Functional associations between support use and forelimb shape in strepsirrhines and their relevance to inferring locomotor behavior in early primates.

Anne-Claire Fabre^{a,b,*}, Judit Marigó^{a,c,d}, Michael C. Granatosky^e and Daniel Schmitt^a

^a Department of Evolutionary Anthropology, Duke University, Durham, NC 27708, USA

^b UMR 7179, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Mécadév, 57 rue Cuvier, CP 55, 75231 Paris cedex 5, France.

^c UMR 7207 CR2P - C.N.R.S., M.N.H.N., U.P.M.C.-Paris 6. Département Histoire de la Terre, Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle, 75005 Paris, France.

^d Institut Català de Paleontologia Miquel Crusafont (ICP), Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Edifici Z (ICTA-ICP), Carrer de les Columnes s/n, Campus UAB, 08193 Cerdanyola del Vallès, Barcelona, Spain

^e Department of Organismal Biology and Anatomy, University of Chicago, Chicago, IL, USA

Number of pages: 59

Number of tables: 8, 1 Supplementary table

Number of figures: 9, 6 Supplementary figures

Author for correspondence:

Anne-Claire Fabre

Muséum National d'Histoire Naturelle

55 rue Buffon

phone: 919-684-6582

75005, Paris

fax: 919-660-7348

France

e-mail: fabreac@gmail.com

Abstract

The evolution of primates is intimately linked to their initial invasion of an arboreal environment. However, moving and foraging in this milieu creates significant mechanical challenges related to the presence of substrates differing in their size and orientation. It is widely assumed that primates are behaviorally and anatomically adapted to movement on specific substrates, but few explicit tests of this relationship in an evolutionary context have been conducted. Without direct tests of form-function relationships in living primates it is impossible to reliably infer behavior in fossil taxa. In this study, we test a hypothesis of co-variation between forelimb morphology and the type of substrates used by strepsirrhines. If associations between anatomy and substrate use exist, these can then be applied to better understand limb anatomy of extinct primates. The co-variation between each forelimb long bone and the type of substrate used was studied in a phylogenetic context. Our results show that despite the presence of significant phylogenetic signal for each long bone of the forelimb, clear support use associations are present. A strong co-variation was found between the type of substrate used and the shape of the radius, with and without taking phylogeny into account, whereas co-variation was significant for the ulna only when taking phylogeny into account. Species that use a thin branch milieu show radii that are gracile and straight and have a distal articular shape that allows for a wide range of movements. In contrast, extant species that commonly use large supports show a relatively robust and curved radius with an increased surface area available for forearm and hand muscles in pronated posture. These results, especially for the radius, support the idea that strepsirrhine primates exhibit specific skeletal adaptations associated with the supports that they habitually move on. With these robust associations in hand it will be possible to

48 explore the same variables in extinct early primates and primate relatives and thus improve
49 the reliability of inferences concerning substrate use in early primates.

50

51 **Keywords:** fine branches milieu, surface geometric morphometrics, humerus, radius, ulna,
52 phylogenetic comparative analysis

Introduction

It is widely argued that over the past 65 million years or more of primate evolution, primates underwent a significant change in the functional role of the forelimb. Primate locomotor evolution thus involved a decrease in the weight-bearing role of the forelimb relative to the hind limb by shifting weight support toward the hind limb and using the forelimb to a greater degree as a grasping and manipulative organ (Jones, 1916; Stern, 1976; Schmitt and Lemelin, 2002; Patel et al. 2015). This evolutionary shift is thought to be associated with a movement of early primates into an arboreal environment (Jenkins, 1973) associated with thin branches (Cartmill, 1972, 1974a,b, 1992). This idea assumes changes in forelimb morphology that can be tracked in both extant and fossil primates. Nonetheless, few studies have tested the relationship between forelimb anatomy and the size of substrates habitually used in extant primates. Without such a test and clear relationships between form and function (Bock and van Wahlert, 1965; Kay and Cartmill, 1977) we cannot hope to infer substrate use in extinct primates like *Carpolestes* (Bloch and Boyer, 2002), *Cantius* (Rose and Walker, 1985), Fayum primates (Conroy, 1976), and the many and diverse primates of the Miocene (Rose, 1989). The goal of the present study is to fill that gap and to ask if there are features of the forelimb that are clearly associated with the size and orientation of the substrate primates use so that if such relationships exist they can be used to better infer behavior in extinct primates and test hypotheses about primate locomotor evolution in future studies.

Although many authors consider the evolution of primates to be intimately linked to the colonization of the arboreal niche (Jones, 1916; Cartmill, 1972, 1992; Jenkins, 1972; Ravosa and Dagosto, 2007; Ross and Martin, 2007; Sussman et al., 2013), there remains

disagreement about the specific size and quality of the substrates used by early primates and little anatomical data linking limb anatomy to substrate that can be applied to the earliest primate fossils. The exploitation of terminal branches is thought to be a strong selective force driving the evolution of the anatomy of modern primates (Cartmill, 1972; Charles-Dominique, 1975; Sussman, 1991). The study of the fossil record of early primates shows that they display morphological features (e.g., nails on digits instead of claws, orbital convergence and frontation, and prehensile hands and feet) that are thought to have evolved early on as a response to living and moving in a terminal-branch environment, which is characterized by substrates of varying diameter and orientation and an overall high degree of spatial complexity (Dunbar and Badam, 2000; Bloch and Boyer, 2002; Schmitt and Lemelin, 2002).

Several hypotheses have been proposed to explain the evolution of the morphological features typical of early primates (e.g., nails on digits instead of claws, orbital convergence and frontation, and prehensile hands and feet; Cartmill, 1972, 1974a,b; Szalay and Dagosto, 1988; Rasmussen, 1990; Godinot, 1991, 2007; Sussman, 1991; Sussman et al., 2013). The visual predation hypothesis suggests that primate ancestors hunted on thin branches and thus developed long and clawless fingers that were used to catch insects without losing stability on narrow supports (Cartmill, 1972, 1974 a,b, 1992; Kirk et al., 2003). Another hypothesis suggested the coevolution of morphological features of early primates with grasping and leaping ability (Szalay and Dagosto, 1988). Along the same lines, Godinot (1991, 2007) proposed that the insect predation hypothesis was a driving factor in primate evolution suggesting that the morphological features of early primates were well adapted specifically for catching insects, rather than being associated with the size of support traveled to catch these insects, or to retrieve terminal food sources such as fruits and nectar

as suggested by the angiosperm coevolution hypothesis (Sussman and Raven, 1978; Sussman, 1991). With the exception of the grasp-leaping hypothesis and the insect predation hypothesis, all other hypotheses seem to agree on the importance of the use of thin branches as a locomotor milieu for early primates. In addition, experimental studies of locomotor behavior in primates and marsupials show broad support for an association between several specialized aspects of primate gait and locomotion on relatively thin supports (Schmitt and Lemelin, 2002; Cartmill et al., 2002, 2007; Lemelin and Schmitt, 2007; Young, 2012 ; Karantanis et al., 2015). The diameter and orientation of the support has been demonstrated to significantly impact the locomotor behavior of an animal, and has been well studied in primates, other mammals, and other vertebrates (see for example Prost, 1965; Vilensky and Larson, 1989; Meldrum, 1991; Vilensky et al. 1994; Schmitt 1998, 1999, 2003; Hirisaki et al. 2000; Schmitt and Hanna, 2004; Higham and Jayne, 2004; Spezzano and Jayne, 2004; Nyakatura et al., 2008; Stevens, 2008; Shapiro and Young, 2010, 2012; Channon et al., 2011; Foster and Higham, 2012; Herrel et al., 2013; Shapiro et al., 2014; Karantanis et al., 2015; Toussaint et al., 2015). For example, thin branches such as twigs and foliage are more flexible and less stable than wide supports, creating challenges for animals in maintaining grip, avoiding support failure, and controlling unwanted pitch (Dunbar and Badam, 2000; Cartmill et al., 2002, 2007). Consequently arboreal species must be able to adapt their locomotor behavior in order to reduce the risk of falling. Moreover, for supports narrower than the width of the body, an active muscular torque needs to be generated by the animal to counter the tendency to topple sideways at the slightest loss of balance (Napier, 1967; Cartmill, 1985; Dunbar and Badam, 2000).

If narrow substrates were indeed a defining feature of the milieu of early primates, then it is reasonable to assume that extant primates will show morphological adaptations of

124 the limbs optimizing locomotion on these types of substrates. In addition, as primates
125 moved into the terminal branch environment they would have developed a strong pedal
126 grip that allowed the forelimbs to be at least partially decoupled from their role in
127 locomotion, and to play a role in reaching beyond the sagittal plane, and grasping and
128 manipulating objects (Patel et al., 2015). The increased non-locomotor role of the forelimb
129 is thought to be associated with a change in peak forelimb forces (Jones, 1916; Stern, 1976;
130 Kimura et al., 1979; Demes et al. 1994) with reduced loading of the forelimb relative to the
131 hind limb, a pattern accentuated in highly arboreal species (Reynolds, 1985; Schmitt, 1999;
132 Schmitt and Hanna, 2004; Wallace and Demes, 2008). This functional differentiation of
133 forelimb and hind limb in both loading and manipulation should then be reflected in an
134 increased mobility of the forearm in species moving and foraging on narrow supports, and
135 more robust and constrained forelimbs in species using wider substrates as the forelimbs
136 maintain their role in locomotion. This hypothesis is supported by studies examining
137 isolated forelimb elements (see as examples Napier and Davis, 1959; Conroy, 1976;
138 Feldesman, 1982; Fleagle and Kay, 1987; Schmitt, 1996; Kay et al., 2004). But these studies
139 were limited by the range of information about forelimb shape available at the time, and by
140 the frequent absence of strepsirrhine primates in the comparative sample. This latter point
141 is especially relevant since strepsirrhine primates represent examples of some of the earliest
142 nodes of primate evolution (Horvath et al., 2008) and they have a long history of locomotion
143 in complex arboreal environments, many of which involve animals habitually moving on thin
144 and flexible supports. Testing for relationships between substrate use and forelimb in
145 strepsirrhines is a necessary step in developing understanding of form-function relationships
146 which can be applied to the fossil record (Kay and Cartmill, 1977).

In this study, we investigate the co-variation between the shape of the long bones of the forelimb and the type of support used (type and orientation of support) in strepsirrhine primates. To do so, we perform a shape analysis on the entire long bones of the forelimb (humerus, ulna, and radius) as well as on each of their extremities and test for co-variation with data on substrate use and orientation collected by Oxnard and collaborators (1990). This allows us to test hypotheses about coevolution between the shape of each long bone of the forelimb and support use. We predict that bones of the forearm (ulna and radius) will show a stronger pattern of co-variation with substrate use than the humerus, due to both their distal position and the associated movements of pronation-supination, allowing positioning of the hand for grasping and complex manipulation movements. In addition, we describe the shape of the long bones of the forelimb associated with the use of a thin branch milieu and large supports in extant species, allowing better future inferences on substrate use in extinct species.

Material and methods

Sample and data collection

The data set was composed of the forelimb long bones (humerus, ulna, and radius) of 92 individuals belonging to four species of Cheirogaleidae, one species of Daubentoniidae, four species of Galagidae, four species of Indridae, six species of Lemuridae, one species of Lepilemuridae, and three species of Lorisidae (Table 1, Supplementary Online Material [SOM] Table S1). For each species, the number of specimens ranged from two to six (Table 1). Where possible, specimens were of wild caught origin and equal numbers of males and females were included. Specimens were obtained from the Anatomie Comparée, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle (MNHN), Paris, France, the research collection at Brunoy,

France, the Royal Museum for Central Africa, Tervuren, Belgium, and from the Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, Washington, District of Columbia. See SOM Table S1 for a complete list of the specimens used in the analyses. All the bones were digitized using a Breuckmann 3D surface scanner at the MNHN. This surface scanner allows the acquisition of the 3D surface of the bone at high resolution using white light fringes (StereoSCAN^{3D} model with a camera resolution of five megapixels).

