

An integrative model of chimaera jaw links
mechanical stress to localized
cartilage mineralization

François CLARAC, Alicia SÁNCHEZ GIMENO, Alexandra QUILHAC,
Anthony HERREL, Quentin GRIMAL & Alan PRADEL

DIRECTEURS DE LA PUBLICATION / PUBLICATION DIRECTORS :
Gilles Bloch, Président du Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle
Étienne Ghys, Secrétaire perpétuel de l'Académie des sciences

RÉDACTEURS EN CHEF / EDITORS-IN-CHIEF : Michel Laurin (CNRS), Philippe Taquet (Académie des sciences)

ASSISTANTE DE RÉDACTION / ASSISTANT EDITOR : Adenise Lopes (Académie des sciences ; cr-palevol@academie-sciences.fr)

MISE EN PAGE / PAGE LAYOUT : Audrina Neveu (Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle ; audrina.neveu@mnhn.fr), Pénélope Laurin

RÉVISIONS LINGUISTIQUES DES TEXTES ANGLAIS / ENGLISH LANGUAGE REVISIONS : Kevin Padian (University of California at Berkeley)

RÉDACTEURS ASSOCIÉS / ASSOCIATE EDITORS (*, *took charge of the editorial process of the article/a pris en charge le suivi éditorial de l'article*):

Micropaléontologie/*Micropalaeontology*

Lorenzo Consorti (Institute of Marine Sciences, Italian National Research Council, Trieste)

Paléobotanique/*Palaeobotany*

Cyrille Prestianni (Royal Belgian Institute of Natural Sciences, Brussels)

Anaïs Boura (Sorbonne Université, Paris)

Métazoaires/*Metazoa*

Annalisa Ferretti (Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Modena)

Paléoichthyologie/*Palaeoichthyology*

Philippe Janvier* (Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Académie des sciences, Paris)

Amniotes du Mésozoïque/*Mesozoic amniotes*

Hans-Dieter Sues (Smithsonian National Museum of Natural History, Washington)

Tortues/*Turtles*

Walter Joyce (Universität Freiburg, Switzerland)

Lépidosauromorphes/*Lepidosauromorphs*

Hussam Zaher (Universidade de São Paulo)

Oiseaux/*Birds*

Jingmai O'Connor (Field Museum, Chicago)

Paléomammalogie (mammifères de moyenne et grande taille)/*Palaeomammalogy (large and mid-sized mammals)*

Grégoire Métais (CNRS, Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Sorbonne Université, Paris)

Paléomammalogie (petits mammifères sauf Euarchontoglires)/*Palaeomammalogy (small mammals except for Euarchontoglires)*

Robert Asher (Cambridge University, Cambridge)

Paléomammalogie (Euarchontoglires)/*Palaeomammalogy (Euarchontoglires)*

K. Christopher Beard (University of Kansas, Lawrence)

Paléoanthropologie/*Palaeoanthropology*

Aurélien Mounier (CNRS/Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris)

Archéologie préhistorique (Paléolithique et Mésolithique)/*Prehistoric archaeology (Palaeolithic and Mesolithic)*

Nicolas Teyssandier (CNRS/Université de Toulouse, Toulouse)

Archéologie préhistorique (Néolithique et âge du bronze)/*Prehistoric archaeology (Neolithic and Bronze Age)*

Marc Vander Linden (Bournemouth University, Bournemouth)

RÉFÉRÉS / REVIEWERS : <https://sciencepress.mnhn.fr/fr/periodiques/comptes-rendus-palevol/referes-du-journal>

COUVERTURE / COVER :

Made from the Figures of the article.

Comptes Rendus Palevol est indexé dans / *Comptes Rendus Palevol is indexed by:*

- Cambridge Scientific Abstracts
- Current Contents® Physical
- Chemical, and Earth Sciences®
- ISI Alerting Services®
- Geoabstracts, Geobase, Georef, Inspec, Pascal
- Science Citation Index®, Science Citation Index Expanded®
- Scopus®.

Les articles ainsi que les nouveautés nomenclaturales publiés dans *Comptes Rendus Palevol* sont référencés par / *Articles and nomenclatural novelties published in Comptes Rendus Palevol are registered on:*

- ZooBank® (<http://zoobank.org>)

Comptes Rendus Palevol est une revue en flux continu publiée par les Publications scientifiques du Muséum, Paris et l'Académie des sciences, Paris
Comptes Rendus Palevol is a fast track journal published by the Museum Science Press, Paris and the Académie des sciences, Paris

Les Publications scientifiques du Muséum publient aussi / *The Museum Science Press also publish:*

Adansonia, Geodiversitas, Zoosystema, Anthropolozologica, European Journal of Taxonomy, Naturae, Cryptogamie sous-sections *Algologie, Bryologie, Mycologie*.

L'Académie des sciences publie aussi / *The Académie des sciences also publishes:*

Comptes Rendus Mathématique, Comptes Rendus Physique, Comptes Rendus Mécanique, Comptes Rendus Chimie, Comptes Rendus Géoscience, Comptes Rendus Biologies.

Diffusion – Publications scientifiques Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle

CP 41 – 57 rue Cuvier F-75231 Paris cedex 05 (France)

Tél. : 33 (0)1 40 79 48 05 / Fax : 33 (0)1 40 79 38 40

diff.pub@mnhn.fr / <https://sciencepress.mnhn.fr>

Académie des sciences, Institut de France, 23 quai de Conti, 75006 Paris.

© This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)
ISSN (imprimé / *print*) : 1631-0683/ ISSN (électronique / *electronic*) : 1777-571X

An integrative model of chimaera jaw links mechanical stress to localized cartilage mineralization

François CLARAC
Alicia SÁNCHEZ GIMENO
Alexandra QUILHAC

Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie – Paris (CR2P), Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle,
Sorbonne Université, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique,
CP 38, 8 rue Buffon, F-75231 Paris cedex 05 (France)
francois.clarac@mnhn.fr (corresponding author)
aliciabeagle@hotmail.com
alexandra.quilhac@sorbonne-universite.fr

Anthony HERREL

Mécanismes Adaptatifs et Évolution, Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle, CNRS,
57 rue Cuvier, F-75005 Paris (France)
and Department of Biology, Evolutionary Morphology of Vertebrates,
Ghent University, K.L. Ledeganckstraat 35, B-9000 Gent (Belgium)
and Department of Biology, University of Antwerp, B-2020 Antwerpen (Belgium)
and Naturhistorisches Museum Bern, Bernastrasse 15, 3005 Bern (Switzerland)
anthony.herrel@mnhn.fr

Quentin GRIMAL

Sorbonne Université, Institut national de la santé et de la recherche médicale (INSERM), CNRS,
Laboratoire d’Imagerie Biomédicale,
15 rue de l’école de médecine, F-75005 Paris (France)
quentin.grimal@sorbonne-universite.fr

