A walk in the maze: variation in Late Jurassic tridactyl dinosaur tracks from the Swiss Jura Mountains (NW Switzerland)

Diego Castanera[1], Matteo Belvedere[2], Daniel Marty[2,3], Géraldine Paratte[2], Marielle Lapaire-Cattin[2], Christel Lovis[2] and Christian A. Meyer[4]

[1] Bayerische Staatssammlung für Paläontologie und Geologie, GeoBioCenter, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich, Germany
[2] Section d'archéologie et paléontologie, Paléontologie A16, Office de la culture, Porrentruy, Switzerland
[3] Naturhistorisches Museum Basel, Basel, Switzerland
[4] Department of Environmental Sciences, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

ABSTRACT

Background: Minute to medium-sized (footprint length (FL) less than 30 cm) tridactyl dinosaur tracks are the most abundant in the Late Jurassic tracksites of Highway A16 (Reuchenette Formation, Kimmeridgian) in the Jura Mountains (NW Switzerland). During excavations, two morphotypes, one gracile and one robust, were identified in the field. Furthermore, two large-sized theropod ichnospecies (*Megalosauripus transjuranicus* and *Jurabrontes curtedulensis*) and an ornithopod-like morphotype (Morphotype II) have recently been described at these sites.
Methods: The quality of morphological preservation (preservation grade), the depth of the footprint, the shape variation, and the footprint proportions (FL/footprint width (FW) ratio and mesaxony) along the trackways have been analyzed using 3D models and false-color depth maps in order to determine the exact number of small to medium-sized morphotypes present in the tracksites.
Results: The study of footprints ($n = 93$) recovered during the excavations has made it possible to identify and characterize the two morphotypes distinguished in the field. The gracile morphotype is mainly characterized by a high FL/FW ratio, high mesaxony, low divarication angles and clear, sharp claw marks, and phalangeal pads (2-3-4). By contrast, the robust morphotype is characterized by a lower FL/FW ratio, weaker mesaxony, slightly higher divarication angles and clear, sharp claw marks (when preserved), whereas the phalangeal pads are not clearly preserved although they might be present.
Discussion: The analysis does not allow the two morphotypes to be associated within the same morphological continuum. Thus, they cannot be extramorphological variations of similar tracks produced by a single trackmaker. Comparison of the two morphotypes with the larger morphotypes described in the formation (*M. transjuranicus*, *J. curtedulensis*, and Morphotype II) and the spatio-temporal relationships of the trackways suggest that the smaller morphotypes cannot reliably be considered as small individuals of any of the larger morphotypes. The morphometric data of some specimens of the robust morphotype (even lower values for the length/width ratio and mesaxony) suggest that more than one ichnotaxon might be represented within the robust morphotype. The features of the

gracile morphotype (cf. *Kalohipus* isp.) are typical of "grallatorid" ichnotaxa with low mesaxony whereas those of the robust morphotype (cf. *Therangospodus* isp. and *Therangospodus?* isp.) are reminiscent of *Therangospodus pandemicus*. This work sheds new light on combining an analysis of variations in footprint morphology through 3D models and false-color depth maps, with the study of possible ontogenetic variations and the identification of small-sized tridactyl ichnotaxa for the description of new dinosaur tracks.

INTRODUCTION

Since the first sauropod tracks were reported in the Lommiswil quarry (Late Kimmeridgian, Canton Solothurn) in the Swiss Jura Mountains (*Meyer, 1990*), dinosaur track discoveries have increased considerably, and to date more than 25 tracksites have been documented in the cantons of Jura, Bern, Neuchâtel, and Solothurn. Most of these tracksites occur in the Reuchenette Formation (Kimmeridgian), and some of them in the Twannbach Formation (Tithonian) (*Meyer & Thüring, 2003*; *Marty, 2008*; *Marty & Meyer, 2012*; *Marty et al., 2010, 2013*). Between 2002 and 2011, six large tracksites were systematically excavated and documented by the Palaeontology A16 (*Marty & Billon-Bruyat, 2009*) prior to the construction of Highway A16 in the Canton Jura (NW Switzerland). These tracksites covered together a surface area of 18,500 m^2, and a total of 59 ichnoassemblages. Out of 14,000 individual tracks, 254 trackways were attributed to sauropods and 411 to bipedal tridactyl dinosaurs. Therefore, the Jura carbonate platform has today become a key area for Late Jurassic dinosaur palaeoichnology (*Marty, 2008*; *Marty & Meyer, 2012*) as it represents one of the areas with the highest number of Late Jurassic dinosaur tracks in the world.

Recent papers have described giant theropod tracks (*Jurabrontes curtedulensis*, *Marty et al., 2017*) and large theropod tracks (*Megalosauripus transjuranicus*, *Razzolini et al., 2017*) from the Swiss Jura Mountains, but most of the tridactyl tracks by far are the still largely undescribed minute, small and medium-sized tracks (footprint length (FL) < 30 cm). *Marty (2008)* described minute and small tridactyl tracks from the Chevenez–Combe Ronde tracksite (Canton Jura, NW Switzerland) and tentatively attributed some of these to *Carmelopodus*. Since then, however, many other tracksites and ichnoassemblages with minute to medium-sized tridactyl tracks have been discovered, including some very well-preserved tracks of different morphotypes and some very long trackways (up to 100 m).

In Europe, apart from the Swiss and French (*Mazin, Hantzpergue & Pouech, 2016*) Jura Mountains, the main Late Jurassic deposits that have yielded minute to medium-sized tridactyl dinosaur tracks are located in the Lusitanian Basin in Portugal (*Antunes & Mateus, 2003*; *Santos, 2008*), the Asturian Basin in Spain (*Lockley et al., 2008*; *Piñuela, 2015*), the Aquitanian Basin in France (*Lange-Badré et al., 1996*; *Mazin et al., 1997*;

Moreau et al., 2017), the Lower Saxony Basin in NW Germany (*Kaever & de Lapparent, 1974*; *Diedrich, 2011*; *Lallensack et al., 2015*), and several units in the Holy Cross Mountains in Poland (*Gierliński, Niedźwiedzki & Nowacki, 2009*). The units that date to around the Jurassic–Cretaceous boundary (Tithonian–Berriasian) in the Iberian range in Spain (*Santisteban et al., 2003*; *Castanera et al., 2013a*; *Alcalá et al., 2014*; *Campos-Soto et al., 2017*) should also be mentioned. It is noteworthy that, while there is a high number of small to medium-sized tridactyl tracks (assigned to both theropods and ornithopods) described, only few ichnotaxa have been formally erected so far. Besides the tracks from the Chevenez–Combe Ronde tracksite tentatively assigned to *Carmelopodus* by *Marty (2008)*, the main small to medium-sized tridactyl tracks identified have been from Spain (*Grallator* and *Anomoepus*, from several sites in Asturias, *Lockley et al., 2008*; *Piñuela, 2015*; *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos, 2016*), France (*Carmelopodus*, Loulle tracksite, *Mazin, Hantzpergue & Pouech, 2016*), Poland (*Wildeichnus*, cf. *Jialingpus*, and *Dineichnus*, different units in the Holy Cross Mountains, *Gierliński, Niedźwiedzki & Nowacki, 2009*), Germany (*Grallator*, Bergkirchen tracksite, *Diedrich, 2011*), and Portugal (*Dineichnus* and ?*Therangospodus*, *Lockley et al., 1998a*; *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*). Other significant Late Jurassic areas with minute to medium-sized tridactyl dinosaur tracks are found in the USA (*Foster & Lockley, 2006*), Morocco (*Belvedere, Mietto & Ishigaki, 2010*), China (*Xing, Harris & Gierliński, 2011*; *Xing et al., 2016*), Yemen (*Schulp & Al-Wosabi, 2012*), and Turkmenistan (*Lockley, Meyer & Santos, 2000*; *Fanti et al., 2013*).

Several recent papers have examined the variability in track morphology along trackways (*Razzolini et al., 2014*, *2017*; *Lallensack, van Heteren & Wings, 2016*), showing how pronounced changes can occur along a single trackway. Thus, sometimes it can be very difficult to determine the exact number of ichnotaxa and clearly distinguish between them, especially when the tracks are morphologically similar. This should be borne in mind particularly when studying the material from Switzerland, where large theropod tracks have shown notable variations in shape along the same trackway (*Razzolini et al., 2017*). In the case of the minute to medium-sized tridactyl tracks, two different morphotypes were identified at first glance during the documentation of the tracksites, one gracile and one more robust type. The aim of this paper is to describe the small to medium-sized tridactyl tracks collected in the Jura Mountains (NW Switzerland). Special emphasis is put on the analysis of track morphology through 3D models and possible variations in footprint shape along trackways in order to find out if the different morphotypes are a consequence of preservation. In addition, other factors such as possible ontogenetic variations in the larger ichnospecies described in the formation are also taken into account. Finally, we discuss the ichnotaxonomy of the tracks.

GEOGRAPHICAL AND GEOLOGICAL SETTING

The studied material comes from six different tracksites from Highway A16 and nearby areas (Fig. 1A): (1) Courtedoux–Bois de Sylleux (CTD–BSY), (2) Courtedoux–Tchâfouè (CTD–TCH), (3) Courtedoux–Béchat Bovais (CTD–BEB), (4) Courtedoux–Sur Combe Ronde (CTD–SCR), (5) Chevenez–Combe Ronde (CHE–CRO), and (6) Chevenez–La

Figure 1 Geographical and geological settings of the Highway 16 tracksites (modified from *Razzolini et al., 2017*; *Marty et al., 2017*). (A) Geographical setting of the Ajoie district (NW Switzerland) with the location of the tracksites (1, Courtedoux—Béchat Bovais; 2, Courtedoux—Bois de Sylleux; 3, Courtedoux—Tchâfouè; 4, Courtedoux—Sur Combe Ronde; 5, Chevenez—Combe Ronde; 6, Chevenez—La Combe) along Highway A16. (B) Chrono-, bio-, and lithostratigraphic setting of the Reuchenette Formation in the Ajoie district, Canton Jura, NW Switzerland (after *Comment, Ayer & Becker, 2011*; *Comment et al., 2015*). Full-size ⤢ DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4579/fig-1

Combe (CHE–CHV). For the sake of simplicity BSY, TCH, BEB, SCR, CRO, and CHV are used in the publication.

All the tracksites are located in the Ajoie district about 6–8 km to the west of Porrentruy (Canton Jura, NW Switzerland) on the track of Swiss federal highway A16 except the Chevenez–La Combe tracksite, which is located in a quarry near the village of Chevenez. The first five tracksites were systematically excavated level-by-level by the Palaeontology A16 (PALA16) from 2002 to 2011 (*Marty et al., 2003*, *2004*, *2007*; *Marty, 2008*; *Marty & Billon-Bruyat, 2009*).

Geologically, the study area belongs to the Tabular Jura Mountains and is located at the eastern end of the Rhine–Bresse transfer zone between the Folded Jura Mountains (South and East) and the Upper Rhine Graben and Vosges Mountains (North). The Upper Jurassic strata of the Swiss Jura Mountains are made up of shallow-marine carbonates deposited on the large and structurally complex Jura carbonate platform, which was located at the northern margin of the Tethys at a palaeolatitude of approximately 30° N (*Thierry, 2000*; *Thierry et al., 2000*; *Stampfli & Borel, 2002*).

The tracksites occur within the Reuchenette Formation (Kimmeridgian), dated by ammonites of the Cymodoce to Mutabilis (Boreal), and Divisum to Acanthicum (Tethyan) biozones (*Comment et al., 2015*). Accordingly, the age of the track-bearing levels is late Early to early Late Kimmeridgian (*Gygi, 2000*; *Jank, Wetzel & Meyer, 2006*). This age is also confirmed by the presence of ostracods (*Schudack et al., 2013*). More information on the sedimentology and palaeoenvironment of the Highway A16 tracksites can be found in *Jank, Wetzel & Meyer (2006)*, *Marty (2008)*, *Razzolini et al. (2017)*, and *Marty et al. (2017)*.