Quantification of shape using 3D geometric morphometrics

The shape of each forelimb long bone is complex and cannot be adequately represented using a traditional landmark based approach (Fabre et al. 2013a, b, 2014, 2015a,b). Consequently, a three-dimensional (3D) sliding-semilandmark procedure (Bookstein, 1997; Gunz et al., 2005) was used to quantify their morphology, and especially their articulations and diaphyses. Through this procedure, semilandmarks are allowed to slide along the curves and surfaces that are predefined while minimizing the bending energy, and are thus transformed into geometrically (i.e., spatially) homologous landmarks that can be used to compare shapes (Parr et al., 2012).

Anatomical landmarks and sliding-semilandmarks of curves were obtained on 3D surface scans of each bone using the software package Idav Landmark (Wiley et al., 2005), while the library 'Morpho' (Schlager, 2013) in R (Hornik, 2015) was used to perform the sliding-semilandmark procedure. To do so, we first created a template for each long bone and their extremities following the method of Cornette et al. (2013). The landmark schemes for the humerus, ulna and radius are given, respectively, in Tables 2, 3 and 4, and Figures 1, 2 and 3. Next, each specimen is first defined by homologous landmark coordinates. All curves are constrained by homologous landmarks (Gunz et al., 2005). Based on the homologous

landmarks and curves taken on the specimen, all the sliding-semilandmarks (curve and surface sliding-semilandmarks) of the template were projected onto the new specimen using a thin plate spline deformation (Gunz and Mitteroecker, 2013). Finally, spline relaxation was performed, with both sliding and relaxation repeated iteratively until the bending energy was minimized (Schlager, 2013), following which the landmarks of all specimens can be compared using traditional geometric morphometric methods. All the spline relaxation steps were performed using the library 'Morpho' (Schlager, 2013) based on the algorithm of Gunz and collaborators (2005), which is implemented in R (Hornik, 2015). Ultimately, four thin-plate spline relaxations were performed, the first relaxation performed against the template, and the three others against Procrustes consensus calculated using the data from the previous iteration. Once all landmark data were obtained, a generalized Procrustes superimposition (Rohlf and Slice, 1990) was performed using the library 'Geomorph' (Adams and Otárola-Castillo, 2013) in R (Hornik, 2015). Finally, a mean shape was calculated for each species using the Procrustes coordinates and this was used in all further analyses.

Allometry

Size and shape are tightly linked. Consequently, shape tends to be influenced by size, termed allometry (Gould, 1966; Klingenberg, 1996). To assess the allometry in our data set, we performed a regression of the mean of the log of the centroid size of each species on the mean shape of each species for each long bone and their extremities using the function 'procD.lm' of the 'Geomorph' package (Adams and Otárola-Castillo, 2013) in R (Hornik, 2015).

Quantification of supports

216 The support data set used comes from Oxnard et al. (1990), who (from detailed
217 descriptions) developed standardized scores for size and orientation of supports used by
218 strepsirrhines, ranging from 0 (never used) to 10 (used exclusively) (Table 5). A principal
219 component analysis (PCA) was performed on these scores to visualise the variation in
220 substrate use in strepsirrhines for the entire support utilization repertoire.

221 *Phylogenetic signal*

222 The phylogenetic tree of strepsirrhines used in all our comparative analyses (Fig. 4) was
223 obtained from the 10kTrees Project (Arnold et al., 2010). Specifically, we used a consensus
224 tree of Version 1 (Matthews et al., 2010) with branch lengths obtained from a Bayesian
225 phylogenetic analysis. It uses four mitochondrial genes and one autosomal gene from
226 GenBank as a backbone, and branch lengths are proportional to geological time. Full details
227 of the phylogenetic reconstruction and the tree are provided in Arnold et al. (2010) and
228 Matthews et al. (2010).

229 To estimate phylogenetic signal in forelimb shape and in support utilization scores (Table 5)
230 we used a randomization test following the method of Blomberg et al. (2003) and the
231 extended methods of Adams (2014). A multivariate K-statistic (Adams, 2014) was calculated
232 based on the mean of the Procrustes coordinate of each species for the shape of each long
233 bone as well as on residual shape and support utilization scores, using the ‘geomorph’
234 library (Adams and Otárola-Castillo, 2013) in R (Hornik, 2015). The higher the K-value is, the
235 stronger the phylogenetic signal. A K-value of one corresponds to character evolution under
236 Brownian motion. A K-value greater than one indicates a strong phylogenetic signal, which
237 means that traits are entirely conserved within the phylogeny. Conversely, a K-value close to
238 zero means that the phylogenetic signal is weak (Blomberg et al., 2003).

239 *Co-variation of forelimb and locomotion*

240 We performed a two-block partial least squares (2B-PLS; Rohlf and Corti, 2000)
241 implemented in the library Geomorph (Adams and Otárola-Castillo, 2013) in R (Hornik,
242 2015) to study co-variation between support utilization and the shape of each bone of the
243 forelimb. A covariance matrix was calculated from two blocks representing the variation of
244 the two objects (support utilization versus humeral shape, proximal articulation of humeral
245 shape, distal articulation of humeral shape, ulnar shape, proximal articulation of ulnar
246 shape, distal articulation of ulnar shape, radius shape, proximal articulation of radial shape,
247 and distal articulation of radial shape). A PLS correlation coefficient between the two blocks
248 of the PLS scores (r_{PLS}) was calculated to estimate the degree of co-variation using the
249 function 'pls2b' in R in the Morpho library (Schlager, 2013) following the method PLS
250 (Bookstein et al., 2003). The pls2b function uses 3D landmark data after superimposition
251 and performs a singular warps analysis (Bookstein et al., 2003). A significance test was
252 obtained by 1000 permutations of the landmarks in one block relative to those of the scores
253 of support use in the other, and a sampling distribution of coefficients is obtained by
254 resampling. The P_{95} -value is calculated by comparison of the observed PLS coefficient to
255 those obtained after resampling. The significance of each linear combination was assessed
256 by comparing the singular value (PLS coefficient) to those obtained from permuted blocks. If
257 the PLS coefficient was higher than those obtained from permuted blocks, its associated
258 P_{95} -value was considered to be significant.

259 As species share some part of their evolutionary history, they cannot be treated as
260 independent data points. Thus, we also conducted 2B-PLS in a phylogenetic framework
261 (Felsenstein, 1985; Harvey and Pagel, 1991) using the phylogeny described above (Fig. 4)

using the 'phylo.integration' function (Adams and Felice, 2014) in the Geomorph library of R (Adams and Otárola-Castillo, 2013). This function allows us to quantify the degree of co-variation between the mean shape of each species for each long bone and the support utilization while accounting for phylogeny using a partial generalised least squares algorithm under a Brownian motion model of evolution (Adams and Felice, 2014). Evolutionary PLS scores were calculated from the two blocks of phylogenetically corrected data, and the evolutionary correlation between the two blocks of the PLS scores (r_{PLS}) was evaluated. PLS correlation significance was assessed using phylogenetic permutation, where the shape or the support use values for all species for one block are permuted on the tips of the phylogeny. The derived correlation scores were obtained from the permuted data sets and can be compared to the observed value.

Shape visualization

In order to visualise shape change at each extreme of the 2B-PLS and phylogenetic 2B-PLS, a thin-plate spline (TPS) deformation of a 3D-scanned long bone was performed. These functions allowed us to visualize the shape at each extreme of the 2B-PLS axis, and thus to evaluate the kind of bone shape that is associated with the support use. This deformation is a smooth interpolation function that maps points of one form to corresponding points on another one and has the advantage of integrating the displacements at all landmarks relative to all others (Rohlf and Corti, 2000; Zelditch et al., 2012). Partial warps are used to represent the shape by supplying a basis for the tangent space of all possible shape differences (Zelditch et al., 2012). Details of the computation of partials warps are given in Bookstein (1989, 1991) and Rohlf (1993). Shape visualization of the effect of support use on each long bone of the forelimb was performed using the 'plsEffects', 'warp.mesh' and

285 'shade3d' functions of the 'rgl' (Adler and Murdoch, 2012) and 'Morpho' (Schlager, 2013)
286 libraries in R using thin-plate spline deformations of a 3D-scanned long bone of an *Avahi*
287 *laniger* (MNHN 1880-2506).

288 *Regression of long bones shapes on small support scores*

289 To estimate the shape of long bones of species that use predominantly small supports (such
290 as twigs or foliage, as defined by Oxnard et al., 1990) we performed a regression of the
291 shape of each long bone as well as its extremities on substrate use scores in R using the
292 function "procD.lm".

293 **Results**

294 *Support use*

295 Figure 5 depicts how the support data set derived from Oxnard et al. (1990) discriminates
296 strepsirrhine species in our data set. The first two principal components account for 86.1 %
297 of the overall variation. The first axis displays species that tend to use vertical supports
298 along the negative part of the axis. In contrast, species that tend to use horizontal supports
299 are situated along the positive part of the axis. On the second axis, the negative part of the
300 axis characterizes species that tend to use narrow supports, whereas the positive part of the
301 axis characterizes species that use large supports (Table 6).

302 *Allometry*

303 Logged centroid size had a significant relationship with the shape (Table 7) of the entire
304 humerus ($R^2 = 0.15$, $p_{rand} = 0.009$) and its proximal articulation ($R^2 = 0.09$, $p_{rand} = 0.045$) but
305 not on the distal articulation ($R^2 = 0.057$, $p_{rand} = 0.22$). Logged centroid size also had a
306 significant relationship with the shape of the entire ulna ($R^2 = 0.13$, $p_{rand} = 0.035$), but not its

proximal ($R^2 = 0.08$, $p_{rand} = 0.1$) and distal articulations ($R^2 = 0.07$, $p_{rand} = 0.1$; Table 7). There was a significant relationship between logged centroid size and proximal ($R^2 = 0.13$, $p_{rand} = 0.007$) and distal ($R^2 = 0.13$, $p_{rand} = 0.003$) articulations of the radius (Table 7), but not with the entire radius ($R^2 = 0.07$, $p_{rand} = 0.14$). Further analyses were performed on shape coordinates as well as on the residuals for each long bone.

Phylogenetic signal

The results of the multivariate K-statistic calculated on the shape data, to evaluate the strength of phylogenetic signal in explaining variation within forelimb long bone anatomy and substrate use scores, are given in Table 8. These results show a significant phylogenetic signal between 0.5 and 1 in the shape of each long bone of the forelimb, which is moderately strong. It highlights the importance of taking phylogeny into account in further analyses. The result of the multivariate K-statistic calculated on the substrate use scores was not significant (Table 8), suggesting that substrate use is not structured by phylogenetic relationships.

Co-variation between forelimb long bone shapes and support use

Humerus There was no significant co-variation between humeral shape and support use (Table 9, SOM Fig. S1A, C, E), nor between entire humerus shape residuals and support use (Table 9, SOM Fig. S2A, C, E). This remained true even when taking phylogeny into account (Table 9, SOM Figs. S1B and S2B). However, when phylogeny was taken into account there was significant co-variation between both proximal and distal articulations and support utilization for shape and shape residuals (Tables 9 and 10, Fig. 6A, B, SOM Fig. S1D, F, and SOM Fig. S2D, F). Thus, there is a significant degree of co-variation between humeral articular shape and support utilization when the phylogeny is taken into account, as is

evident, for example, when comparing the sister taxa *Otolemur garnettii* and *Sciurocheirus alleni*. Occupying a portion of the scatterplot associated with habitual use of horizontal and large supports (Fig. 6), *O. garnettii* displays a relatively round humeral head that is at the same level as the greater and lesser tubercles, both of which are relatively well developed (Fig. 6A). It also shows a relatively more rounded capitulum with a narrower trochlea, and a medial epicondyle and lateral epicondylar ridge that are relatively well developed and posteriorly oriented (Fig. 6B). In contrast, *S. alleni*, which occupies a portion of the scatterplot associated with the use of large and vertical supports (Fig. 6), displays a relatively oval-shaped humeral head that is higher than the greater and lesser tubercles, both of which are also relatively less developed than in *O. garnettii* (Fig. 6A). *Sciurocheirus alleni* also shows a relatively elongated capitulum with a more developed trochlea, as well as a medial epicondyle and lateral epicondyles that are relatively well developed (Fig. 6B).

