Total evidence tip-dating phylogeny of platyrrhine primates and 27 well-justified fossil calibrations for primate divergences

Dorien de Vries ^a, Robin M. D. Beck ^{a,*}

^a *Ecosystems and Environment Research Centre, School of Science, Engineering and Environment, University of Salford, Manchester, UK*

***Corresponding author.**

E-mail address: r.m.d.beck@salford.ac.uk (R. M. D. Beck).

Acknowledgments

We thank the following people for discussion, for providing references, or both: David Alba, Pierre-Olivier Antoine, Ornella Bertrand, Jean Boubli, Lawrence Flynn, Christopher Gilbert, Ian Goodhead, Mareike Janiak, Laurent Marivaux, Michael Matschiner, Michèle Morgan, Christian Roos, and Erik Seiffert. Mareike Janiak helped write the code that generated Figures 1 and 2. Funding for this paper was provided by NERC Standard Grant "Rise of the continent of the monkeys" (NE/T000341/1).

Total evidence tip-dating phylogeny of platyrrhine primates and 27 well-justified fossil calibrations for primate divergences

Abstract

Phylogenies with estimates of divergence times are essential for investigating many evolutionary questions. In principle, “tip-dating” is arguably the most appropriate approach, with fossil and extant taxa analyzed together in a single analysis, and topology and divergence times estimated simultaneously. However, “node-dating” (as used in many molecular clock analyses), in which fossil evidence is used to calibrate the age of particular nodes a priori, will probably remain the dominant approach, due to various issues with analyzing morphological and molecular data together. Tip-dating may nevertheless play a key role in robustly identifying fossil taxa that can be used to inform node-dating calibrations. Here, we present tip-dating analyses of platyrrhine primates (so-called “New World monkeys”) based on a total evidence dataset of 418 morphological characters and 10.2 kb of DNA sequence data from 17 nuclear genes, combined from previous studies. The resultant analyses support a late Oligocene or early Miocene age for crown Platyrrhini (composite age estimate: 20.7-28.2 Ma). Other key findings include placement of the early Miocene putative cebid *Panamacebus* outside crown Platyrrhini, equivocal support for *Proteropithecina* being a pitheciine, and support for a clade comprising three subfossil platyrrhines from the Caribbean (*Xenothrix*, *Antillothrix* and *Paralouatta*), related to Callicebinae. Based on these results and the available literature, we provide a list of 27 well-justified node calibrations for primate divergences, following best practices: 17 within Haplorhini, five within Strepsirrhini, one for crown Primates, and four for deeper divergences within Euarchontoglires. In each case, we provide a hard minimum bound, and for 23 of these

we also provide a soft maximum bound and a suggested prior distribution. For each calibrated node, we provide the age of the oldest fossil of each daughter lineage that descends from it, which allows use of the “CladeAge” method for specifying priors on node ages.

Keywords: primates; platyrrhines; fossil calibrations; molecular clocks; tip-dating; Bayesian phylogenetics; total evidence

1. Introduction

Phylogenies that provide estimates of divergence times between different lineages of organisms (“timetrees”) have the potential to be extremely useful for answering a wide range of questions relating to evolutionary patterns and processes (Blair Hedges and Kumar, 2009; Ho, 2021).

There has been a long history of applying such approaches to primates, for example to identify when humans diverged from their closest living relatives (Sarich and Wilson, 1967; Hasegawa et al., 1985; Scally and Durbin, 2012; Schrago and Voloch, 2013; Püschel et al., 2021), to determine when key phenotypic changes (e.g. increases in brain size; Ni et al., 2019; Püschel et al., 2021) occurred, to clarify the timing of significant biogeographical events (e.g. the dispersal of primates to Madagascar and to South America during the Cenozoic; Poux et al., 2005, 2006; Gunnell et al., 2018; Seiffert et al., 2020), and to infer the likely impact of major environmental changes (e.g., shifts in global climate) on primate diversification (Springer et al., 2012; Herrera, 2017; Godfrey et al., 2020).

Calculation of absolute divergence times between lineages usually requires some form of calibration by incorporating known temporal information, and for “deep time” divergences this typically means evidence from the fossil record (Nguyen and Ho, 2020). In a phylogenetic

context, arguably the most appropriate approach (at least in principle) is “tip-dating”, in which fossil taxa of known age are incorporated as terminals (“tips”) in the phylogenetic analysis, and this temporal information is used to estimate divergence times at the nodes (Pyron, 2011; Ronquist et al., 2012a; O’Reilly et al., 2015; Zhang et al., 2016; Lee, 2020); this approach, in which fossil and extant taxa can be analyzed together, has the advantage that topology and divergence times are estimated simultaneously, in the context of a single analysis, and so the relationships of the fossil taxa do not need to be assumed a priori.

However, it seems unlikely that large quantities of molecular data will ever become available for fossil taxa older than a few million years old (Allentoft et al., 2012; Millar and Lambert, 2013; Welker, 2018), and so tip-dating analyses that include fossil taxa will typically require morphological data to inform their evolutionary relationships (although note that tip-dating can be used to infer divergence times among fossil taxa based purely on their stratigraphic age if their relationships are constrained a priori; Silvestro et al., 2019b; Button and Zanno, 2020; Lloyd and Slater, 2021). One potential problem with this approach concerns models of morphological character evolution, which are still in their infancy; in particular, the most widely used model for analyzing discrete morphological data (the “Mk” model of Lewis, 2001) makes a number of simplifying assumptions that seem biologically unrealistic (O’Reilly et al., 2015; Wright et al., 2016; Pyron, 2017; Billet and Bardin, 2019; Wright, 2019). However, a simulation study by Klopstein et al. (2019) suggests that this may not be particularly problematic for the inference of divergence dates, at least when relevant fossil taxa are densely sampled.

More serious is the fact that, even for primates (perhaps the most well-studied of any clade of organisms), morphological datasets are still small in comparison to equivalent molecular datasets, in terms of both taxon and character sampling (Guillerme and Cooper, 2016a). Species-

level molecular phylogenies have been available for extant primates for a number of years (e.g. Chatterjee et al., 2009; Perelman et al., 2011; Springer et al., 2012; dos Reis et al., 2018), and population- and subpopulation-level phylogenies will undoubtedly be generated with increasing rapidity. By contrast, even in the most recent morphological datasets for primate phylogenetics (at least, those focused on higher level relationships, e.g., between families), extant taxa are typically scored at the genus level, or only a single species-level representative of each genus is included (e.g. Rasmussen et al., 2019; Gilbert et al., 2020; Seiffert et al., 2020).

Given that scoring of morphological datasets requires anatomical expertise, considerable amounts of time, and access to widely scattered museum collections or high quality (ideally 3D) images of specimens, it is unlikely that future morphological datasets for primates will ever be sampled as densely in terms of taxa as will future molecular datasets. Thus, directly combining a phylogenomic dataset that samples extant primates at the population or subpopulation level with a compatible morphological dataset will result in a total evidence dataset in which most extant terminals will lack morphological data (Guillerme and Cooper, 2016b). Relationships between fossil taxa represented solely by morphological data and extant taxa represented solely by molecular data cannot be resolved without the use of topological constraints, because they do not share any character data in common (Springer et al., 2004; Guillerme and Cooper, 2016b; Hunt and Slater, 2016). In addition, phylogenomic datasets for primates can comprise millions of base pairs of sequence data (e.g. Jameson et al., 2011; dos Reis et al., 2018; Vanderpool et al., 2020), while primate morphological datasets typically comprise a few hundred characters (e.g. Rasmussen et al., 2019; Gilbert et al., 2020; Seiffert et al., 2020), and so combining such datasets will mean that fossil taxa (without molecular data) might end up with >99.99% missing data. The impact of such large amounts of missing data on phylogenetic inference is not fully understood,

and may not be as severe as might be expected (Wiens et al., 2005; Guillaume and Cooper, 2016b), but nevertheless can still negatively affect accurate inference of topology, support values, and (crucially for the estimation of divergence times) branch lengths (Lemmon et al., 2009; Simmons, 2012, 2014; Xia, 2014).

For these and other reasons (including, we suspect, the relative unfamiliarity to many bioinformaticians of morphological data and of appropriate methods for analysing it), it seems likely that molecular clock analyses, which use molecular data only, will remain the most common approach for inferring divergence times among lineages. In such analyses, fossil taxa for which molecular data is unavailable cannot be included directly as terminals/tips, but instead can be used to calibrate the age of one or more nodes in the phylogeny (“node-dating”; Nguyen and Ho, 2020). Because fossils are assigned a priori to particular nodes under this approach, it is crucial that each calibrating fossil is assigned appropriately, based on the most accurate and up-to-date information (Parham et al., 2012; Marjanović, 2021).

However, as discussed at length by Marjanović (2021), identifying appropriate fossil calibrations is not trivial, and even comparatively recent lists of calibrations (e.g. Benton et al., 2015) now appear out of date. Such issues affect molecular clock analyses of primates. For example, several studies (Meredith et al., 2011; Perelman et al., 2011; Springer et al., 2012) have used the late Eocene fossil primate *Saharagalago*, which was originally described as a galagid (Seiffert et al., 2003), to place a minimum bound on the age of crown Lorisiformes (= the Galagidae-Lorisidae split). However, a number of subsequent studies - notably, several tip-dating analyses (Herrera and Dávalos, 2016; Gunnell et al., 2018; Seiffert et al., 2020) - have instead placed *Saharagalago* as a stem lorisiform (see summaries in López-Torres and Silcox, 2020; López-Torres et al., 2020), suggesting that it is unsuitable for calibrating the Galagidae-Lorisidae

split. Phillips (2016) and Phillips and Fruciano (2018) also found that use of *Saharagalago* for this calibration results in a seeming mismatch in molecular rates, further suggesting this fossil taxon is not a crown loriform. Tip-dating may therefore still play a key role in determining divergence times within primates, as part of a two-stage process: tip-dating analyses of smaller (in terms of both taxa and characters) datasets, which ideally use combined morphological and molecular (=total evidence) data and which show good overlap of characters between taxa, can be used to robustly identify fossil taxa suitable for calibrating particular nodes; these calibrations can then be applied to clock analyses of larger, molecular-only datasets.

The way that fossil calibrations are specified in a node-dating analysis is known to have a major impact on the estimated divergence times (Warnock et al., 2012, 2015). Although fossil calibrations have been used to specify normal distributions on the ages of nodes in some studies (e.g. Perelman et al., 2011), it seems more appropriate to view the minimum age of a calibrating fossil as providing a minimum bound on the age of that node (Benton and Donoghue, 2007; Benton et al., 2009; Ho and Phillips, 2009; Parham et al., 2012). Wherever possible, it is appropriate to also specify a maximum bound, otherwise there is no direct constraint on the maximum age of a calibrated node (Phillips, 2016; Marjanović, 2021). If maximum and minimum bounds are specified, then a prior probability distribution between these bounds (and, if these bounds are “soft”, outside them as well) also needs to be specified (Ho and Phillips, 2009). In principle, any distribution could be used, but from a paleontological perspective, perhaps the most defensible are: 1) a uniform distribution, in which there is an equal probability that the divergence occurred at any time between the minimum and maximum bounds, and which appears most appropriate in cases where the fossil record is known or suspected to be very incomplete, such that the oldest calibrating fossil may in fact substantially postdate the age of the

divergence being calibrated; 2) an exponential distribution, in which the probability that the divergence is older than the minimum bound decreases exponentially, and which appears most appropriate in cases where the calibrating fossil is suspected to be very close in time to the actual time of divergences (Ho and Phillips, 2009).

Analytical methods for inferring maximum bounds and prior probability distributions on calibrations have been proposed (Marshall, 2008; Wilkinson et al., 2011; Nowak et al., 2013; Matschiner et al., 2017; Matschiner, 2019), but these often require estimates of parameters such as diversification and/or sampling rates that are not always easy to obtain, even for primates (but see Silvestro et al., 2014, 2019a; Herrera, 2017). For this reason, maximum bounds are typically based on somewhat subjective interpretations of available phylogenetic and fossil evidence (as in Benton et al., 2015; Roos et al., 2019; Marjanović, 2021; and most calibrations used by dos Reis et al., 2018). However, dos Reis et al. (2018) based their prior distributions for two nodes - namely the ages of crown Primates and crown Anthrozoidea - on the analytical estimates of Wilkinson et al. (2011); nevertheless, we note that the maximum bounds of both of these calibrations (88.6 Ma for crown Primates, 62.1 Ma for crown Anthrozoidea) seem implausibly old based on the fossil record (see our proposed calibrations for both of these nodes in “Fossil Calibrations” below). In turn, this may explain why the Late Cretaceous divergence time for crown Primates estimated by dos Reis et al. (2018; 95% Highest Posterior Density [HPD] interval of 70.0-79.2 Ma) is also strongly incongruent with the fossil record, although their estimate for crown Anthrozoidea (95% HPD: 41.8-48.3 Ma) is in better agreement with the (very limited) fossil evidence for this node (see “Fossil Calibrations” below).

Here, we take these considerations into account to specify an up-to-date set of well-justified fossil calibrations for divergences within Primates, including several entirely new

calibrations. In our initial survey of the literature, we identified numerous recent studies that have formally tested the affinities of various fossil primates and relatives using large morphological and total evidence datasets, many of them using tip-dating (e.g. Dembo et al., 2015, 2016; Herrera and Dávalos, 2016; Gunnell et al., 2018; Ni et al., 2019; Seiffert et al., 2020; Püschel et al., 2021). However, these studies collectively include a relatively limited sample of platyrrhine taxa (the so-called “New World monkeys”). For this reason, we firstly carry out a tip-dating analysis of living and fossil platyrrhines, based on a total evidence dataset that combines 10.2 kilobases (kb) of DNA sequence data from 17 nuclear genes (taken from Woods et al., 2018), and 418 morphological characters (taken from Kay et al., 2019), to identify fossil taxa that can be robustly placed within crown Platyrrhini and that, as a result, can be used to calibrate the ages of specific platyrrhine divergences.

Secondly, we combine our results with other published evidence regarding the fossil record and phylogeny of primates and other mammals to identify calibrations for 27 nodes: four outside Primates (crown Euarchontoglires, crown Glires, crown Euarchonta and crown Primatomorpha), crown Primates itself, and 22 divergences within crown Primates. This is a >50% increase in the number of calibrations compared to other recent broadscale molecular clock analyses of primates (Perelman et al., 2011; Springer et al., 2012; dos Reis et al., 2018; Vanderpool et al., 2020). For each calibration, we follow the best practices recommended by Parham et al. (2012). We provide a minimum bound for each calibration, based on the minimum age of the calibrating specimen, and for 24 of our 27 calibrations we also provide a maximum bound and a suggested prior probability distribution (either uniform or exponential), based on our interpretation of the available phylogenetic evidence and the relative completeness of the known fossil record. To maximize the utility of our calibration list to other researchers, we also

identify the age of the oldest member of the sister lineage of the calibrating fossil taxon, as required by the CladeAge method for inferring divergence times (Matschiner et al., 2017; Matschiner, 2019). Finally, we compare our proposed calibrations with those suggested in other recent studies (in particular, Benton et al., 2009, 2015; dos Reis et al., 2018; Roos et al., 2019), highlight cases in which there are major differences, and further justify our proposals.

2. Methods

2.1 Total evidence tip-dating analyses of *Platyrrhini*

For the total evidence tip-dating phylogenetic analysis of platyrrhines, we combined existing morphological and molecular data. The morphological dataset is that of Kay et al. (2019), which comprises 418 characters from the dentition, cranium, postcranium and soft tissues, of which 314 are parsimony informative, 34 are autapomorphic, and 70 are invariant; of these 418, 175 represent putative morphoclines that can be ordered. Kay et al. (2019) scored these characters for 16 extant platyrrhine genera, 24 fossil and subfossil primate taxa from South and Central America and the Caribbean, and three extant (*Hylobates*, *Miopithecus* and *Presbytis*) and two fossil (*Aegyptopithecus* and *Catopithecus*) catarrhine genera, plus three fossil stem-anthropoids (*Apidium*, *Proteopithecus* and *Simonsius*) that we specified as outgroups. The molecular dataset comprises DNA sequences from 17 nuclear loci that were selected based on their availability for our extant taxon sample and also for the Jamaican subfossil *Xenothrix* (Perelman et al., 2011; Springer et al., 2012; Woods et al., 2018); these sequences were downloaded from Genbank, aligned using MUSCLE with default settings in MEGA, and concatenated into a single file, resulting in a total of 10244 base pairs of sequence data (Table 1). The morphological and molecular datasets were then merged to produce our initial total evidence dataset.

Some of the fossil taxa present in the total evidence dataset are represented by mandibles and lower dentitions only, whilst for others the maxillary dentition is known but the mandible and lower dentition are currently unknown. Relationships between these two categories of taxa cannot be resolved adequately because they are not scored for any characters in common (Springer et al., 2004). For this reason, we prepared two versions of our total evidence dataset for phylogenetic analysis: a “maxillary” dataset in which the four fossil taxa known only from mandibular specimens (*Aotus dindensis*, *Mohanamico*, *Nuciraptor* and *Proteropithecina*) were deleted, leaving a total of 44 taxa; and a “mandibular” dataset, in which the five fossil taxa for which the mandible and lower dentition are unknown (*Tremacebus*, *Acrecebus*, *Perupithecus*, *Canaanimico* and *Parvimico*) were deleted, leaving a total of 43 taxa.