Stratigraphically, the tracksites include three different track-bearing laminite intervals, separated by shallow marine limestones (*Marty, 2008*; *Waite et al., 2008*; *2013*; *Comment, Ayer & Becker, 2011*; *Comment et al., 2015*). The three main track-bearing laminite intervals are referred to as the lower, intermediate and upper levels, respectively, levels 500–550, 1,000–1,100, and 1,500–1,650 (Fig. 1B). Only tracks from the lower and intermediate track levels are included in the present study (Fig. 1B), and the studied tracks come from a total of 11 different ichnoassemblages (stratigraphic track levels). These are as follows: BEB500, CRO500, BSY1020, BSY1040, BSY1050, TCH1055, SCR1055, TCH1060, TCH1065, TCH1069, and CHV1000–1100 (precise level cannot be indicated).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

We analyzed a total of 93 individual tracks (Table S1) that are housed in the track collection of PALA16 (Canton Jura), either as original specimens or as replicas. This collection will be transferred to JURASSICA Muséum (Porrentruy, Canton Jura) in 2019. All the tracks are from the aforementioned tracksites, the largest samples coming from BEB500 (39 footprints), TCH1065 (15), and CRO500 (20). Each analyzed track has two acronyms (Table S1): one represents the number of the slab within the collection, e.g., TCH006-1100 denotes Tchâfouè tracksite, year 2006 (the year of discovery), slab 1,100 (an "r" in front of the specimen number, means replica). Some high-resolution laser scans were made in the field and those tracks are here referred to as "Laser-Scan". A second acronym represents the level and number of the trackway and track, e.g., TCH1055-T2-L1 denotes Tchâfouè tracksite, level 1,055, trackway 2, track 1, left pes. The second acronym is used throughout the manuscript. As the track-bearing layers were excavated level-by-level there are no doubts about the preservation mode of the tracks. Thus, all the tracks were preserved as true tracks (concave epireliefs) and were produced on the tracking surface, with the only exception of TCH1060-E58, which was preserved as a natural cast (convex hyporelief).

Analysis of track morphology was performed independently for each track; however, some tracks belong to trackways, therefore their variation in morphology along a single trackway was also considered in order to avoid over-identification of morphotypes. These trackways are: BEB500-T16 (3), BEB500-T17 (4), BEB500-T58 (6), BEB500-T73 (4), BEB500-T75 (2), BEB500-T78 (2), BEB-500-T82 (2), BEB-500-T93 (2), BEB500-T120 (4), CRO500-T10 (14), CRO500-T30BIS (5), TCH1055-T2 (2), TCH1065-T15 (2), TCH1065-T25 (2), and TCH1069-T2 (2). We analyzed each individual track and made an evaluation of the quality of preservation according to the scale of *Belvedere & Farlow (2016)* (Table S1). As stated by these authors, "quantitative shape analyses need to be based on data of high quality, and comparisons are best made between tracks comparable in quality of preservation." Accordingly, only the tracks with a preservation grade equal to or higher than two were considered for measurement and analyzed in this paper; field measurements exist for all the other tracks and are stored in the PALA16 database. The descriptions are based on identification of two different morphotypes, one gracile and one robust, during the documentation in the field. Thus, the FL, footprint width (FW), length and width of digits II (LII, WII), III (LIII, WIII), and IV (LIV, WIV), divarication angles

(II–III; III–IV) were measured (see *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos, 2016*, fig. 2). Subsequently, the FL/FW ratio and the mesaxony were calculated. The latter was calculated on the basis of the anterior triangle (AT) length–width ratio following *Lockley (2009)*. All these measurements were taken from perpendicular pictures with the software Image J. The tracks were classified according to different size classes (*Marty, 2008*) on the basis of pes length (FL) as: (1) minute, FL < 10 cm; (2) small, 10 cm < FL < 20 cm; (3) medium, 20 cm < FL < 30 cm; and (4) large, FL > 30 cm. The morphometric data of the studied tracks were compared in a bivariate plot (length/width ratio vs. mesaxony) with larger tracks (*M. transjuranicus*, *J. curtedulensis*, and Morphotype II) described in the Reuchenette Formation (*Razzolini et al., 2017*; *Marty et al., 2017*). In addition, they were also compared with other theropod ichnotaxa using data from *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos (2016)* which were mainly compiled after *Lockley (2009)* and *Xing et al. (2014)*. Data were analyzed with the software PAST v.2.14 (*Hammer, Harper & Ryan, 2001*).

3D-photogrammetric models were generated from pictures taken with a Canon EOS 70D camera equipped with a Canon 10–18 mm STL lens using Agisoft Photoscan (v. 1.3.2, www.agisoft.com) following the procedures of *Mallison & Wings (2014)* and *Matthews, Noble & Breithaupt (2016)*. Within the BEB500 sample, 3D data of 10 footprints were obtained by high-resolution laser-scanning carried out in the field in 2011 by Pöyry AG with a Faro hand-scanner. Most of these 10 footprints were destroyed during the construction of Highway A16. The scaled meshes were exported as Stanford PLY files (.ply) and then processed in CloudCompare (v.2.7.0, www.cloudcompare.com) in order to obtain accurate false-color depth maps. All photogrammetric meshes used in this study are available for download here: https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.5662306.v2 (ca. 2.5 Gb). In addition, we analyzed the maximum depth of all the tracks, in order to ascertain whether there is a relationship between depth, preservation grade, and the morphotype. The maximum depth was estimated using the false-color map derived from the 3D-model in those tracks with a preservation grade generally higher than 0.5.

DESCRIPTION OF THE TRACK MORPHOTYPES AND MORPHOLOGICAL VARIATIONS ALONG THE TRACKWAYS

Gracile morphotype

This morphotype was identified in all six tracksites. The footprints are small to medium-sized (15–21.2 cm) tridactyl tracks (Fig. 2), clearly longer than wide (FL/FW ratio = 1.50–1.90) (Table 1). The digits are slender with an acuminate end and clear claw marks preserved in the three digits in the majority of the tracks. Digit III is clearly longer and slightly wider than digits II and IV. Digits II and IV are similar in length and width. The mesaxony is variable but medium to high (AT = 0.53–0.98), with a mean value of 0.77, although it is higher in most of the specimens (more than 0.8 in half of the sample). The divarication angles are relatively low, II–III generally being slightly higher (mean 25°) than III–IV (mean 22°). The hypices are quite symmetrical. The "heel" morphology is variable; some specimens have an oval to round heel pad connected with digit IV

Figure 2 Pictures and false-color depth maps of the tracks with a high preservation grade that belong to the gracile morphotype. (A) BEB500-T16-R3; (B) BEB500-T26-R5; (C) BEB500-T73-L5; (D) BSY1020-E2; (E) CHV1000-E4; (F) CRO500-T10-L10; (G) SCR1055-T2-L2*; (H) SCR1055-T3-L2*; (I) TCH1055-E53; (J) TCH1055-T2-L1; (K) TCH1060-E58; (L) TCH1065-E3; (M) TCH1065-E177; (N) TCH1065-T25-L2; (O) TCH1069-T1-R2. *In these two cases, it is not a picture but a colored mesh obtained from the 3D-model. Scale bar = 5 cm.

Full-size 🖼 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4579/fig-2

Table 1 Measurements of the specimens with a high preservation grade.

| Track	FL	FW	FL/FW	LII	LIII	LIV	WII	WIII	WIV	II–III	III–IV	ATw	Atl	AT
BEB500-T16-R3	18	10	1.8	13.5	18	13.8	2	1.9	1.8	22.5	17.5	8.8	5.8	0.66
BEB500-T17-R8	19	11.5	1.65	11	19	13	1.9	3.3	1.6	23	20	10.5	8.8	0.84
BEB500-T26-R5	19	12	1.58	13	19	14	2.2	3	2.9	32	26	10.3	9.4	0.91
BEB500-T73-L5	15	8.5	1.76	8.5	15	10	2.3	2.9	2.5	31	22	7.9	5.8	0.73
BSY1020-E2	22	11.7	1.88	15	22	13.5	3.6	3	2.7	21.5	24.5	9.5	8.5	0.89
TCH1055-E53	17.5	10.3	1.7	12.2	17.5	12	3	2.7	2.5	25	17.5	8.5	7	0.82
TCH1055-T2-L1	21.2	13.1	1.62	15.6	21.2	15	2.3	2.1	2.2	25	22	11.4	7	0.61
TCH1055-T2-R1	19.5	13	1.5	13.2	20.5	13.1	3.3	3.7	2.5	29	23	10.6	8.5	0.80
TCH1060-E58	20	10.5	1.90	20	13.5	12	3.4	3.1	2.9	27	22	8.8	7.5	0.85
TCH1065-E177	17.5	9.4	1.86	11.8	17.5	12.5	1.6	2.4	2	21	20	8.2	6.5	0.79
TCH1065-E3	18.4	12.3	1.5	12.3	18.4	11.7	3.3	3.8	2.3	30	24	9.14	7.8	0.85
TCH1065-T25-L2	19.3	12.2	1.58	14	19.3	12.3	3	3	2.7	25	21	10.3	8	0.78
TCH1069-T1-R2	20	13	1.54	14	20	13.5	2.1	2.7	2.1	24	29	11.5	8.3	0.72
SCR1055-T2-L2	20	12	1.67	15	20	16	2.7	2.9	2.5	25	18	11.4	6	0.53
SCR1055-T3-L2	18	11	1.64	12	18	12	2.3	2.1	1.8	26	26	8.5	8.3	0.98
CHV1000-E4	16	8.5	1.88	11	16	10	1.8	2.3	1.7	21	22	8.1	6.1	0.75
CRO500-T10-L10	11	6.5	1.69	6	11	7	1.4	1.8	1.5	32	23	5.6	5.4	0.96
BEB500-T120-R5	17	15	1.13	13.5	17	14.5	3.5	3.2	2.5	30.4	34	13	5	0.38
BEB500-T120-R6	18	15.5	1.16	14.5	18	15	2.5	3.1	3	22	27	14.2	5.7	0.40
TCH1065-E124	19	15.5	1.23	13.5	19	15	3.3	4.5	3.5	27.5	26.5	14.4	7.5	0.52
TCH1065-E188	18	12.3	1.46	13.3	18	13	3.2	3.7	3.3	25	27	10	5.2	0.52
TCH1065-T21-R1	19.8	14.5	1.37	14.4	19.8	14.8	3.5	3.7	3.5	27	27	11.8	6.9	0.58
TCH1065-T15-R1	21.8	15	1.45	15.7	21.8	17.2	2.7	3.4	3.1	29	25	12	7.3	0.61

Notes:
(FL), footprint length; (FW), footprint width; (FL/FW), footprint length/footprint width ratio; (LI, LII, LIII), digit length; (WI, WII, WIII), digit width; (II–III, III–IV), divarication angles; mesaxony (AT, anterior triangle ratio; ATw, anterior triangle width; ATl, anterior triangle length).

(BEB500-T16-R3, TCH1055-E53, TCH1055-T2-R1, TCH1069-T1-R2; see Fig. 2), whereas in others it is not clearly preserved even when the preservation grade is high (e.g., BSY1020-E2). Most of the specimens preserve a clear small medial notch located behind digit II, which with the rounded heel marks gives them an asymmetric shape. In some of the footprints well-defined digital pads can be discerned. The tracks with the best quality of preservation suggest a phalangeal formula of 2-3-4 (including the metatarsophalangeal pad IV).