Ulna There was no significant co-variation between ulnar shape or shape residuals and support use (Table 9 and SOM Fig. S3A, C, E). The same was true when phylogeny was taken into account for the proximal articulation of the ulna (Table 9 and SOM Figs. S3D, S4D). However, there was strong evolutionary co-variation when phylogenetic relationships among taxa are taken into account for shape and shape residuals of the entire ulna, as well as its distal articulation (Tables 9 and 10, Fig. 7A, B, SOM Fig. S3B, F and SOM Fig. 4B, F). Again, for example, the ulna of *O. garnettii* (Fig. 7), has a relatively broad and tall olecranon process that is medially oriented, a large medial flange of the trochlear notch, a diaphysis that is curved in the middle and, a distal end with a radial notch that is oriented relatively distally, a relatively broad styloid process, and a relatively short pronator flange (Fig. 7A). The distal articulation of the ulna shows an ulnar notch that is relatively less rounded and less developed and the styloid process is relatively broader and flatter (Fig. 7B). In contrast,

354 *S. alleni*, has an ulna with a relatively narrow, short and straight olecranon process, a
355 relatively small medial flange of the trochlear notch, a diaphysis that is curved proximally,
356 and a distal end with a radial notch that is oriented relatively ventrally, a relatively narrow
357 styloid process, and a short pronator flange (Fig. 7A). The distal ulnar notch is relatively
358 rounded and prominent and the styloid process is relatively narrower and more angular (Fig.
359 7B).

360 Radius There was no significant co-variation between proximal and distal articulation shape
361 or shape residuals and support use in the radius (Table 9, SOM Fig. S5B, E, SOM Fig. S6C, E).
362 However, there was significant co-variation between radial shape and the orientation and
363 size of supports (Tables 9 and 10, Fig. 8A, SOM Fig. S5A, and SOM Fig. S6A). The scatterplot
364 of the 2B-PLS (Fig. 8A) shows that species, including *Loris tardigradus*, *Galagoides demidoff*
365 and *Sciurocheirus alleni*, that occupy the positive space are mainly nocturnal and use narrow
366 supports. In contrast, taxa using large supports with a gradient from vertical (*Avahi laniger*,
367 *Indri indri*, *Propithecus verreauxi*, *Propithecus diadema*, *Lepilemur ruficaudatus*, *Hapalemur*
368 *griseus* and *Hapalemur simus*) to horizontal (*Eulemur mongoz*, *Eulemur fulvus*, *Otolemur*
369 *garnettii*, *Cheirogaleus major*, *Varecia variegata*) are observed running from the middle of
370 the scatterplot through to the maximum negative side of the axis. Species that tend to use
371 narrow supports display a relatively gracile radius (Fig. 8A) with a relatively straight
372 diaphysis. Species using narrow supports also display relatively small, round, and smooth
373 articulations (radial head, ulnar notch and articulations for lunate and scaphoid) with a
374 styloid process that is largely absent. The articular surface for the scaphoid is relatively small
375 with a triangular shape in comparison to the articulation for the lunate, which is larger with
376 a trapezoidal shape. In contrast, species situated at the negative part (Fig. 8A) of the
377 scatterplot (mainly species using wide supports oriented horizontally) display a radius which

378 is more robust, with a relatively curved diaphysis. They also display relatively large
379 articulations (with a radial head that is less rounded, a wide distal ulnar notch and wide
380 articulations for the lunate and scaphoid) and a well-developed styloid process. The articular
381 surface for the scaphoid is relatively small and curved with a triangular shape, in comparison
382 to the articulation for the lunate which is larger and flatter with a square shape.

383 There was no significant co-variation between the proximal articulation of the radius (shape
384 and shape residuals) and support use when phylogeny was taken into account (Table 9,
385 SOM Fig. S5D, and SOM Fig. S6D). However, co-variation between support use and entire
386 radial shape, and shape residuals, as well as the distal articulation of the radius (shape and
387 shape residuals) was highly significant when the phylogenetic relationships among species
388 were taken into account (Tables 9 and 10, Fig. 8B, SOM Fig. S5B, F, and SOM Fig. S6B, F). As
389 observed for the ulna, a strong difference in support use and forelimb shape between
390 species that are closely related can be observed, with *S. alleni* mainly using vertical supports
391 whereas *O. garnettii* mainly using horizontal ones (Fig. 8B and C). The positive part of the
392 scatterplot corresponds to a radius which is relatively more gracile and straighter with
393 smaller articulations (Fig. 8B). The end of the radius is flat with a styloid process that is
394 poorly developed (Fig. 8B). In contrast, the negative part of the scatterplot corresponds to a
395 relatively more robust and curved radius with wider and bigger articulations. The distal part
396 of the radius is more angular with a styloid process that is well developed (Fig. 8B). The
397 negative part of the scatterplot corresponds to a distal articulation of the radius with a
398 narrower distal articulation for the scaphoid that is posteriorly more developed, with the
399 groove for the extensor digitorum also being relatively less developed (Fig. 8C). In contrast,
400 species in the positive part of the scatterplot display a distal articulation of the radius that is

broader, the scaphoid articulation is less developed posteriorly, and the groove for the extensor digitorum is relatively more developed (Fig. 8C).

Effect of small substrate use on forelimb long bone shape

There was a significant correlation between the use of small supports and the shape of the entire radius, but no significant associations in proximal and distal radial elements, the humerus, or the ulna (Table 11).

Discussion

The goals of this study were to test whether substrate use and forelimb anatomy co-vary in living strepsirrhine primates, and to examine the strength of that relationship when phylogeny and body mass are accounted for. Our results show that patterns of substrate use in strepsirrhines are not influenced by phylogeny, highlighting the fact that these animals have independently evolved different support niches. This result is also evident when examining the principal component analysis with a phylogenetic tree mapped onto the scatterplot. This plot shows a strong overlap between clades, but with a clear distribution of species depending on the type of substrate they used. Nonetheless, our results show that the shape of the forelimb contains a significant phylogenetic signal, implying that species that are closely related are more similar to one another than might be expected by chance. This result has already been highlighted in several studies on cranial anatomy (Fleagle, 2013; Baab et al., 2014). However, even when phylogeny is accounted for there remains a strong relationship between the substrate used and the shape of the long bones of the forearm, although the patterns are not uniform across bones and bone regions. In the following discussion of the functional demands that may have been at the origin of the specific changes in limb shape observed in relation to support use we refer

extensively to Table 12 and Figure 9 depicting the origins and insertions of the major limb muscles in strepsirrhines.

Humerus

Primates that predominantly use horizontal supports during locomotion tend to show adaptations of the humerus that are related to the avoidance of sideways toppling. Strepsirrhine species using horizontal supports have broader greater and lesser tubercles than species using vertical supports. These large tubercles allow the insertion of more strongly developed supraspinatus and the subscapularis muscles, respectively, providing more stability at the shoulder joint (Table 12, Fig. 9). They also display a round humeral head that does not project above the tubercles, which also promotes stability. This is likely important during quadrupedal locomotion in trees (Larson and Stern, 1989; Whitehead et al., 2005; Salton and Sargis, 2008; Fleagle, 2013). In contrast, the proximal articulation of the humerus of species using vertical supports show greater and lesser tubercles that do not project above the humeral head, allowing greater freedom of movement of the shoulder, which can be important for control of rotational force during landing after leaping (Demes et al., 1996).

The distal articulation of the humerus in strepsirrhine species that mainly use horizontal supports displays a trochlea that is less wide than seen in taxa using vertical supports. The shape of the trochlea is often thought to be related to the flexion and extension ability of the forelimb at the elbow joint (Argot, 2001). A less convex trochlea may then reflect a higher stabilization of the forelimb during extension (Jenkins, 1973; Argot, 2001) and may help to stabilize the forearm when the animal is moving on horizontal supports. In the species included in our study that use vertical substrates, the trochlea is less convex, which

may reflect a less-stabilised humeroulnar joint, allowing the ulna to ‘rock’ on the humerus during supination (Taylor, 1974; Argot, 2001). Furthermore, the lateral and medial epicondyles are posteriorly oriented in species in our study that use horizontal substrates. The epicondyles are the attachment sites for extensor and flexor muscles of the hand and the wrist (Fig. 9, Table 12). In general, a medial epicondyle that is posteriorly oriented will decrease the medial torque induced by the flexors at the elbow joint (Jenkins, 1973; Argot, 2001). Thus, when reorienting the epicondyle, the torque may be decreased because the flexors pass behind rather than to the medial side of the trochlea (Argot, 2001), decreasing flexion of the digits and, thus, of the grip on the substrate in species using horizontal supports in comparison to those using vertical ones (Congdon and Ravosa, 2016). In contrast, the medial epicondyle of species using vertical substrates is prominent and may reflect well-developed flexor musculature of the digits (Argot, 2001), with strong flexion of the digits increasing frictional force between the hand and support during climbing on vertical substrates (Jenkins, 1973; Stalheim-Smith, 1984; Argot, 2001). Thus, stronger digit flexion may be necessary to increase the grip on the substrate in order to maintain the position of an animal on a vertical support (Congdon and Ravosa, 2016).

Ulna

The shape differences associated with the ulna of a strepsirrhine species using horizontal supports are a relatively broader and taller olecranon process that is medially oriented. In contrast, species using vertical supports have a relatively narrower and smaller olecranon process, which is straight. The olecranon process is the area of insertion of the main elbow extensor, the triceps brachii (Fig. 9 and Table 12), which can play a role in extension and retraction of the forelimb as a whole (Leach, 1977; Argot, 2001; Fabre et al., 2015a).

470 Nonetheless, the triceps is often categorized as an anti-gravity muscle, providing stability in
471 flexed postures rather than necessarily generating motion (Jouffroy et al., 1990). Thus,
472 species that mainly use horizontal supports and need to maintain elbow angle against the
473 action of gravity, may have a larger triceps brachii (Oxnard, 1963; Argot, 2001), which is
474 reflected in a broader and taller olecranon. In contrast, species using vertical supports may
475 flex their elbows to remain close to the substrate and resist pitch, and have a smaller triceps
476 and consequently display a shorter and smaller olecranon process (Jolly, 1967; Cartmill,
477 1974b; Walker, 1974; Argot, 2001; Preuschoft, 2002; Johnson, 2012). When looking at only
478 the distal articulation of the ulna, species using vertical substrates, have a better defined
479 articular facet than species using horizontal substrates. This more definite articular surface
480 on which the carpal bones can slide could provide a greater mobility of the wrist in species
481 that use vertical substrates (Taylor, 1974).