Alan PRADEL

Centre de Recherche en Paléontologie – Paris (CR2P), Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle,
Sorbonne Université, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique,
CP 38, 57 rue Cuvier, F-75231 Paris cedex 05 (France)
alan.pradel@mnhn.fr

Submitted on 18 September 2024 | Accepted on 10 December 2024 | Published on 21 March 2025

urn:lsid:zoobank.org:pub:C88FACF0-F7F5-494C-817A-5E1783E7E806

Clarac F., Sánchez Gimeno A., Herrel A., Grimal Q. & Pradel A. 2025. — An integrative model of chimaera jaw links mechanical stress to localized cartilage mineralization. *Comptes Rendus Palevol* 24 (8): 123-137. <https://doi.org/10.5852/cr-palevol2025v24a8>

ABSTRACT

Chondrichthyans possess a tessellated cartilage which is characterized by a layer of mineralized minute plates (i.e., the tesserae) that sheathe soft cartilage. This tissue type composes most of the endoskeleton (including the fins, the branchial arches and the skull). Using the example of the adaptation of Holocephalans to durophagy, here we aim to test the capacity of the tessellated cartilage to strengthen in response to mechanical stress. Relying on an integrative approach (i.e., cranial muscle dissections, finite element models, histological cross sections and embryologic data), we strongly argue that chondrichthyans are capable of calcifying their endoskeleton in response to mechanical stress by mimicking bone microstructures (i.e., cortical thickness and formation of trabeculae). In the absence of bone cells, this mechanism relies on the calcification of Liesegang waves around the chondrocytes that might possess mechanosensing properties. This cartilage ability may have been inherited from the early jawless vertebrates before it played a critical role in the evolution of chondrichthyans who subsequently lost the bony skeleton before thriving through 400 million years and surviving four major extinction crises. Indeed, this ability to mineralize cartilage would have allowed to grow a high diversity of mechanically demanding adaptations within “bone-less” vertebrates.

KEY WORDS

Bio mechanics,
chondrocyte,
evolution,
durophagy,
Trabeculae,
finite element analysis,
microanatomy.

RÉSUMÉ

Un modèle intégratif de mâchoire de chimère relie le stress mécanique à la minéralisation localisée du cartilage. Les chondrichthyens possèdent un cartilage tessellé qui se caractérise par une strate de petites plaques minéralisées (i.e., les tesselles) recouvrant le cartilage hyalin. Ce type de tissu compose la majeure partie de l'endosquelette (y compris les nageoires, les arcs branchiaux et le crâne). En prenant l'exemple de l'adaptation des Holocephales à la durophagie, nous visons à tester la capacité du cartilage tessellé à se renforcer en réponse au stress mécanique. En nous appuyant sur une approche intégrative (incluant des dissections des muscles crâniens, des analyses en éléments finis, des coupes histologiques et des données embryologiques), nous soutenons que les chondrichthyens sont capables de calcifier leur endosquelette en réponse au stress mécanique en imitant les microstructures osseuses (i.e., l'épaississement cortical et la formation de trabécules). En l'absence de cellules osseuses, ce mécanisme repose sur la calcification d'anneaux de Liesegang autour des chondrocytes, qui pourraient ainsi posséder des propriétés de mécanoréceptrices. Cette capacité du cartilage pourrait alors avoir été héritée des premiers vertébrés sans mâchoires avant de jouer un rôle crucial dans l'évolution des chondrichthyens, qui ont perdu le squelette osseux avant de prospérer au travers de 400 millions d'années et à survivre à quatre crises d'extinctions majeures. En effet, une telle propriété cellulaire aurait permis le développement d'une grande diversité d'adaptations biomécaniques chez des vertébrés « sans os ».

MOTS CLÉS

Biomécanique,
chondrocyte,
évolution,
durophagie,
trabécules,
analyse en éléments finis,
microanatomie.

INTRODUCTION

The chondrichthyans are the extant representatives of a 400-million-year-old vertebrate group that probably originated from the acanthodians during the Silurian (Maisey *et al.* 2017; Coates *et al.* 2018). They further diversified during the Devonian within two separate sub-groups: the elasmobranchs and the holocephalans (Grogan *et al.* 2012; Boisvert *et al.* 2019), which both share a cartilaginous skeleton that calcifies following one of two distinct patterns (Debiais-Thibaud 2019): 1) the areolar cartilage that grows in centrifugal concentric circles within the center of the vertebrae (Atake *et al.* 2019, 2024; Berio *et al.* 2021); 2) the tessellated cartilage which is basically characterized by a layer of mineralized minute plates (i.e., the tesserae) that sheathe the cartilage and compose most of the endoskeleton, including the fins, the branchial arches and the skull (Dean & Summers 2006; Seidel *et al.* 2020). However, previous studies have shown that the tesserae differ in their size, structure, and organization (Maisey *et al.* 2021; Seidel *et al.* 2021), as they result from either a prismatic mineralization that is usually asso-

ciated to the perichondrium (Dean & Summers 2006) or from a globular calcification that surrounds the chondrocytes within the extracellular matrix (Kemp & Westrin 1979). At a microanatomical level, the association of both prismatic and globular calcification may form either a cortex that can be made of multiple-monolayered or polylayered tesserae (Dingerkus *et al.* 1991; Dean *et al.* 2009; Maisey *et al.* 2021; Pazzaglia *et al.* 2022a, b) or a set of trabeculae (also named “struts”) that cross the uncalcified cartilage to further interconnect the external tesserae layers (Summers 2000; Seidel *et al.* 2017; Atake *et al.* 2019). These two latter microstructures suggest an analogy with bone microanatomy (Swartz *et al.* 1998). Therefore, some authors hypothesized that their function is to strengthen the cartilage in response to external mechanical constraints (Dean & Summers 2006). Indeed, even if the cortical thickening commonly reduces bending stress in most elasmobranch species (Dingerkus *et al.* 1991; Clark *et al.* 2022), trabeculae may also play a more specific role in the reinforcement of the jaw in durophagous taxa (e.g. myliobatid stingrays; Summers 2000; Seidel *et al.* 2017). Like the durophagous batoid elasmobranchs, the holocephalans

(i.e., the sister group of elasmobranchs) are specialized in hard-prey crushing, as evidenced by the combined presence of both dental plates (Johanson *et al.* 2021) and strong jaw adductor muscles (Huber *et al.* 2008).