Robust morphotype

This morphotype has mainly been identified on the track levels BEB500 and TCH1065. The footprints are small or medium-sized (17–21.8 cm) tridactyl tracks (Fig. 3), slightly longer than wide (FL/FW ratio = 1.13–1.46) (Table 1). The digits are relatively robust with an acuminate end and clear claw marks preserved in some of the tracks (e.g., BEB500-T120-R5, TCH1065-T15-R1, TCH1065-T21-R1). Digit III is clearly longer and slightly wider than digits II and IV. Digits II and IV are similar in length and width. The mesaxony is variable but low-medium (AT = 0.38–0.61), with a mean value of 0.49. The divarication

Figure 3 Pictures and false-color depth maps of the tracks with a high preservation grade that belong to the robust morphotype. (A) BEB500-T120-R5; (B) BEB500-T120-R6; (C) TCH1065-T21-R1; (D) TCH1065-E188; (E) TCH1065-E124; (F) TCH1065-T15-R1. Scale bar = 5 cm.
Full-size ⊡ DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4579/fig-3

angles are low, II–III (mean 26°) and III–IV (mean 27°) being quite similar. The hypices are quite symmetrical. The "heel" morphology is variable, ranging from subrounded to subtriangular. Only TCH1065-T21-R1 preserves a clear small medial notch located behind digit II, thus being slightly asymmetrical, whereas the other specimens are more symmetrical. Well-defined digital pads cannot be discerned in most of the footprints, although TCH1065-T21-R1 shows digital pads suggesting a possible phalangeal pad formula of 2-3-4.

Table 2 and Figs. 4 and 5 show the variations in preservation grade and the maximum depth along the analyzed trackways (see Table S1 to see the data of each specific track). 11 trackways belong to the gracile morphotype and four trackways belong to the robust morphotype (see Figs. S1–S3 for the location of the trackways in the tracksite). The preservation grade varies from low (0–0.5 in the scale) to high (2 or more in the scale) for both morphotypes. The maximum depth variation is considerably low, as the maximum variation it is around 5 mm in both morphotypes (CRO500-T30BIS and BEB500-T120).

DISCUSSION

True ichnodiversity or variation due to substrate-foot interaction?

The final shape of a footprint is determined by a combination of factors related to the anatomy of the trackmaker's autopodium, the kinematics and the substrate (*Marty, Strasser & Meyer, 2009*; *Falkingham, 2014*); another important factor is the level in which the tracks were preserved (*Milàn & Bromley, 2006*), i.e., if they are preserved as undertracks. In the case of the tracksites of Highway A16, we can rule out this factor as the excavations were carried out level-by-level, so the footprints are true tracks (or natural casts). As the foot-substrate interaction is a major determinant of the final shape of a track, it is important to analyze variations in depth and shape along trackways to ascertain

Table 2 Variation in preservation grade and variation in maximum depth (difference between highest and lowest value) through the analyzed trackways (see Table S1 for specific values of each track).

Gracile morphotype					Robust morphotype				
Trackway	Number of tracks	Analyzed tracks	Variation in preservation grade (min–max)	Total variation in depth (mm)	Trackway	Number of tracks	Analyzed tracks	Variation in preservation grade (min–max)	Total variation in depth (mm)
BEB500-T16	27	3	0.5–2.5 (High)	1.1	BEB500-T75	71	2	0	0
BEB500-T17	120	4	1–2 (Medium)	2.8	BEB500-T120	29	4	0–2 (High)	5.8
BEB500-T58	53	6	0.5–1.5 (Medium)	2.3	TCH1065-T15	2	2	0.5–2 (High)	1.5
BEB500-T73	18	4	1–2 (Medium)	2	TCH1069-T2	5	2	1–1.5 (Low)	1.8
BEB500-T78	24	2	1–1 (Low)	0.4					
BEB500-T82	59	2	1.5–1.5 (Low)	1.9					
BEB500-T93	64	2	1–1.5 (Low)	3.8					
CRO500-T10	75	14	0–2 (High)	2.6					
CRO500-T30BIS	11	5	0–2 (High)	4.7					
TCH1055-T2	4	2	2–2.5 (Low)	2.5					
TCH1065-T25	4	2	1–2 (Medium)	2.7					

the morphological variation (e.g., *Razzolini et al., 2014*). For this reason, we first analyzed the individual footprint shape (Figs. 2 and 3) and then looked at the variation along the trackway (Figs. 4 and 5). The idea was to establish whether some of the described morphotypes might represent variations produced by the same/similar trackmakers (in the sense of a theropod with tridactyl functionally similar pes structure, as it is not possible to assign the tracks to a particular clade) walking on a substrate with different properties (water content, thickness or cohesiveness). Previous researchers have described variations in dinosaur footprint shape between two extremes of a morphological continuum or a gradational series (*Gatesy et al., 1999*; *Razzolini et al., 2014*) to suggest that similar theropods traversed substrates of variable consistency. Other researchers have shown variations in dinosaur footprint morphology as a consequence of locomotor adaptations associated with changes in substrate consistency (*Wilson, Marsicano & Smith, 2009*). Thus, the same trackmaker can produce footprints with significant shape variation along the trackways when there is a change in the aforementioned substrate properties. Only in such cases where the analysis is along the trackway, the differences can be claimed as a consequence of foot-substrate interactions rather than anatomical differences in the foot morphology of the trackmaker. In the Swiss samples, clear evidence of intermediate morphologies is missing, supporting the presence of at least two different groups of tridactyl trackmakers. Where gradational series of theropod tracks have been reported (see refs above), these show a hallux, metatarsal marks, and distinctive displacement rims in

Castanera et al. (2018), *PeerJ*, DOI 10.7717/peerj.4579

10/33

Figure 4 Morphological variation in the footprint shape along the studied trackways from BEB500 tracksite. (A) BEB500-T16 (gracile morphotype); (B) BEB500-T17 (gracile morphotype); (C) BEB500-T58 (gracile morphotype); (D) BEB500-T73 (gracile morphotype); (E) BEB500-T75 (gracile morphotype); (F) BEB500-T78 (gracile morphotype); (G) BEB500-T82 (gracile morphotype); (H) BEB500-T120 (robust morphotype); (I) BEB500-T93 (gracile morphotype). Full-size 🖼 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4579/fig-4

Figure 5 Morphological variation in the footprint shape along the studied trackways from the CRO500, TCH1055, TCH1065, and TCH1069 tracksites. (A) CRO500-T10 (gracile morphotype); (B) CRO500-T30BIS (gracile morphotype); (C) TCH1055-T2 (gracile morphotype); (D) TCH1065-T15 (robust morphotype); (E) TCH1069-T2 (robust morphotype); (F) TCH1065-T25 (gracile morphotype).

the deepest tracks that are clearly extramorphological features. None of the morphotypes presented in this paper shows such evidence, even in the deepest tracks. This leads us to think that the sediment was relatively firm during the impression of the tracks.

Generally, tracks with a preservation grade of 1 or higher can be classified in one of the two described morphotypes: gracile or robust. There are just a few classification doubts regarding isolated footprints (e.g., CRO500-T30BIS-R4). At the outset, one possible hypothesis was that the robust morphotype could be a variation of the gracile morphotype, produced by a similar trackmaker on a substrate with different rheological properties (e.g., *Gatesy et al., 1999*; *Razzolini et al., 2014*). This hypothesis was especially appealing given the similar footprint dimensions of the two morphotypes. Thus, the deeper tracks would look more robust than the shallow ones, and the absence of clear phalangeal pad marks in most of the robust morphotype tracks might be a consequence of a softer substrate or of deeper penetration by the trackmaker foot. Our max-depth analysis (see Tables 2 and S1), indeed showed that the robust tracks have high values of maximum depth (e.g., BEB500-T120-R5 = 6.1 mm; BEB500-T120-R6 = 10 mm; BEB500-E1 = 10.5 mm; TCH1065-E124 = 6.9 mm; TCH1065-E188 = 5.9 mm; TCH1065-T15-R1 = 8.3 mm; TCH1065-T21-R1 = 12.1 mm, see Table S1). However, it is worth noticing that the highest values all occur on level TCH1065, where also the gracile tracks show their deeper values (TCH1065-E28 = 11.7 mm; TCH1065-T25-R2 = 12.9 mm; TCH1065-T25-L2 = 10.2 mm), quite comparable to the robust ones. Therefore, on this track level the presence of the two morphotypes cannot be directly associated with the depth of the footprints, as both the gracile and the robust show similar values of maximum depth. In the case of BEB500 we see a similar scenario, e.g., BEB500-T16 and BEB500-T17 (gracile) have the same depth as BEB500-T120 and BEB500-E1 (robust). In other words, the depth of the tracks is more determined by the level where they were impressed than by being robust or gracile. Anyway, it is noteworthy that the max-depth analysis shows that depth values are relatively low with maximum depths of slightly more than just 1 cm in the deepest tracks.

The analysis of the morphological variation along the trackways shows that the gracile morphotype is quite consistent along the trackways, and no tracks classifiable as robust are found within these trackways. There are only a few cases, e.g., CRO500-T30BIS-R4 (Fig. 5B) and BEB500-T17-L8/ BEB500-T17-L9 (Fig. 4B), which might look more robust than the other tracks in the trackway, but here the features did not properly fit with the description of the robust morphotype. Regarding the robust morphotype, in the analyzed trackways (BEB500-T120, TCH1065-T15, and TCH1069-T2) none of the tracks shows any feature of the gracile morphotype (noteworthy is the low preservation grade and the scarce data for TCH1065-T15 and TCH1069-T2). The maximum variation in depth along the trackways is low, being around 5 mm in both morphotypes (Gracile, CRO500-T30BIS = 4.7 mm; Robust, BEB500-T120 = 5.8 mm). These data suggest that, in our case, there is no clear correlation between the depth of the footprint and the morphotypes (either gracile or robust), and that the intratrackway variation is never significant enough to denote a shift between the morphotypes. Therefore, the present evidence indicates that

there are *at least* (see following discussion) two different trackmakers of small to medium-sized theropods in the tidal flats of the Jura Mountains.

Analysis of the mesaxony (it represents how far the projection of digit III extends with respect to digits II and IV) and the FL/FW ratio supports the presence of *at least* the two morphotypes (Fig. 6). Some authors have used mesaxony (*Weems, 1992*; *Lockley, 2009*) as a good parameter to distinguish between tridactyl tracks. In the studied sample, this parameter is clearly lower in the robust morphotype than in the gracile one. The FL/FW ratio also shows a considerable difference between the morphotypes (likewise lower in the robust morphotype). A closer look at these two parameters within the robust morphotype (Fig. 6B) raises the question whether it represents a single ichnotaxon. The data for the two analyzed tracks from BEB500-T120 (AT = 0.38–0.40; FL/FW = 1.13–1.16) show considerably lower data for the FL/FW ratio and weaker mesaxony than the tracks from TCH1065, (AT = 0.52–0.61; FL/FW = 1.23–1.46) (see also following discussion).

Morphotype variation due to ontogeny?