482 Strepsirrhine species utilizing horizontal supports also more frequently display a larger
483 medial flange of the trochlear notch of the ulna in comparison to those using vertical
484 supports much more. The medial orientation of the medial flange can have an important
485 role in stabilization of the elbow during the flexion of the forelimb (Rose, 1989) during
486 locomotion on horizontal supports. The diaphysis of species that utilize more horizontal
487 supports is curved posteriorly in its mid-part, whereas it is only posteriorly curved in the
488 proximal part and straight for the rest of the diaphysis in species that utilize vertical
489 supports. Previous studies have suggested that the curvature of the long bones of the
490 forelimb can affect the distribution and magnitude of stresses by reducing bending stresses
491 in bones subjected purely to axial loading and by increasing bending stresses in eccentrically
492 end-loaded bones (Schwartz, 1990). It has also been argued that curvature may affect the
493 geometry of supinator muscles insertions (Fig. 9 and Table 12) on the forelimb (Lanyon,

1980; Schwartz, 1990). Thus, the curvature of the diaphysis can be a mechanism to provide more space to accommodate expanded muscle bellies (Lanyon, 1980; Schwartz, 1990). In this sense, the shape and robusticity of the forelimb bones carries two, not mutually exclusive, signals. The robust and highly curved bones of the species that habitually use relatively large horizontal supports may reflect relatively high loading (Schmitt, 2003) on larger substrates. That shape configuration may also reflect larger muscles both in terms of load and muscle attachment area. Regardless, the configuration suggests that animals that habitually use large horizontal supports have limbs that reflect relatively high loading by muscles or substrate reaction forces compared to those that habitually move on small and non-horizontal supports.

Radius

The radius of strepsirrhine species using horizontal supports is relatively robust in comparison to the relatively more gracile radius those using vertical supports. Gracile limbs have been interpreted in previous studies (Cartmill, 1985; Argot, 2001; Sargis, 2002; Samuels and Van Valkenburgh, 2008) as giving much more mobility to the limb in arboreal species. In the present context, where both species (*O. garnettii* and *S. alleni*) are arboreal but differ in their support use, we can hypothesize that species using more horizontal supports need to have a greater stability of the forelimbs, whereas species using mainly vertical supports may rely more on their hind limbs for stability. The other major shape change that can be seen between strepsirrhine species using vertical supports and those using horizontal supports, are located at the distal end of the radius. Species using horizontal supports display a radial styloid process with a well-developed and a large and concave distal articulation, whereas in vertical climbers the styloid process is not well

517 developed and the distal articulation is small and flat. This feature may be described as
518 allowing greater mobility of the wrist as in species using narrow supports. Thus, species
519 using vertical supports tend to show greater mobility of the hand, as do species using
520 narrow supports, whereas species using wider supports tend to show a morphology
521 conferring a greater stability. Moreover, when looking at only the distal part of the radius,
522 species using horizontal substrates show a broader articulation with the carpal bones in
523 comparison to those mainly using vertical ones. A broader articulation has been previously
524 interpreted as playing an important role in load-bearing at the proximal part of the wrist,
525 providing greater stabilization of the wrist and restriction of its degree of movement (Salton
526 and Sargis, 2008). Thus, again, species using wider and horizontal supports tend to show a
527 morphology more related to the stability of the forelimb.

528 Our radius analyses show a gradient from species that use narrow substrates (*Loris*
529 *tardigradus*, *Microcebus murinus* and *Galagoides demidoff*) to those that use large ones.
530 Furthermore, of the species that use large substrates, another gradient – of species using
531 vertical substrates to horizontal ones – is evident. This result is interesting from a
532 paleontological perspective as it suggests that the radius may be an especially informative
533 bone for inferring the type of support used in extinct taxa. For example, *Loris tardigradus* (a
534 specialist user of narrow supports) displays a radius with a straight and gracile diaphysis,
535 whereas the radius is strongly curved and robust in *Varecia variegata* (a species using wide
536 and horizontal supports). Previous studies have interpreted a strongly curved diaphysis as a
537 way to increase the power of forearm and hand in pronated posture, including increasing
538 the power of pronator teres (Fig. 9) (Whitehead et al., 2005). The distal articulation of the
539 radius of *Varecia variegata* is deeply concave, with a radial styloid process that is well
540 developed in comparison to that of *Loris tardigradus*. The deeply concave distal articulation

541 with a highly developed styloid process has been interpreted by Jenkins and Fleagle (1975)
542 as a feature that provides stability and constrains movement, with the ridge playing a
543 supportive role for the concave surface. In contrast, the distal end of the radius as observed
544 in *Loris tardigradus*, which shows an articulation with a reduced carpal that is flat and
545 triangular and a poorly-developed radial styloid process, is close to that observed in
546 humans, and has been suggested to enhance wrist mobility (Cartmill and Milton, 1977).
547 These results highlight the fact that species using narrow supports tend to show greater
548 mobility of the hand whereas species using wider supports tend to show features enhancing
549 stability.

550 *Ulna/radius*

551 The ulna and radius are likely to be strongly morphologically integrated (Fabre et al., 2014),
552 as they interact functionally by allowing rotation of the radius relative to the ulna, and have
553 two joints in common, as well as being joined via an interosseous membrane (Rose, 1989,
554 1993; Argot, 2001, 2003; Patel, 2005, Fabre et al., 2014). It is interesting to note that co-
555 variation with locomotor supports are higher in the radius, the bone which is the more
556 mobile of the two and responsible for the motions of pronation and supination and, in
557 concert with the ulna, flexion and extension. Pronation-supination movements play an
558 important role in many animal behaviors, including grasping, hunting, and locomotion
559 (Gonyea, 1978; Rose, 1988, 1993; Iwaniuk et al. 1999; Argot, 2001, 2003; Fabre et al., 2013a,
560 2014). Arboreal animals, including strepsirrhines need to maintain balance and stability in
561 an arboreal environment.

562 The proximal posterior convexity of the radius of *S. alleni* and other vertical climbers is at
563 the opposite side of the insertion of the muscles biceps brachii and brachialis, flexors of the

forearm (Fig. 9 and Table 12). This convexity could be explained by the larger limb flexors that need to pull the center of mass of the animal up against gravity in vertical climbers (Taylor, 1971; Argot, 2001). Species that predominantly use horizontal supports show a shorter and more medially developed pronator flange in comparison to those that predominantly use vertical supports that have a relatively taller but less medially developed one. The pronator flange is where the pronator quadratus muscle originates (Fig. 9 and Table 12). This muscle then inserts on the distal posterior end of the radius. This muscle seems to mainly maintain the integrity of the antebrachium near the carpus, because forces applied on this distal part of the forearm (which is mobile) can cause separation of the radius and the ulna relative to each other (Argot, 2001). Thus, it may help to stabilize the forearm when the animal is moving and seems to be more pronounced in species using mainly horizontal supports.

Contribution of this study to the narrow branch hypothesis

The evolutionary origin of early primates seems to be tightly linked to a complex arboreal environment. Irrespective of the main hypotheses proposed (e.g., visual predation [Cartmill, 1972, 1974 a,b, 1992; Kirk et al., 2003], insect predation [Godinot, 1991, 2007], angiosperm coevolution [Sussman and Raven, 1978; Sussman, 1991], predation and angiosperm coevolution [Rasmussen, 1990]), all suggest the importance of narrow support use. Our results show that the long bones of the forearm coevolve with the type of support, at least in strepsirrhines. Our results also show that parts of the bone (proximal and distal end of the humerus and distal end of the ulna and radius) have probably adapted to the type of support, which is promising for making ecological inferences for extinct species often represented by incomplete remains. This means that aspects of the shape of the long bones,

587 even when incomplete, may be used to infer the type of locomotor support used by a
588 species. Characterizing the shapes of the long bones of the forearm in detail can help to
589 infer the supports used by extinct species and test hypotheses on the role of thin branches
590 in primate origins. Considering the association that exists between the proximal and distal
591 end of the humerus, the entire radii and ulnae of extant primates and the type of supports
592 used, and that the morphology of the radii and ulnae of notharctines share many similarities
593 with *Lepilemur* and *Propithecus*, we could hypothesize that notharctines probably used
594 medium sized supports that were neither completely vertical nor horizontal. This seems to
595 indicate that these early primates were generalists.

596 Given the suggested importance of the narrow branch milieu in the origins of the defining
597 anatomical features of primates we also specifically investigated the effect of narrow
598 supports on forelimb shape and found that this effect is significant only for the radius. The
599 radial shape associated with small support use is one that is gracile overall. A clear example
600 of this is the radius of *L. tardigradus* with a relatively straight diaphysis, a flat distal radial
601 end with a reduced articulation with the carpals and a triangular and poorly-developed
602 radial styloid process. These features are thought to enhance wrist mobility (Cartmill and
603 Milton, 1977), highlighting the fact that species using narrow supports tend to show a
604 greater mobility of the hand. The radius is also similar to that described for “brachiating”
605 species (Cartmill and Milton, 1977) that employ cautious arboreal locomotion and show a
606 great range of limb motion. Given the observed impact of substrate diameter on radial
607 shape it would be interesting to include stem primates (Plesiadapiforms) and the earliest
608 members of crown primates (Omomyiformes or Adapiformes) in a future study, to better
609 understand their evolution in, and adaptations to, the arboreal environment.

Conclusions

In summary, our study shows that the shape of the long bones of the forelimb in strepsirrhines is influenced by phylogeny, which may be of interest for systematic studies. However, even if the morphology of the forelimb of strepsirrhines is constrained by phylogeny, our results show that support use adaptations are marked for the radius, the ulna and their distal articulations, in addition to the proximal and distal articulations of the humerus. Furthermore, the long bones of the forearm, which allow pronation-supination and thus enable the hands to adapt their position depending on the substrates used in an arboreal environment, show a strong coevolution with substrate properties. The evolution of morphology in association with substrate use is strongest for the radius, which is mainly involved in mobility of the forelimb. Thus, functional constraints associated with the mobility of the lower arm appear to be driving the evolution of these long bones and the types of substrates used. Finally, this study is promising for testing hypothesis pertaining to the use of the thin branch milieu in early primates and shows that the radius might be an especially informative bone in this context. With these robust associations in hand, it will be possible to explore the same variables in extinct early primates and primate relatives to infer substrates most consistently used and address long-standing debates about the ecological context of primate locomotor evolution.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank several anonymous reviewers and Sarah Elton who made helpful and constructive suggestions that improved the manuscript. We thank Jacques Cuisin, Céline Bens and Aurélie Verguin for access to the specimens from the collections Anatomie Comparée, MNHN, Paris; Anthony Herrel and Fabienne Aujard for access to the

specimens from the research collection, MNHN, Brunoy, France; Emmanuel Gilissen and Wim Wendelen for access to the specimens from the collections of the Royal Museum of Central Africa, Tervuren, Belgium; Esther Langan for access to the specimens from the collections of the Smithsonian Institution, NMNH, Washington DC, USA. We thank the ‘plate-forme de morphométrie’ of the UMS 2700 (CNRS, MNHN) for access to the surface scanner. A-C Fabre and J Marigó thank the Fondation Fyssen for funding. A-C Fabre thanks the Marie-Sklodowska Curie fellowship (EU project 655694 - GETAGRIP). J Marigó wants to thank the Spanish Ministerio de Economía y Competitividad (CGL2014-54373-P) and the Generalitat de Catalunya (2014 SGR 416 GRC and 2014/100604).

References

- Adams, D.C., 2014. A generalized K statistic for estimating phylogenetic signal from shape and other high dimensional multivariate data. *Syst. Biol.* 63, 685–697.
- Adams, D.C., Felice, R., 2014. Assessing phylogenetic morphological integration and trait covariation in morphometric data using evolutionary covariance matrices. *PLOS ONE* 9, e94335.
- Adams, D.C., Otarola-Castillo, E., 2013. Geomorph: an R package for the collection and analysis of geometric morphometric shape data. *Methods Ecol. Evol.* 4, 393–399.
- Adler, D., Murdoch, D., 2012. rgl: 3D visualization device system (OpenGL). *R Package Version* 0.95.1201.
- Argot, C., 2001. Functional-adaptive anatomy of the forelimb in the Didelphidae, and the paleobiology of the Paleocene marsupials *Mayulestes ferox* and *Pucadelphys andinus*. *J. Morphol.* 247, 51–79.