Here, we focus on the lower jaw (i.e., Meckel's cartilage) of *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 to test the role of both cortical thickening and the presence of trabeculae in absorbing the mechanical stress due to the contraction of the jaw adductor muscles and the compression from biting transmitted by the dental plates to Meckel's cartilage during hard-prey crushing (Huber *et al.* 2008). To do so, we use a combination of finite element models of the calcified Meckel's cartilage (Fig. 1) and histological cross sections in order to explore the possible link between mechanical stress and the development of microanatomical structures (i.e., cortical thickness, trabecular structures) in the tessellated cartilage. Specifically, we ask: do the chondrocytes possess a mechanosensing property (Williantarra *et al.* 2022) allowing to strengthen the chondrichthyan cartilage by calcification (Takagi *et al.* 1984; Hara *et al.* 2018; i.e., either via cortical thickening or trabecular reticulation) in response to external loading? Beyond the adaptation to hard-prey crushing in holocephalans, such a cartilage property might further be at the origin of a large set of adaptive morphological traits that were useful to respond to external stress throughout 400 million years of evolution (Burrow & Blaauwen 2021).

MATERIAL AND METHODS

SAMPLE

We sampled three specimens that belong to *Chimaera monstrosa* (Holocephali): one juvenile (skull length: 68 mm) which was collected in 2005 by Alan Pradel during an IFREMER mission (under the funding of John G. Maisey) in the Gulf of Gascony (Atlantic ocean); one sub-adult (MNHN-2022-361; skull length: 95 mm) and one fully mature specimen (MNHN-2022-362; skull length: 115 mm), which were also captured in the Atlantic Ocean and gathered by the marine station of Concarneau (Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Quai de la Croix, 29900 Concarneau, France). All specimens were preserved in ethanol (70°). We scanned both the sub-adult (MNHN-2022-361) and the fully mature specimen (MNHN-2022-362) at the μ CT scan platform (AST-RX) of the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle at a voxel size of 71 μ m. Before scanning, the sub-adult specimen (MNHN-2022-361) was placed in a contrast agent (phosphomolybdic acid, 5%) to reconstruct the cranial muscles in 3D (see below).

3D-MODELLING

We modeled both the sub-adult (MNHN-2022-361) and the adult specimen (MNHN-2022-362) using segmentation software (Mimics 21.0.0.46, Materialise license, Technologielaan 153001 Leuven Belgique). For the adult specimen we segmented the calcified cartilage which is distinguishable by its high contrast on the tomographic slides. As we previously stained the sub-adult specimen (MNHN-2022-361) with

phosphomolybdic acid, we also segmented the muscles that are involved in the jaw adduction (i.e., the anterior adductors and the posterior adductors).

In order to export watertight STL files to build a FE model of the lower jaw (Meckel's cartilage), we repeated the segmentation using VG Studiomax (version 3.1; Speyerer Straße 4-6 69115 Heidelberg Germany). We thus created: 1) one realistic model which includes all the calcified cartilage (i.e., with the trabeculae that interconnect the tesseræ and external collar); and 2) one virtual model that only consists of the tessellated external collar. We cleaned the exported mesh by correcting the remaining problems using Geomagic Wrap 2021 (version 2.1; Artec 3D, 4 Rue Lou Hemmer, L-1748 Senningerberg (Headquarters) 11 Breedewues, Luxembourg) before we exported a final STL file for further importation into a Finite Element software (Strand7 R 3.1.3, Suite 1, Level 565 York Street Sydney NSW 2000 Australia). We finally created a volume tetrahedral mesh on Strand7 for both models, each of which is composed of more than 37 million of bricks (tetrahedrons).

MUSCLE FORCES

We dissected the adult specimen (MNHN-2022-362), which we further used for finite element models. In order to facilitate the dissection, we previously fixed the specimen in a 10% formaldehyde solution for 48 hours, rinsed it overnight and transferred it to a 70% aqueous ethanol solution. We dissected and weighed the muscles after removing the excess of alcohol. Muscles were transferred to petri dishes which were filled with nitric acid (30% in water) in order to separate the muscle fibres. After a period of 24 hours, we removed the nitric acid from the petri dish and added a 50% aqueous glycerol solution to arrest fibre digestion. We finally separated the fibres with the use of tweezers and needles so we measured 10 fibres per muscle in order to calculate their mean length. Within the same step, we measured the pennation angle (θ). We subsequently calculated the physiological cross section area (PCSA; Appendix 1) of each muscle and deduced the theoretical maximum tetanic force (P_o).

$$P_{CSA} = \frac{\text{muscle mass}}{\text{muscle density}} \cdot \cos\theta \cdot \frac{1}{\text{fiber length}}$$

$$P_o = P_{CSA} \cdot T_{SPR}$$

With a gnathostome muscle density value of 1.05 g.cm⁻³ (Powell *et al.* 1984; Wainwright 1988; Huber *et al.* 2008) and the specific tension of elasmobranch red muscle (T_{SPR} = 142 kN.m⁻²; Lou *et al.* 2002).

THEORETICAL BITE FORCE

Using Geomagic Wrap, we imported a STL file of both the lower jaw (Meckel's cartilage), the upper jaw (fused neurocranium and palatoquadrate) and the dental plates of the adult specimen (MNHN-2022-362) at a gape angle of 0°; we then created an anatomical coordinate system (ACS). We defined the origin of the system at the left joint between the lower jaw and the upper jaw, the X axis is defined toward the anterior part of the lower jaw, the Y axis is defined by the lateral axis




FIG. 1. — Determination of the mechanical stress in the lower jaw (Meckel's cartilage) due to biting in *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (Holocephali): **A**, step 1, 3D modeling, *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 sub-adult (MNHN-2022-361), gape angle 40°; **B**, step 2, muscle vectorisation, *C. monstrosa* adult (MNHN-2022-362), gape angle 0°; **C**, step 3, ACS, *C. monstrosa* adult (MNHN-2022-362), gape angle 0°: **C1**, posterior view; **C2**, left view; **D**, step 4, muscle force estimation; **E**, step 5, theoretical bite force estimation; **F**, step 6, von Mises Stress calculation in the Meckel's cartilage (finite element model): **F1**, anterior view; **F2**, posterior view. Abbreviations: **ACS**, anatomical coordinate system; **AMA**, adductor mandibulae anterior; **AMP**, adductor mandibulae posterior. See "Material and methods" for details. Scale bars: 1 cm.




FIG. 2. — Distribution of the von Mises stress in the lower jaw (Meckel's cartilage) due to biting in the adult specimen of *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (MNHN-2022-362): **A**, the realistic model that includes all the calcified cartilage (i.e., the trabeculae that connect the tesserae within the external collar); **B**, the modified model that only consists of the tessellated external collar; **A1, B1**, anterior view; **A2, B2**, posterior view; **A3, B3**, dorsal view; **A4, B4**, transversal cross-sectional views; **A5, B5**, left lateral view; **A6, B6**, longitudinal cross section. The **black lines** delimit the areas where the forces were applied (i.e., on the labial regions: the jaw adductor muscle insertions; on the lingual regions: the dental plate insertions). Abbreviations: **AMA**, adductor mandibulae anterior; **AMP**, adductor mandibulae posterior. Scale bars: 1 cm.