Another salient point relating to the number of morphotypes in the analyzed sample is the possibility of variations due to different ontogenetic states. Few works have dealt with the relationship between dinosaur footprints and ontogeny (e.g., *Lockley, 1994*; *Matsukawa, Lockley & Hunt, 1999*; *Hornung et al., 2016*). Ontogenetic variations have been suggested to explain morphological variation in the classical theropod ichnotaxa of the *Grallator–Eubrontes* plexus (*Olsen, 1980*; *Olsen, Smith & McDonald, 1998*; *Moreau et al., 2012*). *Olsen, Smith & McDonald (1998)* proposed that the major proportional differences between *Grallator*, *Anchisauripus*, and *Eubrontes* might be derived from the allometric growth of individuals of several related species. In these typical theropod footprints the large tracks (*Eubrontes*) are wider with weaker mesaxony than the smaller tracks (*Grallator*), showing a positive correlation between the elongation of the track and a stronger mesaxony (*Lockley, 2009*). As this author suggested, the assumption of ontogenetic variation is thus based mainly on the hypothesis of a discernible allometric pattern. Although the growth dynamics have been documented in several groups of theropods (*Bybee, Lee & Lamm, 2006*; *Griffin, 2018*, and references therein) little is known about how possible ontogenetic variations may have affected variations in theropod feet proportions and thus in footprint shape (*Farlow & Lockley, 1993*; *Farlow et al., 2013*). Generally, tracks that are similar in morphology but different in size are considered to belong to the same ichnotaxon (*Thulborn, 1990*; *Lockley, 1994*; *Matsukawa, Lockley & Hunt, 1999*; *Clark, Ross & Booth, 2005*; *Pascual-Arribas & Hernández-Medrano, 2011*; *Castanera et al., 2015*). *Demathieu (1990)* also explored the use of ratios of length characters to reduce the influence of size when comparing footprints. For instance, *Lockley, Mitchell & Odier (2007)* assumed that small theropod tracks (*Carmelopodus*) from the Jurassic of North America represent adults of small species and not juveniles of larger species and suggested that "this inference is consistent with a model of rapid growth rates such as is typical of birds, which would have reduced the number of potential track making juveniles that could habitually make footprints." By contrast, *Pascual-Arribas & Hernández-Medrano (2011)* considered minute theropod tracks from the Early Cretaceous

A

B

Figure 6 Bivariate graph plotting the footprint length/footprint width ratio against the mesaxony (AT) of the studied tracks (gracile and robust morphotype) with the larger tracks described in the Reuchenette Formation. (A) Gracile and robust morphotype compared with *Megalosauripus* tracks (including tracks classified as *Megalosauripus transjuranicus*, *Megalosauripus* cf. *transjuranicus* and *Megalosauripus* isp.), the Morphotype II tracks and *Jurabrontes curtedulensis* (after *Razzolini et al., 2017*; *Marty et al., 2017*). Note that in many cases the points represent tracks from the same trackway, so variation through the trackway is also represented. (B) The studied tracks compared with just the holotype and paratype specimens of *Megalosauripus transjuranicus* and *Jurabrontes curtedulensis*, plus the best-preserved tracks of Morphotype II (BEB500-TR7). Outline drawings not to scale. The specimen in red is CRO500-T10-L10 (previously classified as *Carmelopodus* and herein consider as part of the gracile morphotype, see discussion).   Full-size ▣ DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4579/fig-6

of Spain (subsequently assigned to *Kalohipus bretunensis* by *Castanera et al., 2015*) to belong to baby theropods because of the morphometric similarities with larger tracks from the same site and formation.

Two possible different ontogenetic stages should be considered in the interpretation of the Ajoie ichnocoenosis. In one case, there are similarities between the gracile morphotype and the previously described *Carmelopodus* tracks from the Chevenez–Combe Ronde tracksite (CRO500-T8; CRO500-T10; CRO500-T16; CRO500-T21; CRO500-T26; CRO500-T41) so the first hypothesis would be that both are an ontogenetic variation of the same morphotype. According to the original description by *Marty (2008)*, these tracks can be characterized as mesaxonic, slightly asymmetric, tridactyl tracks that are clearly longer than wide. Digit III is always the longest, digit IV being longer than digit II, which is shorter posteriorly. Claw impressions are present in the three digits, and there is a phalangeal pad formula of 2-3-3. There is a low total divarication angle, and divarication angles of the same order between digits II and III, and III and IV. It has a narrow-gauge trackway with small tracks with outward rotation. CRO500-T10-L10 is the track with the highest preservation grade recovered from level CRO500. Regarding the data taken from this footprint, it should be noted that the FL/FW ratio (1.69) falls within the range of the other gracile tracks, while the mesaxony is among the highest in the whole sample (0.96) but still within the range of the gracile morphotype (Fig. 6). The divarication angle is also low (32°–23°). Moreover, reanalysis of the tracks with the use of false-color depth maps (Fig. 2F) allowed the fourth phalangeal pad in digit IV to be distinguished, suggesting a formula of 2-3-4, although this is not preserved in most of the tracks with a lower preservation grade (Fig. 5A). Accordingly, we consider that there are not enough data to interpret CRO500-T10-L10 as a different morphotype of the tracks included in the gracile morphotype and we regard them as part of it (see next section for the new ichnotaxonomic assignation). This fact highlights the importance of analyzing large samples and the variation in shape through the trackways. The differences in size between CRO500-T10-L10 (FL = 11 cm) and the rest of the specimens of the gracile morphotype (FL = 16–21.2 cm) but similar footprint shape, FL/FW ratio and mesaxony might be explained by an isometric growth. However, the absence of more data of smaller size classes of the gracile morphotype, prevent us to test this first hypothesis.

A second hypothesis considers whether the gracile and the robust morphotype might be ontogenetic variations of one of the three previously identified larger ichnotaxa (*M. transjuranicus, J. curtedulensis,* and the informally named Morphotype II tracks) of the Jura Mountains (*Razzolini et al., 2017*; *Marty et al., 2017*). The two formally described

ichnospecies represent large and more slender (*M. transjuranicus*) and giant and more robust (*J. curtedulensis*) theropod tracks, respectively. In addition, the third large morphotype not assigned to any known ichnotaxon and named Morphotype II is characterized by subsymmetric tracks that are generally slightly longer than wide (sometimes almost as wide as long), blunt digit impressions, with no evidence for discrete phalangeal pad and claw marks (*Razzolini et al., 2017*). The interpretation of this morphotype is quite complex, as tracks with the aforementioned features have been also documented as a morphological variation in *Megalosauripus* trackways. However, other trackways show a very consistent morphology throughout very long trackways, and have been considered by the authors a true unnamed ichnotaxon different from *Megalosauripus* and with a probable ornithopod affinity. This means that tracks with Morphotype II features can represent two different trackmakers, a theropod (*Megalosauripus*) and an ornithopod (the proper informally named Morphotype II). Long trackways of Morphotype II are found on the same surfaces that many in the studied sample come from, such as BEB500 and CRO500 (*Razzolini et al., 2017*). Thus, the hypothesis that the gracile and the robust morphotypes might represent juvenile/subadult specimens of the larger tracks described in the tracksites must be explored.

Analyzing footprint proportions, it should be noted that the FL/FW ratio of the gracile morphotype fits within the upper range of the tracks included in the ichnotaxon *Megalosauripus* (Fig. 6A) from the Reuchenette Formation; considering just the type material of *M. transjuranicus*, it fits well (Fig. 6B) (*Razzolini et al., 2017*). However, the mesaxony is substantially higher in the gracile morphotype than in the *Megalosauripus* tracks. In the case of the robust morphotype, the FL/FW ratio fits within the range of *J. curtedulensis* and the Morphotype II tracks when analyzing all the referred material (Fig. 6A) or just the type material of *J. curtedulensis* and the best-preserved tracks of Morphotype II (BEB500-TR7-L2; BEB500-TR7-R2; BEB500-TR7-R7; BEB500-TR7-L10, *Razzolini et al., 2017*) (Fig. 6B). The robust morphotype has higher mesaxony than *J. curtedulensis*, being more similar in this respect to the Morphotype II tracks. It is notable that the footprint proportions within the robust morphotype are quite variable between stratigraphic levels. For example, tracks from trackway BEB500-T120 have a lower FL/FW ratio and mesaxony, whereas tracks from track level TCH1065 have higher ratios. Thus, BEB500-T120 is closer to the ranges of *J. curtedulensis* whereas the tracks from TCH1065 are closer to the ranges of *M. transjuranicus* and especially the Morphotype II tracks (Fig. 6).

As previously discussed, the variations in mesaxony, where larger tracks have lower mesaxony, are well documented in theropod tracks (*Weems, 1992*; *Olsen, Smith & McDonald, 1998*; *Lockley, 2009*). Because there are some overlapping areas in the footprint proportions of the larger and the smaller tracks, it might be tempting to relate them according to these values; i.e., gracile with *M. transjuranicus*, robust from BEB500 with *Jurabrontes*, and robust from TCH1065 with Morphotype II. Nonetheless, the smaller morphotypes show other considerable morphological differences apart from size and mesaxony with respect to the larger morphotypes. The gracile morphotype differs from *M. transjuranicus* in key features of the diagnosis such as the sigmoidal impression of

digit III (less sigmoidal), the divarication angle (less divaricated), and the digital pad of digit IV (proportionally smaller when preserved). The robust morphotype (from both BEB500 and TCH1065) differs from *J. curtedulensis* in the absence of clear phalangeal pads (preservation bias?), the absence of the peculiar, isolated proximal pad PIII1 of digit III, and the interdigital divarication angles (asymmetric vs. symmetric); it also differs from the Morphotype II tracks in the absence of blunt digit impressions, possible evidence of a discrete phalangeal pad, and the presence of clear claw marks. Therefore, despite some overlap of the morphometric data and the fact that there are considerable differences in shape (although some of them might be extramorphological variations), we consider that there are not enough data to support the second hypothesis just on the basis of the footprint shape and morphometric data.

Finally, we examine whether there is any spatio-temporal relationship between the larger and the smaller tracks from the Ajoie ichnocoenosis. *Lockley (1994)* warned that the track data "that most probably represent monospecific assemblages are those obtained for a single ichnotaxon from a single bedding plane." In this regard, it is interesting to note the scarcity of large theropod tracks in the ichnoassemblages where both the gracile and the robust morphotype have been identified, mainly levels BEB500, TCH1065, and CRO500. Level BEB500 (Fig. S1), the one with the highest number of studied tracks ($n = 39$), is mainly composed of sauropods ($n = 17$ trackways), and minute to small tridactyl ($n = 158$ trackways) tracks. No tracks assigned to *J. curtedulensis* or *M. transjuranicus* have been documented in this level although it is the surface with the most Morphotype II tracks ($n = 8$ trackways) documented. Level TCH1065 (Fig. S2) ($n = 15$ studied tracks) is composed of 189 tracks, mainly of minute to small-sized theropods, and two parallel trackways (TCH1065-T26, TCH1065-T27) assigned to *Jurabrontes* have also been documented. In level CRO500 (Fig. S3) ($n = 20$ studied tracks), 16 sauropod trackways, and 57 tridactyl trackways have been documented. One of the tridactyl trackways (CRO500-T43) has been assigned to Morphotype II (*Razzolini et al., 2017*). Thus, there are in three cases a large track type (Morphotype II in BEB500 and CRO500, and *Jurabrontes* in TCH1065) and the robust and the gracile morphotypes in the same surface (Figs. S1–S3). Interestingly, no *Megalosauripus* tracks have been documented in any of the three levels. One way to confirm that some of the small tracks were juveniles of the larger ichnospecies would be to find some kind of relationship among them, such as gregarious behaviour (*sensu Castanera et al., 2014*). However, there is no clear relationship between the trackways, neither of the same size nor of different sizes. In BEB500 (Fig. S1), trackways TR1, TR3, TR4, TR5, TR6, and TR8 (Morphotype II) cross several trackways made by small trackmakers, but the orientations are completely different and do not show any kind of relationship. TR2 (Morphotype II) is subparallel with T34 (small track but unknown morphotype) at the beginning of the trackway but shows a significant change in direction, so this does not show any relationship either. Notably, TR7 (Morphotype II) is a long trackway that is subparallel to T120 (robust morphotype). Tracks T120-L10 and T120-R10 tread over tracks TR7-R8 and TR7-L9 but pass afterwards, so although this might indicate some kind of interaction there is no clear evidence of gregarious behavior. In level TCH1065 (Fig. S2), the two parallel trackways

(TCH1065-T26, TCH1065-T27) assigned to *Jurabrontes* do not show any evidence of a relationship with the smaller tracks either. Finally, in CRO500 (Fig. S3), T43 (Morphotype II) is slightly subparallel to T42 (small track but unknown morphotype), but there is no clear evidence to suggest that they were walking together. To sum up, generally the orientation of the large trackways does not seem to suggest any sort of relationship, with the possible exception of TR7 and T120. This single case might hint at the hypothesis that some tracks of the robust morphotype (BEB500-T120) might represent a juvenile of the producer of the tracks classified as Morphotype II. However, BEB500-T120 is the very trackway that shows more morphometric similarities to *Jurabrontes* than to Morphotype II (Fig. 6), thus weakening this hypothesis. In the light of the previous discussion, there is no evidence to suggest an interaction (i.e., behavioral aspect) among the dinosaurs that produced trackways of different sizes when they are left on the same surface. Thus, there is no indication (nor in footprint shape, nor morphometric, nor spatio-temporal) to suggest that the gracile and the robust morphotype are smaller tracks of the same of the larger morphotypes described from the area. Thus, the differences between the larger and the smaller morphotypes have thus led us to treat them as different ichnotaxa (see next section).