Tip-dating analyses of the maxillary and mandibular total evidence datasets were carried out using MrBayes 3.2.7a (Huelsenbeck and Ronquist, 2001; Ronquist et al., 2012b), running on the JASMIN data analysis facility (Lawrence et al., 2013). Given the comparatively large number of autapomorphies (34 out of 348 variable characters), the morphological partition of the total evidence dataset was assigned the Lewis (2001) Mk model with the assumption that variable characters have been scored, i.e. the Mk_v variant (the 70 constant characters were therefore ignored in the analysis), with an eight category lognormal distribution to model rate heterogeneity between sites (Harrison and Larsson, 2015). For the molecular partition, PartitionFinder 2.2 (Lanfear et al., 2017) was used to identify an appropriate partitioning scheme and substitution model for each partition, with possible models restricted to only those implemented by MrBayes, and with variants that combine a gamma distribution to model rate heterogeneity between sites with a proportion of invariant sites not considered, following the recommendations of Stamatakis (2014). The PartitionFinder analysis used the “greedy

algorithm” and assumed linked branch lengths, and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) was used for model selection. The best fitting partitioning scheme and set of substitution models for the molecular partition are shown in Table 1. Because we did not consider models that combine a gamma distribution and a proportion of invariant sites, we increased the number of gamma rate categories from the MrBayes default of four to eight.

<TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE>

We assigned a fixed age of 0 Ma to all of our extant taxa. For most of our fossil and subfossil taxa, we assigned uniform age ranges corresponding to the entire possible age range of the specimens used for scoring purposes (following Püschel et al., 2020); however, we assigned a fixed age of 33.4 Ma to *Catopithecus* and *Proteopithecus*, all specimens of which are from Quarry L-41 of the Jebel Qatrani Formation in the Fayum Depression of Egypt, which has been assigned an age of 33.4 Ma by Van Couvering and Delson (2020). A full justification of the assigned ages for all of our fossil and subfossil taxa is given in Supplementary Online Material. In an attempt to reduce the time needed to achieve stationarity and convergence between MrBayes runs, we enforced the following topological constraints, corresponding to clades the monophyly of which is uncontroversial: crown Anthropoidea (= all our taxa except the stem anthropoids *Apidium*, *Proteopithecus* and *Simonsius*), crown Catarrhini (= *Hylobates*, *Presbytis* and *Miopithecus*), and crown Cercopithecidae (= *Presbytis* and *Miopithecus*). To assist with rooting, we also specified a partial constraint that enforced monophyly of our extant platyrrhine taxa to the exclusion of our extant non-platyrrhine taxa, but left the position of fossil taxa free to vary. We did not provide node calibrations for any of these clades, i.e., we have used a “tip-

dating” approach, rather than “tip-and-node dating” (O’Reilly and Donoghue, 2016). However, following Sallam and Seiffert (2020), we calibrated the age of the root as a truncated normal prior with a minimum of 33.401 Ma (which is only slightly older than the oldest taxa in our dataset, namely *Catopithecus* and *Proteopithecus* - see above), a mean age that is 0.1 Ma older than the age of our oldest fossil taxa (i.e. 33.5 Ma), and a standard deviation of 1.0 Ma.

We applied a single Independent Gamma Rates (IGR) clock model to the entire molecular partition, and a separate IGR model to the morphological partition, with the prior on the clock rate specified using the custom R script of Gunnell et al. (2018), and the prior on the variance left as the MrBayes default. For the tree model, we assumed the Fossilized Birth Death process (Stadler, 2010; Gavryushkina et al., 2014; Heath and Huelsenbeck, 2014), allowing for sampled ancestors, and with diversity sampling assumed (Zhang et al., 2016). Because our focus is Platyrrhini, and our taxa are genus-level (with one possible exception, “*Aotus*” *dindensis*, which nevertheless does not form a clade with extant *Aotus* in several recent phylogenetic analyses; Kay, 2015; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019; but see Ni et al., 2019), we assumed a sampling probability of 0.727, corresponding to the inclusion of 16 of the 22 extant platyrrhine genera currently recognized. Priors on speciation, extinction and sampling were left as the MrBayes defaults.

MrBayes analyses comprised two independent runs of four MCMC chains (one “cold”, three “heated”, with default heating parameters), run for 40 million generations and sampling trees and other parameters every 5000 generations. Use of Tracer indicated that stationarity and convergence between runs was achieved within four million generations in both analyses; based on this, the first 10% of sampled trees were excluded. The remaining post-burnin trees were summarized in MrBayes using majority rule consensus (following the recommendations of

O'Reilly and Donoghue, 2018), rather than a Maximum Clade Credibility tree, with clades retained if they were present in less than 50% of the post-burnin trees provided they were compatible with the 50% majority rule consensus topology (using the “contype=allcompat” command in MrBayes). Support values were calculated as Bayesian posterior probabilities (BPPs). Selected estimates of divergence times in the maxillary and mandibular analyses are given in Table 2.

2.2 Identification of fossil calibrations

We used the results from our total evidence tip-dating analyses of platyrrhines, in combination with the published literature, to identify a set of robust fossil calibrations within crown Platyrrhini. Based on published studies, we also identified fossil calibrations for other divergences within crown Primates, for crown Primates itself, and for four other divergences within Euarchontoglires: crown Euarchontoglires, crown Glires, crown Euarchonta, and crown Primatomorpha. In identifying appropriate fossil calibrations, wherever possible we based our decisions on the results of formal, algorithmic phylogenetic analyses that have robustly tested the affinities of relevant fossil taxa, using the following hierarchy (from what we consider to be the most robust analyses to the least robust analyses): total evidence tip-dating analyses; undated total evidence analyses; undated analyses with a molecular scaffold; morphology-only tip-dating analyses; undated morphology-only analyses. In a few cases, we have proposed calibrations that are not based on evidence presented in formal phylogenetic analyses; for most of these, we have based our decisions on the presence of one or more morphological synapomorphies that clearly support assignment of that fossil taxon to a particular clade.

In general, we have followed the recommendations of Parham et al. (2012) for “best practices” for fossil calibrations; these include identifying a specific fossil specimen for each calibration, providing a full phylogenetic justification for using a particular fossil taxon (following our general approach listed above), discussing (where relevant) differences between morphological and molecular phylogenetic analyses, giving detailed locality and stratigraphic information for the calibrating specimen, and explaining clearly how this translates to a particular fixed age or age range. For each calibration, we provide a minimum bound, which we argue can reasonably be viewed as “hard” (i.e. zero probability of the divergence being younger than this). For most calibrations, we also propose a maximum bound, which should be viewed as “soft” (i.e., with a small probability that the divergence is older than this). Where we have provided a minimum and a maximum bound, we also propose a prior probability distribution. For most calibrations, we propose a uniform distribution, in which all ages between the minimum and the maximum bound have equal probability, which we consider to be most appropriate in cases where the fossil record is obviously highly incomplete (Ho and Phillips, 2009). For a few calibrations, however, we consider that the fossil record is sufficiently complete to be relatively confident the true age of divergence is close to the minimum bound; in such cases, we suggest that this should be modelled as an offset exponential distribution, with the minimum bound as the offset, and the shape of the exponential distribution specified such that there is a 5% probability of the divergence being older than the maximum bound (Ho and Phillips, 2009). In each case, we explain in detail why we consider a uniform or an offset exponential prior distribution is appropriate.

Our list of a minimum and (where relevant) a maximum bound for a calibrated node reflects standard practice in node-dating analyses. However, Matschiner et al. (2017) proposed

the “CladeAge” method (see also Matschiner, 2019), in which information about the oldest fossils for particular clades is combined with estimates of sampling and diversification rates to construct prior distributions on the ages of those clades. The simulation study of Matschiner (2019) suggests that the CladeAge method is more robust to model violations than are standard node dating-analyses that use the Fossilized Birth Death (FBD) model (Stadler, 2010; Gavryushkina et al., 2014; Heath and Huelsenbeck, 2014). The CladeAge method requires information on the oldest member of each clade present in a phylogeny, not just of the oldest of the daughter clades descending from a particular node (as required in “standard” node-dating). Therefore, to maximize the utility of our calibration list to other researchers, and to allow use of the CladeAge method, for each calibrated node, we provide ages for the oldest member of each daughter lineage descending from that node. It should be noted the CladeAge method also requires estimates of sampling and diversification rates, which we do not give here (such rates can be estimated using programs such PyRate; Silvestro et al., 2014, 2019a). Table 3 summarizes our full calibration list, including minimum and (where relevant) maximum bounds, suggested prior age distributions, and calibrations in a format suitable for use in the CladeAge method.

3. Results

Relationships among extant platyrrhines recovered by tip-dating analysis of the maxillary and mandibular total evidence datasets, using the Fossilized Birth Death (FBD) model, are highly congruent (Figures 1-2). Both analyses place all pre-Laventan (i.e., older than ~13.8-11.8 Ma; Prevosti and Forasiepi, 2018) fossil primates from Central and South America outside crown Platyrrhini, with one potential exception: *Proteropithecina* from the Collón Curá Formation of Argentina (present in the mandibular dataset only), which is very weakly supported (BPP = 0.30)

as a stem pitheciine. The age of *Proteropithecina* is poorly constrained (19.76-10.4 Ma old; see Supplementary Online Material), but may still predate the Laventan. However, examination of the individual post-burnin trees from the mandibular analysis reveals slightly stronger support (BPP = 0.34) for placing *Proteropithecina* outside crown Platyrrhini (note that this is not seen in Figure 1 because the post-burnin trees that find this relationship conflict with the overall 50% majority rule consensus topology).

<FIGURES 1 AND 2 ABOUT HERE>

Of particular note is the fact that *Panamacebus*, which was identified as a cebid in its original description (Bloch et al., 2016), is recovered outside the crown clade in both the mandibular and maxillary analyses, where it forms a very weakly supported clade with *Chilecebus* (BPP of 0.38 in the mandibular analysis, and 0.41 in the maxillary analysis). Monophyly of crown Platyrrhini excluding *Panamacebus* is strongly supported in the maxillary analysis (BPP = 0.82), although not in the mandibular analysis (BPP = 0.36), likely because of the unstable position of *Proteropithecina* discussed above. Among the other fossil stem platyrrhines, there is strong support for *Homunculus*+*Carlocebus* (BPP of 0.99 in both analyses), and somewhat weaker support for *Mazzonicebus*+*Soriacebus* (BPP of 0.69 in the mandibular analysis, and 0.70 in the maxillary analysis), but most other relationships otherwise received very weak support (BPP <0.5). Among these very weakly supported relationships is a position for the early Miocene (19.6-16.4 Ma) *Parvimico* as sister to all other crown and stem platyrrhines, with the early Oligocene (29.68-29.52 Ma) *Perupithecus* the next taxon to branch (these two taxa are present in the maxillary analysis only).

Within crown Platyrrhini, the topology in both analyses is congruent with recent molecular phylogenies in supporting a basal split between Pitheciidae (here also including the three Caribbean subfossil taxa *Xenothrix*, *Antillothrix*, and *Paralouatta*) and a clade comprising the remaining extant families (Atelidae, Aotidae, Callitrichidae and Cebidae); these two clades receive weak-to-moderate support in the maxillary analysis (BPP of 0.60 and 0.62, respectively) but not in the mandibular analysis (BPP of 0.32 and 0.36, respectively), again likely due to instability in the position of *Proteropithecina* in the latter analysis. Both analyses also agree in placing Atelidae sister to a clade comprising Aotidae (*Aotus*), Callitrichidae and Cebidae, although again support for the latter clade is stronger in the maxillary analysis (BPP = 0.79) than the mandibular analysis (BPP = 0.49). The analyses disagree on the position of Aotidae (*Aotus*), which is sister to Cebidae in the mandibular analysis (BPP = 0.34) but sister to Callitrichidae in the maxillary analysis (BPP = 0.46), but support is very weak in both cases.

Turning now to the Laventan fossil taxa, there is strong support for placing *Stirtonia* as sister to *Alouatta* within crown Atelidae (BPP = 1.00 in both analyses), *Neosaimiri* as sister to *Saimiri* within crown Cebidae (BPP = 1.00 in both analyses), and *Lagonimico* as a stem callitrichid (BPP of 1.00 in the maxillary analysis, and 0.95 in the mandibular analysis). In the mandibular analysis, there is also strong support for *Cebupithecina* and *Nuciruptor* forming a clade with extant pitheciines (BPP = 0.92), whereas there is somewhat weaker support for placing *Cebupithecina* with extant pitheciines in the maxillary analysis (BPP = 0.77); *Nuciruptor* is known from lower jaw material only, and so was not included in the latter analysis. The other Laventan taxa known solely from lower jaw material, namely “*Aotus*” *dindensis* and *Mohanamico*, form a strongly supported (BPP = 1.00) clade in the mandibular analysis, which is in turn part of a weakly supported (BPP = 0.36) clade that also includes Aotidae (*Aotus*),

Callitrichidae and Cebidae. The Huayquerian (9.0-5.28 Ma) *Acrecebus*, which is known from a single upper molar, receives fairly strong support (BPP = 0.87) for a position as sister to *Cebus* in the maxillary analysis.

Strikingly, both the maxillary and mandibular analyses recover a clade comprising the Caribbean subfossil *Xenothrix*, *Antillothrix*, and *Paralouatta*, although support for this is relatively weak (BPP of 0.59 in the maxillary analysis, and 0.58 in the mandibular analysis). Both analyses also place this Caribbean clade sister to *Callicebus*, but support for this relationship is again quite weak (BPP of 0.58 in the maxillary analysis, and 0.50 in the mandibular analysis).

Focusing now on divergence times (see Table 2), the oldest split within total-clade Platyrrhini found here is between *Parvimico* (present in the maxillary analysis only) and the remaining taxa, with a median estimated age of 33.8 Ma and 95% HPD of 31.7-35.8 Ma. The maxillary and mandibular analyses both place the origin of crown Platyrrhini in the late Oligocene or early Miocene, with a median estimate of 23.6 Ma and 95% HPD of 20.7-27.0 Ma in the maxillary analysis, and a median estimate of 24.7 Ma and 95% HPD of 21.4-28.2 Ma in the mandibular analysis. Among the fossil taxa, the very short temporal branch (0.01 Ma) leading to *Stirtonia* in both analyses is congruent with its being ancestral to the extant *Alouatta*, but there are no other plausible ancestor-descendant relationships among our fossil taxa. The divergence between *Callicebus* and the Caribbean clade is dated to the early-to-middle Miocene in both analyses (median estimate of 16.3 Ma and 95% HPD of 12.3-20.9 Ma in the maxillary analysis; median estimate of 17.5 Ma and 95% HPD of 12.7-22.9 Ma in the mandibular analysis). The first divergence within the Caribbean clade itself (the split between *Xenothrix* and *Antillothrix*+*Paralouatta*) has important biogeographical implications, but is only weakly

constrained to some point from the middle Miocene to the Pliocene here, with a median estimate of 9.3 Ma and 95% HPD of 3.5-15.2 Ma in the maxillary analysis, and a median estimate of 10.5 Ma and 95% HPD of 4.4-16.8 Ma in the mandibular analysis. Selected estimated divergence times are summarized in Table 2.

<TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE>

4. Discussion

To date, there have been relatively few published total evidence phylogenetic analyses focused on platyrrhine relationships. Several recent studies (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019) have used an alternative approach for incorporating molecular information, namely constraining relationships among modern taxa to match current molecular phylogenies (a molecular “scaffold”), but this prevents the morphological and molecular data from interacting synergistically (Hermsen and Hendricks, 2008).

Schrager et al. (2013) did present a total evidence analysis of Platyrrhini, and used a novel approach to infer divergence dates by first carrying out an undated total evidence analysis, and then performing a relaxed clock analysis of morphological data only on the total evidence topology, with age estimates from a separate molecular clock analysis used as node age priors. However, this approach lacks a key aspect of tip-dating, namely that the stratigraphic ages of the fossil terminals can influence their phylogenetic position (Bapst et al., 2016; Turner et al., 2017; Lee and Yates, 2018; Beck and Taglioretti, 2020; King and Beck, 2020; Beck et al., 2021; King, 2021). The morphological clock analysis of Schrager et al. (2013) also assumed a Yule prior on tree shape, which has been shown to lead, in at least some cases, to unrealistically ancient

divergence dates (Condamine et al., 2015), although we note that the dates calculated by Schrago et al. (2013) in this analysis are in fact largely congruent with those presented here (Table 2). The sampling of fossil platyrrhines by Schrago et al. (2013) was also relatively restricted, and lacked a number of taxa that have been consistently associated with crown lineages, such as the *Stirtonia*, *Cebupithecia*, *Neosaimiri*, and *Lagonimico* (Kay, 2015). Indeed, only one fossil taxon (*Proteropithecia*) fell within crown Platyrrhini (as a stem pitheciine) in the analysis of Schrago et al. (2013), and so the results of this analysis are of limited use in identifying robust fossil calibrations for divergences among crown platyrrhines. In addition, our own results raise questions about whether *Proteropithecia* is indeed a pitheciine (discussed in more detail below).

Finally, Silvestro et al. (2019b) carried out a tip-dating analysis of platyrrhines that included 34 fossil taxa, using the FBD model, but the fossil taxa were not represented by character data (living taxa were represented by combined nuclear and mitochondrial sequence data only), and their relationships were constrained a priori; thus, their phylogenetic position was not free to vary, and could not be informed by morphological data. Perhaps most significantly, Silvestro et al. (2019b) assumed the “Long Lineage” hypothesis, which considers that pre-Laventan platyrrhines from Patagonia are members of the crown clade (Rosenberger et al., 2009; Rosenberger, 2010, 2011, 2019; Rosenberger and Tejedor, 2013), when constraining the relationships of their fossil taxa; the “Long Lineage” hypothesis is not supported by our analyses (see below).

