.** Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1993-2, the holotype of
34
35 *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**,
36
37 ventral; and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold
38
39 black ones represent the relief. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for whole page
40
41 width]
42

43
44
45
46 **FIGURE 4.** Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1995-9, a skull referred to
47
48 *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**,
49
50 ventral; and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold
51
52 black ones represent the relief. The dotted line represents our interpretation of
53
54 sutures based on variation in bone texture. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for
55
56 whole page width]
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

FIGURE 5. Close-up photograph and interpretive drawing of the lateral snout region of the referred skull LPB 1995-9, attributed to *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. The thin grey lines represent the sutures, and the bold black ones represent the relief. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for 2/3 of a whole page width]

38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE 6. The most parsimonious cladogram (1156.346 steps, CI = 0.236, RI = 0.712). Numbers at nodes represent the Bremer supports. Capital letters indicate the following clades (Maisch, 2001; Kammerer and Angielczyk, 2009): A, Dicynodontia. B, Pylaecephalidae. C, Endothiodontia. D, Therochelonina. E, Emydopoidea. F, Emydopidae. G, Kistecephalia. H, Kingoriidae. I, Cistecephalidae. J, Bidentalia. K, Cryptodontia. L, Rhachiocephalidae. M, Geikiidae. N, Geikiinae. O, Lystrosauridae. P, Kannemeyeriiformes. Q, Shansiodontidae. R, Stahleckeriidae. S, Kannemeyeriidae. [Intended for whole page width]

Tables

TABLE 1. Summary of the maximum depositional ages obtained by U–Pb Laser Ablation – Inductively Coupled – Mass Spectrometry dating on detrital zircon grains from volcanoclastic rocks of the samples collected in the Purple Claystone Formation (LP03, LP04, LP05) (Rossignol et al., 2016). LP03 was collected at the dicynodont fossil site. The MSWD and the probability given for the concordia ages are for both concordance and equivalence. **Abbreviations:** **MSWD**, mean square of weighted deviates; **n**, number of analyses used to calculate the maximum depositional age; **N**, number of concordant zircon grain; **N_a**, number of analyses per sample; **N_{zr}**, number of zircon grains analyzed per sample.

1
2
3
4
5 TABLE 2. Cranial measurements (in cm, scaled with Image J 1.50i) of the three
6
7
8 Laotian dicynodont skulls attributed to *Counillonia superoculis* and *Repelinosaurus*
9
10 *robustus*.

11 12 13 14 **Appendices**

15
16 APPENDIX 1. Continuous and discrete codings in the Laotian dicynodonts used in
17
18 the phylogenetic analysis. The whole character-taxon matrix is available online as
19
20
21 Supplementary Data 1.
22
23
24

25 26 **Supplementary Data**

27
28 SUPPLEMENTARY DATA 1. Data matrix used in the phylogenetic analysis (modified
29
30
31 from Angielczyk and Kammerer, 2017) (Matrix.txt).
32
33
34

35
36 SUPPLEMENTARY DATA 2. List of characters (continuous and discrete) used in the
37
38 phylogenetic analysis (modified from Angielczyk and Kammerer, 2017).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




FIGURE 1. Continental blocks of Southeast Asia and geological map of the Luang Prabang Basin. **A**, Tectonic subdivisions of Southeast Asia after Metcalfe (2011); **B**, geological map of the Luang Prabang Basin with the emplacement of fossil sites and dated samples (modified after Blanchard et al., 2013). Sample LP03 was collected at the dicynodont site, sample LP04 in an unfossiliferous site, and sample LP05 at the chroniosuchian site (Arbez et al., 2018). **Abbreviations:** **AL**, Ailaoshan suture zone; **CM**, Changning Menglian suture zone; **JH**, Jinghong suture zone; **NU**, Nan Uttaradit suture zone; **SK**, Sra Kaeo suture zone; **LP**, emplacement of the Luang Prabang Basin. [Intended for 2/3 of a whole page width]