655 Argot, C., 2003. Functional adaptations of the postcranial skeleton of two Miocene
 656 Borhyaenoids (Mammalia, Metatheria), *Borhyaena* and *Prothylacinus*, from South
 657 America. *Palaeontology* 46, 1213–1267.

658 Arnold, C., Matthews, L.J., Nunn, C.L., 2010. The 10kTrees Website: a new online resource
 659 for primate phylogeny. *Evol. Anthropol.* 19, 114–118.

660 Baab, K.L., Perry, J.M.G., Rohlf, F.J., Jungers, W.L., 2014. Phylogenetic, ecological, and
 661 allometric correlates of cranial shape in Malagasy lemuriforms. *Evolution* 65, 1450–
 662 1468.

663 Bloch, J.I., Boyer, D.M., 2002. Grasping primate origins. *Science* 298, 1606–1610.

664 Blomberg, S.P., Garland, T. Jr., Ives, A.R., 2003. Testing for phylogenetic signal in
 665 comparative data: behavioural traits are more labile. *Evolution* 57, 717–745.

666 Bock, W.J., van Wahlert, G., 1965. Adaptation and the form-function complex. *Evolution*, 19,
 667 269–301.

668 Bookstein, F.L., 1989. Principal warps: thin-plate splines and the decomposition of
 669 deformations. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.* 11, 567–585.

670 Bookstein, F.L., 1991. *Morphometric Tools for Landmark Data: Geometry and Biology*.
 671 Cambridge University Press, New York.

672 Bookstein, F.L., 1997. Landmark methods for forms without landmarks: morphometrics of
 673 group differences in outline shape. *Med. Image Anal.* 1, 225–243.

674 Bookstein, F.L., Gunz, P., Mitteroecker, P., Prossinger, H., Schaefer, K., Seidler, H., 2003.
675 Cranial integration in *Homo*: singular warps analysis of the midsagittal plane in
676 ontogeny and evolution. *J. Hum. Evol.* 44, 167–187.

677 Cartmill, M., 1972. Arboreal adaptations and the origin of the order Primates. In: Tuttle, R.H.
678 (Ed.), *The Functional and Evolutionary Biology of Primates*. Aldine-Atherton Press,
679 Chicago, pp. 97–122.

680 Cartmill, M., 1974a. Rethinking primate origins. *Science* 184, 436–443.

681 Cartmill, M., 1974b. Pads and claws in arboreal locomotion. In: Jenkins, F.A. (Ed.), *Primate*
682 *Locomotion*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 45–83.

683 Cartmill, M., 1985. Climbing. In: Hildebrand, M., Bramble, D.M., Liem, F.K., Wake, D.B. (Eds),
684 *Functional Vertebrate Morphology*. The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press,
685 Cambridge, pp. 73–88.

686 Cartmill, M., 1992. New views on primate origins. *Evol. Anthropol.* 1, 105–111.

687 Cartmill, M., Milton, K., 1977. The lorisiform wrist joint and the evolution of “brachiating”
688 adaptations in the hominoidea. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 47, 249–272.

689 Cartmill, M., Lemelin, P., Schmitt, D., 2002. Support polygons and symmetrical gaits in
690 mammals. *Zool. J. Linn. Soc.* 136, 401–420.

691 Cartmill, M., Lemelin, P., Schmitt, D., 2007. Primate gaits and primate origins. In: Ravosa, M.,
692 Dagosto, M. (Eds), *Primate Origins: Adaptations and Evolution*. Kluwer Academic, New
693 York, pp. 403–435.

694 Channon, A.J., Günther, M.M., Crompton, R.H., D'Août, K, Preuschoft, H., Vereecke, E.E.,
695 2011. The effect of substrate compliance on the biomechanics of gibbon leaps. *J. Exp.*
696 *Biol.* 214, 687–696.

697 Charles-Dominique, P., 1975. Nocturnality and diurnality: An ecological interpretation of
698 these two modes of life by an analysis of the higher vertebrate fauna in tropical forest
699 ecosystems. In: Lockett, W.P., Szalay, F.S. (Eds), *Phylogeny of the Primates: A*
700 *Multidisciplinary Approach*. Plenum Press, New York, pp. 69–88.

701 Congdon, K.A., Ravosa, M. J., 2016. Get a grip: Substrate orientation and digital grasping
702 pressures in strepsirrhines. *Folia Primatol.* 87, 224–243.

703 Conroy, G.C., 1976. Primate postcranial remains from the Oligocene of Egypt. *Contrib.*
704 *Primatol.* 8, 1–134.

705 Cornette, R., Baylac, M., Souter, T., Herrel, A., 2013. Does shape co-variation between the
706 skull and the mandible have functional consequences? A 3D approach for a 3D
707 problem. *J. Anat.* 223, 329–336.

708 Demes, B., Larson, S.G., Stern, J.T. Jr., Jungers, W.L., Biknevicius, A.R., Schmitt, D., 1994. The
709 kinetics of primate quadrupedalism: “hindlimb drive” reconsidered. *J. Hum. Evol.* 26,
710 353–374.

711 Demes, B., Jungers, W.L., Fleagle, J.G., Wunderlich, R.E., Richmond, B.G., Lemelin, P., 1996.
712 Body size and leaping kinematics in Malagasy vertical clingers and leapers. *J. Hum.*
713 *Evol.* 137, 281–298.

714 Dunbar, D.C., Badam, G.L., 2000. Locomotion and posture during terminal branch feeding.
 715 Int. J. Primatol. 21, 649–669.

716 Fabre, A.-C., Cornette, R., Slater, G., Argot, C., Peigné, S., Goswami, A., Pouydebat, E., 2013a.
 717 Getting a grip on the evolution of grasping in musteloid carnivorans: a three-
 718 dimensional analysis of forelimb shape. J. Evol. Biol. 26, 1521–1535.

719 Fabre, A.-C., Cornette, R., Peigné, S., Goswami, A., 2013b. Influence of body mass on the
 720 shape of forelimb in musteloids carnivorans. Biol. J. Linnean Soc. 110, 91–103.

721 Fabre, A.-C., Goswami, A., Peigné, S., Cornette, R., 2014. Morphological integration in the
 722 forelimb of musteloid carnivorans. *J. Anat.* 225, 19–30.

723 Fabre, A.-C., Cornette, R., Goswami, A., Peigné, S., 2015a. Do constraints associated with the
 724 locomotor habitat drive the evolution of forelimb shape? A case study in musteloid
 725 carnivorans. *J. Anat.* 226, 596–610

726 Fabre, A.-C., Salesa, M.J., Cornette, R., Antón, M., Morales, J., Peigné, S., 2015b.
 727 Quantitative inferences on the locomotor behaviour of extinct species applied to
 728 *Simocyon batalleri* (Ailuridae, Late Miocene, Spain). *Sci. Nature* 102, 30.

729 Feldesman, M.R., 1982. Morphometric analysis of the distal humerus of some Cenozoic
 730 catarrhines: The late divergence hypothesis revisited. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 59, 73–
 731 95.

732 Felsenstein, J., 1985. Phylogenies and the comparative method. Am. Nat. 125, 1–15.

733 Fleagle, J.G. 2013. Primate Adaptation and Evolution. Third Edition. Elsevier Academic Press,
734 New York.

735 Fleagle, J.G., Kay, R.F., 1987. The phyletic position of the Parapithecidae. J. Hum. Evol. 16,
736 483–532.

737 Foster, D.R., Higham, T.E., 2012. How forelimb and hindlimb function changes with incline
738 and perch diameter in the green anole, *Anolis carolinensis*. J. Exp. Biol. 215, 2288–
739 2300.

740 Godinot, M., 1991. Functional approaches of Paleogene primate hands. Geobios 24, 161–
741 173.

742 Godinot, M., 2007. Primate origins: A reappraisal of historical data favoring tupaiid affinities.
743 In: Ravosa, M.J., Dagosto, M. (Eds.), Primate Origins: Adaptation and Evolution.
744 Springer, New York, pp. 83–133.

745 Gonyea, W.J., 1978. Functional implications of felid forelimb morphology. Acta Anat. 102,
746 111–121.

747 Gould, S.J., 1966. Allometry and size in ontogeny and phylogeny. Biol. Rev. 41, 587–638.

748 Gunz, P., Mitteroecker, P., 2013. Semilandmarks: a method for quantifying curves and
749 surfaces. Hystrix 24, 103–109.

750 Gunz, P., Mitteroecker, P., Bookstein, F.L., 2005. Semilandmarks in three dimensions. In:
751 Slice, D.E. (Ed.), Modern Morphometrics in Physical Anthropology. Springer, Berlin, pp.
752 73–98.

753 Harvey, P.H., Pagel, M.D., 1991. *The Comparative Method in Evolutionary Biology*. University
754 Press Oxford, Oxford.

755 Herrel, A., Perrenoud, M., Decamps, T., Abdala, V., Manzano, A., Pouydebat, E., 2013. The
756 effect of substrate diameter and incline on locomotion in an arboreal frog. *J. Exp. Biol.*
757 216, 3599–3605.

758 Higham, T.E., Jayne, B.C., 2004. Locomotion of lizards on inclines and perches: hindlimb
759 kinematics of an arboreal specialist and a terrestrial generalist. *J. Exp. Biol.* 207, 233–
760 248.

761 Hirisaki, E., Kumakura, H., Matano, S., 2000. Biomechanical analysis of vertical climbing in
762 the spider monkey and the Japanese macaque. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 113, 455–472.

763 Hornik, K., 2015. The R FAQ. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/doc/FAQ/R-FAQ.html>

764 Horvath, J.E., Weisrock, D.W., Embry, S.L., Fiorentino, I., Balhoff, J.P., Kappeler, P., Wray,
765 G.A., Willard, H.F., Yoder, A.D., 2008. Development and application of a phylogenetic
766 toolkit: resolving the evolutionary history of Madagascar’s lemurs. *Genome Res.* 18,
767 489–499.

768 Iwaniuk, A.N., Pellis, S.M., Whishaw, I.Q., 1999. The relationship between forelimb
769 morphology and behaviour in North American carnivores (Carnivora). *Can. J. Zool.* 77,
770 1064–1074.

771 Jenkins, F.A., 1972. Chimpanzee bipedalism: Cineradiographic analysis and implications for
772 the evolution of gait. *Science* 178, 877–879.

773 Jenkins, F.A., 1973. The functional anatomy and evolution of the mammalian humero-ulnar
 774 articulation. *Am. J. Anat.* 137, 281–298.

775 Jenkins, F.A., Fleagle, J.G., 1975. Knuckle-walking and the functional anatomy of the wrist in
 776 living apes. In: Tuttle, R.H. (Ed), *Primate Functional Morphology and Evolution*. The
 777 Hague, Mouton, pp. 213–27.

778 Johnson, L., 2012. Biomechanics of vertical clinging and grasping in primates. Ph.D.
 779 Dissertation, Duke University.

780 Jolly, C.J., 1967. The evolution of baboons. In: Vagtborg, H., (Ed), *The Baboon in Medical*
 781 *Research*. II. Univ Texas Press, Austin, pp. 23–50.

782 Jones, W.F., 1916. *Arboreal Man*. Arnold, London.

783 Jouffroy, F.-K., 1962. La musculature des membres chez les lémuriens de Madagascar. Etude
 784 descriptive et comparative. *Mammalia* 26, 1–326.

785 Jouffroy, F.-K, Stern, J., 1990. Telemetered EMG study of the antigravity versus propulsive
 786 actions of knee and elbow muscles in the slow loris (*Nycticebus coucang*). In: Jouffroy,
 787 F.-K, Stack, M., Niemitz, C. (Eds.), *Gravity, Posture and Locomotion in Primates*.
 788 Firenze, Il Sedicesimo, pp. 221–236.