TABLE 1. — Statistical summary of the von Mises stress and brick displacements in the lower jaw (Meckel’s cartilage) of *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (MNHN-2022-362): **model A**, the realistic model which includes all the calcified cartilage (i.e., the trabeculae that interconnect within the tesseræ external collar); **model B**, the modified model that only consists of the tessellated external collar; Wilcoxon rank test comparison between the model A and the model B. Abbreviations: **Displ.**, displacement; **Qu.**, quartile, **X**, longitudinal axis; **Y**, lateral axis; **Z**, vertical axis (shown in Figure 1 and detailed in “Material and methods”). **Asterisks** mean test significance.

Model A: realistic model which includes all the calcified cartilage						
Brick	Min	1 st Qu.	Median	Mean	3 rd Qu.	Max
Stress (MPa)	0	0.3693	0.9002	1.4342	1.8566	197.5030
Displ. X (mm)	0	0.003421	0.023854	0.038097	0.065983	0.154583
Displ. Y (mm)	0	0.004677	0.017300	0.047484	0.081410	0.224477
Displ. Z (mm)	0	0.006125	0.020331	0.021307	0.032731	0.067055
Model B: modified model that only consists of the tessellated external collar						
Brick	Min	1 st Qu.	Median	Mean	3 rd Qu.	Max
Stress (MPa)	0	1.151	2.685	4.672	5.645	516.138
Displ. X (mm)	0	0.04638	0.13430	0.15866	0.24928	0.52995
Displ. Y (mm)	0	0.009794	0.020331	0.021307	0.032731	0.067055
Displ. Z (mm)	0	0.3512	0.7825	0.7462	1.1477	1.5842
Wilcoxon rank test comparison between the model A and the model B						
Brick	W	P-value				
Stress (MPa)	5.7783e+14	< 2.2e-16***				
Displ. X (mm)	7.617e+13	< 2.2e-16***				
Displ. Y (mm)	5.9894e+13	< 2.2e-16***				
Displ. Z (mm)	6.8802e+12	< 2.2e-16***				

between the left to the right joint, the Z axis is orthogonal to Y and X and points dorsally. We then imported and scaled both the anterior and the posterior adductor muscles from the sub-adult specimen (MNHN-2022-361) so we could define both the muscle insertion and origin areas on the adult specimen skull via a Boolean operation (i.e., intersection between two objects). We then defined the centroid of these intersection areas with the dedicated tool so we could model the muscles as vectors and further compute both their length and orientation relative to each axis (X, Y, Z). We could thus deduce the force component of each muscle along each axis (X, Y, Z) when the gape angle is 0° (Fig. 1A-D; Appendix 2):

$$P_{o(X,Y,Z)} = P_o \cos \alpha_{(X,Y,Z)}$$

With α the angle between the muscle vector and each axis at the muscle insertion on the lower jaw.

We repeated the upper Boolean operation between the Meckel’s cartilage and the dental plate in order to determine their intersection. We could then calculate the theoretical bite force at the centroid of the intersection area when the gape angle is 0°, using the following formula (Fig. 1D, E):

$$F_{B(z)} = \frac{F_{AMA(z)} \cdot lever_{AMA(x)} + F_{AMP(z)} \cdot lever_{AMP(x)}}{lever_{B(x)}}$$

With “lever” the distance between each centroid and the origin of the ACS along the X axis.

FINITE ELEMENT MODEL

After we created the 3D-volume mesh on Strand 7, we imported the perimeter of the 6 intersection areas (IGES files) in order to circle and identify the nodes on which we

applied the forces (Fig. 1F). We previously determined the component of each muscle force along the 3 ACS axes (X, Y, Z) using a trigonometric formula:

$$F_{M(X,Y,Z)} = F_M \cos \alpha_{(X,Y,Z)}$$

Where α is the angle between the muscle force vector and the ACS axes (X, Y, Z). The calculated force components are summarised in Appendix 2.

To apply the theoretical bite force on the intersection area between the Meckel’s cartilage and each dental plate, we considered that the resulting force acts only vertically along the Z axis since the gape angle is 0° (Fig. 1C-E).

$$F_{B(x)} = 0; F_{B(y)} = 0; F_{B(z)} = F_B = 22.85 \text{ N}$$

We imposed zero nodal displacement to the elements of the joint area that contact the palatoquadrate (upper jaw). We disregard the stress absorption effect of the hyaline cartilage which homogeneously surrounds the calcified cartilage both on the outer and the inner part of the tessellated collar (see Fig. 3C1). We also disregard the part of the bite force component that should be partly absorbed by the dental plate that has a very complex structure (Smith *et al.* 2020).

Since our purpose here is to compare the mechanical effect of the struts, we repeated the same analysis over two versions of the same model by including one in which the trabeculae have been artificially removed (as explained above). We calculated both the three-dimensional displacement of the tetrahedral bricks (i.e., the finite elements) and the von Mises criterion (a scalar measure encompassing the whole 3D stress state, which is commonly used to define a strength criterion in terms of the maximum distortion of a ductile material; Fig. 1F) after




FIG. 3. — The tessellated cartilage reinforcement process: **A**, von Mises stress in the lower jaw (Meckel's cartilage) of the adult specimen of *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (MNHN-2022-362): **A1**, dorsal view of the whole element; **A2**, **A3**, transversal cross-sectional views; **B**, histological cross sections of the adult specimen of *Chimaera monstrosa* (MNHN-2022-362); **B1**, cortical thickening; **B2**, single tesseræ layer; **B3**, trabeculae. The Masson's trichrome colorant stains in **pink**, the mineralized cartilage, in **blue**, the hyaline cartilage, in **green**, the perichondrium; **C**, histological cross sections of the juvenile specimen of *Chimaera monstrosa*; **C1**, monolayered tesseræ collar; **C2**, cortical thickening and trabeculae setting; **C3**, chondrocyte mineralization. The toluidine stains in purple: the calcified cartilage, in **deep blue**, the chondrocytes. Symbols: **asterisk**, hyaline cartilage; **black arrows**, monolayer of tesseræ; **green arrow**, dying chondrocyte after growing several rings of calcified cartilage (called Liesegang waves); **red arrows**, globular cartilage calcification; **yellow arrow**, chondrocyte mineralization. Scale bars: A, 1 cm; B, C1, C2, 100 μ m; C3, 10 μ m.

setting a Young modulus of ($E = 4.05$ GPa) and a Poisson ratio of 0.30 (Wroe *et al.* 2008). In order to assess the sensitivity of our results to the choice of the mechanical properties, we repeated the calculation with a much higher Young modulus ($E = 40$ GPa). We noticed no difference in the results (i.e., von Mises stress). We ran a Linear Static Analysis (LSA, which involves a small deformation with no change of loading with

time), a sparse storage scheme, an AMD sorting method and an Iterative Preconditioned Conjugate Gradient (PCG) solution type. After solving the finite element model, we exported the displacements and the mean stress calculated for each finite element (in a .txt format). We opened this file with R 4.0.0 (CRAN; R Core team) and ran a Wilcoxon signed-rank test to compare both the median brick von Mises stress and




FIG. 4. — Summary of the cartilage mechanosensing mineralization hypothesis in the holocephalan jaw. In **blue**, the hyaline cartilage; in **light purple**, the cartilage under calcification; in **dark purple**, the calcified cartilage.

the median brick displacement between the two models. We estimated that this non-parametric statistical test which aims to compare the median value between two paired groups was suitable since the data should not follow a normal distribution in our model. Indeed, we compare the median stress between two populations that are made of interconnected finite elements (Clarac *et al.* 2024). Both the brick displacement and stress values are summarized in Table 1.