Published total evidence tip-dating analyses of broad primate phylogeny, meanwhile, have typically included a relatively limited sampling of platyrrhines (e.g. Gunnell et al., 2018; Seiffert et al., 2020). An exception is that of Ni et al. (2019: fig. S1), which included a relatively dense sampling of fossil platyrrhines, as well as other primates, and which used a similar

approach to that here (specifically, the Fossilized Birth Death tree model in combination with the IGR clock model, as implemented in MrBayes), but with a different dataset (1186 morphological characters from the dentition, cranium, postcranium and soft tissues; 658 SINE and LINE insertion characters) that was focused on relationships within Haplorhini as a whole. However, of the 11 fossil platyrrhines included by Ni et al. (2019 fig. S1), only two fell within crown Platyrrhini in their analysis: “*Aotus*” *dindensis* as sister to the extant *Aotus azarae*, and *Mohanamico hershkovitzi* as a stem callitrichid. Several other recent analyses (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019) have failed to support “*A.*” *dindensis* as an aotid, and have also placed two fossil taxa that Ni et al. (2019 fig. S1) found to be stem platyrrhines - namely *Stirtonia* and *Neosaimiri* - within crown Platyrrhini. Like Schrago et al. (2013), Ni et al. (2019 fig. S1) also did not include several other fossil taxa that have been suggested to fall within crown Platyrrhini, namely *Proteropithecina*, *Cebupithecina*, *Nuciraptor* and *Lagonimico* (Kay, 2015).

The total evidence tip-dating analyses we present here should therefore be of interest because they are the first to include a diverse sampling of fossil platyrrhines, including putative members of many crown lineages. As such, they should help identify robust calibrations within crown Platyrrhini for use in molecular clock analyses, as well as providing their own estimates of platyrrhine relationships and divergence times.

Relationships among the extant platyrrhines recovered in our both our total evidence tip-dating analyses are strongly congruent with most recent molecular analyses of Platyrrhini in supporting a basal split between Pitheciidae and the remaining families, with Atelidae sister to a Aotidae+Callitrichidae+Cebidae clade (Perelman et al., 2011; Perez et al., 2012; Springer et al., 2012; dos Reis et al., 2018; Valencia et al., 2018; Woods et al., 2018; but see X. Wang et al.,

2019). Our two analyses differ over the precise position of Aotidae (= *Aotus*), with the mandibular analysis placing this family sister to Cebidae but the maxillary instead placing it sister to Callitrichidae, but with very weak support (BPP <0.5) in both cases. Failure of both of our analyses to unambiguously resolve the precise branching pattern between Aotidae, Callitrichidae and Cebidae is perhaps unsurprising as much larger molecular sequence datasets also fail to do this (Osterholz et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2012; Valencia et al., 2018; Schrago and Seuánez, 2019; X. Wang et al., 2019; Vanderpool et al., 2020). Relationships among extant members of Callitrichidae, Atelidae and Pitheciidae are congruent with recent molecular analyses (Perelman et al., 2011; Springer et al., 2012; Buckner et al., 2015; dos Reis et al., 2018; Garbino and Martins-Junior, 2018).

In terms of relationships among our non-living taxa, perhaps the most significant aspect of both analyses is the fact that all pre-Laventan (middle Miocene) South American primate taxa (all of which come from Patagonia in southern South America) included in our analyses fall outside crown Platyrrhini, with the possible exception of *Proteropithecina*. Of particular interest is the position of the early Miocene (21.1-18.748 Ma) *Panamacebus*, which was originally described as a cebid by Bloch et al. (2016), and which has been recovered within Cebidae in several published phylogenetic analyses that have used a molecular scaffold approach (Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019). Here, both of our total evidence tip-dating analyses instead place *Panamacebus* outside crown Platyrrhini, in a very weakly supported (BPP <0.5) clade with *Chilecebus*. Thus, our analyses do not support the “Long Lineage” hypothesis (Rosenberger et al., 2009; Rosenberger, 2010, 2011, 2019; Rosenberger and Tejedor, 2013), which posits that the pre-Laventan taxa are early members of crown platyrrhine lineages.

The case of *Proteropithecina* from the Collón Curá Formation of Argentina warrants further discussion. Firstly, the age of *Proteropithecina* is poorly constrained, to between 19.76 and 10.4 Ma (see Supplementary Online Material), and so it may in fact postdate the Laventan (which is ~13.8-11.8 Ma; Prevosti and Forasiepi, 2018). Secondly, although the majority rule consensus from our mandibular analysis placed *Proteropithecina* within crown Platyrrhini, as a stem pitheciine (congruent with current hypotheses), support for this relationship was very weak (BPP = 0.30), and in fact 34% of the post-burnin trees (equivalent to a BPP of 0.34) placed *Proteropithecina* outside crown Platyrrhini. To our knowledge, the pitheciine status of *Proteropithecina* has been uncontroversial (Kay et al., 2013; Rosenberger and Tejedor, 2013; Kay, 2015; Tejedor and Novo, 2016; Rosenberger, 2020), although Kay et al. (1998) noted some notable dental differences between *Proteropithecina* and living pitheciines in their original description of this taxon. We do not attempt a detailed reassessment of the affinities of *Proteropithecina*, but merely note that our results raise the possibility that this taxon may be a stem platyrrhine convergent on pitheciines (as has also been proposed for *Soriacebus*; Kay, 1990, 2010, 2015; Kay et al., 2013). If so, this would remove the last direct biogeographical link between the Patagonian platyrrhines (all of which would therefore seem to be stem taxa) and crown Platyrrhini, the known fossil record of which is confined to northern South America.

Another notable aspect of both of our analyses is recovery of a clade (sister to *Callicebus*) comprising the three Caribbean subfossil taxa *Xenothrix*, *Antillothrix* and *Paralouatta*. This clade was also found by Marivaux et al. (2016), but not by Kay (2015) or Kay et al. (2019), even though we used the latter's morphological matrix here; however, all of these previous studies were based on parsimony analysis of a morphological matrix with a molecular scaffold enforced, which precludes synergistic interactions between morphological and

molecular data and which does not take into account temporal information, unlike the approach used here. The Caribbean clade receives weak support in our analyses (BPP of 0.50 in the mandibular analysis, and 0.58 in the maxillary analysis), but it is of interest because it implies that the presence of these genera in the Caribbean may be the result of a single dispersal event, as also recently suggested for Caribbean caviomorph rodents based on DNA evidence (Woods et al., 2021; although the presence of oryzomyin muroids and an apparent geomorph still indicates multiple dispersals by rodents from mainland South America to Caribbean landmasses; Marivaux et al., 2021). Of the three Caribbean taxa, DNA sequence data is currently only available for *Xenothrix* (Woods et al., 2018); obtaining molecular data (e.g., ancient DNA or protein sequences) from *Antillothrix*, *Paralouatta*, and also *Insulacebus* (Cooke et al., 2011), will allow rigorous testing of this hypothesis.

Based on our results, the following four South American fossil primate taxa can be identified as representing robust calibrations for informing the minimum bound on divergences within Platyrrhini: *Stirtonia*, which is strongly supported as a stem alouattine, and so provides a minimum bound on age of the Alouattinae-Atelinae split; *Neosaimiri*, which is strongly supported as a stem saimirine, and so provides a minimum bound on the age of the Cebinae-Saimirinae split; *Cebupithecia*, which is strongly supported as a pitheciine, and so provides a minimum bound on the age of Pitheciinae-Callicebinae split; and *Lagonimico*, which is strongly supported as a stem callitrichid, and so provides a minimum bound on the divergence of Callitrichidae from its sister family (which varies depending on the precise relationship of Aotidae to Callitrichidae and Cebidae). Each of these calibrations is discussed in more detail below (see “Fossil Calibrations”). We note here, however, that the tip-dating total evidence analysis of Ni et al. (2019: fig. S1) suggests a very different set of relationships, with *Stirtonia*

and *Neosaimiri* both placed outside crown Platyrrhini (*Cebupithecia* and *Lagonimico* were not included).

Studies suggest that accurate estimates of divergence times under the Fossilized Birth Death model require dense sampling of fossil taxa (Klopfstein et al., 2019; O'Reilly and Donoghue, 2019). The morphological dataset we used here, namely that of Kay et al. (2019), includes most named South American primate genera (note that *Szalatavus*, *Killikaike*, and *Laventiana* have been argued to be synonyms of *Branisella*, *Homunculus*, and *Neosaimiri* respectively; Kay, 2015), but this is a reflection of the overall paucity of the known fossil record (although this continues to improve thanks to ongoing, extensive efforts by a number of different research teams; Kay et al., 2019; Marivaux et al., 2020a; Seiffert et al., 2020; Antoine et al., 2021; Novo et al., 2021). However, this dataset includes a limited selection of fossil catarrhines and stem anthropoids, some of which (e.g., *Talahpithecus*, *Proteopithecus*, and oligopithecids) may be of particular relevance for understanding the origin of platyrrhines, including the timing of their arrival in South America (Bond et al., 2015). For this reason, the divergence times estimated in our total evidence tip-dating analyses should be treated with caution. Nevertheless, our maxillary analysis suggests that platyrrhines arrived in South America between 36.8 and 31.7 Ma, based on the maximum estimate for the Platyrrhini-Catarrhini split (95% HPD: 36.8-33.9 Ma) and the minimum estimate for the divergence of the earliest diverging South American taxon (*Parvimico*, known only from a single upper molar, and hence not present in the mandibular analysis) in our dataset (95% HPD: 35.8-31.7 Ma). Strikingly, this is very similar to Seiffert et al.'s (2020) estimate for the timing of dispersal of a second South American primate taxon, the parapithecoid *Ucayalipithecus*, namely 35.1-31.7 Ma, which these authors noted coincides with a major drop in global sea levels (Miller et al., 2008).

Our late Oligocene-early Miocene estimate for the age of crown Platyrrhini is similar to estimates from several previous molecular clock analyses (Perelman et al., 2011; Springer et al., 2012; dos Reis et al., 2018; Woods et al., 2018; X. Wang et al., 2019), as well as from the novel two stage molecular and morphological clock analysis of Schrago et al. (2013), and from the total evidence tip-dating analysis of Ni et al. (2019). It is worth noting that this is similar to the crown age of another major clade of predominantly South and Central American mammals, namely the marsupial family Didelphidae (opossums), as estimated by some molecular clock (node-dating) analyses (Jansa et al., 2014) - although others suggest a somewhat earlier age (Steiner et al., 2005; Meredith et al., 2011; Mitchell et al., 2014; Vilela et al., 2015) -, and also by total evidence clock (combined tip-and-node dating; O'Reilly and Donoghue, 2016) analyses (Beck and Taglioretti, 2020; Beck et al., 2021).

Node-dated molecular clock estimates for the age of crown Caviomorpha are markedly older, typically mid-to-late Eocene or earliest Oligocene (Sallam et al., 2009; Rowe et al., 2010: table 1; Meredith et al., 2011; Upham and Patterson, 2012, 2015; Voloch et al., 2013; Álvarez et al., 2017; Woods et al., 2021). Several of these studies (Voloch et al., 2013; Upham and Patterson, 2015; Álvarez et al., 2017) have calibrated the deepest divergences within crown Caviomorpha based on fossil taxa from Contamana in Peru, which have been dated to ~41 Ma and which have been referred to crown clades by some authors (Antoine et al., 2012; Boivin et al., 2017). However, this reported age has been questioned (Campbell et al., 2021), and, in any case, the recent phylogenetic study of Boivin et al. (2019) suggests that the Contamana rodents fall outside the crown clade. However, definitive crown caviomorphs have been reported from the Tinguiririca fauna of Chile (Bertrand et al., 2012), and appear to be 37.5-31.5 Ma based on radiometric dating (Wyss et al., 1990, 1993; Flynn et al., 2003; Bertrand et al., 2012), indicating

that crown Caviomorpha had begun to diversify by the earliest Oligocene at the latest. Campbell et al. (2021: fig. S7) presented a morphological tip-dating analysis of Caviomorpha (based on the matrix of Marivaux et al., 2020b) in which the ages of fossil taxa from localities of controversial age (at Santa Rosa, Shapaja, and Contamana; Campbell et al., 2021) were allowed to vary between 56 and 0 Ma. In this analysis, the median estimate for the age of crown Caviomorpha was 40.2 Ma, with a 95% HPD of 43.5-37.5 Ma. Collectively, then, current evidence suggests that crown Caviomorpha is at least 10 million years older than crown Platyrrhini.

The tip-dating analysis of Campbell et al. (2021: fig. S7) suggests that the dispersal of Caviomorpha to South America occurred after 44.5 Ma but before 37.5 Ma. This is close to, but does not overlap with, our composite estimate for the timing of dispersal of platyrrhines (36.8-31.7 Ma), or Seiffert et al.'s (2020) estimate for the dispersal of the parapiithecoid lineage represented by *Ucayalipithecus* (35.1-31.7 Ma). However, the accuracy of divergence dates estimated by tip-dating approaches needs further exploration (Beck and Lee, 2014; Drummond and Stadler, 2016; Puttick et al., 2016; Ronquist et al., 2016; Parins-Fukuchi and Brown, 2017; Luo et al., 2019; King and Beck, 2020; Püschel et al., 2020; Simões et al., 2020), and molecular clock studies suggest that the dispersals of platyrrhines and caviomorphs could have been coincident in time (Poux et al., 2006; Loss-Oliveira et al., 2012).

As noted above, monophyly of the Caribbean genera *Xenothrix*, *Antillothrix* and *Paralouatta* raises the possibility that they may be the result of a single dispersal event from the South American mainland; if so, our divergence estimates permit a wide range of ages for this event, spanning from the earliest Miocene to the late Pliocene (22.9-3.5 Ma). Although poorly constrained, this nevertheless overlaps with the inferred timing of dispersal of caviomorph rodents to Caribbean landmasses based on the molecular clock (node-dating) analysis of Woods

et al. (2021), which is 21.7-7.1 Ma. These estimates are therefore permissive of synchronous dispersals by platyrrhines and caviomorphs from mainland South America to Caribbean landmasses.

5. Fossil calibrations

<TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE>

5.1 Crown Euarchontoglires = Euarchonta-Glires split

Calibrating taxon *Purgatorius mckeeveri*

Specimen UCMP 150021, an isolated left m2, from Harley's Point locality in the lowermost part of the Tullock Member of the Fort Union Formation in Montana, USA (Wilson Mantilla et al., 2021).

Phylogenetic justification *Purgatorius mckeeveri* is the oldest known member of "Plesiadapiformes", a likely non-monophyletic grade of fossil euarchontans (Silcox et al., 2017). Some phylogenetic analyses focused on deep relationships within Eutheria have recovered *Purgatorius* outside Placentalia (e.g., Wible et al., 2007, 2009; Goswami et al., 2011). However, recent phylogenetic analyses specifically intended to resolve euarchontan relationships consistently place *Purgatorius* and other "plesiadapiforms" within crown Euarchonta, and specifically closer to Primates and Dermoptera than to Scandentia, although the precise affinities of "plesiadapiforms" vary in these analyses (e.g., Bloch et al., 2007; Chester et al., 2015, 2017; Li and Ni, 2016; Ni et al., 2016; Silcox et al., 2017; Gunnell et al., 2018; Morse et al., 2019; Seiffert et al., 2020): different "plesiadapiform" taxa may represent stem-members of Primates

and/or Dermoptera, or they may fall outside crown Primatomorpha (=Primates+Dermoptera; Mason et al., 2016) entirely. Definitive stem-euarchontans older than *P. mckeeveri* have not been identified. The oldest members of the sister-taxon of Euarchonta, namely Glires, are younger than the oldest known material of *P. mckeeveri* (see “Crown Glires” below). Thus, *P. mckeeveri* is the oldest known taxon that can be used to calibrate the Euarchonta-Glires split.

Hard minimum bound 65.79 Ma

Soft maximum bound 125.816 Ma

Suggested prior distribution offset exponential

Age justifications High resolution geochronological data constrains the age of the oldest known material of *P. mckeeveri* to the early Puercan (Pu1), chron C29r, and specifically to within ~208 kyr after the K/Pg boundary (Wilson Mantilla et al., 2021). Wilson Mantilla et al. (2021) reported an $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ data of a tuff 78 cm located above the Harley’s Point locality, source of our calibrating specimen UCMP 150021, of $65.844 \pm 0.033/0.054$ Ma (with the uncertainty shown as analytical/systematic uncertainty). We thus use a minimum age of 65.79 Ma for this node. A second date from an underlying tuff has an age of $66.052 \pm 0.008/0.043$ Ma, bracketing the age of UCMP 150021 to 66.095–65.79 Ma; we use the maximum age as our soft maximum bound for the age of crown Primates (see below).