789 Karantanis, N.-E., Youlatos, D., Rychlik, L., 2015. Diagonal gaits in the feathertail glider
 790 *Acrobates pygmaeus* (Acrobatidae, Diprotodontia): Insights for the evolution of
 791 primate quadrupedalism. *J. Hum. Evol.* 86, 43–54.

792 Kay, R.F., Cartmill, M., 1977. Cranial morphology and adaptations of *Palaeochthon nacimienti*
 793 and other Paromomyidae (Plesiadapoidea, Primates), with a description of a new
 794 genus and species. J. Hum. Evol. 6, 19-53.

795 Kay, R.F., Schmitt, D., Vinyard, C.J., Perry, J.M.G., Shigehara, N., Takai, M., Egi, N., 2004. The
 796 paleobiology of Amphithecidae, South Asian late Eocene primates. J. Hum. Evol. 46, 3–
 797 25.

798 Kimura, T., Okada, M., Ishida, H., 1979. Kinesiological characteristics of primate walking: its
 799 significance in nonhuman walking. In: Morbeck, M.E., Preuschoft, H., Gomberg, N.
 800 (Eds.), Environment, Behavior, and Morphology: Dynamic Interactions in Primates.
 801 Gustav Fischer, New York, pp. 297–311.

802 Kirk, E.C., Cartmill, M., Kay, R.F., Lemelin, P., 2003. Comment on “Grasping primate origins”.
 803 Science 300, 741.

804 Klingenberg, C.P., 1996. Multivariate allometry. In: Marcus, F., Corti, M., Loy, A., Naylor,
 805 G.J.P., Slice, D.E. (Eds.), Advances in Morphometrics. Springer US Plenum Press, New
 806 York, pp. 23–49.

807 Lanyon, L.E., 1980. The influence of function on the development of bone curvature. An
 808 experimental study on the rat tibia. J. Zool. 192, 457–466.

809 Larson, S.G., Stern, J.T. Jr, 1989. Role of supraspinatus in the quadrupedal locomotion of
 810 vervets (*Cercopithecicus aethiops*): Implications for interpretation of humeral
 811 morphology. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 79, 369–377.

812 Leach, D., 1977. The forelimb musculature of marten (*Martes americana* Turton) and fisher
813 (*Martes pennanti* Erxleben). Can. J. Zool. 55, 31–41.

814 Lemelin, P., Schmitt, D., 2007. The origins of grasping and locomotor adaptations in
815 primates: comparative and experimental approaches using an opossum model. In:
816 Ravosa, M., Dagosto, M. (Eds.), Primate Origins: Adaptations and Evolution. Kluwer
817 Academic, New York, pp. 329–380.

818 Matthews, L.J., Arnold, C., Machanda, Z., Nunn, C.L., 2010. Primate extinction risk and
819 historical patterns of speciation and extinction in relation to body mass. Proc. Royal
820 Soc. B 278, 1256–1263.

821 Meldrum, D.J., 1991. Kinematics of the cercopithecine foot on arboreal and terrestrial
822 substrates with implications for the interpretation of hominid terrestrial adaptations.
823 Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 84, 273–289.

824 Napier, J.R., 1967. Evolutionary aspects of primate locomotion. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 27,
825 333–342.

826 Napier, J.R., Davis, P.R., 1959. The forelimb skeleton and associated remains of *Proconsul*
827 *africanus*. Fossil Mammals of Africa no., 16 Brit. Mus. Nat. Hist., London.

828 Nyakatura, J.A., Fisher, M.S., Schmidt, M., 2008. Gait parameter adjustments of cotton-top
829 tamarins (*Saguinus oedipus*, Callitrichidae) to locomotion on inclined arboreal
830 substrates. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 135, 13–26.

831 Oxnard, C.E., 1963. Locomotor adaptations in the primate forelimb. Symp. Zool. Soc. Lond.
832 10, 165–182.

833 Oxnard, C.E, Crompton, R.H., Lieberman, S.S., 1990. Animal Lifestyles and Anatomies: The
834 case of the Prosimian Primates. University of Washington Press, Seattle, London.

835 Parr, W.C.H., Wroe, S., Chamoli, U., Richards, H.S., McCurry, M.R., Clausen, P.D., McHenry,
836 C., 2012. Toward integration of geometric morphometrics and computational
837 biomechanics: New methods for 3D virtual reconstruction and quantitative analysis of
838 Finite Element Models. J. Theor. Biol. 301, 1–14.

839 Patel, B.A., 2005. The hominoid proximal radius: re-interpreting locomotor behaviors in
840 early hominins. J. Hum. Evol. 48, 415–432.

841 Patel, B.A., Wallace, I.J., Boyer, D.M., Granatosky, M.C., Larson, S.G., Stern, J.T. Jr., 2015.
842 Distinct functional roles of primate grasping hands and feet during arboreal
843 quadrupedal locomotion. J. Hum. Evol. 88, 79–84.

844 Preuschoft, H., 2002. What does “arboreal locomotion” mean exactly and what are the
845 relationships between “climbing”, environment and morphology? Z. Morph.
846 Anthropol. 83, 171–188

847 Prost, J., 1965. A definitional system for the classification of *primate* locomotion. Am.
848 Anthropol. 67, 1198–1214.

849 Rasmussen, D.T., 1990. Primate origins: Lessons from a Neotropical marsupial. Am. J.
850 Primatol. 22, 263–277.

851 Ravosa, M.J., Dagosto, M., 2007. Primate Origins: Adaptations and Evolution. Springer, New
852 York.

853 Reynolds, T.R., 1985. Stresses on the limbs of quadrupedal primates. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.*
854 67, 351–362.

855 Rohlf, F.J., 1993. Relative warp analysis and an example of its application to mosquito wings.
856 In: Marcus, L.F., Bello, E., Garcia-Valdecasa, A. (Eds.), *Contributions to Morphometrics*.
857 Museo Nacionales de Ciencias Naturales, Madrid, pp. 131–159.

858 Rohlf, F.J., Corti, M., 2000. Use of two-block partial least-squares to study covariation in
859 shape. *Syst. Biol.* 49, 740–753.

860 Rohlf, F.J., Slice, D., 1990. Extensions of the Procrustes method for the optimal
861 superimposition of landmarks. *Syst. Biol.* 39, 40–59.

862 Rose, K.D., Walker, A., 1985. The skeleton of early Eocene *Cantius*, oldest lemuriform
863 primate. *Amer. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 66, 73–89.

864 Rose, M.D., 1988. Another look at the anthropoid elbow. *J. Hum. Evol.* 17, 193–224.

865 Rose, M.D., 1993. Functional anatomy of the elbow and forearm in primates. In: Gebo, D.L.
866 (Ed.), *Postcranial Adaptations in Non-Human Primates*. Northern Illinois University
867 Press, DeKalb, pp. 70–95.

868 Rose, M.D., 1989. New postcranial specimens of catarrhines from the Middle Miocene Chinji
869 Formation, Pakistan: descriptions and a discussion of proximal humeral functional
870 morphology in anthropoids. *J. Hum. Evol.* 18, 131–162.

871 Ross, C.F., Martin, R.D., 2007. The role of vision in the origin and evolution of primates. In:
872 Todd, M.P., Kaas, J. (Eds.), *Evolution of Nervous Systems*, Vol. 4: Primates. Elsevier,
873 Oxford, pp. 59–78.

874 Salton, J.A., Sargis, E.J., 2008. Evolutionary morphology of the Tenrecoidea (Mammalia)
875 forelimb skeleton. In: Sargis, E.J., Dagosto, M. (Eds.), *Mammalian Evolutionary*
876 *Morphology: A Tribute to Frederick S. Szalay*. Springer, Dordrecht, The Netherlands,
877 pp. 51–71.

878 Samuels, J.X., Van Valkenburgh, B., 2008. Skeletal indicators of locomotor adaptations in
879 living and extinct rodents. *J. Morphol.* 269, 1387–1411.

880 Sargis, E.J., 2002. The postcranial morphology of *Ptilocercus lowii* (Scandentia, Tupaiidae): an
881 analysis of primatomorphan and volitantian characters. *J. Mamm. Evol.* 9, 137–160.

882 Schlager, S., 2013. Morpho: Calculations and visualizations related to Geometric
883 Morphometrics. R Package Version 21-1141011.

884 Schmitt, D., 1996. Humeral head shape as an indicator of locomotor behavior in extant
885 strepsirhines and Eocene adapids. *Int. J. Primatol.* 67, 137–51.

886 Schmitt, D., 1998. Forelimb mechanics during arboreal and terrestrial quadrupedalism in Old
887 World monkeys. In: Strasser, E., Fleagle, J., Rosenberger, A., McHenry, H. (Eds.),
888 *Primate Locomotion: Recent Advances*. Plenum Press, New York, pp. 175–200.

889 Schmitt, D., 1999. Compliant walking in primates. *J. Zool. Lond.* 248, 149–160.

890 Schmitt, D., 2003. Substrate size and primate forelimb mechanics: Implications for
 891 understanding the evolution of primate locomotion. *Int. J. Primatol.* 24, 1023–1036.

892 Schmitt, D., Hanna, J.B., 2004. Substrate alters forelimb to hindlimb peak force ratios in
 893 primates, *J. Hum. Evol.* 46, 237–252.

894 Schmitt, D., Lemelin, P., 2002. Origins of primate locomotion: Gait mechanics of the woolly
 895 opossum. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 118, 231–238.

896 Schwartz, S.M., 1990. Curvature of the forelimb bones of anthropoid primates: overall
 897 allometric patterns and specializations in suspensory species. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.*
 898 83, 477–498.

899 Shapiro, L.J., Young, J.W., 2010. Is primate-like quadrupedalism necessary for fine branch
 900 locomotion? A test using sugar gliders (*Petaurus breviceps*). *J. Hum. Evol.* 58, 309–319.

901 Shapiro, L.J., Young, J.W., 2012. Kinematics of quadrupedal locomotion in sugar gliders
 902 (*Petaurus breviceps*): effects of age and substrate size. *J. Exp. Biol.* 215, 480–496.

903 Shapiro, L.J., Young, J.W., VandeBerg, J.L., 2014. Body size and the small branch niche: Using
 904 marsupial ontogeny to model primate locomotor evolution. *J. Hum. Evol.* 68, 14–31.

905 Spezzano, L., Jr, Jayne, B.C., 2004. The effects of surface diameter and incline on the
 906 hindlimb kinematics of an arboreal lizard (*Anolis sagrei*). *J. Exp. Biol.* 207, 2115–2131.

907 Stalheim-Smith, A., 1984. Comparative study of the forelimbs of the semifossorial prairie
 908 dog, *Cynomys gunnisoni*, and the scansorial fox squirrel, *Sciurus niger*. *J. Morphol.* 180,
 909 55–68.

- 910 Stern, J.T. Jr., 1976. Before bipedality. Yearb. . Phys. Anthropol. 19, 59–68.
- 911 Stevens, N.J., 2008. The effect of branch diameter on primate gait sequence pattern. Am. J.
912 Primatol. 70, 356–362.
- 913 Sussman, R.W., 1991. Primate origins and the evolution of angiosperms. Am. J. Primatol. 23,
914 209–223.
- 915 Sussman, R. W., Raven, P.H., 1978. Pollination by lemurs and marsupials: an archaic
916 coevolutionary system. Science 200, 731–736.
- 917 Sussman, R.W., Rasmussen, D.T., Raven, P.H., 2013. Rethinking primate origins again. Am. J.
918 Primatol. 75, 95–106.
- 919 Szalay, F.S., Dagosto, M., 1988. Evolution of hallucial grasping in the primates. J. Hum. Evol.
920 17, 1–33.
- 921 Taylor, M.E., 1971. Bone diseases and fractures in East African Viverridae. Can. J. Zool. 49,
922 1035–1042.
- 923 Taylor, M.E., 1974. The functional anatomy of the forelimb of some African Viverridae
924 (Carnivora). J. Morphol. 143, 307–335.
- 925 Toussaint, S., Herrel, A., Ross, C.F., Aujard, F., Pouydebat, E., 2015. Substrate diameter and
926 orientation in the context of food type in the gray mouse lemur, *Microcebus murinus*:
927 implications for the origins of grasping in primates. Int. J. Primatol. 36, 583–604.
- 928 Vilensky, J.A., Larson, S.G., 1989. Primate locomotion: Utilization and control of symmetrical
929 gaits. Ann. Rev. Anthropol. 18, 17–35.