HISTOLOGICAL SECTIONS FOR LIGHT MICROSCOPY

We performed semi-thin sections on the lower jaw of the juvenile specimen, which we fixed in 2.5% glutaraldehyde, 2% paraformaldehyde in 0.1 mol/l cacodylate buffer after removing most of the flesh. The samples were demineralized with 5% EDTA added in the fixative. The demineralized samples were dehydrated and subsequently embedded in Epon. Semi-thin sections (100 microns thick) stained with toluidine blue were examined by light microscopy. We then performed paraffin sections on lower jaw samples of the fully mature specimen (MNHN-2022-362), which we fixed in a Bouin's mixture, dehydrated in butanol, and embedded in paraffin. The sections were stained with Masson's trichrome (as in Marconi *et al.* 2020). For both semi-thin and paraffin sections, the lower jaw cartilage was longitudinally and transversely sectioned.

RESULTS

The contraction of the adductor muscles combined with the reaction force on the jaw at the bite point results in a high stress on the posterior dorsal region of the Meckel's cartilage toward the lower jaw joint (Fig. 2A). To assess the consequences of mechanical stress from a histological point of view, Masson's trichrome staining is particularly suitable. Mineralized cartilage is stained pink, contrasting with

non-mineralized hyaline cartilage stained in blue (Fig. 3B). In addition, there is a gradation of pink depending on the degree of mineralization. In this way, we were able to highlight cartilage mineralization in a precise spatio-temporal manner. Areas of constraints are obviously reinforced by a cortical thickening of the calcified tessellated collar, which likely helps absorb the high stress. Notable is the development of globular cartilage which grows from the tesseræ monolayer to the perichondrium (Figs 2A4 Cross section 1; 3B1). The stress is also high in the anterior dorsal region of the lower jaw, likely as a result of the shearing constraints that are due to the combined tensile forces generated by the adductor muscles and the compression of the dental plate where the stress is absorbed by the trabeculae (or "struts") that interconnect the external tessellated collar (Fig. 2A4 Cross section 2). These trabeculae are set up through the development of globular cartilage that grows from the hyaline cartilage matrix that is enclosed in the tessellated collar (Fig. 3B3). Mineralization progresses from the tesseræ towards the center of the collar. Both mineralization fronts join to form parallel highly mineralized trabeculae interspersed with hyaline cartilage. These trabeculae do not only absorb the local stress but also maintain the overall lower jaw structure. Indeed, the finite element model on which we artificially removed the trabeculae (Fig. 2B) shows an extension of the high stress area over the ventral region of the lower jaw (where the external tessellated collar is only made up of a tesseræ monolayer; Figs 2B; 3B2). The finite element analysis shows that the removal of the trabeculae provokes an increase of the median von Mises stress from 0.90 MPa to 2.69 MPa and a higher brick displacement mainly along the vertical axis (Z) and secondarily along the longitudinal axis (X) (Table 1, Appendix 3).

Cortical thickening and trabeculae development involve the same process of globular cartilage growth, which is observable from the juvenile stage (Fig. 3C). This growth is initiated by the chondrocytes that are located in the hyaline cartilage either distally between the tessellated collar and the perichondrium or proximally within the tessellated collar (Fig. 3C2). The combined individual action of each chondrocyte results in the connection of various irregular calcified blocks (Fig. 3C2) that will eventually shape up as bone-like microstructures (Fig. 3B1, B3). The chondrocytes will be progressively surrounded by several concentric layers of calcified cartilage before they may eventually die (Fig. 3C3). As calcification progresses, the tesseræ may lose their cuboidal shape and merge with newly formed calcified blocks (Fig. 3B3). At this later stage, it is difficult to delimit the tesseræ which seem to have fused with neighboring elements (Fig. 4).

DISCUSSION

Our results suggest that the post-hatching mineralization of the holocephalan lower jaw is built in response to the mechanical stress that is induced by hard-prey crushing. Observations on *Callorhynchus callorhynchus* (Linnaeus, 1758) (Holocephali) show that there are no trabeculae in the lower jaw of neither

pre-hatching nor hatchling specimens (Appendix 4) whereas they are present in adults. Therefore, unless the Liesegang waves mineralize along a pre-established late developmental pattern, the holocephalan jaw chondrocytes shall possess a mechanical sensing property (Williantarra *et al.* 2022) that allows to calcify the cartilage (Kemp & Westrin 1979; Takagi *et al.* 1984; Hara *et al.* 2018) in response to the recurrent external loading associated with hard-prey crushing. Such a cellular mechanism would be key in the evolution of Chondrichthyes since they are assumed to have lost (Rineau *et al.* 2015) their bony skeleton during the Silurian (Pradel *et al.* 2014; Coates *et al.* 2018; Frey *et al.* 2020). Indeed, this would provide a mechanism allowing to mineralize their hyaline cartilage in response to external loading without the action of bone cells. Moreover, in contrast to bone growth and remodeling that relies on a blood vessel network (Zoetis *et al.* 2003), the cartilage calcification does not need any vascular supply and might thus require less metabolic energy (De Paula & Rosen 2013). Even though our results show that the tesserae layers are difficult to identify in some secondarily calcified areas (i.e., at the base of the trabeculae; Fig. 3B3), we cannot so far demonstrate any cell resorption activity that targets the calcified cartilage in analogous way to bone resorption which allows secondary bone remodeling in bony skeleton vertebrates (Teitelbaum 2000).