Placing a maximum bound on the age of Euarchontoglires is difficult because early members of Placentalia, including stem members of Euarchontoglires, probably differed little from stem-eutherians in terms of their overall morphology (Bininda-Emonds et al., 2012). This may explain why probable early placentals such as *Purgatorius* (generally accepted as a euarchontan; see above) and *Protungulatum* (often placed within Laurasiatheria, typically close to euungulates; O’Leary et al., 2013) fall outside Placentalia in some phylogenetic analyses (e.g.,

Wible et al., 2007, 2009; Goswami et al., 2011). We have chosen to use a conservative maximum bound based on the age of well preserved eutherians from the Yixian Formation such as *Ambolestes*, *Eomaia*, and *Sinodelphys*, which have fallen outside Placentalia in all published phylogenetic analyses to date (e.g., Ji et al., 2002; Kielan-Jaworowska et al., 2004; Bi et al., 2018). The age of the Yixian Formation has now been constrained to between 125.755 ± 0.061 and 124.122 ± 0.048 Ma, based on U-Pb chemical abrasion-isotope dilution-isotope ratio mass spectrometry (CA-ID-IRMS; Zhong et al., 2021); we use the maximum age of this range (125.816 Ma) as our maximum bound here. However, this is almost certainly highly conservative, as the oldest convincing records of Placentalia are from the earliest Palaeocene (e.g., *Purgatorius mckeeveri*; Wilson Mantilla et al., 2021) or very slightly before (e.g., the latest Cretaceous *Protungulatum coombsi*; Archibald et al., 2011). The putative leptictidan *Gypsonictops* is known from the late Cretaceous (Campanian-Maastrichtian; Kielan-Jaworowska et al., 2004) but has also been reported from much older, Turonian deposits (Cohen and Cifelli, 2015), although this material remains to be formally published; if *Gypsonictops* is indeed a leptictidan, and if leptictidans are crown clade placentals, then this would push the origin of Placentalia considerably earlier than the K-Pg boundary, but this remains uncertain (see Springer et al., 2019; Marjanović, 2021). The preponderance of fossil evidence, however, appears to support an origin of Placentalia and of the major placental superorders closer to the K-Pg boundary, and we explicitly take this into account by proposing that this calibration be modelled as an offset exponential prior distribution. Assuming a 5% probability of exceeding the soft maximum bound, this would give a mean and median prior on this divergence of 85.9 and 79.7 Ma, respectively.

Additional CladeAge calibration As discussed above, *Purgatorius mckeeveri* is the oldest known member of Euarchonta. The sister-taxon of Euarchonta is Glires, and the oldest definitive members of Glires (*Heomys* sp., *Mimotona wana*, and *M. lii*) are from the lower part of the Upper Member of the Wanghudun Formation in Anhui Province, China (Li, 1977; see “Crown Glires” below). The lower part of the Upper Member of the Wanghudun Formation is currently interpreted as the Shanguan Stage spanning 66.0-62.22 Ma (Y. Wang et al., 2019). Anagalidans have been suggested to be stem-members of Glires (López-Torres and Fostowicz-Frelik, 2018), and the earliest members of this group are from the Lower Member of the Wanghudun Formation (Marjanović, 2021: node 155), thus predating *Heomys* sp., *Mimotona wana*, and *M. lii*. However, the precise relationship of Anagalida to Glires remains to be clearly resolved (López-Torres and Fostowicz-Frelik, 2018), and we note that they fell outside Euarchontoglires in the recent phylogenetic analysis of Asher et al. (2019). In addition, Wang et al. (2019) did not provide separate ages for the Lower Member and the lower part of the Upper Member of the Wanghudun Formation, and so the same age range (66.0-62.22 Ma) would apply even if we elected to use anagalidans for this additional CladeAge calibration.

Comments The material of *Purgatorius mckeeveri* recently described by Wilson Mantilla et al. (2021) results in a very slightly older minimum on the age of this node than assumed in some previous studies (Benton et al., 2015; Marjanović, 2021). Benton et al. (2009) followed a similar approach to that used here, and based their soft maximum bound on the age of the Yixian eutherians, which were the oldest definitive eutherians known at the time. In their revised list of calibrations, Benton et al. (2015) used the maximum age of an even older eutherian discovered subsequently, namely *Juramaia sinensis* (Luo et al., 2011) to set a maximum bound of 164.6 Ma; however, such a liberal maximum bound is unlikely to place much constraint on the age of this

node. By contrast, Marjanović (2021: node 152) proposed a hard maximum bound of 72 Ma on the age of Placentalia, which would force the maximum age of Euarchontoglires (and all other divergences within Placentalia) to be younger than this; however, this very tight maximum bound implicitly endorses an “explosive” model of placental origins, and the validity of this model remains controversial (Springer et al., 2019). We prefer to leave this node quite loosely calibrated, (although not as loosely as Benton et al., 2015), an approach that we feel is warranted given continuing uncertainty regarding the timing of the origin of Placentalia (Bininda-Emonds et al., 2012; Foley et al., 2016; Springer et al., 2019).

5.2 Crown Glires = Rodentia-Lagomorpha split

Calibrating taxon *Heomys* sp.

Specimen IVPP V4323, a crushed skull without cheek teeth, from the lower part of the Upper Member of the Wanghudun Formation in Anhui Province, China (Li, 1977).

Phylogenetic justification Recent phylogenetic analyses (Asher et al., 2019; Rankin et al., 2020) support *Heomys* sp. as the earliest known member of Simplicidentata, which includes Rodentia.

Of perhaps greatest significance, simplicidentates (including *Heomys* sp.) are characterized by the presence of a single pair of upper incisors, a synapomorphic feature shared by all rodents (Li et al., 2016; Fostowicz-Frelik, 2017, 2020).

Hard minimum bound 62.22 Ma

Soft maximum bound 66 Ma

Suggested prior distribution offset exponential

Age justifications IVPP V4323 is from the lower part of the Upper Member of the Wanghudun Formation in Qianshan, Anhui Province (Li, 1977). According to Wang et al. (2019), the Lower

Member and lower part of the Upper Member of the Wanghudun Formation can be correlated to the Shanghuan Stage, corresponding to chron C27n to C29r, which is 66.0 to 62.22 Ma; the latter date therefore provides the hard minimum bound for this node.

As summarized by Marjanović (2021: node 155), crown-clade Glires (rodents and other simplicitates; lagomorphs and other duplicidentates) have not been found in the earlier, Lower Member of the Wanghudun Formation (Wang et al., 2016). However, fossil sites from the Lower Member are characterized by a diverse range of anagalidans (anagalids, the pseudictopid *Cartictops* and the astigalid *Astigale*; Marjanović, 2021: node 155). The affinities of anagalidans are in need of detailed study, but it is widely accepted that they include stem relatives of crown Glires (Meng et al., 2003; Fostowicz-Frelik, 2017; López-Torres and Fostowicz-Frelik, 2018; but see the phylogenetic analysis of Asher et al., 2019). Evidence from their molar structure (including a tendency to hypsodonty) and tooth wear suggests that anagalidans were at least partially herbivorous (Fostowicz-Frelik, 2017), as is also the case for most living and fossil members of crown Glires, and features of the postcranial skeleton indicates that pseudictopids were cursorially adapted, similar to lagomorphs (Rose, 2006). We consider the presence in the Lower Member of the Wanghudun Formation of probable stem Glires (namely anagalidans, including some that were probably ecologically similar to lagomorphs), in combination with the apparent absence of crown Glires, to be reasonable evidence that the Rodentia-Lagomorpha split had not occurred by this time. We therefore propose the maximum age of the Shanghuan Stage (66.0 Ma; Y. Wang et al., 2019) as the soft maximum bound on this node.

Given our assumption that the absence of crown Glires in the Lower Member of the Wanghudun Formation is not an artefact of incomplete sampling, but that it is an indication that Rodentia-Lagomorpha split had yet to occur, we consider that this calibration is most

appropriately modelled using an offset exponential distribution. Assuming a 5% probability of exceeding the soft maximum bound, this would give a mean and median prior on this divergence of 63.5 and 63.1 Ma respectively.

Additional CladeAge calibration Our calibrating taxon, *Heomys* sp., is the oldest known stem-rodent. The duplicidentates *Mimotona wana* and *M. lii* are from the same deposit as *Heomys* sp. (Li, 1977; Dashzeveg and Russell, 1988; Li et al., 2016). *Mimotona* and other duplicidentates differ from simplicidentates such as rodents and *Heomys* sp. but resemble lagomorphs in retaining two upper incisors (Li et al., 2016; Fostowicz-Frelik, 2020). However, presence of two upper incisors is plesiomorphic for crown Glires, and so does not by itself constitute evidence that duplicidentates are stem-lagomorphs rather than stem-Glires. Nevertheless, *Mimotona* does share one distinctive derived dental synapomorphy with lagomorphs that is not seen in rodents or other simplicidentates, namely a longitudinal groove on the labial surface of the anteriormost upper incisor (Li and Ting, 1993; Li et al., 2016). *Mimotona* was also placed as a stem-lagomorph in the recent phylogenetic analyses of Asher et al. (2019) and Rankin et al. (2020). Based on this collective evidence, we consider *Mimotona wana* and *M. lii* the oldest known stem representatives of Lagomorpha, at 66.0-62.22 Ma, and so provide the second CladeAge calibration for this node.

Comments Benton et al. (2009) proposed a similar minimum bound for this node as that proposed here, but they proposed a much older maximum bound of 131.5 Ma, based on the maximum age of stem eutherians from the Yixian Formation (see “Crown Euarchontoglires” above). Benton et al. (2015) proposed an even older maximum bound, 164.6 Ma, based on the maximum age of the oldest currently known stem eutherian *Juramaia* (see “Crown Euarchontoglires” above). However, we consider both of these maximum bounds to be unduly

conservative given the distinctive craniodental apomorphies of members of crown-Glires, and the failure to find such taxa in any mammal-bearing site from the Cretaceous (see also Marjanović, 2021: node 155).

5.3 Crown Euarchonta = Scandentia-Primates split

Calibrating taxon *Purgatorius mckeeveri*

Specimen UCMP 150021, an isolated lower m2, from Harley's Point locality in the lowermost part of the Tullock Member of the Fort Union Formation in Montana, USA (Wilson Mantilla et al., 2021).

Phylogenetic justification Retrotransposon insertions provide statistically significant support for the hypothesis that Primates and Dermoptera form a clade (= Primatomorpha) to the exclusion of Scandentia (Mason et al., 2016). Some published analyses examining deep relationships within Eutheria have recovered *Purgatorius* outside Placentalia (e.g., Wible et al., 2007, 2009; Goswami et al., 2011), but all recent published phylogenetic analyses focused on euarchontan relationships have placed *Purgatorius* closer to Primates and/or Dermoptera than Scandentia (Bloch et al., 2007; Ni et al., 2013, 2016; Chester et al., 2015, 2017; Li and Ni, 2016; Gunnell et al., 2018; Morse et al., 2019; Seiffert et al., 2020; see "Crown Euarchontoglires" above).

Hard minimum bound 65.79 Ma

Soft maximum bound 125.816 Ma

Suggested prior distribution offset exponential

Age justifications In contrast to the craniodentally distinctive early crown members of Glires such as *Heomys* and *Mimotona* (see "Crown Glires" above), the earliest crown euarchontans may have been morphologically little different from stem-eutherians (Bininda-Emonds et al., 2012),

which might explain why, for example, *Purgatorius* falls outside Placentalia in some published analyses (Wible et al., 2007, 2009; Goswami et al., 2011). For this reason, we use the same minimum and maximum bounds for this node as for Crown Euarchontoglires, and again suggest modelling this as an offset exponential prior (see “Crown Euarchontoglires” above).

Additional CladeAge calibration The fossil record of Scandentia is sparse. Besides the questionable *Eodendrogale parva* from the middle Eocene (Tong, 1988; Ni and Qiu, 2012), the oldest known scandentian is *Ptilocercus kylin* from the early Oligocene Lijiawa locality, Yunnan Province, China, which has an age estimate of ~34 Ma (Li and Ni, 2016), and represents a second CladeAge calibration for this node. Phylogenetic analyses place *P. kylin* within crown Scandentia, sister to the extant *P. lowii*, suggesting an extensive unsampled history of earlier scandentians.

Comments Benton et al. (2009) proposed similar minimum and maximum bounds to those used here, whilst Benton et al. (2015) instead suggested a maximum bound of 164.6 Ma based on the maximum age of the oldest currently known stem eutherian, *Juramaia* (see “Crown Euarchontoglires” above). Marjanović (2021) did not calibrate this node.

5.4 Crown Primatomorpha = Primates-Dermoptera split

Calibrating taxon *Teilhardina brandti*

Specimen UM 99301 (holotype), an isolated m2, from UM locality SC-351 at the head of Big Sand Coulee in the Clarks Fork Basin, Wyoming (Gingerich, 1993a).

Phylogenetic justification As summarized above (see “Crown Euarchontoglires” above), the precise relationships of the various “plesiadapiforms” to the extant primatomorphan orders Primates and Dermoptera differ quite markedly between recent phylogenetic analyses; we

826 therefore consider them unsuitable for calibrating this node. Two groups with Paleocene
 827 representatives, namely plagiomenids and mixodectids, have been proposed by some authors to
 828 be dermopteran relatives (Rose, 2006), but this has been questioned (MacPhee et al., 1989;
 829 Yapuncich et al., 2011), and so we have also chosen not to use these to calibrate this node.
 830 Instead, we use the oldest well-supported member of crown Primates, the omomyiform
 831 *Teilhardina brandti* (Gingerich, 1993a; Rose et al., 2011; Morse et al., 2019) as a necessarily
 832 conservative minimum bound.

833 Hard minimum bound 55.935 Ma

834 Soft maximum bound none

835 Suggested prior distribution not applicable (minimum bound only)

836 Age justifications The oldest known material of *Teilhardina brandti*, including our calibrating
 837 specimen UM 99301, comes from the Bighorn Basin in Wyoming (Gingerich, 1993a; Smith et
 838 al., 2006; Rose et al., 2011; Morse et al., 2019). *T. brandti* material has been reported from
 839 various localities in the Bighorn Basin: Big Sand Coulee in the Clarks Fork Basin, a northern
 840 sub-basin in the Bighorn Basin (Gingerich, 1993a; Smith et al., 2006), the Willwood formation
 841 (Bown and Rose, 1987), and the Sand Creek Divide and Cabin Fork sections (Rose et al., 2011;
 842 Morse et al., 2019). All these localities correlate to the second earliest biozone of the early
 843 Eocene, Wasatchian-0 (Wa-0), which follows the brief Wa-M biozone and coincides with most
 844 of the Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum (PETM; Rose et al., 2011) which is marked by a
 845 global carbon isotope excursion (CIE; (Yans et al., 2006). Rose et al. (2011) reported that, based
 846 on carbon isotopic stratigraphy, *Teilhardina brandti* appeared only 25 kyr after the onset of the
 847 PETM. Using 56.01 ± 0.05 Ma for the start of the PETM (Zeebe and Lourens, 2019), the age
 848 estimate of the appearance of *Teilhardina brandti* 25 kyr after this is then 55.985 ± 0.05 Ma,

giving a minimum age of 55.935 Ma for UM 99301, which we use as our minimum bound here, and a maximum age of 56.035 Ma.

If the early Palaeocene *Purgatorius* is closer to Primates than to Dermoptera, or vice versa, then it seems likely that the Primates-Dermoptera split could predate the K-Pg boundary; conversely, if *Purgatorius* and other early “plesiadapiforms” are stem rather than crown primatomorphans, then the Primates-Dermoptera split could potentially be close to the Palaeocene-Eocene boundary (the age of the oldest definitive, crown, primates). For this reason, we have chosen not to propose a soft maximum bound on this node.

Additional CladeAge calibration the oldest known definitive dermopteran material is Dermoptera indet. from the Pondaung Formation of Myanmar (Marivaux et al., 2006a), which has been radiometrically dated to 40.31-40.22 Ma ((Khin Zaw et al., 2014; Jaeger et al., 2019).

Comments: This node does not appear to have been calibrated in recent molecular clock analyses, perhaps because compelling evidence for monophyly of Primatomorpha has only become available comparatively recently (Mason et al., 2016).

5.5 Crown Primates = Haplorhini-Strepsirrhini split

Calibrating taxon *Teilhardina brandti*

Specimen UM 99301 (holotype), an isolated m2, from UM locality SC-351 at the head of Big Sand Coulee in the Clarks Fork Basin, northwestern Wyoming (Gingerich, 1993a).

Phylogenetic justification *Teilhardina brandti* has been identified as an omomyiform (Gingerich, 1993a; Rose et al., 2011; Morse et al., 2019). Phylogenetic analyses consistently place Omomyiformes generally, and *Teilhardina* specifically, within crown Primates. In these analyses, omomyiforms are usually placed within Haplorhini as stem-members of the lineage

872 leading to modern tarsiers (=Tarsiiformes), with which they share large orbit size, elongated
873 tarsals, small body size, an anteriorly positioned foramen magnum indicating a vertical head
874 posture, and shortened crania (Ni et al., 2013, 2016; Gunnell et al., 2018; Jaeger et al., 2019;
875 Morse et al., 2019). Even if *T. brandti* and other omomyiforms are discounted as the oldest
876 crown primates (Godinot, 2015, 2017; Gunnell and Miller, 2018), the oldest known stem
877 strepsirrhine (the 55.8-55.12 Ma old *Donrussellia provincialis*; see below) is only slightly
878 younger than the oldest material of *T. brandti*, and so this would have little impact on the
879 minimum bound of this calibration.