Ichnotaxonomy

As noted by *Marty (2008)*, small to medium-sized tridactyl tracks are generally not very common in the Late Jurassic and Early Cretaceous, and accordingly such tracks have only recently been the focus of ichnotaxonomic descriptions. Although recent descriptions have considerably increased the number of small to medium-sized tridactyl tracks, few ichnotaxa have been described in the Late Jurassic and Early Cretaceous of Europe. *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla (2000)* suggested that theropod track morphologies are much more variable through time than previously thought. These authors pointed out that "the perception of morphological conservatism and uniformity through time is, in part, a function of lack of study of adequately large samples of well-preserved material (*Baird, 1957*)." In this sense, the studied tracks from the Ajoie ichnocoenosis represent a good sample of tridactyl dinosaur tracks in terms of the number of specimens ($n = 93$), with a considerable quality of preservation in many of them ($n = 23$ with a preservation grade greater than 2).

Although they are not very abundant in other European tracksites, small to medium-sized tridactyl trackways are the most abundant in the Ajoie ichnocoenosis. As mentioned above, the main small to medium-sized tridactyl dinosaur ichnotaxa that have been described from the Late Jurassic of Europe are (Fig. 7) *Grallator* (Fig. 7A) and *Anomoepus* (Fig. 7B) in Spain (*Lockley et al., 2008*; *Piñuela, 2015*; *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos, 2016*); *Carmelopodus* (Fig. 7C) and *Eubrontes* (Fig. 7D) in France (*Mazin et al., 2000*; *Mazin, Hantzpergue & Pouech, 2016*); *Wildeichnus* (Fig. 7E), cf. *Jialingpus* (Fig. 7F) and *Dineichnus* (Fig. 7G) in Poland (*Gierliński, Niedźwiedzki & Nowacki, 2009*); *Dineichnus* (Fig. 7H) (*Lockley et al., 1998a*) and *Therangospodus*-like tracks (Fig. 7I) (*Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*) in Portugal; and *Grallator* in Germany (Fig. 7J) (*Diedrich, 2011*). In addition, *Conti et al. (2005)* described medium-sized footprints (Fig. 7K) that "resemble *Therangospodus*" (their type 3) and another morphotype (their

Figure 7 **Main small-medium-sized tridactyl dinosaur footprints described in the Late Jurassic of Europe.** (A) *Grallator* from Spain (S, after *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos, 2016*); (B) *Anomoepus* from Spain (S, after *Piñuela, 2015*); (C) *Carmelopodus* from France (C, after *Mazin, Hantzpergue & Pouech, 2016*); (D) *Eubrontes* from France (C, after *Mazin et al., 2000*); (E) *Wildeichnus* from Poland (C, after *Gierliński, Niedźwiedzki & Nowacki, 2009*); (F) cf. *Jialingpus* from Poland (C, after *Gierliński, Niedźwiedzki & Nowacki, 2009*). (G) *Dineichnus* from Poland (C, after *Gierliński, Niedźwiedzki & Nowacki, 2009*); (H) *Dineichnus* from Portugal (S, *Lockley et al., 1998a*); (I) *Therangospodus*-like track from Portugal (S, after *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*); (J) *Grallator* from Germany (S, after *Diedrich, 2011*); (K) *Therangospodus*-like track from Italy (C, after *Conti et al., 2005*); (L) *Carmelopodus*-like track from Italy (C, after *Conti et al., 2005*). Scale bar = 1 cm (E), 5 cm (A, F, G), 10 cm (B, C, D, H, I, J, K, L). S and C refer to siliciclastic and carbonate substrate, respectively. Full-size 🖼 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4579/fig-7

type 2, Fig. 7L) that shares the same functional character with *Carmelopodus*, i.e., the lack of the fourth proximal pad on digit IV.

When compared with the type specimens of these ichnotaxa, the new data on the gracile morphotype of CRO500-T10 (Figs. 5A and 8N) (see previous sections) allow us to rule out the presence of *Carmelopodus untermannorum* (Fig. 8A) in the Ajoie, as previously discussed. Generally, the gracile morphotype (Figs. 8M–8O) does not fit with key features of the diagnosis of this ichnotaxon (*Lockley et al., 1998b*), differing in the phalangeal pad formula (2-3-4 rather than 2-3-3), symmetry, different length/width ratio, or the lower divarication. Among other theropod ichnotaxa, the gracile morphotype shows considerable differences with respect to *Wildeichnus navesi* (Fig. 8B, *Casamiquela, 1964*; *Valais, 2011*) from the Jurassic of Argentina (as well as larger size, a not subequal but lower divarication angle, larger claw marks, an unrounded digital phalangeal pad in digit IV, greater asymmetry, a generally higher length/width ratio); and with respect to *Therangospodus pandemicus* from the Late Jurassic of North America and Asia (Fig. 8C, smaller size, presence of clear phalangeal pads, higher mesaxony) (*Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*; *Fanti et al., 2013*). The differences with respect to ornithopod ichnotaxa are noteworthy: it differs from *Anomoepus scambus* (Fig. 8D) in being less symmetric, having a metatarsal-phalangeal pad of digit IV not in line with the digit III axis, no hallux marks, higher mesaxony, and no manus prints present (see *Olsen & Rainforth, 2003*). It also differs notably with respect to *Dineichnus socialis*

Figure 8 Small-medium-sized tridactyl dinosaur ichnotaxa with affinities with the described morphotypes. (A) Outline drawing of the holotype of *Carmelopodus untermannorum* (S, redrawn after *Lockley et al., 1998b*); (B) outline drawing of the holotype of *Wildeichnus navesi* (V, redrawn after *Lockley, Mitchell & Odier, 2007*); (C) outline drawing of the topotype of *Therangospodus pandemicus* (S, after *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*); (D) outline drawing of *Anomoepus scambus* (S, after *Olsen & Rainforth, 2003*); (E) outline drawing of the holotype of *Dineichnus socialis* (S, after *Lockley et al., 1998a*); (F) composite outline drawing of type trackway of *Grallator parallelus* (S, redrawn from *Olsen, Smith & McDonald, 1998*); (G) outline drawing of type specimen of *Anchisauripus sillimani* (S, redrawn from *Olsen, Smith & McDonald, 1998*); (H) outline drawing of type specimen of *Eubrontes giganteus* (S, redrawn from *Olsen, Smith & McDonald, 1998*); (I) outline drawing of type specimen of *Jialingpus yuechiensis* (S, redrawn from *Lockley et al., 2013*); (J) outline drawing of type specimen of *Kalohipus bretunensis* (S, redrawn from *Fuentes Vidarte & Meijide Calvo, 1998*); (K) drawing of type specimen of *Jurabrontes curtedulensis* (redrawn from *Marty et al., 2017*); (L) outline drawing of type specimen of *Megalosauripus transjuranicus* (redrawn from *Razzolini et al., 2017*); (M) outline drawing of specimen BSY1020-E2 (cf. *Kalohipus* isp.); (N) outline drawing of specimen CRO500-T10-L10 (cf. *Kalohipus* isp.); (O) outline drawing of specimen TCH-1060-E58 (cf. *Kalohipus* isp.); (P) outline drawing of specimen TCH-1065-T21-R1 (cf. *Therangospodus* isp.); (Q) outline drawing of specimen BEB500-T120-R5 (*Therangospodus*? isp.). S, C, and V refer to siliciclastic, carbonate and volcanoclastic substrate, respectively. Scale bar = 2 cm (B, D), 5 cm (F, G, H, I, J), 10 cm (A, C, E, L, M–Q), 50 cm (K).

Full-size ◨ DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4579/fig-8

(Fig. 8E) for higher FL/FW ratio, higher mesaxony, no quadripartite morphology, a different heel pad impression, lower digit divarication (see *Lockley et al., 1998a*).

The features of the gracile morphotype fit better with the smaller ichnotaxa of the *Grallator–Anchisauripus–Eubrontes* (Figs. 8F–8H) plexus (*Olsen, 1980*; *Demathieu, 1990*; *Weems, 1992*; *Olsen, Smith & McDonald, 1998*): small to medium-sized, well-defined digital pads, digits II and IV of similar length, digit III being longer and showing high mesaxony, an oval/subrounded "heel" and a low interdigital angle. Although these footprints have mainly been described from Late Triassic and Early-Middle Jurassic

deposits, in recent years they are also known from younger strata including the Late Jurassic of Europe (see *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos, 2016* and references therein). Regarding the use of the ichnotaxon *Anchisauripus*, *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos (2016)* wrote a short review examining how different authors have considered *Grallator* and *Anchisauripus* as synonyms (*Lucas et al., 2006*; *Lockley, 2009*; *Piñuela, 2015*). The main sample of "grallatorid" tracks that has been described from Late Jurassic deposits in Europe comes from Asturias (Spain), and these have been assigned to *Grallator* (*Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos, 2016*). However, the gracile tracks from the Ajoie ichnocoenosis differ in the digit proportions (FL/FW ratio) and mesaxony (Fig. 9) from those in Asturias. It should be noted that the Asturian sample shows a great variation in mesaxony (that does not correlate with size). This holds also true for the gracile morphotype although the footprint proportions are less variable. Whereas *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos (2016)* stated that mesaxony "should be used with caution in distinguishing between different ichnotaxa," we consider that the differences in mesaxony between the gracile morphotype (AT = 0.53–0.98) and the *Grallator* tracks from Asturias (AT = 0.72–1.12, *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos, 2016*) tracks are large enough to do so. Furthermore, the FL/FW ratio is also considerably higher in the *Grallator* tracks (FL/FW ratio = 1.73–2.5, *Castanera, Piñuela & García-Ramos, 2016*) than in the gracile morphotype (FL/FW ratio = 1.50–1.90). Oversplitting has occurred in some theropod ichnotaxa similar to *Grallator–Eubrontes* plexus. For example, *Lockley et al. (2013)* proposed a great reduction in the Jurassic theropod ichnotaxa from Asia, arguing that many of them were subjective junior synonyms of *Grallator* and *Eubrontes*. Nonetheless, the authors retain the ichnotaxon *Jialingpus yuechiensis* (Fig. 8I) from the Late Jurassic-Early Cretaceous of China (*Xing et al., 2014*). On the basis of digit proportions (FL/FW ratio) and mesaxony, the gracile morphotype falls partially within the range of *Jialingpus* but also within the range of *K. bretunensis* (Fig. 8J) from the Early Cretaceous (Berriasian) of Spain (*Fuentes Vidarte & Meijide Calvo, 1998*; *Castanera et al., 2015*). According to *Xing et al. (2014)*, the main differences between *Jialingpus* and *Grallator* are the presence of a digit I trace and the large metatarsophalangeal area positioned in line with digit III, which are its main features. These features are absent in the gracile morphotype, so an assignment to *Jialingpus* can be excluded. On the other hand, the diagnosis of *K. bretunensis* (*Fuentes Vidarte & Meijide Calvo, 1998*) clearly includes features that distinguish it from the gracile morphotype, such as its smaller size or robust digits, and as seen in Fig. 9, the footprint proportions and especially the mesaxony are also slightly different. As mentioned above, the morphology is also different from the larger ichnotaxa (*J. curtedulensis*, Fig. 8K, and *M. transjuranicus*, Fig. 8L) that occur in the same deposits.