The mineralizing chondrocyte abilities likely permits a large spectrum of morphologies that could be at the origin of putative functional adaptations that rely on the jaw cartilage reinforcement via local calcification (Dingerkus *et al.* 1991; Clark *et al.* 2022). For instance, within the early holocephalans, some species are known to be durophagous and to possess similar “struts” in the upper jaw (i.e., *Helodus* Agassiz, 1838; Johanson *et al.* 2021; Coates *et al.* 2021), whereas others, such as *Iniopera* sp. are thought to be suction feeders (Late Carboniferous, 305-299 Ma; Dearden *et al.* 2023), which is the type of feeding that is the least mechanically constraining since the jaws are not involved in food prehension. Within this extinct form, we observed the absence of both cortical thickening and trabeculae within the lower jaw that is instead only composed of continuous monolayered tesserae (Appendix 5). These observations suggest that the acquisition of such microanatomical features went hand in hand with the adaptation to durophagy in holocephalans. The independent convergence of these traits in both holocephalan and the elasmobranch durophagous taxa (e.g. the myliobatid stingrays; Summers *et al.* 1998; the hybodontid sharks; Lane & Maisey 2012) is made possible by the plasticity of the chondrichthyan tessellated cartilage. The chondrocyte biomineralization abilities likely originated in acanthodians (Burrow & Blaauwen 2021) or even perhaps in early jawless vertebrates since globular calcified cartilage has been documented in at least some of them (e.g. *Astraspis* Walcott, 1892; Lemierre & Germain 2019). Such a cell property would have subsequently allowed to strengthen parts of the skeleton subjected to major mechanical stress to grow mechanically demanding adaptations within “bone-less” vertebrates over 400 million years ago.

Acknowledgements

This research project was supported by the ANR-22-CE02-0015-01_MACHER which was obtained by Dr. Alan Pradel (Curator at the Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle) in collaboration with Prof. Quentin Grimal (Sorbonne Université) and Prof. Anthony Herrel (Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle). We thank both Hayat Lamrous (Lab technician at the Centre de Recherche de Paléontologie-Paris) for preparing the histological cross sections and our 3D-platform engineers (Florent Goussard and Nathalie Poulet-Crovisier) for helping with the installation of the software. We send our respectful regards to both Prof. Mickael Coates for sharing CT-scan data of the skull of *Helodus simplex* (NHMUK PV P8212) and Prof. Adam Summers for sharing raw images of the specimen SIO 64-483, which was scanned by Matt Kolmann at the Scripps Museum (California, United States). We also wish to acknowledge all the participants who were involved in the collecting of the specimens: Samuel Iglesias (station marine de Concarneau, Muséum national d’Histoire naturelle), Robert Bellail (station marine de la Rochelle-L’Houmeau, Ifremer), Edgardo Ernesto Di Giacomo (Station Marine de San Antonio Oeste, Rio Negro, Instituto de Biología Marina y Pesquera Almirante Storni de la Universidad de Comahue). We also thanks the associated editor, Philippe Janvier, and the referees.

REFERENCES

- ATAKE O., COOPER D. M. L. & EAMES B. F. 2019. — Bone-like feature in skate suggest a novel elasmobranch synapomorphy and deep homology of trabecular mineralisation patterns. *Acta Biomaterialia* 84: 424-436. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actbio.2018.11.047>
- ATAKE O. J., BERIO F., DEBIAIS-THIBAUD M. & EAMES B. F. 2024. — Extant cartilaginous fishes share trabecular and areolar mineralisation patterns, but not tesserae, and evidence for a paedomorphic chimaera skeleton. *eLife* 13: RP94900. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.94900.1>
- BERIO F., BROYON M., ENAULT S., PIROT N., LÓPEZ-ROMERO F. A. & DEBIAIS-THIBAUD M. 2021. — Diversity and evolution of mineralised skeletal tissues in chondrichthyans. *Frontiers in Ecology and Evolution* 9: 660767. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fevo.2021.660767>
- BOISVERT C. A., JOHNSTON P., TRINAJSTIC K. & JOHANSON Z. 2019. — Chondrichthyan evolution, diversity, and senses, in ZIERMANN J. M., DIAZ R. E. JR & DIOGO R. (eds), *Heads, Jaws, and Muscles*. Springer International Publishing, Fascinating Life Sciences, Berlin: 65-91. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-93560-7_4
- BURROW C. J. & BLAAUWEN J. L. 2021. — Endoskeleton tissues of acanthodians (Stem Chondrichthyes), in PRADEL A., DENTON J. S. S. & JANVIER P. (eds), *Ancient Fishes and Their Living Relatives: A Tribute to John G Maisey*. Verlag Dr. Freidrich Pfeil, Munich, 81-91.
- CLARAC F., CORNILLE A., BIJL S. & SANCHEZ S. 2024. — Tetrapod terrestrialisation: a weight-bearing potential already present in the humerus of the stem-tetrapod fish *Eusthenopteron fordsi*. *bioRxiv* 2024.02.09.579723. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.09.579723>
- CLARK B., CHAUMEL J., JOHANSON Z., UNDERWOOD C., SMITH M. M. & DEAN M. N. 2022. — Bricks, trusses and superstructures: strategies for skeletal reinforcement in batoid fishes (rays and skates). *Frontiers in Cell and Developmental Biology* 10: 932341. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fcell.2022.932341>