880 Hard minimum bound 55.935 Ma

881 Soft maximum bound 66.095 Ma

882 Suggested prior distribution offset exponential

883 Age justifications The minimum bound is based on the minimum age of the oldest specimen of
884 the oldest crown primate, *Teilhardina brandti* (see “Crown Primatomorpha” above). The
885 maximum bound is based on the maximum age of the oldest specimen of the oldest known
886 plesiadapiform *Purgatorius mckeeveri* (see “Crown Euarchontoglires” above). Although the
887 affinities of *Purgatorius* and other “plesiadapiforms” vary between analyses, they have not been
888 recovered within crown Primates in any recently published study of which we are aware. A
889 diversity of “plesiadapiforms” is known throughout the Palaeocene (Silcox et al., 2017). At least
890 some of them were likely ecologically similar to early crown primates (Silcox et al., 2017), and
891 they are known from fossil deposits in the same regions (particularly North America) where
892 crown primates are known from younger sites. The presence of “plesiadapiforms” but the
893 absence of ecologically similar crown primates in these Palaeocene sites (several of which are
894 comparatively rich and well-sampled), and the approximately synchronous appearance of

895 members of Haplorhini (*Teilhardina* spp.) and Strepsirrhini (*Donrussellia* spp.) in the earliest
896 Eocene, collectively suggests to us that crown Primates probably originated close to the
897 Palaeocene-Eocene boundary. Based on this, we suggest that this calibration is most
898 appropriately modelled as an offset exponential prior. Assuming a 5% probability of exceeding
899 the soft maximum bound, this would give a mean and median prior on this divergence of 59.3
900 and 58.3 Ma respectively.

901 Additional CladeAge calibration We recognize *Teilhardina brandti* as the oldest known
902 haplorhine. Based on current evidence, the oldest known strepsirrhine appears to be the
903 adapiform *Donrussellia*, with three species known from various early Eocene (MP7) sites in
904 Europe (*Donrussellia magna* and *D. provincialis* from France: Godinot, 1978, 1998; and *D.*
905 *lusitanica* from Portugal: Estravís, 2000). A fourth species, *D. gallica*, is slightly younger
906 (MP8+9; Ramdarshan et al., 2015). Of these, *Donrussellia provincialis* and *D. gallica* have had
907 their phylogenetic affinities formally tested in the context of large scale analyses (e.g., Ni et al.,
908 2013; Morse et al., 2019), and are usually recovered as stem strepsirrhines. *Donrussellia*
909 *provincialis* is also the best known species, based on multiple dental specimens and an isolated
910 astragalus from the Rians locality (Boyer et al., 2017). We therefore use *D. provincialis* as our
911 additional CladeAge calibration as the oldest known strepsirrhine, with an age range of 55.8-
912 55.12 Ma, based on Solé et al.'s (2015) suggested age for Rians.

913 Comments We differ from Benton et al. (2015) and dos Reis et al. (2018), who used *Altiatlasius*
914 *koulchii* from the Adrar Mgorn 1 locality, Morocco (Sigé et al., 1990), as the earliest record of
915 crown primates. Adrar Mgorn 1 can be correlated to Chron 24r (Seiffert et al., 2010b), which
916 spans the Paleocene-Eocene boundary, but based on associated fauna of invertebrates and
917 selachians a latest Paleocene age for Adrar Mgorn 1 appears more likely (Gheerbrant, 1998;

Seiffert et al., 2010b). This results in a minimum age of 56.0 Ma for *Altiatlasius koulchii*, based on the age of the end of the Thanetian (Walker et al., 2018), which is only 0.065 Ma older than the minimum bound we set based on the appearance of *Teilhardina brandti*. However, *Altiatlasius* is of very uncertain phylogenetic relationships: it has been identified as a stem primate (Hooker et al., 1999; Morse et al., 2019), a crown primate of uncertain affinities (Silcox, 2008), a stem tarsiiform (Boyer et al., 2010), a basal haplorhine (Marivaux, 2006; Patel et al., 2012), or a stem anthropoid (Godinot, 1994; Marivaux, 2006; Bajpai et al., 2008; Seiffert et al., 2009; Tabuce et al., 2009; Patel et al., 2012) by different authors. Additionally, Seiffert et al. (2010b) note that the morphological variation shown by the upper molars of *Altiatlasius* is problematic, although they still conclude that *Altiatlasius* is more likely to be an anthropoid than a plesiadapiform. Given the uncertainty surrounding its relationships, and the fact its minimum age being very close to that of *Teilhardina brandti*, we do not use *A. koulchii* to calibrate this node.

Benton et al. (2015) used a similar maximum bound to ours, but dos Reis et al. (2018) preferred a much older maximum (88.6 Ma), based on the results of statistical modelling of primate diversification by Wilkinson et al. (2011). In principle, such a quantitative approach is preferable to the admittedly subjective interpretation of the fossil record used here and in most other attempts to identify fossil calibrations for primates. However, we consider a Cretaceous origin for crown Primates to be highly unlikely. Not only is there no record of crown Primates from any Cretaceous site, including the comparatively well-sampled North American record (Kielan-Jaworowska et al., 2004; Wilson, 2014), but a Cretaceous origin for crown Primates would require that all deeper nodes within Euarchontoglires also occurred in the Cretaceous or earlier; there is, however, no record of Cretaceous “plesiadapiforms” either. Furthermore, there

does not appear to be a clear explanation why the plesiomorphic “plesiadapiform” *Purgatorius* (a small-bodied [~100g], predominantly insectivorous, arboreal form; Chester et al., 2015; Silcox et al., 2017; Wilson Mantilla et al., 2021) should appear in the fossil record almost immediately after the K-Pg boundary (Wilson Mantilla et al., 2021), but the oldest crown primates, which appear to have been ecologically broadly similar to *Purgatorius*, appear ~10 Ma later (and approximately simultaneously in North America, Asia and Europe; Smith et al., 2006; Beard, 2008; Rose et al., 2011) if the lineages leading to *Purgatorius* and crown primates had already diverged in the Cretaceous. Instead, we consider the late Cretaceous and Paleocene fossil record to be sufficiently well sampled to support an origin of crown Primates close to the Palaeocene-Eocene boundary.

5.6 Crown Strepsirrhini = Lorisiformes-(Lemuriformes+Chiromyiformes) split

Calibrating taxon *Saharagalago misrensis*

Specimen CGM 40266 (type), a lower first molar from the BQ-2 locality in the Fayum region, Egypt (Seiffert et al., 2003).

Phylogenetic justification Recent phylogenetic analyses of *Saharagalago misrensis* consistently place it as a crown strepsirrhine, typically as a stem lorisiform (Gunnell et al., 2018; Seiffert et al., 2018, 2020). A second taxon from BQ-2, *Karanisia clarki*, is also usually placed as a crown strepsirrhine (Gunnell et al., 2018; Seiffert et al., 2018, 2020; López-Torres and Silcox, 2020), providing further evidence that the Lorisiformes-(Lemuriformes+Chiromyiformes) split predates the age of this locality.

Hard minimum bound 37.0 Ma

Soft maximum bound 55.8 Ma

Suggested prior distribution uniform

Age justifications The BQ-2 locality has been correlated with Chron 17n.1n (Seiffert, 2006), which is currently recognized as spanning ~37.5-37.0 Ma (Houben et al., 2019; Agnini et al., 2020), resulting in a minimum bound for this node of 37.0 Ma (see also Van Couvering and Delson, 2020). The maximum bound is based on the maximum age of the earliest well known stem strepsirrhine, *Donrussellia provincialis* (see “Crown Primates” above), based on the assumption that the divergence of crown Strepsirrhini is unlikely to predate the oldest stem member of the clade. There is a comparatively rich record of stem strepsirrhines from the Eocene in Europe, but the African record is still poorly known, with only three definitive stem strepsirrhines (*Djebelemur*, *Azibius* and *Algeripithecus*) known from the middle Eocene (~48 Ma; Van Couvering and Delson, 2020) of Algeria and Libya (Tabuce et al., 2009; Marivaux et al., 2013), followed by a ~11 million year gap until the probable crown strepsirrhines *Saharagalago* and *Karanisia* from BQ-2 mentioned above. For this reason, we suggest that this calibration be implemented as a uniform prior between the minimum and maximum bounds.

Additional CladeAge calibration We accept *Saharagalago* as the oldest known lorisiform. We consider the oldest well supported member of the sister-taxon of Lorisiformes, namely the Chiromyiformes+Lemuriformes clade, to be the stem chiromyiform *Plesiopithecus teras*, from Quarry L-41 in the Fayum region, Egypt (Simons, 1992; Gunnell et al., 2018), which is dated to ~33.4 Ma (Van Couvering and Delson, 2020; see “Chiromyiformes-Lemuriformes split” below,).

Comments While we have used *Saharagalago* to provide the minimum bound on this node, Benton et al. (2015) instead used *Karanisia clarki* (Seiffert et al., 2003), to provide a minimum bound on the age of this node. In its original description, *Karanisia* was placed as a crown lorisid (Seiffert et al., 2003), but its position in subsequent studies has varied, having been found as a

stem-strepsirrhine, stem lorisiform, or stem lemuriform (see summary in López-Torres and Silcox, 2020). We therefore prefer to use *Saharagalago*, which has been consistently placed as a lorisiform in recent analyses, to calibrate this node, as did dos Reis et al. (2018). For the maximum bound, both Benton et al. (2015) and dos Reis (2018) used the age of *Altiaatlasius*, which they recognized as the oldest crown primate. However, as already discussed (see “Crown Primates” above), *Altiaatlasius* is of uncertain affinities, and we instead use the age of the early stem strepsirrhine, *Donrussellia provincialis*, as our maximum bound here. Nevertheless, the ages of the minimum and maximum bounds proposed here fall closely to those of Benton et al. (2015) and dos Reis et al. (2018).

5.7 Chiromyiformes-Lemuriformes split

Calibrating taxon *Plesiopithecus teras*

Specimen DPC 12393, a crushed but nearly complete cranium with maxillary dentition from Quarry L-41 in the Fayum region, Egypt (Simons, 1992; Simons and Rasmussen, 1994).

Phylogenetic justification Gunnell et al. (2018) presented compelling morphological evidence that *Plesiopithecus* (and a second taxon, the Miocene *Propotto*) is a stem member of Chiromyiformes (see also comments by Godinot, 2006), which today is represented by a single species, the aye-aye *Daubentonia madagascariensis*. This conclusion is supported by total evidence dating phylogenetic analyses, with and without the use of a clock model (Gunnell et al., 2018).

Hard minimum bound 33.4 Ma

Soft maximum bound 55.8 Ma

Suggested prior distribution uniform

1010 Age justifications *Plesiopithecus teras* comes from Quarry L-41 in the Fayum region, Egypt. The
1011 age of L-41 has been debated (Gingerich, 1993b; Seiffert, 2006, 2010; see summary in Van
1012 Couvering and Delson, 2020), but we follow Van Couvering and Delson (2020) in assigning it
1013 an age of 33.4 Ma.

1014 Our proposed maximum bound is the same as for crown Strepsirrhini (see above). In particular,
1015 *Plesiopithecus* shows a range of unusual chiromyiform specializations (Godinot, 2006; Gunnell
1016 et al., 2018), suggesting that it probably postdates the Chiromyiformes-Lemuriformes split quite
1017 considerably, and implying an extensive unsampled ghost lineage. The Oligocene *Bugtilemur*
1018 *mathesoni* from the Bugti Hills, Pakistan, was originally described as a crown lemuriform
1019 (Marivaux et al., 2001), but was subsequently identified as an adapiform, and hence a stem
1020 strepsirrhine, following the discovery of additional specimens (Marivaux et al., 2006b). The
1021 37.0-37.5 Ma old *Karanisia* was placed as a stem lemuriform in the tip-dating analysis of
1022 Seiffert et al. (2018), but most other analyses place it as a stem lorisiform (see summary in
1023 López-Torres et al., 2020). Thus, no definitive stem lemuriform fossils are currently known.

1024 However, if the Chiromyiformes-Lemuriformes split occurred in mainland Africa, as concluded
1025 by Gunnell et al. (2018), then lemuriforms should be expected to be found in the African fossil
1026 record. Indeed, Gunnell et al. (2018) implied that the poorly known *Notnamaia* from the middle
1027 Eocene (~47 Ma; Van Couvering and Delson, 2020) of Namibia (Pickford et al., 2008) might be
1028 a stem lemuriform (but see Godinot et al., 2018), although this has not (to our knowledge) been
1029 tested via formal phylogenetic analysis. Thus it seems possible that the Chiromyiformes-
1030 Lemuriformes split might be much older than 33.4 Ma. We therefore consider that a uniform age
1031 prior is most appropriate for this node.

1032 Additional CladeAge calibration *Plesiopithecus teras* is the oldest known chiromyiform. The
 1033 oldest definitive records of the sister clade of Chiromyiformes, Lemuriformes, are subfossil
 1034 remains from Madagascar, the earliest of which are *Hadropithecus stenognathus*, dating to about
 1035 7500 years ago (Burney et al., 2008; Godfrey et al., 2010); this record provides a very young
 1036 additional CladeAge calibration.
 1037 Comments Benton et al. (2015) and dos Reis et al. (2018) did not calibrate this node.
 1038
 1039 *5.8 Crown Lorisiformes = Lorisidae-Galagidae split*
 1040 Calibrating taxon *Komba robustus*
 1041 Specimen KNM-SO 501 (holotype), a right mandibular fragment with p4–m2, from Songhor,
 1042 Kenya (Le Gros Clark and Thomas, 1952).
 1043 Phylogenetic justification A position for *Komba* within crown lorisiforms, as a galagid, receives
 1044 consistently strong support in recent published phylogenetic analyses (Gunnell et al., 2018;
 1045 Seiffert et al., 2018, 2020). The older *Saharagalago* (see “Crown Strepsirrhini” above) *Karansia*
 1046 and *Wadilemur* have been recovered as stem galagids in some analyses, but are placed outside
 1047 crown Lorisiformes in others (see summaries in López-Torres and Silcox, 2020; López-Torres et
 1048 al., 2020). Also of note is the finding of Phillips (2016) and Phillips and Fruciano (2018) that use
 1049 of *Saharagalago* to calibrate the lorisid-galagid split results in extremely high apparent dating
 1050 error. Using the results of molecular dating analyses to assess the appropriateness of particular
 1051 fossil calibrations risks circularity, but in this case the strong mismatch in molecular rates found
 1052 by Phillips (2016) and Phillips and Fruciano (2018) when *Saharagalago* is assumed to be a
 1053 crown lorisiform, together with the fact that *Saharagalago* falls outside crown Lorisiformes in at

1054 least some analyses (Gunnell et al., 2018; Seiffert et al., 2018, 2020), persuades us that *Komba*
 1055 *robustus* is a more appropriate calibrating fossil taxon for this divergence.
 1056 Hard minimum bound 18.5 Ma
 1057 Soft maximum bound 55.8 Ma
 1058 Suggested prior distribution uniform
 1059 Age justifications species of *Komba* (as well as several other putative galagids that have not had
 1060 their phylogenetic affinities robustly tested, such as *Progalago* spp. and *Mioeuoticus* spp.) are
 1061 known from multiple early Miocene sites in east Africa (Harrison, 2010a: table 20.2). Although
 1062 radiometric dates are available for at least some of these sites, including Songhor from where
 1063 KNM-SO 501 was collected, this dating was done in the 1960s using K-Ar dating (Bishop et al.,
 1064 1969), and it is in need of verification using more modern techniques (Cote et al., 2018).
 1065 Songhor is currently recognized as falling within the Legetetian African Land Mammal Age
 1066 (Van Couvering and Delson, 2020), and so pending new radiometric dating of this site, we use
 1067 the minimum age of the Legetetian (which spans 22.5-18.5 Ma according to Van Couvering and
 1068 Delson, 2020) as our minimum bound here, namely 18.5 Ma. Our maximum bound is the same
 1069 as for crown Strepsirrhini and Chiromyiformes-Lemuriformes (see above).
 1070 Given that *Saharagalago*, *Karanisia* and *Wadilemur* have all been recovered as stem
 1071 galagids in some analyses, it is possible that the galagid-lorisid split predates considerably our
 1072 proposed minimum bound. For this reason, this calibration is most appropriately modelled as a
 1073 uniform distribution.
 1074 Additional CladeAge calibration The oldest lorisid that has had its phylogenetic affinities
 1075 rigorously tested is *Nycticeboides simpsoni*, which is dated to ~8.9 Ma, and falls within crown
 1076 Lorisidae in most recent analyses (see “Crown Lorisidae” below).

1077 Comments Benton et al. (2015) did not calibrate this node. By contrast, dos Reis et al. (2018)
1078 used a similar minimum bound to ours (18 Ma), based on the early Miocene *Mioeuoticus*, which
1079 they recognized as a crown lorisid, but a tighter maximum bound (38 Ma) that seems
1080 questionable given the possibility that the 37.5-37.0 Ma *Saharagalago* is a crown lorisiform (see
1081 above); indeed, we note that their 95% posterior credibility interval for the Lorisidae-Galagidae
1082 split (34.1-40.9 Ma) exceeds their proposed maximum bound.

1083

1084 *5.9 Crown Lorisidae = Lorisinae-Perodicticinae split*

1085 Calibrating taxon *Nycticeboides simpsoni*

1086 Specimen YGSP 8091 (holotype), a near complete dentition formed by mandibular and
1087 maxillary fragments, some skull fragments, and a few postcranial fragments including a distal
1088 humerus, all believed to represent a single individual, from the YGSP 363 locality in the Dhok
1089 Pathan Formation, Pakistan (Jacobs, 1981).