930 Vilensky, J.A., Moore, A.M., Libii, J.N., 1994. Squirrel monkey locomotion on an inclined
 931 treadmill: implications for the evolution of gaits. *J. Hum. Evol.* 26, 375–386.

932 Wallace, I.J., Demes, B., 2008. Symmetrical gaits of *Cebus apella*: Implications for the
 933 functional significance of diagonal sequence gait in primates. *J. Hum. Evol.* 54, 783 –
 934 794.

935 Walker, A., 1974. Locomotor adaptations in past and present prosimian primates. In:
 936 Jenkins, F.A. (Ed.), *Primate Locomotion*. Academic Press, New York, pp. 349–381.

937 Whitehead, P.F., Sacco, W.K., Hochgraf, S.B., 2005. *A Photographic Atlas for Physical*
 938 *Anthropology*. Morton Publishing Company, Englewood.

939 Wiley, D.F., Amenta, N., Alcantara, D.A., Ghosh, D., Kil, Y.J., Delson, E., Harcourt-Smith, W.,
 940 Rohlf, F.J., St John, K., Hamann, B., 2005. Evolutionary morphing. In: *Proceedings of*
 941 *IEEE Visualization 2005 (VIS'05)*, 23-28 October 2005. Minneapolis, MN, USA.

942 Young, J.W., 2012. Gait selection and the ontogeny of quadrupedal walking in squirrel
 943 monkeys (*Saimiri boliviensis*). *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 147, 580–592.

944 Zelditch, M.L., Swiderski, D.L., Sheets, H.D., 2012. Partial least squares analysis. In: Zelditch,
 945 M.L., Swiderski, D.L., Sheets, H.D. (Eds.), *Geometric Morphometrics for Biologists, a*
 946 *Primer*. Second Edition. Academic Press, New York, pp.169–188.

947

948 **Figure Legends:**

949 **Figure 1.** Humerus landmarks used in our analyses. Red points represent anatomical
950 landmarks (see numbers / definitions in Table 2), blue points represent semilandmarks of
951 curves, and light green points represent surface semilandmarks.

952 **Figure 2.** Ulna landmarks used in our analyses Red points represent homologous landmarks
953 (see numbers / definitions in Table 3), blue points represent semilandmarks of curves, and
954 light green points represent surface semilandmarks.

955 **Figure 3.** Radius landmarks used in our analyses. Red points represent homologous
956 landmarks (see numbers / definitions in Table 4), blue points represent semilandmarks of
957 curves, and light green points represent surface semilandmarks.

958 **Figure 4.** The phylogenetic relationships of the strepsirrhine species used in this study,
959 derived from the 10kTrees Project website (Arnold et al., 2010).

960 **Figure 5.** Results of the principal components analysis performed on support data. The
961 scatter plot illustrates the position of the different species on the first two principal
962 components. The first principal component tends to separate species depending on whether
963 they use vertical or horizontal supports, whereas the second principal component tends to
964 separate species depending on whether they use small or large supports. Loadings for each
965 variable can be found in Table 6.

966 **Figure 6.** Results of the phylogenetic 2B-PLS between the humerus and the supports used.
967 **A,** Scatter plot of the first PLS axis describing shape co-variation between the proximal
968 articulation of the humerus and the supports used taking phylogeny into account. Proximal

969 humeral shapes (left side) associated with each minimum and maximum of co-variation are
970 illustrated in blue and red, respectively, at the bottom of the scatter plot. **B**, Scatter plot of
971 the first PLS axis describing shape co-variation between the distal articulation of the
972 humerus and the supports used taking into account the phylogeny. Distal humeral shapes
973 (left side) associated with each minimum and maximum of co-variation are illustrated in
974 blue and red, respectively, at the bottom of the scatter plot.

975 **Figure 7.** Results of the phylogenetic 2B-PLS between the ulna and the supports used. **A**,
976 Scatter plot of the first PLS axis describing shape co-variation between the ulna and the
977 supports used taking phylogeny into account. Ulnar shapes (left side) associated with each
978 minimum and maximum of co-variation are illustrated in blue and red, respectively, at the
979 bottom of the scatter plot. **B**, Scatter plot of the first PLS axis describing shape co-variation
980 between the distal articulation of the ulna and the supports used taking phylogeny into
981 account. Distal ulnar shapes (left side) associated with each minimum and maximum of co-
982 variation are illustrated in blue and red, respectively, at the bottom of the scatter plot.

983 **Figure 8.** Results of the 2B-PLS and the phylogenetic 2B-PLS between the radius and the
984 supports used. **A**, Scatter plot of the first PLS axis describing shape co-variation between the
985 radius and the supports. Radial shapes (left side) associated with each minimum and
986 maximum of co-variation are illustrated in blue and red, respectively, at the bottom of the
987 scatter plot. **B**, Scatter plot of the first PLS axis describing shape co-variation between the
988 radius and the supports used taking phylogeny into account. Radial shapes (left side)
989 associated with each minimum and maximum of co-variation are illustrated in blue and red,
990 respectively, at the bottom of the scatter plot. **C**, Scatter plot of the first PLS axis describing
991 shape co-variation between the distal articulation of the radius and the supports used taking

992 phylogeny into account. Distal radial shapes (left side) associated with each minimum and
993 maximum of co-variation are illustrated in blue and red, respectively, at the bottom of the
994 scatter plot.

995 **Figure 9.** Schematic figure illustrating the origins and insertions of muscles discussed in the
996 manuscript for the left scapula, humerus, radius and ulna (modified from Jouffroy, 1962).
997 Colors represent different muscles inserting on the long bones of the forelimb and the
998 scapula. Definition of the muscle origins, insertions, and their suggested actions can be
999 found in Table 7. Muscles names in bold indicate muscle origins, whereas their insertions
1000 are indicated in normal font.

1001

1 Table 1. Specimens used in the analyses with family, species name, and sample size (*n*).

Family	Species	<i>n</i>
Cheirogalidae	<i>Cheirogaleus major</i>	2
	<i>Microcebus murinus</i>	5
	<i>Mirza coquereli</i>	2
	<i>Phaner furcifer</i>	5
Daubentoniidae	<i>Daubentonia madagascariensis</i>	4
Galagidae	<i>Sciurocheirus alleni</i>	3
	<i>Galagoides demidoff</i>	3
	<i>Galago senegalensis</i>	4
	<i>Otolemur garnettii</i>	2
Indriidae	<i>Avahi laniger</i>	5
	<i>Indri indri</i>	5
	<i>Propithecus diadema</i>	3
	<i>Propithecus verreauxi</i>	5
Lemuridae	<i>Eulemur fulvus</i>	4
	<i>Eulemur mongoz</i>	4
	<i>Hapalemur griseus</i>	6
	<i>Hapalemur simus</i>	2
	<i>Lemur catta</i>	5
	<i>Varecia variegata</i>	5
Lepilemuridae	<i>Lepilemur ruficaudatus</i>	5
Lorisidae	<i>Loris tardigradus</i>	3

Nycticebus coucang 5

Perodicticus potto 5

2

3

4 Table 2. Anatomical and semilandmarks used in this study (humerus)

5 2a) Summary of landmarks

Landmark type	Number of landmarks		
	Whole humerus	Proximal articulation	Distal articulation
Anatomical	27	9	11
Semilandmarks on curves	99	26	26
Semilandmarks on surfaces	265	35	61

6

7 2b) Definition of anatomical landmarks.

Landmark^a Definition

E P D

-
1	-	1	Most medial and distal point of the posterior part of the trochlea
2	-	2	Most medial and proximal point of the posterior side of the trochlea
3	-	3	Point of maximum of curvature of the olecranon fossa
4	-	4	Most lateral and proximal point of the posterior side of the trochlea
5	-	5	Most lateral and distal point of the posterior side of the trochlea
6	-	6	Most lateral and proximal point of the anterior side of the capitulum
7	-	-	Most distal point of the anterior side of the supracondylar foramen
8	-	7	Most proximal point of contact between the trochlea and the capitulum
9	-	-	Most proximal point of the anterior side of the supracondylar foramen

- 10 - 8 Most proximal point of the anterior side of the trochlea
- 11 - 9 Most proximal point of the medial epicondyle
- 12 - 10 Most distal point of the medial epicondyle
- 13 - 11 Most distal point of the lateral epicondyle
- 14 - - Most proximal point of insertion of the lateral supracondylar ridge on the diaphysis
- 15 - - Most proximal point of insertion of the medial supracondylar ridge on the diaphysis
- 16 - - Most distal point of the deltopectoral crest
- 17 1 - Most distal point of the humeral head
- 18 2 - Most lateral point of contact between the humeral head and the greater tubercle
- 19 3 - Most medial point of contact between the humeral head and the greater tubercle
- 20 4 - Most lateral point of contact between the humeral head and the lesser tubercle
- 21 5 - Most medial point of contact between the humeral head and the lesser tubercle
- 22 6 - Most proximo-lateral point of the greater tubercle
- 23 7 - Most proximo-medial point of the greater tubercle
- 24 8 - Most proximo-lateral point of the lesser tubercle
- 25 9 - Most proximo-medial point of the lesser tubercle
- 26 - - Most proximal point of the posterior side of the supracondylar foramen
- 27 - - Most distal point of the posterior side of the supracondylar foramen

8 ^aD – distal articulation of the humerus; E – entire humerus; P – proximal articulation of the
 9 humerus.

11 Table 3. Anatomical and semilandmarks used in this study (ulna)

12 3a) Summary of landmarks

Landmark type	Number of landmarks		
	Whole ulna	Proximal articulation	Distal articulation
Anatomical	25	12	8
Semilandmarks on curves	97	39	15
Semilandmarks on surfaces	311	60	64

13

14 3b) Definition of anatomical landmarks.

Landmark ^a Definition			
E	P	D	
1	1	-	Most distal point of the radial notch
2	2	-	Most lateral point between the radial and the trochlear notches
3	3	-	Point of maximum of concavity in the disto-lateral side of the trochlear notch
4	4	-	Point of maximum of concavity in the proximo-lateral side of the trochlear notch
5	5	-	Point of maximum of concavity in the proximo-medial side of the trochlear notch
6	6	-	Point of maximum of concavity in the disto-medial side of the trochlear notch
7	7	-	Most medial point between the radial and the trochlear notches
8	8	-	Point of maximum of concavity between the radial and trochlear notches
9	9	-	Most antero-medial point of the olecranon

- 10 10 - Most antero-lateral point of the olecranon
- 11 11 - Most postero-lateral point of the olecranon
- 12 12 - Most postero-medial point of the olecranon
- 13 - 1 Most proximal point of the distal radial notch
- 14 - 2 Most lateral point of the distal radial notch
- 15 - 3 Most distal point of the distal radial notch
- 16 - 4 Most medial point of the distal radial notch
- 17 - 5 Most anterior point of the styloid process
- 18 - 6 Most lateral point of the styloid process
- 19 - 7 Most posterior point of the styloid process
- 20 - 8 Most medial point of the styloid process
- 21 - - Most distal point of the interosseous crest
- 22 - - Point of maximum of convexity of the interosseous crest
- 23 - - Most proximal point of the interosseous crest
- 24 - - Most proximal point of the anterior ridge of the diaphysis of the ulna
- 25 - - Most distal point of the postero-lateral ridge of the diaphysis of the ulna

15 ^aD - distal articulation of the ulna; E - entire ulna; P - proximal articulation of the ulna.