- COATES M. I., FINARELLI J. A., SANSOM I. J., ANDREEV P. S., CRISWELL K. E., TIETJEN K., RIVERS M. L. & LA RIVIERE P. J. 2018. — An early chondrichthyan and the evolutionary assembly of a shark body plan. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 285: 20172418. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.2418>
- COATES M. I., TIETJEN K., JOHANSON Z., FRIEDMAN M. & SANG S. 2021. — The cranium of *Helodus simplex* (Agassiz, 1838) revised, in PRADEL A., DENTON J. S. S. & JANVIER P. (eds), *Ancient Fishes and Their Living Relatives: A Tribute to John G Maisey*. Verlag Dr. Friedrich Pfeil, Munich: 193-204.
- DE PAULA F. J. A. & ROSEN C. J. 2013. — Bone remodeling and energy metabolism: new perspectives. *Bone Research* 1: 72-84. <https://doi.org/10.4248/BR201301005>
- DEAN M. N. & SUMMERS A. P. 2006. — Mineralised cartilage in the skeleton of chondrichthyan fishes. *Zoology* 109 (2): 164-168. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.zool.2006.03.002>
- DEAN M. N., MULL C. G., GORB S. N. & SUMMERS A. P. 2009. — Ontogeny of the tessellated skeleton: insight from the skeletal growth of the round stingray *Urobatis halleri*. *Journal of Anatomy* 215 (3): 227-239. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2009.01116.x>
- DEARDEN R. P., HERREL A. & PRADEL A. 2023. — Evidence for high-performance suction feeding in the Pennsylvanian stem-group holocephalan *Iniopera*. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 120 (4): e2207854119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2207854119>
- DEBIAIS-THIBAUD M. 2019. — 6. The evolution of endoskeletal mineralisation in chondrichthyan fish. Development, cells and molecules, in JOHANSON Z., UNDERWOOD C. & RICHTER M. (eds), *Evolution and Development of Fishes*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom: 110-125.
- DINGERKUS G., SÉRET B. & GUILBERT E. 1991. — Multiple prismatic calcium phosphate layers in the jaws of present-day sharks (Chondrichthyes; Selachii). *Experientia* 47: 38-40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02041246>
- FREY L., COATES M. I., TIETJEN K., RÜCKLIN M. & KLUG C. 2020. — A symmoriiform from the Late Devonian of Morocco demonstrates a derived jaw function in ancient chondrichthyans. *Communications Biology* 3: 681. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42003-020-01394-2>
- GROGAN E., LUND R. & GREENFEST-ALLEN E. 2012. — The origin and relationships of early chondrichthyans, in CARRIER J., MUSICK J. & HEITHAUS M. (eds), *Biology of Sharks and their Relatives*. CRC Press, Boca Raton: 3-31.
- HARA E. S., OKADA M., NAGAOKA N., HATTORI T., KUBOKI T., NAKANO T. & MATSUMOTO T. 2018. — Bioinspired mineralisation using chondrocyte membrane nanofragments. *ACS Biomaterials Science & Engineering* 4 (2): 617-625. <https://doi.org/10.1021/acsbomaterials.7b00962>
- HUBER D. R., DEAN M. N. & SUMMERS A. P. 2008. — Hard prey, soft jaws and the ontogeny of feeding mechanics in the spotted ratfish *Hydrolagus coliei*. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 5 (25): 1867-1878. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2007.1325>
- JOHANSON Z., UNDERWOOD C., COATES M. I., FERNANDEZ V., CLARK B. & SMITH M. M. 2021. — The stem-holocephalan *Helodus* (Chondrichthyes; Holocephali) and the evolution of modern chimaeroid dentitions, in PRADEL A., DENTON J. S. S. & JANVIER P. (eds), *Ancient Fishes and Their Living Relatives: A tribute to John G Maisey*. Verlag Dr. Friedrich Pfeil, Munich: 205-214.
- KEMP N. E. & WESTRIN S. K. 1979. — Ultrastructure of calcified cartilage in the endoskeleton tesseræ of sharks. *Journal of Morphology* 160 (1): 75-102. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmor.1051600106>
- LANE J. A. & MAISEY J. G. 2012. — The visceral skeleton and jaw suspension in the durophagous hybodontid shark *Tribodus limae* from the Lower Cretaceous of Brazil. *Journal of Paleontology* 86 (5): 886-905. <https://doi.org/10.1666/11-139.1>
- LEMIERRE A. & GERMAIN D. 2019. — A new mineralised tissue in the early vertebrate *Astraspis*. *Journal of Anatomy* 235 (6): 1105-1113. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.13070>
- LOU F., CURTIN N. A. & WOLEDGE R. C. 2002. — Isometric and isovelocity contractile performance of red muscle fibres from the dogfish *Scyliorhinus canicular*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 205 (11): 1585-1595. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.205.11.1585>
- MAISEY J. G., MILLER R., PRADEL A., DENTON J. S. S., BRONSON A. & JANVIER P. 2017. — Pectoral morphology in *Doliodus*: bridging the ‘acanthodian’ – chondrichthyan divide. *American Museum Novitates* 3875: 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1206/3875.1>
- MAISEY J. G., DENTON J. S. S., BURROW C. & PRADEL A. 2021. — Architectural and ultrastructural features of tessellated calcified cartilage in modern and extinct chondrichthyan fishes. *Journal of Fish Biology* 98 (4): 919-941. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14376>
- MARCONI A., HANCOCK-RONEMUS A. & GILLIS J. A. 2020. — Adult chondrogenesis and spontaneous cartilage repair in the skate, *Leucoraja erinacea*. *eLife*: 2020;9: e53414. <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.53414>
- PAZZAGLIA U. E., REGUZZONI M., MANCONI R., ZECCA P. A., ZARATTINI G., CAMPAGNOLO M. & RASPANTI M. 2022a. — The combined cartilage growth – calcification patterns in the wing-fins of Rajidae (Chondrichthyes): a divergent model from endochondral ossification of tetrapods. *Microscopy Research & Technique* 85 (11): 3642-3652. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jemt.24217>
- PAZZAGLIA U. E., REGUZZONI M., MANCONI R., ZECCA P. A., ZARATTINI G., CAMPAGNOLO M. & RASPANTI M. 2022b. — Morphology of joints and patterns of cartilage calcification in the endoskeleton of the batoid *Raja cf. polystigma*. *Journal of Anatomy* 240 (6): 1127-1140. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.13623>
- POWELL P. L., ROY R. R., KANIM P., BELLO M. A. & EDGERTON V. R. 1984. — Predictability of skeletal muscle tension from architectural determinations of guinea pigs. *Journal of Applied Physiology* 57 (6): 1715-1721. <https://doi.org/10.1152/jappl.1984.57.6.1715>
- PRADEL A., MAISEY J. G., TAFFOREAU P., MAPES R. H. & MALLATT J. 2014. — A Palaeozoic shark with osteichthyan-like branchial arches. *Nature* 509: 608-611. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13195>
- RINEAU V., GRAND A., ZARAGUETA R. & LAURIN M. 2015. — Experimental systematics: sensitivity of cladistic methods to polarization and character ordering schemes. *Contributions to Zoology* 84 (2): 129-148. <https://doi.org/10.1163/18759866-08402003>
- SEIDEL R., BLUMER M., ZASLANSKY P., KNÖTEL D., HUBER D. R., WEAVER J. C., FRATZL P., OMELON S., BERTINETTI L. & DEAN M. N. 2017. — Ultrastructural, material and crystallographic description of endophytic masses – A possible damage response in shark and ray tessellated calcified cartilage. *Journal of Structural Biology* 198 (1): 5-18. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsb.2017.03.004>
- SEIDEL R., BLUMER M., CHAUMEL J., AMINI S. & DEAN M. N. 2020. — Endoskeletal mineralisation in chimaera and a comparative guide to tessellated cartilage in chondrichthyan fishes (sharks, rays and chimaera). *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* 17 (171): 20200474. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsif.2020.0474>
- SEIDEL R., JAYASANKAR A. K. & DEAN M. N. 2021. — The multiscale architecture of tessellated cartilage and its relation to function. *Journal of Fish Biology* 98 (4): 942-955. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14444>
- SMITH M., MANZANARES E., UNDERWOOD C., HEALY C., CLARK B. & JOHANSON Z. 2020. — Holocephalan (Chondrichthyes) dental plates with hypermineralised dentine as a substitute for missing teeth through developmental plasticity. *Journal of Fish Biology* 97 (1): 16-27. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jfb.14302>