1090 Phylogenetic justification *Nycticeboides simpsoni* closely resembles extant *Nycticebus* species
1091 (Jacobs, 1981; MacPhee and Jacobs, 1986; Flynn and Morgan, 2005) and is typically found to be
1092 a crown lorisine in published phylogenetic analyses: either sister to *Nycticebus* (Seiffert et al.,
1093 2015, 2018; Herrera and Dávalos, 2016), or sister to *Loris* (Seiffert et al., 2018). In a few
1094 analyses, however, *Nycticeboides* is placed as a stem lorisine, outside *Loris+Nycticebus* (Seiffert
1095 et al., 2015), or as part of an unresolved polytomy with *Loris* and *Nycticebus* (Seiffert et al.,
1096 2010a). Regardless, all of these phylogenetic placements support the use of *Nycticeboides* to
1097 place the minimum bound for the divergence between Lorisinae and Perodicticinae. An
1098 exception to this general pattern is seen in the total-evidence phylogenetic analyses by Seiffert et
1099 al. (2018), in which *Nycticeboides* was placed as a stem rather than crown lorisid. However,

1100 Gunnell et al. (2018) and Seiffert et al. (2020) both used morphological matrices that were
1101 expanded from Seiffert et al. (2018), and in both cases *Nycticeboides* was placed within crown
1102 Lorisidae. Morphological synapomorphies that support *Nycticeboides* as a lorisine (and hence a
1103 crown lorisid) are found in its facial, dental, and postcranial morphology (Jacobs, 1981;
1104 MacPhee and Jacobs, 1986), and so we are confident in using this taxon to calibrate this node
1105 here.

1106 Hard minimum bound 8.9 Ma

1107 Soft maximum bound 37.5 Ma

1108 Suggested prior distribution uniform

1109 Age justifications The YGSP 363 locality in the Dhok Pathan Formation, Pakistan, has been
1110 argued to be younger than 8 Ma based on dating of older sites in the same section (Tauxe, 1979),
1111 and *Nycticeboides* was assigned an approximate age of ~8-7 Ma in its original description
1112 (Jacobs, 1981). MacPhee and Jacobs (1986) listed an age of 7.5-7.0 Ma for the holotype based on
1113 tracing of the lithologic unit to a measured section dated by Tauxe and Opdyke (1982). However,
1114 Flynn and Morgan (2005) subsequently reported an age of 9.1-7.8 Ma for YGSP 363, and this
1115 locality is currently believed to be ~8.9 Ma old (L. J. Flynn, pers. comm. 21/01/2021); we use
1116 this latter date as our hard minimum bound here

1117 As discussed above (see “Crown Strepsirrhini” and “Crown Lorisiformes” above), most recent
1118 published phylogenetic analyses find that the 37.0-37.5 Ma old *Saharagalago* and *Karanisia* are
1119 stem lorisiforms, and so it seems likely that they predate divergences within the crown lorisiform
1120 families Lorisidae and Galagidae. We therefore use the maximum age of the BQ-2 Quarry (see
1121 “Crown Strepsirrhini” above) as our maximum bound here.

1122 There are a number of fossil putative lorisids that are older than *Nycticeboides simpsoni*, at least
1123 some of which may be members of crown Lorisidae. These include *Mioeuoticus* from the early
1124 Miocene (~19-18 Ma) of East Africa (Le Gros Le Gros Clark, 1956; Leakey, 1962), ?*Nycticebus*
1125 *linglom* from the Miocene (18.0-17.0 Ma or 14.2-12.0 Ma) of Thailand (Mein and Ginsburg,
1126 1997), and an isolated m1 from the middle Miocene (~15.2 Ma) locality Y682 in the Kamliyal
1127 Formation of Pakistan that Flynn and Morgan (2005) identified as *Nycticeboides* sp. We have not
1128 used these taxa to inform our proposed minimum bound on this divergence here, because their
1129 phylogenetic affinities are either controversial or have not been formally tested; nevertheless,
1130 they suggest that the Lorisinae-Perodicticinae split may predate considerably the age of
1131 *Nycticeboides simpsoni*, and so a uniform prior distribution on the age of this node seems
1132 appropriate.

1133 Additional CladeAge calibration As summarized above, we consider *Nycticeboides simpsoni* to
1134 be the oldest well supported member of crown Lorisidae. The affinities of most other fossil
1135 lorisids currently known are controversial or have not been tested via formal phylogenetic
1136 analysis. Pickford (2012) described OCO 119'10, a partial rostrum (preserving part of the upper
1137 dentition) of a lorisid from the Aragai locality in the Lukeino Formation, and tentatively referred
1138 this specimen to the extant perodicticine genus *Arctocebus*. Although OCO 119'10 has not been
1139 included in a published phylogenetic analysis, its close overall resemblance to *Arctocebus* means
1140 that we consider it the oldest definitive perodicticine. The Aragai locality is currently considered
1141 to be ~6.1 Ma (Gilbert et al., 2010).

1142 Comments dos Reis et al. (2018) used a considerably older minimum bound for this divergence
1143 of 14 Ma, based on an undescribed genus and species from Fort Ternan in Kenya, which
1144 Harrison (2010a) reported “is most similar to *Perodicticus*, and may eventually be referable to

1145 the Perodicticinae.” However, pending description of this specimen and formal testing of its
 1146 affinities, we prefer a younger minimum bound here. The maximum bound of dos Reis et al.
 1147 (2018) is similar to that used here.
 1148
 1149 *5.10 Galagoides-(Galago+Paragalago+Otolemur+Sciurocheirus) split*
 1150 Calibrating taxon *Galago farafraensis*
 1151 Specimen SA 8’05, a right p4, from the Sheikh Abdallah locality, Egypt (Pickford et al., 2006b).
 1152 Phylogenetic justification *Galago farafraensis* is represented by dental and postcranial material.
 1153 Although the affinities of this taxon have not been tested via formal phylogenetic analyses, its p4
 1154 exhibits a reduced metaconid that is positioned close to the protoconid, a derived trait that is
 1155 shared with extant *Galago* and *Otolemur* species, in contrast to the plesiomorphic condition in
 1156 early and middle Miocene galagids and extant *Euoticus* and *Galagoides*, in which the metaconid
 1157 is larger and more offset from the protoconid (Schwartz and Tattersall, 1985; Walker, 1987;
 1158 McCrossin, 1992; Pickford et al., 2006b). Although we recognize that this is only a single
 1159 character, in the absence of a suitably comprehensive phylogenetic analysis, we suggest that
 1160 *Galago farafraensis* is more closely related to living *Galago*, *Paragalago*, *Otolemur*, and
 1161 *Sciurocheirus* species than to *Euoticus* and *Galagoides* based on this dental synapomorphy, and
 1162 so *G. farafraensis* can be used to calibrate this divergence. Other fragmentary galagid material
 1163 from the Miocene and Pliocene has not been formally described, or is so fragmentary that it
 1164 cannot be confidently placed in a phylogenetic framework, or both (Harrison, 2010a).
 1165 Hard minimum bound 10.0 Ma
 1166 Soft maximum bound 33.4 Ma
 1167 Suggested prior distribution uniform

1168 Age justifications Van Couvering and Delson (2020) assigned an age of ~11 Ma to Sheikh
1169 Abdallah, but we take the more conservative approach of assuming an age range corresponding
1170 to the entire Tugenian African Land Mammal Age (12.8-10 Ma), which includes Sheikh
1171 Abdallah (Van Couvering and Delson, 2020).

1172 Based on molecular evidence (Pozzi et al., 2014, 2015), this node is the second split
1173 within crown Galagidae, with *Euoticus* the first modern galagid genus to diverge. It seems
1174 unlikely that a nested divergence within crown Galagidae will predate the oldest fossil record of
1175 stem galagids. For this reason, we use the *Wadilemur elegans* from Quarry L-41 in the Fayum,
1176 which has been recovered as a stem galagid in most (but not all) recent phylogenetic analyses, to
1177 provide our maximum bound (see “Chiromyiformes-Lemuriformes split” above for discussion of
1178 the age of Quarry L-41). However, given the fragmentary nature of the galagid fossil record from
1179 the Miocene and Pliocene, and the lack of a robust phylogenetic framework for most of these
1180 specimens (Harrison, 2010a, 2011; Kunimatsu et al., 2017), it seems possible, if not probable,
1181 that this divergence could predate our minimum bound considerably, and so a uniform
1182 distribution seems appropriate.

1183 Additional CladeAge calibration An isolated right m2 (L. 1-521) from the upper Member B of
1184 the Shungura Formation at Omo, Ethiopia, described by Wesselman (1984) was identified by
1185 Harrison (2010a) as *Galagoides* cf. *zanzibaricus* based on its very close resemblance to the
1186 modern species. Although this is not the result of a formal phylogenetic analysis, we accept this
1187 identification here and use this specimen to provide our additional CladeAge calibration for this
1188 node. Van Couvering and Delson (2020) report an age of 3.42 Ma for Member B of the
1189 Shungura Formation, and we use this date here.

1190 Comments dos Reis et al. (2018) used a ~15 Ma old undescribed galagid from Maboko Island,
 1191 Kenya (McCrossin, 1999), to provide the minimum bound for the calibration of crown
 1192 Galagidae. We do not calibrate crown Galagidae here, preferring instead to calibrate a less
 1193 inclusive node. In any case, in the absence of a formal description, it is unclear whether the
 1194 Maboko Island taxon represents a crown or a stem galagid. For their maximum bound,
 1195 meanwhile, dos Reis et al. (2018) used a similar, but slightly older date for crown Galagidae to
 1196 that proposed here for *Galagoides*-(*Galago*+*Paragalago*+*Otolemur*+*Sciurocheirus*), namely 37
 1197 Ma based on the age of *Karanisia clarki* from the BQ-2 locality in the Fayum (see “Crown
 1198 Strepsirrhini” above).
 1199
 1200 *5.11 Crown Haplorhini = Anthropeidea-Tarsiiformes split*
 1201 Calibrating taxon *Tarsius eocaenus*
 1202 Specimen IVPP V14563, a left premaxillary-maxillary fragment preserving the crown of P3,
 1203 alveoli for I2, C1, P2, and the mesial roots of P4, from Shanghuang fissure D, near the village of
 1204 Shanghuang, southern Jiangsu Province, China (Rossie et al., 2006).
 1205 Phylogenetic justification *Tarsius eocaenus* has not, to our knowledge, been included in a
 1206 comprehensive phylogenetic analysis to formally test its affinities, but its preserved cranial
 1207 morphology is almost identical to that seen in modern tarsiids, and includes several unusual
 1208 derived traits (Rossie et al., 2006). Based on this, we are confident that *Tarsius eocaenus* is a
 1209 definitive tarsiiform. Omomyiforms, including the oldest known member of this group
 1210 *Teilhardina brandti*, are typically placed as stem tarsiiforms in recent phylogenetic analyses (see
 1211 “Crown Primates” above). However, some doubts remain as to whether omomyiforms are indeed
 1212 members of the tarsiiform lineage (Godinot, 2015; Gunnell and Miller, 2018). Based on current

evidence, the oldest anthropoids are eosimiids and amphipithecids from the Eocene of Asia (Jaeger et al., 2019, 2020), of which the oldest well dated taxa are from the Pondaung Formation of Myanmar (Zin-Maung-Maung-Thein et al. 2017; Jaeger et al., 2020), which has been radiometrically dated to 40.31-40.22 Ma (Khin Zaw et al., 2014; Jaeger et al., 2019). Older putative records of anthropoids are based on specimens that are much more fragmentary, and are correspondingly more equivocal; they include *Altiatlasius koulchii* from the Palaeocene-Eocene of Africa, which is of very uncertain relationships (see “Crown Primates” above), and *Anthrasimias gujaratensis* from the early Eocene of India (Bajpai et al., 2008), the material of which has subsequently been suggested to in fact represent the asiadapid (stem strepsirrhine) *Marcgodinotius indicus* (Rose et al., 2009, 2018). There is thus a ~15 million year gap between the oldest omomyiform (*Teilhardina brandti*) and the oldest generally accepted record of stem anthropoids, from the Pondaung Formation. By contrast, *Tarsius eocaenus*, which is from the 47.8-41.0 Ma old (Ni et al., 2020) Shanghuang fissure fills of China, is similar in age to the Pondaung stem anthropoids. While the primate fossil record is obviously far from complete, the large gap between the oldest omomyiforms and the oldest anthropoids may be an indication that omomyiforms are stem rather than crown haplorhines; thus, we prefer to use the *Tarsius eocaenus* to provide a minimum on this node.

Hard minimum bound 41.0 Ma

Soft maximum bound none

Suggested prior distribution not applicable (minimum bound only)

Age justifications Ni et al. (2020) identified the Shanghuang fissure fills as spanning 47.8-41.0

Ma, and so we use 41.0 Ma as our minimum bound. Given the uncertainty regarding the

1235 affinities of omomyiforms discussed above, we find it difficult to define a maximum bound, and
1236 so we leave this uncalibrated here.

1237 Additional CladeAge calibration We assume that *Tarsius eocaenus* is the oldest definitive
1238 member of Tarsiiformes. Similarly, we assume that the oldest definitive stem anthropoids are
1239 from the 40.22-40.31 Ma Pondaung Formation (see above), which we use as our additional
1240 CladeAge calibration.

1241 Comments Although dos Reis et al. (2018) did not discuss omomyiform affinities, it is notable
1242 that they chose to specify the minimum bound on crown Haplorhini using *Tarsius eocaenus* (as
1243 done here), together with a second fossil tarsiid from China (*Xanthorhysis*), rather than using an
1244 omomyiform. They also, like us, leave the maximum bound on this node uncalibrated.

1245

1246 *5.12 Crown Anthropoidea = Catarrhini-Platyrrhini split*

1247 Calibrating taxon *Catopithecus browni*

1248 Specimen DPC 8701, a near complete skull, from Quarry L-41 in the Fayum Region, Egypt
1249 (Simons, 1989, 1990).

1250 Phylogenetic justification *Catopithecus* can be identified as a stem-catarrhine, and therefore a
1251 crown anthropoid, based on the loss of the upper and lower second premolars, and the
1252 development of a honing blade for the upper canine on a sexually dimorphic lower p3 (Simons
1253 and Rasmussen, 1996; Seiffert and Simons, 2001). The stem catarrhine position of *Catopithecus*
1254 is confirmed by numerous recent phylogenetic analyses, including those of Ni et al. (2016),
1255 Morse et al. (2019), and Seiffert et al. (2020).

1256 Hard minimum bound 33.4 Ma

1257 Soft maximum bound 56.035 Ma

1258 Suggested prior distribution uniform

1259 Age justifications *Catopithecus browni* comes from Quarry L-41 in the Fayum Region, Egypt,
1260 for which we use an age estimate of 33.4 Ma, following Van Couvering and Delson (2020; see
1261 “Crown Strepsirrhini” above). For the maximum bound we use the maximum age of our
1262 calibrating specimen of the oldest crown primate, *Teilhardina brandti* (see “Crown
1263 Primatomorpha” above).

1264 A few stem anthropoids have been described from African sites that are slightly older
1265 than Quarry L-41 (e.g., *Biretia*, *Talahpithecus*), but as yet no definitive crown anthropoids;
1266 however, a currently undescribed taxon from the 37.5-37.0 Ma BQ-2 locality may represent a
1267 stem catarrhine (Gunnell and Miller, 2018; E. R. Seiffert, pers. comm. 24/03/2021), which would
1268 result in a slightly older minimum bound than that proposed here. In addition, some phylogenetic
1269 analyses presented by Jaeger et al. (2019) placed *Aseanpithecus* from the 40.31-40.22 Ma
1270 Pondaung Formation of Myanmar within crown Anthropoidea. For these reasons, at present we
1271 consider that this calibration is best modelled as a uniform distribution, although we suspect that
1272 this divergence is almost certainly closer to the minimum than the maximum bound.

1273 Additional CladeAge calibration *Catopithecus browni* is the oldest known stem catarrhine.

1274 Antoine et al. (2021) recently described highly fragmentary primate teeth from Shapaja, San
1275 Martín, Peruvian Amazonia in a site (TAR-21) that they dated to between 33.9 and 34.5 Ma, i.e.,
1276 the latest Eocene (Antoine et al., 2021, fig. 6). These specimens resemble *Perupithecus*
1277 *ucayaliensis* from the early Oligocene (29.6 ± 0.08 Ma) Santa Rosa Fauna of Peru (Campbell et
1278 al., 2021), which is probably a stem platyrrhine (see “Results” and “Discussion” above; Bond et
1279 al., 2015; Seiffert et al., 2020), and so we tentatively recognize them as stem platyrrhines as well.
1280 However, the reported ages of the Shapaja sites were questioned by Campbell et al. (2021), with

1281 these authors concluding that an Oligocene date was more likely. Pending resolution of this
1282 issue, we prefer to use the detrital zircon date for the Santa Rosa Fauna, source of the probable
1283 platyrrhine *Perupithecus*, as our second CladeAge calibration: this is 29.68-29.52 Ma.
1284 *Talahpithecus* from the ~36 Ma (Van Couvering and Delson, 2020) Dur At-Talah escarpment,
1285 central Libya, was recovered as a stem-platyrrhine in the phylogenetic analysis of Bond et al.
1286 (2015), but its position as sister to *Perupithecus* implies a very complex biogeographical origin
1287 for Platyrrhini with multiple crossings of the Atlantic Ocean, and so we do not use *Talahpithecus*
1288 as the oldest record of Platyrrhini here.

1289 Comments Benton et al. (2015) and dos Reis et al. (2018) also used *Catopithecus* to provide a
1290 minimum bound on this node. However, both these studies used a more conservative maximum
1291 bound than that proposed here. Benton et al. (2015) used 66 Ma, based in part on their
1292 identification of *Altiatlasius* as the oldest crown primate and possible crown anthropoid;
1293 however, we consider the affinities of *Altiatlasius* to be uncertain (see “Crown Primates” above)
1294 and do not use it for calibration purposes. Dos Reis et al. (2018), meanwhile, used a maximum of
1295 62.1 Ma based on the modelling of primate diversification by Wilkinson et al. (2011), about
1296 which we have concerns (see “Crown Primates” above).