To summarize, the gracile morphotype is quite similar to other grallatorid tracks (*Grallator, Anchisauripus, Kalohipus, Jialingpus*), the main differences being the digit proportions and mesaxony. Given the current state of knowledge, it is difficult to interpret how much variation between the aforementioned ichnotaxa is a consequence of variations in preservation, ontogeny or ichnodiversity. Taking into account the whole discussion, and bearing in mind the high variation in both the FL/FW ratio and mesaxony seen

Figure 9 Bivariate graph plotting the footprint length/footprint width ratio against Mesaxony of the studied tracks (gracile and robust morphotype) with some of the main dinosaur tridactyl ichnotaxa mentioned in the text. Outline drawings not to scale.　　　Full-size 🖼 DOI: 10.7717/peerj.4579/fig-9

in tracks assigned to *Grallator,* we thus tentatively classify the gracile morphotype as cf. *Kalohipus* isp., as this is the ichnotaxon that is closest to it (Fig. 9). Future studies should elucidate the similarities and differences between these grallatorid tracks. *Jialingpus* tracks have been also described in the Late Jurassic/Early Cretaceous of Europe (*Gierliński, Niedźwiedzki & Nowacki, 2009*), and an analysis of the differences between *Jialingpus* and other grallatorid tracks (including *Kalohipus*) is "pending" (*Xing et al., 2014*). In this regard, it would be interesting to note the differences in mesaxony among both *Kalohipus* and *Jialingpus* (low mesaxony) and *Grallator* (high mesaxony), and questioning whether mesaxony is a good measure for discriminating between the three ichnotaxa. Possible substrate related differences in preservation or ichnofacies substrates have to be tested too. For example, *K. bretunensis* and the main grallatorid ichnotaxa (Figs. 8F–8J) are preserved in siliciclastic sediments whereas the tracks cf. *Kalohipus* isp. from the Swiss Jura Mountains are preserved in marginal marine carbonates.

　Regarding the robust morphotype (Figs. 8P–8Q), a crucial question is whether it represents a single ichnotaxon. In this context, it should be noted that, the morphology of the tracks with a preservation grade of 2 or more, as well as the footprint proportions (Fig. 6B) such as those of trackway BEB500-T120 and the tracks from TCH1065 (TCH1065-T21-R1, TCH1065-E124, and TCH1065-E188) varies considerably. The appearance of this morphotype is completely different from ichnotaxa like *C. untermannorum* (Fig. 8A, size, phalangeal pad formula, digit divarication, well-developed claw marks), *W. navesi* (Fig. 8B, size, gracility, symmetry, length/width ratio, and mesaxony), *A. scambus* (Fig. 8D, size, absence of a manus impression, morphology of the metatarsal-phalangeal pad of digit IV) and *D. socialis* (Fig. 8E, no quadripartite morphology or circular heel pad impression). It differs also from all the aforementioned grallatorid ichnotaxa *Grallator–Anchisauripus–Eubrontes*, plus *Jialingpus, Kalohipus*

(Figs. 8F–8J, mainly in the more robust morphology, footprint proportions, mesaxony, heel morphology, divarication), and the larger ichnotaxa (*J. curtedulensis*, Fig. 8K, and *M. transjuranicus*, Fig. 8L) that occur at the same localities.

Of all the known ichnotaxa, it shares most similarities with *T. pandemicus* (Fig. 8C, *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*; *Fanti et al., 2013*; see also *Castanera et al., 2013b* for new data on tracks previously assigned to *Therangospodus*), although the robust morphotype from the Swiss Jura Mountains has a higher digit divarication and probably higher mesaxony (unpublished data for this parameter in the original publication, *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*). According to the original diagnosis, this ichnotaxon is a "medium sized, elongate, asymmetric theropod track with coalesced, elongate, oval digital pads, not separated into discrete phalangeal pads. Trackway narrow with little or no rotation of digit III long axis from trackway axis". The tracks from the Ajoie ichnoassemblages are slightly smaller in size than *T. pandemicus* (*Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*; *Fanti et al., 2013*). According to these authors, and based on the original descriptions by *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla (2000)*, *Therangospodus* is characterized by: "(1) oval digital pads not separated into discrete digital pads, (2) no rotation of digit III, (3) narrow trackway, and (4) relatively reduced size (<30 cm in average length)." Regarding the absence of discrete digital pads, *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla (2000)* described in the type ichnospecies of *Therangospodus* the presence of "faint indentations at the margin of the pads" that sometimes reveal the location of the phalangeal pads, suggesting a 2-3-4 phalangeal pad formula. *Razzolini et al. (2017)* also pointed out the difficulties of distinguishing between *Therangospodus* and *Megalosauripus*. This has also been previously discussed by other authors (*Gierliński, Niedźwiedzki & Pieńkowski, 2001*; *Piñuela, 2015*), suggesting that some of the diagnostic features might be extramorphological variations. It is notable that *Megalosauripus* and *Therangospodus* generally co-occur in the same sites (*Meyer & Lockley, 1997*; *Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*; *Lockley, Meyer & Santos, 2000*; *Xing, Harris & Gierliński, 2011*; *Fanti et al., 2013*), which might be relevant as the size and preservation could be the only differences between the two ichnotaxa. Interestingly, as we have seen in the previous section, the robust morphotype does not co-occur with any *Megalosauripus* tracks, although some of them (BEB500-T120) co-occur with tracks described as Morphotype II. Even though the robust morphotype is reminiscent of *T. pandemicus*, it is not possible to assign it to this ichnospecies or to any of the known small-medium-sized ichnotaxa. The rarity of collected specimens and the preservation grade (none of them as high as 2.5–3) prevents us from erecting a new ichnotaxon. Taking into account that *T. pandemicus* is the closest ichnotaxon described, we thus tentatively classify the tracks from level TCH1065 as cf. *Therangospodus* isp. and the tracks from BEB500 as *Therangospodus*? isp. in order to show that there are some differences (both morphometric and in shape) within the robust morphotype. As for the Swiss specimens, *T. pandemicus* tracks have been preserved in carbonate materials (*Lockley, Meyer & Moratalla, 2000*), so we can rule out the differences between this ichnotaxon and the robust morphotype being a consequence of this factor as the substrate and the palaeoenvironmental conditions were probably similar at the time of track production.

CONCLUSION

The minute to medium-sized tridactyl dinosaur footprints from the tracksites of Highway A16 in the Jura Mountains (NW Switzerland) represent one of the largest samples from the Late Jurassic worldwide. The integrated analyses of the quality of preservation (preservation grade), the maximum depth, the shape variation along the trackway, and the footprint proportions (FL/FW ratio and mesaxony) open a new window into the interpretation of dinosaur track variations also considering other factors such as preservation, ontogeny and ichnotaxonomy. The descriptions and analyses of the material have made it possible to characterize in detail two different morphotypes, one gracile and one robust, that were already identified in the field. The new data allow us to rule out the notion that the two morphotypes represent a morphological continuum of extramorphological variations, or ontogenetic variations of the larger tracks described from the same sites. New morphometric data allow us to include the small sized tracks previously described from Chevenez–Combe Ronde tracksite within the gracile morphotype, being the only case in the studied sample that might be explained by an ontogenetic variation. An ichnotaxonomical comparison with the main minute to medium-sized tridactyl ichnotaxa did not allow assigning them to any known ichnotaxon with confidence. The gracile morphotype, though similar to some grallatorid ichnotaxa, shows a number of morphometric differences and have been assigned to cf. *Kalohipus* isp. The robust morphotype, though similar to *T. pandemicus*, also shows some differences with respect to the diagnosis of the type specimen, and therefore is classified as cf. *Therangospodus* isp. and *Therangospodus*? isp. Further work is needed in order to understand the possible influence of the substrate composition on theropod ichnotaxonomy in general and the aforementioned ichnotaxa in particular. This study also highlights the difficulties of distinguishing between minute and medium-sized tridactyl dinosaur ichnotaxa and the importance of analyzing different factors related to preservation and ontogeny before assigning a single track to a specific ichnotaxon. The new data increase theropod ichnodiversity to 4/5? theropod ichnotaxa in the tidal flats of the Jura carbonate platform and support previous suggestions that carbonate tidal flats were mainly dominated by theropod and sauropod dinosaurs (*Lockley, Hunt & Meyer, 1994*; *D'Orazi Porchetti et al., 2016*).

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

Competing Interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author Contributions

- Diego Castanera conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, approved the final draft.
- Matteo Belvedere conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, approved the final draft.
- Daniel Marty conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, approved the final draft.
- Géraldine Paratte performed the experiments, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, prepared figures and/or tables, approved the final draft.
- Marielle Lapaire-Cattin performed the experiments, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, prepared figures and/or tables, approved the final draft.
- Christel Lovis performed the experiments, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, prepared figures and/or tables, approved the final draft.
- Christian A. Meyer conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools, prepared figures and/or tables, authored or reviewed drafts of the paper, approved the final draft.

REFERENCES

Alcalá L, Mampel L, Royo-Torres R, Cobos A. 2014. On small quadrupedal ornithopod tracks in Jurassic-Cretaceous transition intertidal deposits (El Castellar, Teruel, Spain). *Spanish Journal of Palaeontology* **29(2)**:83–190.

Antunes MT, Mateus O. 2003. Dinosaurs of Portugal. *Comptes Rendus Palevol* **2(1)**:77–95 DOI 10.1016/s1631-0683(03)00003-4.

Baird D. 1957. Triassic reptile footprint faunules from Milford, New Jersey. *Bulletin of the Museum of Comparative Zoology* **117**:449–520.

Belvedere M, Farlow JO. 2016. A numerical scale for quantifying the quality of preservation of vertebrate tracks. In: Falkingham PL, Marty D, Richter A, eds. *Dinosaur Tracks—The Next Steps.* Bloomington, Idianapolis: Indiana University Press, 92–99.

Belvedere M, Mietto P, Ishigaki S. 2010. A Late Jurassic diverse ichnocoenosis from the siliciclastic Iouaridene Formation (Central High Atlas, Morocco). *Geological Quarterly* **54(3)**:367–380.

Bybee PJ, Lee AH, Lamm ET. 2006. Sizing the Jurassic theropod dinosaur *Allosaurus*: assessing growth strategy and evolution of ontogenetic scaling of limbs. *Journal of Morphology* **267(3)**:347–359 DOI 10.1002/jmor.10406.

Campos-Soto S, Cobos A, Caus E, Benito MI, Fernández-Labrador L, Suárez-Gonzalez P, Quijada E, Royo-Torres R, Mas R, Alcalá L. 2017. Jurassic Coastal Park: a great diversity of palaeoenvironments for the dinosaurs of the Villar del Arzobispo Formation (Teruel, eastern Spain). *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* **485**:154–177 DOI 10.1016/j.palaeo.2017.06.010.

Casamiquela RM. 1964. Estudios icnológicos: problemas y métodos de la icnología con aplicación al estudio de pisadas mesozoicas, Reptilia, Mammalia de la Patagonia. Librart. Buenos Aires: Gobierno de la Provincia de Río Negro, Ministerio de Asuntos Sociales.

Castanera D, Colmenar J, Sauqué V, Canudo JI. 2015. Geometric morphometric analysis applied to theropod tracks from the Lower Cretaceous (Berriasian) of Spain. *Palaeontology* **58(1)**:183–200 DOI 10.1111/pala.12132.

Castanera D, Pascual C, Razzolini NL, Vila B, Barco JL, Canudo JI. 2013b. Discriminating between medium-sized tridactyl trackmakers: tracking ornithopod tracks in the base of the Cretaceous (Berriasian, Spain). *PLOS ONE* **8(11)**:e81830 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0081830.

Castanera D, Piñuela L, García-Ramos JC. 2016. *Grallator* theropod tracks from the Late Jurassic of Asturias (Spain): ichnotaxonomic implications. *Spanish Journal of Palaeontology* **31(2)**:283–296.

Castanera D, Vila B, Razzolini NL, Falkingham PL, Canudo JI, Manning PL, Galobart À. 2013a. Manus track preservation bias as a key factor for assessing trackmaker identity and quadrupedalism in basal ornithopods. *PLOS ONE* **8(1)**:e54177 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0054177.

Castanera D, Vila B, Razzolini NL, Santos VF, Pascual C, Canudo JI. 2014. Sauropod trackways of the Iberian Peninsula: palaeoetological and palaeoenvironmental implications. *Journal of Iberian Geology* **40(1)**:49–59 DOI 10.5209/rev_jige.2014.v40.n1.44087.

Clark ND, Ross DA, Booth P. 2005. Dinosaur tracks from the Kilmaluag Formation (Bathonian, Middle Jurassic) of Score Bay, Isle of Skye, Scotland, UK. *Ichnos* **12(2)**:93–104 DOI 10.1080/10420940590914516.