120x160mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 1. Continental blocks of Southeast Asia and geological map of the Luang Prabang Basin. **A**, Tectonic subdivisions of Southeast Asia after Metcalfe (2011); **B**, geological map of the Luang Prabang Basin with the emplacement of fossil sites and dated samples (modified after Blanchard et al., 2013). Sample LP03 was collected at the dicynodont site, sample LP04 in an unfossiliferous site, and sample LP05 at the chroniosuchian site (Arbez et al., 2018). **Abbreviations:** **AL**, Ailaoshan suture zone; **CM**, Changning Menglian suture zone; **JH**, Jinghong suture zone; **NU**, Nan Uttaradit suture zone; **SK**, Sra Kaeo suture zone; **LP**, emplacement of the Luang Prabang Basin. [Intended for 2/3 of a whole page width]

120x160mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 2. Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1993-3, the holotype of *Counillonia superoculis* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**, ventral; and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold black ones represent the relief. The dotted line represents our interpretation of sutures based on variation in bone texture. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for whole page width]

182x232mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 2. Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1993-3, the holotype of *Counillonia superoculis* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**, ventral; and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold black ones represent the relief. The dotted line represents our interpretation of sutures based on variation in bone texture. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for whole page width]

182x234mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 3. Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1993-2, the holotype of *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**, ventral; and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold black ones represent the relief. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for whole page width]

182x232mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 3. Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1993-2, the holotype of *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**, ventral; and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold black ones represent the relief. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for whole page width]

182x232mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 4. Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1995-9, a skull referred to *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**, ventral; and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold black ones represent the relief. The dotted line represents our interpretation of sutures based on variation in bone texture. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for whole page width]

182x230mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 4. Photographs and interpretive drawings of LPB 1995-9, a skull referred to *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. Skull in **A**, dorsal; **B**, right lateral; **C**, ventral; and **D**, occipital views. The thin grey lines represent the sutures and the bold black ones represent the relief. The dotted line represents our interpretation of sutures based on variation in bone texture. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for whole page width]

182x230mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 5. Close-up photograph and interpretive drawing of the lateral snout region of the referred skull LPB 1995-9, attributed to *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. The thin grey lines represent the sutures, and the bold black ones represent the relief. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for 2/3 of a whole page width]

120x61mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 5. Close-up photograph and interpretive drawing of the lateral snout region of the referred skull LPB 1995-9, attributed to *Repelinosaurus robustus* gen. et sp. nov. The thin grey lines represent the sutures, and the bold black ones represent the relief. Scale bar equals 5 cm. [Intended for 2/3 of a whole page width]

120x61mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 6. The most parsimonious cladogram (1156.346 steps, CI = 0.236, RI = 0.712). Numbers at nodes represent the Bremer supports. Capital letters indicate the following clades (Maisch, 2001; Kammerer and Angielczyk, 2009): A, Dicynodontia. B, Pylaecephalidae. C, Endothiodontia. D, Therochelonia. E, Emydopoidea. F, Emydopidae. G, Kistecephalia. H, Kingoriidae. I, Cistecephalidae. J, Bidentalialia. K, Cryptodontia. L, Rhachiocephalidae. M, Geikiidae. N, Geikiinae. O, Lystrosauridae. P, Kannemeyeriiformes. Q, Shansiodontidae. R, Stahleckeriidae. S, Kannemeyeriidae. [Intended for whole page width]

233x182mm (300 x 300 DPI)




FIGURE 6. The most parsimonious cladogram (1156.346 steps, CI = 0.236, RI = 0.712). Numbers at nodes represent the Bremer supports. Capital letters indicate the following clades (Maisch, 2001; Kammerer and Angielczyk, 2009): A, Dicynodontia. B, Pylaecephalidae. C, Endothiodontia. D, Therochelonia. E, Emydopoidea. F, Emydopidae. G, Kistecephalia. H, Kingoriidae. I, Cistecephalidae. J, Bidentalina. K, Cryptodontia. L, Rhachiocephalidae. M, Geikiidae. N, Geikiinae. O, Lystrosauridae. P, Kannemeyeriiformes. Q, Shansiodontidae. R, Stahleckeriidae. S, Kannemeyeriidae. [Intended for whole page width]