1297

1298 *5.13 Crown Catarrhini = Cercopithecoidea-Hominoidea split*

1299 Calibrating taxon *Rukwapithecus fleaglei*

1300 Specimen RRBP 12444A (holotype), a right mandible including p4-m3 and part of ascending
1301 ramus from Nsungwe 2B, Tanzania

1302 Phylogenetic justification *Rukwapithecus fleaglei* was consistently recovered as a stem-hominoid
1303 (within the clade Nyanzapithecinae) in the parsimony and Bayesian phylogenetic analyses of

1304 Stevens et al. (2013), indicating that it postdates the Cercopithecoidea-Hominoidea split. Stevens
 1305 et al. (2013, fig. 3) noted that some nodes within their illustrated phylogeny have low support
 1306 values, but there are various synapomorphies reported for four nodes leading up to
 1307 Nyanzapithecinae, and for this subfamily itself. *Rukwapithecus fleaglei* shares two
 1308 synapomorphies with Miocene and extant hominoids that are not present in cercopithecoids or
 1309 stem-catarrhines: a buccal position of the M2 hypoconulid, and the mesial migration of cusps on
 1310 the buccal side of lower molars such that the hypoconid is positioned opposite the lingual notch
 1311 between the metaconid and the entoconid (Stevens et al., 2013).
 1312 Hard minimum bound 25.193 Ma
 1313 Soft maximum bound 33.4 Ma
 1314 Suggested prior distribution uniform
 1315 Age justifications *Rukwapithecus fleaglei* comes from locality Nsungwe 2B in the Oligocene
 1316 Nsungwe Formation in southwestern Tanzania (Stevens et al., 2013). The age of the fossil
 1317 bearing unit is constrained by two volcanic tuffs dated by U-Pb zircon CA-TIMS (U-Pb chemical
 1318 abrasion thermal ionization mass spectrometry) at 25.237 ± 0.098 and 25.214 ± 0.021 Ma
 1319 (Stevens et al., 2013). Taking into account these confidence intervals, the minimum age for this
 1320 specimen is 25.193 Ma and the maximum is 25.335 Ma. For the soft maximum bound, we use
 1321 the age of the oldest known probable stem-catarrhine, *Catopithecus browni*, from the Quarry L-
 1322 41 of the Fayum, Egypt (see “Crown Strepsirrhini” above). The late Oligocene record of
 1323 primates and other terrestrial mammals in Africa is notoriously poor (Kappelman et al., 2003;
 1324 Wilkinson et al., 2011; Stevens et al., 2013), and for this reason we suggest that this calibration is
 1325 best modelled as a uniform calibration.

1326 Additional CladeAge calibration Another fossil species from Nsungwe 2B is *Nsungwepithecus*
 1327 *gunnelli*, currently known from a single specimen (RRBP 11178), a left partial mandible with a
 1328 lower m3 (Stevens et al., 2013). *Nsungwepithecus* was not included in the phylogenetic analyses
 1329 by Stevens et al. (2013), but they report the presence of numerous lower molar synapomorphies
 1330 that are shared with “victoriapithecoid” cercopithecoids (“Victoriapithecidae” is a paraphyletic
 1331 assemblage of stem cercopithecoids in the phylogenetic analyses of Stevens et al. (2013) and
 1332 Rasmussen et al. (2019)), such as deeply incised buccal clefts, a high degree of buccal flare, and
 1333 the lack of a buccal cingulid. Rasmussen et al. (2019) confirmed the stem cercopithecoid position
 1334 of *Nsungwepithecus* in their phylogenetic analysis, but they argued that the phylogenetic position
 1335 of *Nsungwepithecus* should be regarded as tentative until more material is available. We
 1336 therefore recognize *Nsungwepithecus gunnelli* as the oldest (stem) representative of
 1337 Cercopithecoidea, with the same age as *Rukwapithecus fleaglei*.
 1338 Comments Although differing in detail, Benton et al. (2015), dos Reis et al. (2018) and Roos et
 1339 al. (2019) all proposed very similar minimum and maximum bounds for this node.
 1340
 1341 *5.14 Crown Cercopithecidae = Cercopithecinae-Colobinae split*
 1342 Calibrating taxon Colobinae gen. et. sp. indet.
 1343 Specimen KNM-TH 48368, an isolated right lower molar (?m3) from the Baringo
 1344 Paleontological Research Project (BPRP) no. 38 site in the Kabasero type section of the Ngorora
 1345 Formation, Tugen Hills succession, Kenya (Rossie et al., 2013).
 1346 Phylogenetic justification Phylogenetic analyses by Rossie et al. (2013) consistently placed
 1347 KNM-TH 48368 as an early colobine, regardless of whether it was coded as an m2 or an m3.
 1348 KNM-TH 48368 displays a very small but distinct hypoconulid which is also present in the fossil

1349 colobines *Microcolobus* and *Mesopithecus* and many extant colobines (Rossie et al., 2013).
1350 Synapomorphies that KNM-TH 48368 shares with extant colobines are: “tall and sharp
1351 transverse lophids, reduced basal flare of the crown, a wide and deep median buccal cleft, buccal
1352 cusps with a columnar profile and mesial tilt, a long talonid basin relative to overall crown
1353 length, and subequal mesial and distal crown breadths” (Rossie et al., 2013).

1354 Hard minimum bound 12.47 Ma

1355 Soft maximum bound 25.235 Ma

1356 Suggested prior distribution offset exponential

1357 Age justifications KNM-TH 48368 comes from the Kabasero section of the Ngorora Formation
1358 in the Tugen Hills, Kenya (Rossie et al., 2013). $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ dating of the fossiliferous horizon
1359 itself provides an age of 12.49 ± 0.02 Ma for this locality, resulting in a minimum and maximum
1360 age for this specimen of 12.47 and 12.51 Ma respectively. The horizon is also bracketed below
1361 and above by $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ dates of 12.56 ± 0.04 Ma and 12.26 ± 0.07 Ma respectively (Deino et
1362 al., 2002; Hill et al., 2002; Rossie et al., 2013). The maximum bound for this node is based on
1363 the maximum age of the two oldest known crown-catarrhines, namely the stem cercopithecoid
1364 *Nsungwepithecus* and stem hominoid *Rukwapithecus* from Nsungwe 2B, Tanzania, with a
1365 maximum age of 25.214 ± 0.021 Ma (see “Crown-Catarrhini” above).

1366 Between the oldest known stem cercopithecoid *Nsungwepithecus* and KNM-TH 48368, a
1367 diverse range of fossil cercopithecoids are known from multiple early and middle Miocene
1368 (~22.5-15 Ma; Van Couvering and Delson, 2020) sites throughout Africa, comprising at least
1369 nine species-level taxa (Locke et al., 2020 table 1). Not all of these have had their phylogenetic
1370 affinities formally tested, but those that have (namely the “victoriapithecids” *Prohylobates*,
1371 *Noropithecus*, and *Victoriapithecus*) consistently fall outside crown Cercopithecidae (Miller et

1372 al., 2009; Stevens et al., 2013; Rasmussen et al., 2019). The African primate fossil record is
1373 sparse between 15 and 6 Ma (Rossie et al., 2013). However, the diversity of stem cercopithecids
1374 between 22.5 and 15 Ma (Locke et al., 2020 table 1) and the apparent absence of crown
1375 cercopithecids in this same time interval persuades us that this divergence is likely to be close to
1376 our minimum bound, and so we propose an offset exponential prior distribution. Assuming a 5%
1377 probability of exceeding the soft maximum bound, this would give a mean and median prior on
1378 this divergence of 16.7 and 15.4 Ma respectively.

1379 Additional CladeAge calibration KNM-TH 48368 is the oldest known colobine. The oldest
1380 known record of Cercopithecinae is possible stem papionin material from the Beticha locality in
1381 the Chorora Formation, Ethiopia (Suwa et al., 2015; Katoh et al., 2016). Based on available
1382 evidence, we do not consider the Beticha material to be unequivocally papionin (see “Crown
1383 Cercopithecinae” below), but we do recognize it as the oldest cercopithecine. The Beticha fossil-
1384 bearing unit is above a pumiceous tuff that has been dated to 8.18 +/-0.15 Ma by K–Ar dating
1385 and 7.86 +/- 0.10 Ma by ^{40}Ar – ^{39}Ar dating, and below a consolidated tuff dated to 7.67 +/- 0.17
1386 Ma by K–Ar dating and 7.82 +/- 0.11 Ma by ^{40}Ar – ^{39}Ar dating (Katoh et al., 2016). Taking the
1387 maximum and minimum bounds for these radiometric dates, this gives an age range of 8.33–7.5
1388 Ma, which we suggest as our additional CladeAge calibration.

1389 Comments dos Reis et al. (2018) do not calibrate this node, but our maximum and minimum
1390 bounds are similar to those proposed by Roos et al. (2019).

1391

1392 *5.15 Crown Colobinae = Colobini-Presbytini split*

1393 Calibrating taxon *Mesopithecus pentelicus delsoni* (*Mesopithecus delsoni* according to de Bonis
 1394 et al., 1990; recognized here as subspecies of *Mesopithecus pentelicus* following Alba et al.,
 1395 2015).
 1396 Specimen RZO 159 (holotype of *Mesopithecus delsoni*, recognized as a subspecies of
 1397 *Mesopithecus pentelicus* by Alba et al. (2014a, 2015)), a nearly complete adult male mandible,
 1398 from Ravin des Zouaves-5, Greece.
 1399 Phylogenetic justification *Mesopithecus* has been consistently placed as a member of Presbytini
 1400 in the few published morphological phylogenetic analyses that have specifically examined this
 1401 question (Jablonski, 1998; Byron, 2001). In addition, dental metrics of *Mesopithecus* are more
 1402 similar to modern presbytins than to colobins (Pan et al., 2004), and mandibular morphology of
 1403 *Mesopithecus* shows particular similarities to that of the modern presbytin genera *Rhinopithecus*
 1404 and *Pygathrix* (Jablonski et al., 2020), although these resemblances are only suggestive because
 1405 they have not been placed in an explicit phylogenetic context. Some researchers have cited the
 1406 unreduced pollex of *Mesopithecus* as evidence that it falls outside crown Colobinae, all living
 1407 members of which are characterized by a reduced-to-absent pollex (with a greater degree of
 1408 pollicial reduction in colobins than presbytins; Alba et al., 2015; Frost et al., 2015). However,
 1409 *Mesopithecus* has been reported to have a slightly reduced pollex (but see Frost et al., 2015;
 1410 Jablonski et al., 2020), and Jablonski (1998: character 148) specifically included “thumb length”
 1411 as one of the 455 morphological characters used in her phylogenetic analysis. As noted by
 1412 Jablonski et al. (see also Nakatsukasa et al., 2010; 2020), pollicial reduction has occurred at least
 1413 twice within Anthroidea, as the pollex is greatly reduced or absent in the platyrrhine atelids
 1414 *Ateles* and *Brachyteles* (Rosenberger et al., 2008), and we agree with those authors that undue
 1415 weight should not be placed on a single morphological character, at least when phylogenetic

1416 analyses based on multiple characters are available (Jablonski, 1998; Byron, 2001). We therefore
1417 recognize *Mesopithecus* as the earliest definitive presbytin based on the results of available
1418 phylogenetic analyses (Jablonski, 1998; Byron, 2001), and therefore suitable for calibrating this
1419 node.

1420 Hard minimum bound 8.2 Ma

1421 Soft maximum bound 15 Ma

1422 Suggested prior distribution uniform

1423 Age justifications The source of our calibrating specimen, the Ravin des Zouaves-5 locality in
1424 Greece, is estimated to date to ~8.2 Ma based on magnetostratigraphic evidence, specifically
1425 correlation to C4r.1r (Sen et al., 2000; Koufos, 2009), which we therefore use as our minimum
1426 bound. A *Mesopithecus* specimen from another Greek locality, Nikiti 2, may slightly pre-date
1427 this (Koufos, 2016), but its minimum age is also 8.2 Ma. The material from Nikiti 2 is also very
1428 incomplete, comprising one metacarpal and one metatarsal, and we prefer to use the Ravin des
1429 Zouaves-5 specimen (which is a near complete mandible) to calibrate this node. A maxillary
1430 fragment of *Mesopithecus* has also been reported from Grebeniki 1 (Gremyatskii, 1961),
1431 Ukraine, which was originally dated to the early Turolian and the MN11 [8.8-7.9 Ma, following
1432 collated information by Alba et al. (2015)], but a recent faunal correlation by Vangengeim and
1433 Tesakov (2013) correlated Grebeniki 1 with the preceding MN10 (9.7-8.8 Ma) which would
1434 imply an older minimum bound on this node; however, given the current uncertainty surrounding
1435 the age of this site (see Koufos, 2019), we do not use it to calibrate this node.

1436 The oldest stem-colobine material is the ~12.5 Ma Colobinae gen. et. sp. indet. from
1437 Tugen Hill (Rossie et al., 2013; see “Crown Cercopithecidae” above). However, we have
1438 decided against using this material as the basis for our maximum bound due to the poor African

1439 record of primates between 15 and 6 Ma (Rossie et al., 2013); instead, we use 15 Ma as our
 1440 maximum bound, as the better sampled Miocene record prior to this date reveals a diversity of
 1441 stem-cercopithecoids (“victoriapithecids”) but no crown forms (Locke et al., 2020: table 1; see
 1442 “Crown Cercopithecidae” above). Based on this poor record 15-6 Ma, we suggest modelling this
 1443 calibration as a uniform prior.

1444 Additional CladeAge calibration *Mesopithecus pentelicus delsoni* is the oldest known presbytin.
 1445 The oldest colobin, meanwhile, appears to be *Cercopithecoides bruneti* from Toros-Menalla,
 1446 Chad, which can be referred to Colobini rather than Presbytini based on probable synapomorphic
 1447 traits such as its gracile mandibular morphology and terrestrial locomotion adaptations in its
 1448 forelimb (Pallas et al., 2019). The dentognathic morphology supports the placement of
 1449 *Cercopithecoides* as a stem rather than crown colobin (Pallas et al., 2019). The Toros-Menalla
 1450 locality has been dated to 7 ± 0.2 Ma (Lebatard et al., 2010), giving a CladeAge calibration of
 1451 6.8-7.2 Ma.

1452 Comments dos Reis et al. (2018) used the 9.8 Ma colobine *Microcolobus* to provide a minimum
 1453 bound on this node, but to our knowledge *Microcolobus* has not been demonstrated to be a
 1454 member of crown Colobinae, and in fact Rossie et al. (2013) found it to be more distantly related
 1455 to extant colobines than the older Tugen Hills material, suggesting that this taxon is more likely
 1456 to be a stem form. Their maximum bound of 23 Ma is more conservative than ours, and does not
 1457 appear to take into account the diverse early Miocene record of stem cercopithecoids (Locke et
 1458 al., 2020). Roos et al. (2019), meanwhile, used *Mesopithecus* to provide a minimum bound on
 1459 this node in their “calibration set 1”, as done here, but set their maximum as 12.5 Ma based on
 1460 the Kabasero colobine material (Rossie et al., 2013; see “Crown Cercopithecidae” above), which,

1461 as discussed, we consider overly restrictive given the poor African primate record 15-6 Ma
 1462 (Rossie et al., 2013).
 1463
 1464 *5.16 Crown Cercopithecinae = Cercopithecini-Papionini split*
 1465 Calibrating taxon Cercopithecini sp. indet
 1466 Specimen AUH 1321, a lower left molar, most likely an m1, from the SHU 2-2 locality in the
 1467 Baynunah Formation, Abu Dhabi (Gilbert et al., 2014).
 1468 Phylogenetic justification Published phylogenetic analyses indicate that AUH 1321 is a crown
 1469 cercopithecine (Gilbert et al., 2014; Plavcan et al., 2019; see “Crown Cercopithecini” below).
 1470 Hard minimum bound 6.5 Ma
 1471 Soft maximum bound 15.0 Ma
 1472 Suggested prior distribution uniform
 1473 Age justifications There are no radiometric dates for the SHU 2-2 locality, and so its age
 1474 estimate is based on geochronological comparisons with Asian and African faunas. These faunal
 1475 correlations indicate an age between 8.0 and 6.5 Ma, with the most probable age reported as
 1476 being around 7.0 Ma (Gilbert et al., 2014), but we prefer to use the minimum of this age range as
 1477 our minimum bound here. As already discussed (see “Crown Cercopithecidae” and “Crown
 1478 Colobinae” above), a diverse range of stem cercopithecoids, but no crown forms, are known
 1479 from the early Miocene prior to ~15 Ma (Locke et al., 2020: table 1), with the African fossil
 1480 record becoming scarce 15-6 Ma (Rossie et al., 2013). A few fossils are known within this
 1481 interval that may be relevant for calibrating this node, in particular a possible stem papionin from
 1482 the Beticha locality of the Chorora Formation at 8.33-7.5 Ma (Suwa et al., 2015; Katoh et al.,
 1483 2016). However, material of this Beticha taxon is extremely fragmentary (Suwa et al., 2015), it

1484 has (not to our knowledge) been included in a formal phylogenetic analysis, and Roos et al.
1485 (2019, p. 119) pointed out the difficulty in determining whether it is a stem papionin or stem
1486 cercopithecine without lower incisors that might reveal whether or not enamel was present
1487 lingually, (absence of lingual enamel is the only compelling dental synapomorphy of Papionini).
1488 For this reason, we do not use the Beticha taxon to provide our minimum bound.