- SUMMERS A. P., KOOB T. J. & BRAINERD E. L. 1998. — Stingray jaws strut their stuff. *Nature* 395: 450-451. <https://doi.org/10.1038/26649>
- SUMMERS A. P. 2000. — Stiffening the stingray skeleton — An investigation of durophagy in myliobatid stingrays (Chondrichthyes, Batoidea, Myliobatidae). *Journal of Morphology* 243 (2): 113-126. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4687\(200002\)243:2<113::AID-JMOR1>3.0.CO;2-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4687(200002)243:2<113::AID-JMOR1>3.0.CO;2-A)
- SWARTZ S. M., PARKER A. & HUO C. 1998. — Theoretical and empirical scaling patterns and topological homology in bone trabeculae. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 201 (4): 573-590. <https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.201.4.573>
- TAKAGI M., PARMLEY R. T., DENYS F. R., YAGASAKI H. & TODA Y. 1984. — Ultrastructural cytochemistry of proteoglycans associated with calcification of shark cartilage. *Anatomical Record* 208 (2): 149-158. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.1092080202>
- TEITELBAUM S. L. 2000. — Bone resorption by osteoclasts. *Science* 289 (5484): 1504-1508. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.289.5484.1504>
- WAINWRIGHT P. C. 1988. — Morphology and ecology: functional basis of feeding constraints in Caribbean labrid fishes. *Ecology* 69 (3): 635-645. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1941012>
- WILLIANTARRA I., LEUNG S., CHOI Y. S., CHHANA A. & MCGLASHAN S. R. 2022. — Chondrocyte-specific response to stiffness-mediated primary cilia formation and centriole positioning. *American Journal of Physiology - Cell Physiology* 323 (1): C236-C247. <https://doi.org/10.1152/ajpcell.00135.2022>
- WROE S., HUBER D. R., LOWRY M., MCHENRY C., MORENO K., CLAUSEN P., FERRARA T. L., CUNNINGHAM E., DEAN M. N. & SUMMERS A. P. 2008. — Three-dimensional computer analysis of white shark jaw mechanics: how hard can a great white bite? *Journal of Zoology* 276 (4): 336-342. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2008.00494.x>
- ZOETIS T., TASSINARI M. S., BAGI C., WALTHALL K. & HURTT M. E. 2003. — Species comparison of postnatal bone growth and development. *Birth Defects Research Part B* 68 (2): 86-110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/bdrb.10012>

*Submitted on 18 September 2024;
accepted on 10 December 2024;
published on 21 March 2025.*

APPENDICES


APPENDIX 1. — Cranial muscle characteristics of the adult specimen of *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (MNHN-2022-362; after dissection, see “Material and methods” for details). Abbreviation: **PCSA**, physiological cross section area.

Cranial muscles	Weight (gr.)	Pennation angle (rad)	Mean Fibre Length (cm)	Muscle density (g/cm ³)	PCSA (cm ²)
<i>M. Epiaxialis</i>	1.58	0	1.95	1.05	0.77
<i>M. Protractor dorsalis pectoralis</i>	1.69	0.35	1.34	1.05	1.13
<i>M. Retractor latero-ventralis pectoralis</i>	1.97	0.785	1.86	1.05	0.72
<i>M. Constrictor operculi dorsalis anterior</i>	0.74	0.35	1.89	1.05	0.35
<i>M. Constrictor operculi dorsalis</i>	1.75	2.18	2.47	1.05	0.39
<i>M. Cucullaris superficialis</i>	2.66	0	1.73	1.05	1.47
<i>M. Adductor mandibulae anterior</i>	5.26	0.52	2.05	1.05	2.11
<i>M. Levator anguli oris anterior</i>	0.51	0	2.90	1.05	0.17
<i>M. Levator anguli oris posterior</i>	3.47	0	2.54	1.05	1.30
<i>M. Adductor mandibulae posterior</i>	0.70	0.52	1.10	1.05	0.53
<i>M. Constrictor operculi ventralis</i>	2.10	0.70	2.83	1.05	0.54
<i>M. Coracomandibularis</i>	3.46	0.087	3.00	1.05	1.10
<i>M. Coracohyoideus</i>	1.00	0	2.00	1.05	0.48
<i>mm. Coracobranchiales</i>	6.91	0.87	1.78	1.05	2.38


APPENDIX 2. — Calculation of the jaw adductor muscle force components in the adult specimen of *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (MNHN-2022-362). Abbreviations: **PCSA**, physiological cross section area; **Po**, the muscle theoretical maximum tetanic force; **TSPR**, the specific tension of elasmobranch red muscle; **α**, the angle between the muscle vector and each axis at the muscle insertion on the lower jaw.

Jaw adductor muscles	PCSA (cm ²)	TSPR (kNm ⁻²)	Po (N)	cos α			Force components (N)		
				X	Y	Z	X	Y	Z
L Anterior	2.11	142	30	-0.67	-0.19	0.717	-20.15	-5.61	21.51
L Posterior	0.525	142	7.46	-0.97	0.22	0.11	-7.23	1.601	0.82
R Anterior	2.11	142	30	-0.67	0.19	0.72	-20.15	5.61	21.51
R Posterior	0.525	142	7.46	-0.97	-0.22	0.11	-7.23	-1.61	0.82

APPENDIX 3. — Brick displacement (in millimeters) along the vertical (Z) axis in the lower jaw (Meckel's cartilage) due to biting in the adult specimen of *Chimaera monstrosa* Linnaeus, 1758 (MNHN-2022-362): **A1, B1**, anterior view; **A2, B2**, posterior view; **A3, B3**, dorsal view; **A4, B4**, transversal cross-sectional views; **A5, B5**, left lateral view; **A6, B6**, longitudinal cross section. Scale bars: 1 cm.



APPENDIX 4. — Ontogenetic growth of the Meckel cartilage in *Callorhynchus callorhynchus* (Linnaeus, 1758): **A**, pre-hatching; **B**, hatchling; **C**, adult. The embryos (both pre-hatching and hatchling) were captured in the San Matías Gulf (Patagonia, Argentina, 2013). The specimens were fixed in a 10% formaldehyde solution and then preserved in a 96% ethanol solution for scanning at the European Synchrotron Radiation Facilities (ESRF) in Grenoble (France). This sampling was organized within a collaborative program between the Instituto de Biología Marina y Pesquera Alte Storni (San Antonio Oeste, Río Negro, Argentina), the American Museum of Natural History (New-York City, United States), the Laboratoire Evolution Génomes Comportement Ecologie (Paris, France), the Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle (Paris, France) and the Medical University of South Carolina, Marine Genomics (United States). The adult specimen (SIO 64-483) was provided by Adam Summers and was scanned by Matt Kolmann at the Scripps Museum (California, United States). Scale bars: 1 cm.



APPENDIX 5. — **A**, Right lateral view of the skull of *Iniopera* sp. (KUVV 22060), the Upper Pennsylvanian (late Virgilian, 305 to 299 Ma) Haskell Formation, Kansas, United States; **B**, transversal cross section of the posterior part of the lower jaw; **C**, transversal cross section of the anterior part of the lower jaw. . Scale bars: 1 mm.

A