Comment G, Ayer J, Becker D. 2011. Deux nouveaux membres lithostratigraphiques de la Formation de Reuchenette (Kimméridgien, Ajoie, Jura suisse)–Nouvelles données géologiques et paléontologiques acquises dans le cadre de la construction de l'autoroute A16 (Transjurane). *Swiss Bullettin for Applied Geology* **16**:3–24.

Comment G, Lefort A, Koppka J, Hantzpergue P. 2015. Le Kimméridgien d'Ajoie (Jura, Suisse): lithostratigraphie et biostratigraphie de la Formation de Reuchenette. *Revue de Paléobiologie* **34**:161–194.

Conti MA, Morsilli M, Nicosia U, Sacchi E, Savino V, Wagensommer A, Di Maggio L, Gianolla P. 2005. Jurassic dinosaur footprints from southern Italy: footprints as indicators of constraints in paleogeographic interpretation. *Palaios* **20(6)**:534–550 DOI 10.2110/palo.2003.p03-99.

Demathieu GR. 1990. Problems in discrimination of tridactyl dinosaur footprints, exemplified by the Hettangian trackways, the Causses, France. *Ichnos* **1(2)**:97–110 DOI 10.1080/10420949009386339.

Diedrich C. 2011. Upper Jurassic tidal flat megatracksites of Germany–coastal dinosaur migration highways between European islands, and a review of the dinosaur footprints. *Palaeobiodiversity and Palaeoenvironments* **91(2)**:129–155 DOI 10.1007/s12549-010-0044-y.

D'Orazi Porchetti S, Bernardi M, Cinquegranelli A, Santos VF, Marty D, Petti FM, Caetano PS, Wagensommer A. 2016. A review of the dinosaur track record from Jurassic and Cretaceous shallow marine carbonate depositional environments. In: Falkingham PL, Marty D, Richter A, eds. *Dinosaur Tracks—The Next Steps*. Bloomington, Idianapolis: Indiana University Press, 380–392.

Falkingham PL. 2014. Interpreting ecology and behaviour from the vertebrate fossil track record. *Journal of Zoology* **292(4)**:222–228 DOI 10.1111/jzo.12110.

Fanti F, Contessi M, Nigarov A, Esenov P. 2013. New data on two large dinosaur tracksites from the Upper Jurassic of Eastern Turkmenistan (Central Asia). *Ichnos* **20(2)**:54–71 DOI 10.1080/10420940.2013.778845.

Farlow JO, Holtz TRJ, Worthy TH, Chapman RE. 2013. Feet of the fierce (and not so fierce): pedal proportions in large theropods, other non-Avian dinosaurs, and large ground birds. In: Parrish JM, Molnar RE, Currie PJ, Koppelhus EB, eds. *Tyrannosaurid Paleobiology*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 89–132.

Farlow JO, Lockley MG. 1993. An osteometric approach to the identification of the makers of early mesozoic tridactyl dinosaur footprints. In: Lucas SG, Morales M, eds. *The Nonmarine Triassic. New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bullletin*. Vol. 3. Albuquerque: New Mexico Museum of Natural History, 123–131.

Foster JR, Lockley MG. 2006. The vertebrate ichnological record of the Morrison Formation (Upper Jurassic, north America). In: Foster JR, Lucas SG, eds. *Paleontology and Geology of the Upper Jurassic Morrison Formation. New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bullletin*. Vol. 26. Albuquerque: New Mexico Museum of Natural History, 203–216.

Fuentes Vidarte C, Meijide Calvo M. 1998. Icnitas de dinosaurios terópodos en el Weald de Soria (España). Nuevo icnogénero *Kalohipus. Estudios Geológicos* **54**:147–152.

Gatesy SM, Middleton KM, Jenkins FA Jr, Shubin NH. 1999. Three-dimensional preservation of foot movements in Triassic theropod dinosaurs. *Nature* **399(6732)**:141–144 DOI 10.1038/20167.

Gierliński GD, Niedźwiedzki G, Nowacki P. 2009. Small theropod and ornithopod footprints in the Late Jurassic of Poland. *Acta Geologica Polonica* **59(2)**:221–234.

Gierliński GD, Niedźwiedzki G, Pieńkowski G. 2001. Gigantic footprint of a theropod dinosaur in the Early Jurassic of Poland. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* **46(3)**:441–446.

Griffin CT. 2018. Developmental patterns and variation among early theropods. *Journal of Anatomy* **232(4)**:604–650 DOI 10.1111/joa.12775.

Gygi RA. 2000. Annotated index of lithostratigraphic units currently used in the Upper Jurassic of Northern Switzerland. *Eclogae Geologicae Helvetiae* **93**:125–146.

Hammer Ø, Harper DAT, Ryan PD. 2001. PAST: paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica* **4**:1–9.

Hornung JJ, Böhme A, Schlüter N, Reich M. 2016. Diversity, Ontogeny, or Both? A Morphometric Approach to Iguanodontian Ornithopod (Dinosauria: Ornithischia) Track Assemblages from the Berriasian (Lower Cretaceous) of North Western Germany. In: Falkingham PL, Marty D, Richter A, eds. *Dinosaur Tracks—The Next Steps.* Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 202–225.

Jank M, Wetzel A, Meyer CA. 2006. A calibrated composite section for the Late Jurassic Reuchenette Formation in northwestern Switzerland (?Oxfordian, Kimmeridgian *sensu gallico*, Ajoie-Region). *Eclogae Geologicae Helvetiae* **99(2)**:175–191 DOI 10.1007/s00015-006-1187-8.

Kaever M, de Lapparent AF. 1974. Les traces de pas de dinosaures du Jurassique de Barkhausen (Basse Saxe, Allemagne). *Bulletin de la Société Géologique de France* **S7-XVI(5)**:516–525 DOI 10.2113/gssgfbull.s7-xvi.5.516.

Lallensack JN, Sander PM, Knötschke N, Wings O. 2015. Dinosaur tracks from the Langenberg Quarry (Late Jurassic, Germany) reconstructed with historical photogrammetry: evidence for large theropods soon after insular dwarfism. *Palaeontologia Electronica* **18.2.31A**:1–34 DOI 10.26879/529.

Lallensack JN, van Heteren AH, Wings O. 2016. Geometric morphometric analysis of intratrackway variability: a case study on theropod and ornithopod dinosaur trackways from Münchehagen (Lower Cretaceous, Germany). *PeerJ* **4**:e2059 DOI 10.7717/peerj.2059.

Lange-Badré B, Dutrieux M, Feyt J, Maury G. 1996. Découverte d'empreintes de pas de dinosaures dans le Jurassique supérieur des Causses du Quercy (Lot, France). *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des sciences.* Série 2. Sciences de la terre et des planets **323(1)**:89–96.

Lockley M, Hunt A, Paquette M, Bilbey SA, Hamblin A. 1998b. Dinosaur tracks from the Carmel Formation, northeastern Utah: implications for Middle Jurassic paleoecology. *Ichnos* **5(4)**:255–267 DOI 10.1080/10420949809386424.

Lockley M, Mitchell L, Odier GP. 2007. Small theropod track assemblages from Middle Jurassic eolianites of Eastern Utah: paleoecological insights from dune ichnofacies in a transgressive sequence. *Ichnos* **14(1–2)**:131–142 DOI 10.1080/10420940601010901.

Lockley MG. 1994. Dinosaur ontogeny and population structure: interpretations and speculations based on fossil footprints. In: Carpenter K, Hirsch KF, Horner JR, eds. *Dinosaur Eggs and Babies.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 347–365.

Lockley MG. 2009. New perspectives on morphological variation in tridactyl footprints: clues to widespread convergence in developmental dynamics. *Geological Quarterly* **53**:415–432.

Lockley MG, Garcia-Ramos JC, Piñuela L, Avanzini M. 2008. A review of vertebrate track assemblages from the Late Jurassic of Asturias, Spain with comparative notes on coeval ichnofaunas from the western USA: implications for faunal diversity in siliciclastic facies assemblages. *Oryctos* **8**:53–70.

Lockley MG, Hunt AP, Meyer C. 1994. Vertebrate tracks and the ichnofacies concept: implications for paleoecology and palichnostratigraphy. In: Donovan SK, ed. *The Palaeobiology of Trace Fossils.* New York: Wiley, 241–268.

Lockley MG, Li JI, Li RH, Matsukawa M, Harris JD, Xing LD. 2013. A review of the tetrapod track record in China, with special reference to type ichnospecies: implications for ichnotaxonomy and paleobiology. *Acta Geologica Sinica (English Edition)* **87(1)**:1–20 DOI 10.1111/1755-6724.12026.

Lockley MG, Meyer CA, Moratalla JJ. 2000. *Therangospodus*: trackway evidence for the widespread distribution of a Late Jurassic theropod with well-padded feet. *Gaia* **15**:339–353.

Lockley MG, Meyer CA, Santos VF. 2000. *Megalosauripus* and the problematic concept of megalosaur footprints. *Gaia* **15**:313–337.

Lockley MG, Santos VF, Meyer C, Hunt A. 1998a. A new dinosaur tracksite in the Morrison Formation, Boundary Butte, Southeastern Utah. *Modern Geology* **23**:317–330.

Lucas SG, Klein H, Lockley MG, Spielmann JA, Gierliński GD, Hunt AP, Tanner LH. 2006. Triassic-Jurassic stratigraphic distribution of the theropod footprint ichnogenus Eubrontes. In: Harris JD, Lucas SG, Spielmann JA, Lockley MG, Milner ARC, Kirkland JI, eds. *The Triassic-Jurassic Terrestrial Transition. New Mexico Museum of Natural History and Science Bulletin.* Vol. 37. Albuquerque: New Mexico Museum of Natural History, 86–93.

Mallison H, Wings O. 2014. Photogrammetry in paleontology—A practical guide. *Journal of Paleontological Techniques* **12**:1–31.

Marty D. 2008. Sedimentology, taphonomy, and ichnology of Late Jurassic dinosaur tracks from the Jura carbonate platform (Chevenez–Combe Ronde tracksite, NW Switzerland): insights into the tidalflat palaeoenvironment and dinosaur diversity, locomotion, and palaeoecology. *GeoFocus* **21**:1–278.

Marty D, Ayer J, Becker D, Berger JP, Billon-Bruyat JP, Braillard L, Hug WA, Meyer CA. 2007. Late Jurassic dinosaur tracksites of the Transjurane highway (Canton Jura, NW Switzerland): overview and measures for their protection and valorisation. *Bulletin für Angewandte Geologie* **12**:75–89.

Marty D, Belvedere M, Meyer CA, Mietto P, Paratte G, Lovis C, Thüring B. 2010. Comparative analysis of Late Jurassic sauropod trackways from the Jura Mountains (NW Switzerland) and the central High Atlas Mountains (Morocco): implications for sauropod ichnotaxonomy. *Historical Biology* **22(1–3)**:109–133 DOI 10.1080/08912960903503345.

Marty D, Belvedere M, Razzolini NL, Paratte G, Cattin M, Lovis C, Meyer C. 2017. The tracks of giant theropods (*Jurabrontes curtedulensis* ichnogen. & ichnosp. nov.) from the Late Jurassic of NW Switzerland: palaeoecological and palaeogeographical implications. *Historical Biology* 1–29 DOI 10.1080/08912963.2017.1324438 [Epub ahead of print 20 June 2017].

Marty D, Billon-Bruyat JP. 2009. Field-trip to the excavations in the Late Jurassic along the future Transjurane highway near Porrentruy (Canton Jura, NW Switzerland): dinosaur tracks, marine vertebrates and invertebrates. In: Billon-Bruyat JP, Marty D, Costeur L, Meyer CA, Thüring B, eds. *5th International Symposium on Lithographic Limestone and Plattenkalk—Abstracts and Field Guides.* Porrentruy: Société jurassienne d'émulation, 94–129.