233x182mm (300 x 300 DPI)

TABLE 1. Summary of the maximum depositional ages obtained by U–Pb Laser Ablation – Inductively Coupled – Mass Spectrometry dating on detrital zircon grains from volcanoclastic rocks of the samples collected in the Purple Claystone Formation (LP03, LP04, LP05) (Rossignol et al., 2016). LP03 was collected at the dicynodont fossil site. The MSWD and the probability given for the concordia ages are for both concordance and equivalence. **Abbreviations:** **MSWD**, mean square of weighted deviates; **n**, number of analyses used to calculate the maximum depositional age; **N**, number of concordant zircon grain; **N_a**, number of analyses per sample; **N_{zr}**, number of zircon grains analyzed per sample.

	N _a	N _{zr}	N	Maximum depositional age				
				Concordia age	± (2σ)	n	MSWD	Probability
LP03	105	102	25	252.0	2.6	6	0.89	0.55
LP04	41	36	7	300.5	3.7	4	0.73	0.65
LP05	96	95	39	251.0	1.4	21	0.55	0.99

TABLE 2. Cranial measurements (in cm, scaled with Image J 1.50i) of the three Laotian dicynodont skulls attributed to *Counillonia superoculis* and *Repelinosaurus robustus*.

	<i>C. superoculis</i>		<i>R. robustus</i>	
	LPB 1993-3	LPB 1995-9	LPB 1993-2	
Basal length (from the tip of snout to the occipital condyle, in ventral view)	16.02	15.72	19.00	
Maximum width (in dorsal view)	13.41	NA	NA	
Maximum orbital height (in lateral view)	4.82	4.19	5.79	
Maximum orbital length (in lateral view)	5.67	4.73	6.82	
Mediolateral diameter of the tusk root (in ventral view)	1.27	1.46	2.02	
Anteroposterior diameter of the tusk root (in ventral view)	1.56	0.90	1.49	
Pineal foramen length (in dorsal view)	1.36	1.33	0.96	
Pineal foramen width (in dorsal view)	0.96	0.87	0.66	

1
2
3 APPENDIX 1. Continuous and discrete codings in the Laotian dicynodonts
4
5 used in the phylogenetic analysis; en dash (-) indicates missing values. The whole
6
7 character-taxon matrix is available online as Supplementary Data 1.
8
9
10

11
12 **Continuous codings (characters 1 to 23)**

13
14 LPB 1993-3 (holotype of *Counillonia superoculis*)

15
16 0.2975.068 - - 0.276 0.134 - 0.131 8.333 0.140 - 9.616 0.876 - - - -
17
18
19 - - - - - -
20

21
22 LPB 1993-2 (holotype of *Repelinosaurus robustus*)

23
24 0.200 - 0.295 - 0.408 0.281 - - - - - 14.698 0.829 - - - - - - - - -
25
26 -
27

28
29 LPB 1995-9 (attributed to *Repelinosaurus robustus*)

30
31 0.205 - 0.254 - - 0.316 - 0.124 - 0.101 - - 0.935 - - - - - - - - -
32
33 -
34
35
36
37

38
39 **Discrete codings (characters 24 to 194)**

40
41 LPB 1993-3 (holotype of *Counillonia superoculis*)

42
43
44 120022121010000???00022??1101000??2?????????0?????????0?0100211002011?0
45
46 ??11111210301??101210102110?022?120?????01011?????????????????????
47
48 ??
49

50
51 LPB 1993-2 (holotype of *Repelinosaurus robustus*)

52
53
54 1200221210?10000?100?22??1101001?100?10??100201110000010021100201??0
55
56 ??????1?????????1012??10?11??022?120?????01??1?????????????????????
57
58 ??
59
60

APPENDIX 1. (Continued)

LPB 1995-9 (attributed to *Repelinosaurus robustus*)

12002012101?000??100022??0101001?10001001?0010?1100000100211?02??1?0
??1111121030???1012101?2110?02???20?????????1?????????????????????
??

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60