16

17

18 Table 4. Anatomical and semilandmarks used in this study (radius)

19 4a) Summary of landmarks

Landmark type	Number of landmarks		
	Whole radius	Proximal articulation	Distal articulation
Anatomical	21	6	11
Semilandmarks on curves	49	16	32
Semilandmarks on surfaces	252	49	24

20

21 4b) Definition of anatomical landmarks.

22

Landmark ^a			Definition
E	P	D	
1	1	-	Most proximo-lateral point of the anterior side of the radial head
2	2	-	Point at the middle of the fovea
3	3	-	Most latero-proximal point of the radial head
4	4	-	Point of maximum of curvature of the postero-lateral side of the radial head
5	5	-	Most latero-distal point of the radial head
6	6	-	Point of maximum of curvature of the antero-medial side of the radial head
7	-	1	Point of insertion of the styloid process on the diaphysis
8	-	2	Most lateral point of the styloid process

- 9 - 3 Point of maximum of curvature on the anterior side of the scaphoid articulation
- 10 - 4 Tip of the styloid process
- 11 - 5 Point of maximum of curvature on the posterior side of the scaphoid articulation
- 12 - 6 Most distal point of the groove for extensor digitorum
- 13 - 7 Most disto-medial point of the lunar facet
- 14 - 8 Most proximal point of the groove for extensor digitorum
- 15 - 9 Most posterior point of the distal ulnar notch
- 16 - 10 Most proximal point of the distal ulnar notch
- 17 - 11 Most anterior point of the distal ulnar notch
- 18 - - Most proximo-lateral of the tuberosity
- 19 - - Most disto-lateral of the tuberosity
- 20 - - Most disto-medial of the tuberosity
- 21 - - Most proximo-medial of the tuberosity

23 ^aD - distal articulation of the radius; E - entire radius; P - proximal articulation of the radius.

24

25

Family	Species	Horizontal supports	Vertical supports	Small supports	Large supports
Cheirogaleidae	<i>Cheirogaleus major</i>	4.4	2	1.6	4.2
	<i>Microcebus murinus</i>	4	3.7	7	2
	<i>Mirza coquereli</i>	3.8	2.8	2	3
	<i>Phaner furcifer</i>	4	2.8	2.8	3
Daubentoniidae	<i>Daubentonia madagascariensis</i>	4	3	2	3
Galagidae	<i>Galago alleni</i>	1.8	8	1.8	2.3
	<i>Galago demidoff</i>	3.8	5.2	7	2
	<i>Galago senegalensis</i>	4	2.6	1.6	2
	<i>Otolemur garnettii</i>	8	2.3	2	3.8
Indriidae	<i>Avahi laniger</i>	3.2	4.5	2	4.5
	<i>Indri indri</i>	3	5	1.8	4.4
	<i>Propithecus diadema</i>	3.4	3.5	3	4.5
	<i>Propithecus verreauxi</i>	3.4	3.5	3	4.5
Lemuridae	<i>Eulemur fulvus</i>	7.1	1.3	1.6	2.4
	<i>Eulemur mongoz</i>	7.1	1.2	1.6	2.4
	<i>Hapalemur griseus</i>	1	5	2	3
	<i>Hapalemur simus</i>	1	5	2	3
	<i>Lemur catta</i>	4.5	2.6	2	3.5
	<i>Varecia variegata</i>	4	1.6	1.8	3

Lepilemuridae	<i>Lepilemur ruficaudatus</i>	1.4	5.5	1.2	4.5
Lorisidae	<i>Loris tardigradus</i>	4	4	5	2.7
	<i>Nycticebus coucang</i>	6	2.4	3.2	3.2
	<i>Perodicticus potto</i>	4.2	4.2	1.8	4.5

27

28 ^aScale for scoring: 0 = never; 0.1–0.2 = rarely; 0.5 = sometimes; 1 = quite often; 2 =

29 commonly; 4–5 = mostly; 6 = dominated by; 8 = almost exclusively; 10 = exclusively. Small

30 supports include twigs and leaves, large supports are branches (see Oxnard et al., 1990).

31

32 Table 6. Loadings of the Principal Component Analysis performed on the support data.

Variable	Principal Component 1	Principal Component 2	Principal Component 3
Horizontal support	0.7518	-0.1468	0.5936
Vertical support	-0.6531	-0.08	0.6484
Small support	-0.0765	-0.9412	0.0007
Large support	-0.0477	0.2933	0.4765

33

34 Table 7. Results of the regression analysis of centroid size and forelimb long bone shape^a.

Bone	Part	R ²	<i>p</i>
Humerus	Entire	0.15	0.009
	Proximal	0.09	0.045
	Distal	0.057	0.22
Ulna	Entire	0.13	0.035
	Proximal	0.08	0.1
	Distal	0.07	0.1
Radius	Entire	0.07	0.14
	Proximal	0.13	0.007
	Distal	0.13	0.003

35 ^a Significant results are indicated in bold.

36

37

38 Table 8. Results of the multivariate K-statistic for long bone shape and substrate use^a.

Trait		Procrustes coordinates		Shape residuals coordinates	
Bone	Part	Kmult	<i>p</i>	Kmult	<i>p</i>
HUMERUS	Entire	0.69	0.001	0.63	0.003
	Proximal	0.65	0.001	0.62	0.001
	Distal	0.78	0.001	0.74	0.001
ULNA	Entire	0.7	0.001	0.69	0.001
	Proximal	0.93	0.001	0.87	0.001
	Distal	0.77	0.001	0.75	0.001
RADIUS	Entire	0.71	0.001	0.68	0.001
	Proximal	0.54	0.002	0.48	0.016
	Distal	0.68	0.001	0.61	0.001
Substrate use scores		0.38	0.44	NA	NA

^aSignificant Kmults are indicated in bold.

40

41

42 Table 9. Results of the 2B-PLS and the phylogenetic 2B-PLS between each long bone of the
 43 forelimb and the supports used^a.

Bone	Part	2B-PLS between shape and substrate		Phylogenetic 2B-PLS between shape and substrate		2B-PLS between shape residuals and substrate		Phylogenetic 2B- PLS between shape residuals and substrate	
		r_{PLS}	p	r_{PLS}	p	r_{PLS}	p	r_{PLS}	p
HUMERUS	Entire	0.55	0.15	0.55	0.18	0.57	0.15	0.57	0.13
	Proximal	0.55	0.53	0.74	0.03	0.55	0.4	0.72	0.05
	Distal	0.56	0.43	0.78	0.04	0.51	0.6	0.79	0.01
ULNA	Entire	0.47	0.28	0.62	0.02	0.52	0.28	0.66	0.01
	Proximal	0.53	0.2	0.67	0.2	0.4	0.7	0.72	0.08
	Distal	0.45	0.5	0.72	0.02	0.52	0.19	0.73	0.02
RADIUS	Entire	0.63	0.05	0.7	0.01	0.61	0.06	0.69	0.01
	Proximal	0.71	0.06	0.55	0.53	0.67	0.82	0.57	0.48
	Distal	0.59	0.56	0.77	0.04	0.58	0.61	0.77	0.04

44 ^aSignificant co-variations are indicated in bold.

45 Table 10. Summary of the significant PLS loadings of the different types of supports used in
 46 relation to the different anatomical parts of the long bones.

BONE	Part of the bone and figure associated	Horizontal	Vertical	Small	Large
Phylogenetic 2B-PLS HUMERUS	Proximal part (Fig. 6A)	-0.68	0.7	0.12	-0.1
	Residuals proximal part (Fig. S2D)	-0.69	0.71	0.09	-0.07
	Distal part (Fig. 6B)	0.7	-0.6	-0.1	0.1
	Residuals distal (SOM Fig. S2F)	-0.7	0.65	0.01	-1.1
Phylogenetic 2B-PLS ULNA	Entire shape (Fig. 7A)	0.61	-0.66	-0.33	0.25
	Entire residuals (SOM Fig. S4B)	0.59	-0.66	-0.39	0.21
	Distal part (Fig. 7B)	0.69	-0.71	-0.004	0.08
	Residuals distal (SOM Fig. S4F)	0.69	-0.71	-0.02	0.07
2B-PLS RADIUS	Entire shape (Fig. 8A)	-0.33	0.65	0.6	-0.11
Phylogenetic 2B-PLS RADIUS	Entire shape (Fig. 8B)	-0.6	0.67	0.33	-0.19
	Entire residuals (SOM Fig. S6B)	-0.63	0.67	0.35	-0.18
	Distal part (Fig. 8C)	0.74	-0.63	-0.2	0.18
	Residuals distal part (SOM Fig. S6F)	0.74	-0.64	-0.06	0.14

48 Table 11. Results of the regression analysis testing the effect of use of small substrates on
 49 the forelimb long bone shape.

		R^2	p -value ^a
Humerus:	Entire	0.09	0.09
	Proximal	0.06	0.16
	Distal	0.06	0.12
Ulna:	Entire	0.06	0.19
	Proximal	0.09	0.06
	Distal	0.062	0.1
Radius:	Entire	0.12	0.04
	Proximal	0.077	0.1
	Distal	0.049	0.3

50 ^aSignificant correlations are indicated in bold.

51 Table 12. General origin and insertion of the muscles depicted in Figure 9 and their hypothesized
52 action (modified from Jouffroy, 1962 and Moore et al., 2013).

Muscle	Origin	Insertion	Hypothesized action
Triceps brachii complex	Axillary border of the scapula (only long head), diaphysis of humerus (medial and lateral heads)	Olecranon of ulna	Elbow extension, shoulder extension, forelimb retraction
Brachialis	Posterolateral aspect of proximal humerus	Medial aspect of coronoid process of ulna	Elbow flexion
Biceps brachii	Coracoid process of scapula and from glenoid cavity until the bicipital groove of humerus	Bicipital tuberosity of radius	Elbow flexion
Pronator teres	Medial epicondyle of humerus	Distal half of the medial side of radius	Pronation of forearm
Flexors of the forearm, wrist and digits:	Medial epicondyle of the humerus and medio-proximal ulna	Carpal bones and digits on ventral side of the hand:	Flexion of hand, wrist and digits
- 1, flexor carpi radialis	- 1, medial epicondyle of humerus	- 1, ventral side of trapezium and second metacarpi	
- 2, flexor digitorum	- 2, medial epicondyle of the humerus	- 2, phalanges of digits II to V	
- 3, flexor carpi ulnaris	- 3, humeral and ulnar origin	- 3, pisiform and base of V metacarpal	
Extensors of the forearm, wrist and digits:	Lateral epicondyle of the humerus	Carpals bones and digits on dorsal side of the hand:	Extension of the forearm, wrist and digits:
- 1, extensor carpi radialis		- 1, second and third metacarpals	- 1, extension of digits
- 2, extensor		- 2, phalanges of digits II to V	- 2, extension of digits

digitorium communis		- 3, between dorsal surface of unciform and fifth metacarpi	- 3, extension of wrist and hand
- 3, extensor carpi ulnaris			
Pronator quadratus	Pronator flange of ulna	Pronator flange of radius	Pronation of forearm

Entire humerus dataset

Proximal articulation of humerus dataset

Distal articulation of humerus dataset

Figure 2

Entire ulna dataset

Proximal articulation of ulna dataset

Distal articulation of ulna dataset

Figure 3

Entire radius dataset

Proximal articulation of radius dataset

Distal articulation of radius dataset

Figure 4

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure 7

Figure 8

Figure 9