Marty D, Cavin L, Hug WA, Jordan P, Lockley MG, Meyer CA. 2004. The protection, conservation and sustainable use of the Courtedoux dinosaur tracksite, Canton Jura, Switzerland. *Revue de Paléobiologie* **9**:39–49.

Marty D, Hug W, Iberg A, Cavin L, Meyer C, Lockley M. 2003. Preliminary Report on the Courtedoux Dinosaur Tracksite from the Kimmeridgian of Switzerland. *Ichnos* **10(2–4)**:209–219 DOI 10.1080/10420940390256212.

Marty D, Meyer CA. 2012. From sauropods to cycads—The Late Jurassic terrestrial record of the Swiss Jura Mountains. In: Witzmann F, Aberhan M, eds. *Centen Meet Palaontologische Gesellschaft—Program Abstr F Guid Terra Nostra—Schriften der GeoUnion Alfred-Wegener-Stiftung*. Postdam: Paläontologische Gesellschaft, 119–120.

Marty D, Meyer CA, Belvedere M, Ayer J, Schafer KL. 2013. Rochefort-Les Grattes: an early Tithonian dinosaur tracksite from the Canton Neuchatel, Switzerland. *Revue de Paléobiologie* **32**:373–384.

Marty D, Strasser A, Meyer CA. 2009. Formation and taphonomy of human footprints in microbial mats of present-day tidal-flat environments: implications for the study of fossil footprints. *Ichnos* **16(1–2)**:127–142 DOI 10.1080/10420940802471027.

Matsukawa M, Lockley MG, Hunt AP. 1999. Three age groups of ornithopods inferred from footprints in the mid-Cretaceous Dakota Group, eastern Colorado, North America. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* **147(1–2)**:39–51 DOI 10.1016/s0031-0182(98)00154-0.

Matthews N, Noble T, Breithaupt B. 2016. Close-range photogrammetry for 3-D ichnology: the basics of photogrammetric ichnology. In: Falkingham PL, Marty D, Richter A, eds. *Dinosaur Tracks—The Next Steps*. Bloomington, Indianapolis: Indiana University Press, 28–55.

Mazin JM, Billon-Bruyat JP, Hantzpergue P, Lafaurie G. 2000. Domination reptilienne dans l'écosystème littoral de Crayssac (Tithonien inférieur, Quercy, Lot). *Bulletin de la Société herpétologique de France* **96**:71–81.

Mazin JM, Hantzpergue P, Bassoullet JP, Lafaurie G, Vignaud P. 1997. The Crayssac site (Lower Tithonian, Quercy, Lot, France): discovery of dinosaur trackways in situ and first ichnological results. *Comptes Rendus de l'Academie des Sciences*. Series IIA Earth and Planetary Science **9(325)**:733–739.

Mazin JM, Hantzpergue P, Pouech J. 2016. The dinosaur tracksite of Loulle (early Kimmeridgian; Jura, France). *Geobios* **49(3)**:211–228 DOI 10.1016/j.geobios.2016.01.018.

Meyer CA. 1990. Sauropod tracks from the Upper Jurassic Reuchenette Formation (Kimmeridgian; Lommiswil, Kt. Solothurn) of Northern Switzerland. *Eclogae Geologicae Helvetiae* **83**:389–397.

Meyer CA, Lockley MG. 1997. Jurassic and Cretaceous dinosaur tracksites from Central Asia (Uzbekistan and Turkmenistan). *Paleontological Society of Korea* **2**:77–92.

Meyer CA, Thüring B. 2003. Dinosaurs of Switzerland. *Comptes Rendus Palevol* **2(1)**:103–117 DOI 10.1016/s1631-0683(03)00005-8.

Milàn J, Bromley RG. 2006. True tracks, undertracks and eroded tracks, experimental work with tetrapod tracks in laboratory and field. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* **231(3–4)**:253–264 DOI 10.1016/j.palaeo.2004.12.022.

Moreau JD, Gand G, Fara E, Michelin A. 2012. Biometric and morphometric approaches on Lower Hettangian dinosaur footprints from the Rodez Strait (Aveyron, France). *Comptes Rendus Palevol* **11(4)**:231–239 DOI 10.1016/j.crpv.2011.12.003.

Moreau JD, Néraudeau D, Vullo R, Abit D, Mennecart B, Schnyder J. 2017. Late Jurassic dinosaur footprints from Chassiron–La Morelière (Oléron Island, western France). *Palaeobiodiversity and Palaeoenvironments* **97(4)**:773–789 DOI 10.1007/s12549-017-0282-3.

Olsen PE. 1980. Fossil great lakes of the Newark Supergroup in New Jersey. In: Manspeizer W, ed. *Field Studies of New Jersey Geology and Guide to Field Trips 52nd Annual Meeting New York State Geology Association.* Newark: Rutgers University, 352–398.

Olsen PE, Rainforth EC. 2003. The early Jurassic ornithischian dinosaurian ichnogenus Anomoepus. In: LeTourneau PM, Olsen PE, eds. *The Great Rift Valleys of Pangea in Eastern North America, Volume 2: Sedimentology, Stratigraphy, and Paleontology.* New York: Columbia University Press, 314–367.

Olsen PE, Smith JB, McDonald NG. 1998. Type material of the type species of the classic theropod footprint genera *Eubrontes*, *Anchisauripus*, and *Grallator* (Early Jurassic, Hartford and Deerfield basins, Connecticut and Massachusetts, USA). *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **18(3)**:586–601 DOI 10.1080/02724634.1998.10011086.

Pascual-Arribas C, Hernández-Medrano N. 2011. Posibles huellas de crías de terópodo en el yacimiento de Valdehijuelos (Soria, España). *Studia Geologica Salmanticensia* **47(1)**:77–110.

Piñuela L. 2015. Huellas de dinosaurios y de otros reptiles del Jurásico Superior de Asturias. D. Phil. Thesis, Oviedo University.

Razzolini NL, Belvedere M, Marty D, Paratte G, Lovis C, Cattin M, Meyer CA. 2017. *Megalosauripus transjuranicus* ichnosp. nov. A new Late Jurassic theropod ichnotaxon from NW Switzerland and implications for tridactyl dinosaur ichnology and ichnotaxomy. *PLOS ONE* **12(7)**:e0180289 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0180289.

Razzolini NL, Vila B, Castanera D, Falkingham PL, Barco JL, Canudo JI, Manning PL, Galobart À. 2014. Intra-trackway morphological variations due to substrate consistency: the El Frontal dinosaur tracksite (Lower Cretaceous, Spain). *PLOS ONE* **9(4)**:e93708 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0093708.

Santisteban C, Gaete R, Galobart A, Suñer M. 2003. Rastros de dinosaurios en el Jurásico terminal (Facies Purbeck) de Corcolilla (Los Serranos, Valencia). In: Pérez Lorente F, Romero Molina MM, Rivas Carrera P, eds. *Dinosaurios y otros reptiles mesozoicos en España.* Logroño: Instituto de Estudios Riojanos, 33–40.

Santos VF. 2008. *Pegadas de dinossáurios de Portugal.* Lisboa: Museu Nacional de História Natural da Universidade de Lisboa, 123.

Schudack U, Schudack M, Marty D, Comment G. 2013. Kimmeridgian (Late Jurassic) ostracods from Highway A16 (NW Switzerland): taxonomy, stratigraphy, palaeoecology, and palaeobiogeography. *Swiss Journal of Geosciences* **106(2)**:371–395 DOI 10.1007/s00015-013-0138-4.

Schulp AS, Al-Wosabi M. 2012. Telling apart ornithopod and theropod trackways: a closer look at a large, Late Jurassic tridactyl dinosaur trackway at Serwah, Republic of Yemen. *Ichnos* **19(4)**:194–198 DOI 10.1080/10420940.2012.710672.

Stampfli G, Borel G. 2002. A plate tectonic model for the Paleozoic and Mesozoic constrained by dynamic plate boundaries and restored synthetic oceanic isochrons. *Earth and Planetary Science Letters* **196(1–2)**:17–33 DOI 10.1016/s0012-821x(01)00588-x.

Thierry J. 2000. Early Kimmeridgian. In: Dercourt J, Gaetani M, Vrielvynck B, Barrier E, Biju-Duval B, Brunet MF, Cadet JP, Crasquin S, Sandulescu M, eds. *Atlas Peri-Tethys, Palaeogeographical Maps—Explanatory Notes.* Paris: Commission for the Geological Map of the World (CCGM/CGMN), 85–97.

Thierry J, Barrier E, Abbate E, Alekseev AS, Ait-Salem H, Bouaziz S, Canerot J, Georgiev G, Guiraud R, Hirsch F, Ivanik M, Le Metour J, Le Nindre YM, Medina F, Mouty M, Nazarevich B, Nikishin AM, Page K, Panov DL, Pique A, Poisson A, Pique A, Poisson A, Sandulescu M, Sapunov IG, Seghedi A, Soussi M, Tchoumatchenko PV, Vaslet D, Vishnevskaya V, Volozh YA, Voznenezenski A, Walley CD, Wong TE, Ziegler M, Barrier E, Bergerat F, Bracene R, Brunet MF, Cadet JP, Guezou JC, Jabaloy A, Lepvrier C, Rimmele G, De Wever P. 2000. Map 10: early Kimmeridgian (146–144 Ma). In: Dercourt J, Gaetani M, Vrielvynck B, Barrier E, Biju-Duval B, Brunet MF, Cadet JP, Crasquin S, Sandulescu M, eds. *Atlas Peri-Tethys Palaeogeographical Maps*. Paris: Commission for the Geological Map of the World (CCGM/CGMN).

Thulborn T. 1990. *Dinosaur tracks*. London: Chapman and Hall.

Valais SD. 2011. Revision of dinosaur ichnotaxa from the La Matilde Formation (Middle Jurassic), Santa Cruz Province, Argentina. *Ameghiniana* 48(1):28–42 DOI 10.5710/amgh.v48i1(244).

Waite R, Marty D, Strasser A, Wetzel A. 2013. The lost paleosols: masked evidence for emergence and soil formation on the Kimmeridgian Jura platform (NW Switzerland). *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 376:73–90 DOI 10.1016/j.palaeo.2013.02.020.

Waite R, Wetzel A, Meyer CA, Strasser A. 2008. The paleoecological significance of nerineoid mass accumulations from the Kimmeridgian of the Swiss Jura Mountains. *Palaios* 23:548–558.

Weems RE. 1992. A re-evaluation of the taxonomy of Newark Supergroup saurischian dinosaur tracks, using extensive statistical data from a recently exposed tracksite near Culpeper, Virginia. In: Sweet PC, ed. *Proceedings of the 26th Forum on the Geology of Industrial Minerals*. Vol. 119. Charlottesville: Virginia Division of Mineral Resources Publication, 113–127.

Wilson JA, Marsicano CA, Smith RM. 2009. Dynamic locomotor capabilities revealed by early dinosaur trackmakers from Southern Africa. *PLOS ONE* 4(10):e7331 DOI 10.1371/journal.pone.0007331.

Xing LD, Harris JD, Gierliński G. 2011. *Therangospodus* and *Megalosauripus* track assemblage from the Upper Jurassic–Lower Cretaceous Tuchengzi Formation of Chicheng County, Hebei Province, China and their paleoecological implications. *Vertebrata PalAsiatica* 49(4):423–434.

Xing LD, Lockley MG, Hu N, Li G, Tong G, Matsukawa M, Klein H, Ye Y, Zhang J, Persons WS. 2016. Saurischian track assemblages from the Lower Cretaceous Shenhuangshan Formation in the Yuanma Basin, Southern China. *Cretaceous Research* 65:1–9 DOI 10.1016/j.cretres.2016.04.006.

Xing LD, Lockley MG, Klein H, Gierliński GD, Divay JD, Hu SM, Zhang JP, Ye Y, He YP. 2014. The non-avian theropod track *Jialingpus* from the Cretaceous of the Ordos Basin, China, with a revision of the type material: implications for ichnotaxonomy and trackmaker morphology. *Palaeoworld* 23(2):187–199 DOI 10.1016/j.palwor.2013.12.001.