1489 We use 15.0 Ma as our maximum bound, based on the same reasoning as for crown
1490 Colobinae (see “Crown Colobinae” above). Because of the poor fossil record 15-6 Ma, and the
1491 possibility of a markedly earlier divergence (based on the Beticha taxon) than specified by our
1492 minimum bound, a uniform prior on this calibration seems most appropriate.

1493 Additional CladeAge calibration AUH 1321 is the oldest known cercopithecine. Discounting the
1494 possible stem papionin from Beticha for the reasons discussed above, we consider the oldest
1495 record of Papionini to be two isolated teeth from the Lukeino Formation at Tugen Hills identified
1496 as cf. “*Parapapio*” *lothagamensis* (Gilbert et al., 2010). Although yet to be rigorously tested by a
1497 suitably comprehensive phylogenetic analysis, it is generally accepted that “*Parapapio*”
1498 *lothagamensis* is a stem papionin (Leakey et al., 2003; Pugh and Gilbert, 2018). The specimens
1499 from the Lukeino Formation described by Gilbert et al. (2010) closely resemble “*Parapapio*”
1500 *lothagamensis* in dimensions and overall morphology, and were identified by those authors as
1501 probably belonging to that taxon, or a slightly smaller close relative. The older of the two
1502 specimens (KNM-LU 861) comes from the Cheboit locality BPRP#29, which is ~6.1 Ma
1503 (Gilbert et al., 2010), which we use as our CladeAge calibration.

1504 Comments Our minimum bound on this node is the same as that proposed by Roos et al. (2019)
1505 in their calibration set 2, whilst dos Reis et al. (2018), used a younger minimum bound of 5.0
1506 Ma, based on “*Parapapio*” *lothagamensis*; although the phylogenetic analyses of Gilbert et al.

1507 (2014) and Plavcan et al. (2019) differ somewhat, they both place AUH 1321 within crown
1508 Cercopithecini (see below), and so the Cercopithecini-Papionini split must predate this. For a
1509 maximum bound, Roos et al. (2019) used the ~12.5 Ma Kabasero colobine material (Rossie et
1510 al., 2013; see “Crown Cercopithecidae” above), which, as discussed, we consider overly
1511 restrictive given the poor African primate record 15-6 Ma (Rossie et al., 2013). The maximum
1512 bound of dos Reis et al. (2018) meanwhile, was 23 Ma, based on the presence of
1513 *Kamoyapithecus* (which dos Reis et al., 2018, considered to be hominoid) at ~25 Ma, and the
1514 appearance of the stem cercopithecoid *Prohylobates* at 19.5 Ma onwards. Similarly to crown
1515 Colobinae (see above), we consider this overly conservative: the diversity of stem
1516 cercopithecoids but absence of crown forms in the early Miocene African record prior to ~15 Ma
1517 persuades us that the Cercopithecini-Papionini split probably postdates this.

1518

1519 *5.17 Crown Papionini = Macacina-Papionina split*

1520 Calibrating taxon cf. *Macaca* sp.

1521 Specimen MGPT-PU 130508, a partial male cranium, from the Moncucco Torinese locality,
1522 Italy (Alba et al., 2014b).

1523 Phylogenetic justification In a conference abstract, Alba et al. (2014a) reported that MGPT-PU
1524 130508 is “undoubtedly papionin, as evidenced by facial and dental morphology and size”, and
1525 that its molars “display the typical generalized papionin morphology that is characteristic of
1526 *Macaca*, and their size fits with the upper-most range of *M. sylvanus* subspp.”, and they
1527 identified it as cf. *Macaca* sp. A full description of this significant specimen has yet to be
1528 published, and it lacks a full phylogenetic context, but based on the information provided by
1529 Alba et al. (2014a) we tentatively recognize this as a member of Macacina. In particular, we

1530 consider that it provides a more robust basis for calibrating this node than older (~7.0-5.8 Ma)
 1531 but much more fragmentary remains of ?*Macaca* sp. from Menacer, Algeria (Arambourg, 1959;
 1532 Delson, 1975), which have been used by some previous authors (see below).
 1533 Hard minimum bound 5.33 Ma
 1534 Soft maximum bound 12.51 Ma
 1535 Suggested prior distribution uniform
 1536 Age justifications The fossil locality at Moncucco Torinese has been assigned a late Turolian
 1537 (MN13, late Miocene) age based on its fossil fauna. The presence of an ostracod assemblage
 1538 assigned to the *Loxocorniculina djafarovi* Zone allows a further refinement of the age to 5.40-
 1539 5.33 Ma (Alba et al., 2014b), with the minimum age providing our minimum bound.
 1540 For a maximum bound, we propose the maximum age of the oldest crown cercopithecoid, namely
 1541 the Kabasero Colobinae gen. et. sp. indet. material, which is 12.51 Ma (see “Crown
 1542 Cercopithecidae” above); although the African primate fossil record is poor 15-6 Ma (Rossie et
 1543 al., 2013), it seems unlikely that the Macacina-Papionina split, which is nested well within
 1544 Cercopithecidae, would predate the overall oldest crown cercopithecoid record.
 1545 We do not use the 7.0-5.8 Ma record of ?*Macaca* sp. from Menacer, Algeria (Arambourg,
 1546 1959; Delson, 1975) to calibrate this node (see below), but this record raises the possibility that
 1547 our minimum bound is relatively conservative; we therefore propose a uniform prior on this
 1548 calibration.
 1549 Additional CladeAge calibration We consider MGPT-PU 130508 to be the oldest robust record
 1550 of Macacina. Based on available evidence, we consider the oldest robust record of Papionina to
 1551 be 4.2-4.1 Ma old specimens from Kanapoi, West Turkana, Kenya, which have been identified

1552 as *Theropithecus* sp. indet. (Frost et al., 2020), and which provide our additional CladeAge
 1553 calibration.
 1554 Comments dos Reis et al. (2018) did not calibrate this node. However, Roos et al. (2019) used an
 1555 older minimum bound on this node of 5.8 Ma in their “calibration set 1” based on ~7.0-5.8 Ma
 1556 old remains of ?*Macaca* sp. from Menacer, Algeria (Arambourg, 1959; Delson, 1975). Roos et
 1557 al. (2019) noted themselves that it is unclear whether ?*Macaca* sp. from Menacer falls on the
 1558 Macacina or the Papionina lineage. More seriously, Jablonski and Frost (2010) observed that
 1559 there are no features of the ?*Macaca* sp. material from Menacer that would distinguish it from
 1560 being a stem papionin, as was also noted by Delson (1975, 1980) and Szalay and Delson (1979).
 1561 We therefore refrain from using this taxon for calibrating this node and instead use the slightly
 1562 younger cf. *Macaca* from Moncucco Torinese discussed above. Roos et al. (2019) also used a
 1563 comparatively young maximum bound of 8 Ma based on the possible stem papionin from the
 1564 Beticha locality; we have already discussed the uncertainty surrounding this material (see
 1565 “Crown Cercopithecinae” above), and such a tight maximum bound seems unjustified given the
 1566 comparatively poor record of primates in Africa between 15 and 6 Ma (Rossie et al., 2013).
 1567
 1568 *5.18 Crown Cercopithecini*
 1569 Calibrating taxon Cercopithecini sp. indet.
 1570 Specimen AUH 1321, a lower left molar (most likely the first molar), from the SHU 2-2 locality
 1571 in the Baynunah Formation, Abu Dhabi (Gilbert et al., 2014).
 1572 Phylogenetic justification As already mentioned (see “Crown Cercopithecinae” above),
 1573 published phylogenetic analyses indicate that AUH 1321 is a crown cercopithecine: it was placed
 1574 as sister to *Chlorocebus* or *Cercopithecus* in the analysis of Gilbert et al. (2014), but sister to

1575 *Miopithecus* or in a polytomous clade with all extant cercopithecine genera except *Allenopithecus*
1576 in the analysis of Plavcan et al. (2019). A combination of features makes AUH 1321 most similar
1577 to non-*Allenopithecus* cercopithecines, namely a small and narrow molar with low-to-moderately
1578 flaring, elongated basin, and a distally expanded lophid (Gilbert et al., 2014). Nevertheless, the
1579 variation in the position of AUH 1321 between these analyses mean that its precise affinities are
1580 unclear. Furthermore, molecular phylogenies support a somewhat different set of relationships
1581 within Cercopithecini than do the analyses of Plavcan et al. (2019), in which the deepest split
1582 among extant cercopithecines is between *Allenopithecus* and the remaining genera; for example,
1583 Perelman et al. (2011) found *Allenopithecus* to be part of a clade that also includes *Chlorocebus*
1584 and *Erythrocebus*, whilst dos Reis et al. (2018) recovered an *Allenopithecus*+*Miopithecus* clade.
1585 These issues notwithstanding, we consider the phylogenetic analyses of Gilbert et al. (2014) and
1586 Plavcan et al. (2019) to collectively comprise sufficient evidence that AUH 1321 postdates the
1587 deepest split within Cercopithecini, and so can be used to provide a minimum bound on this
1588 node.

1589 Hard minimum bound 6.5 Ma

1590 Soft maximum bound 12.51 Ma

1591 Suggested prior distribution uniform

1592 Age justifications The age of the SHU 2-2 locality, which informs the minimum bound of this
1593 node, is discussed above (see “Crown Cercopithecinae”). Our maximum bound and suggested
1594 prior distribution follow the same logic as for crown Papionini (see above).

1595 Additional CladeAge calibration Because it is uncertain exactly where AUH 1321 fits within
1596 crown Cercopithecini, and because of the incongruence between morphological (Gilbert et al.,
1597 2014; Plavcan et al., 2019) and molecular (e.g., Perelman et al., 2011; dos Reis et al., 2018)

1598 phylogenies of Cercopithecini, we refrain from suggesting an additional CladeAge calibration for
1599 this node.

1600 Comments This node was not calibrated by Benton et al. (2015), dos Reis et al. (2018), or Roos
1601 et al. (2019).

1602

1603 *5.19 Crown Hominoidea = Hominidae–Hylobatidae split*

1604 Calibrating taxon *Kenyapithecus wickeri*

1605 Specimen KNM-FT 46a-b (holotype), left maxillary fragment with C1 and P4-M2 present, from
1606 Fort Ternan, Kenya (Leakey, 1961).

1607 Phylogenetic justification *Kenyapithecus* has consistently been referred to as a crown hominoid,
1608 and specifically a hominid, by researchers (Pickford, 1985; Kelley et al., 2008; Harrison, 2010b;
1609 Alba, 2012) based in particular on the presence of the putative hominid synapomorphy of an
1610 anteriorly situated zygomatic root that is relatively high above the alveolar plane. This has been
1611 supported by formal phylogenetic analyses, with *Kenyapithecus* typically recovered as a stem
1612 hominid (e.g., Young and MacLatchy, 2004; Begun et al., 2012; Worthington, 2012), although
1613 Nengo et al. (2017) and Gilbert et al. (2020) found it to fall within crown Hominidae as a
1614 pongine. Regardless of its exact affinities, a position within crown Hominoidea for
1615 *Kenyapithecus* is well supported (but see Benoit and Thackeray, 2017), and we consider it the
1616 oldest definitive crown hominoid currently known.

1617 Hard minimum bound 13.4 Ma

1618 Soft maximum bound 25.235 Ma

1619 Suggested prior distribution offset exponential

1620 Age justifications The minimum age is based on dates of the Fort Ternan fossil locality
1621 published by Pickford et al. (2006a), who report on whole-rock K/Ar and single-crystal
1622 $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ dates of lava flows underlying and overlying the fossil beds at Fort Ternan. The fossil
1623 beds at Fort Ternan are estimated to be 13.7 ± 0.3 Ma (Pickford et al., 2006a), giving an age
1624 range of 13.4-14.0 Ma, with the minimum age as our hard minimum bound. A second species of
1625 *Kenyapithecus*, *K. kizili*, has been described from Paşalar, Turkey (Kelley et al., 2008), which
1626 may be slightly older than *K. wickeri* (Roos et al., 2019). However, the age of Paşalar is poorly
1627 constrained (Casanovas-Vilar et al., 2011; Roos et al., 2019) and we do not use it to inform our
1628 minimum bound. The maximum bound is based on the maximum age of the oldest stem-
1629 hominoid *Rukwapithecus* (see “Crown Catarrhini” and “Crown Cercopithecidae” above).

1630 In a situation equivalent to that seen in cercopithecoids (see “Crown Cercopithecidae”),
1631 the early Miocene African fossil record of Hominoidea is characterized by a diversity of stem
1632 taxa (proconsuline and nyanzapithecine “proconsulids”) without any evidence of crown
1633 representatives (Harrison, 2010b; Stevens et al., 2013; Nengo et al., 2017; Almécija et al., 2021).
1634 We tentatively interpret this as evidence that the Hominidae-Hylobatidae split was probably
1635 much closer to our minimum bound than our maximum bound, and so we propose calibrating
1636 this divergence with an offset exponential prior distribution. Assuming a 5% probability of
1637 exceeding the soft maximum bound, this would give a mean and median prior on this divergence
1638 of 17.4 and 16.1 Ma respectively.

1639 Additional CladeAge calibration We consider *Kenyapithecus wickeri* to be the oldest known
1640 hominid (stem or crown, see above). The oldest hylobatid is the recently described *Kapi*
1641 *ramnagarensis* from the Lower Siwaliks of Ramnagar, India, with an estimated age of ~13.8-
1642 12.5 Ma (Gilbert et al., 2020), which provides the additional CladeAge calibration for this node.

1643 Comments Our minimum and maximum bounds are broadly similar to those of Roos et al.
1644 (2019). By contrast, Benton et al. (2015) proposed the crown hominid (stem pongine)
1645 *Sivapithecus* as the oldest crown hominoid, with a minimum age of 11.6 Ma, and used the age of
1646 the earliest anthropoids in the Fayum Depression as their maximum bound; in light of our
1647 discussion above, we consider both minimum and maximum bounds proposed for this node by
1648 Benton et al. (2015) to be unduly conservative. dos Reis et al. (2018) did not calibrate this node,
1649 but they stated in three separate places that they considered the ~25 Ma old *Kamoyapithecus* to
1650 be a “crown hominoid”, a conclusion that they themselves admitted is “controversial”. However,
1651 the paper they cited in support of this conclusion, Zalmout et al. (2010), found *Kamoyapithecus*
1652 to be a stem (not crown) hominoid, and more distantly related to Hylobatidae+Hominidae than is
1653 “Proconsulidae”; table 1 of dos Reis et al. (2018) also lists *Kamoyapithecus* as a stem hominoid,
1654 in agreement with current evidence, as summarized above.

1655

1656 5.20 Crown Hominidae = Homininae-Ponginae split

1657 Calibrating taxon *Sivapithecus indicus*

1658 Specimen (GSP) Y 16075, a partial maxilla (Raza et al., 1983; Kappelman et al., 1991) with the
1659 connection between the maxilla and premaxilla partially preserved (Begun, 2015), from locality
1660 Y494 from the Chinji Formation, Pakistan (Pilgrim, 1910).

1661 Phylogenetic justification *Sivapithecus* has been consistently recovered as a pongine in recent
1662 phylogenetic analyses (e.g., Begun et al., 2012; Nengo et al., 2017; Gilbert et al., 2020). (GSP) Y
1663 16075 is the oldest *Sivapithecus* specimen to preserve the derived subnasal anatomy
1664 characteristic of modern orangutans (*Pongo* spp.; Kappelman et al., 1991). Isolated teeth from
1665 slightly older sites in the Chinji Formation have been referred to *Sivapithecus*, but they lack

1666 diagnostic features to support this referral (Kappelman et al., 1991), and so we do not use these
1667 for calibration purposes. We note that the slightly older *Kenyapithecus* (see “Crown
1668 Hominoidea” above) has been recovered as a pongine in some recent phylogenetic analyses
1669 (Nengo et al., 2017; Gilbert et al., 2020), but others place it as a stem-hominid (e.g., Young and
1670 MacLatchy, 2004; Begun et al., 2012; Worthington, 2012), and so it is not suitable for calibrating
1671 this node.

1672 Hard minimum age 12.3 Ma

1673 Soft maximum age 25.235 Ma

1674 Suggested prior distribution offset exponential

1675 Age justifications The minimum bound is based on the reported age of 12.3 Ma for another site
1676 in the mid-Chinji Formation, Y647 (which also preserves *Sivapithecus indicus* specimens),
1677 which is stated to be at the same stratigraphic level as Y494 (Morgan et al., 2015); this age is
1678 stated to be based on magnetostratigraphy, but Morgan et al. (2015) do not provide further
1679 details, and so it should be treated as tentative. The maximum bound is based on the maximum
1680 age of the oldest stem-hominoid *Rukwapithecus* (see “Crown Catarrhini”, “Crown
1681 Cercopithecidae”, and “Crown Hominoidea” above). We consider that this calibration is best
1682 modelled as an offset exponential distribution, based on the same arguments given for the crown
1683 Hominoidea node (see “Crown Hominoidea” above). Assuming a 5% probability of exceeding
1684 the soft maximum bound, this would give a mean and median prior on this divergence of 16.6
1685 and 15.3 Ma respectively.

1686 Additional CladeAge calibration We consider *Sivapithecus indicus* to be the oldest definitive
1687 pongine. A number of “dryopiths” (sensu Almécija et al., 2021; Urciuoli et al., 2021) from
1688 Europe, including the ~9.6-8.7 Ma old *Ouranopithecus macedoniensis* (Sen et al., 2000; Koufos

et al., 2016), have been found to be stem hominines in some published phylogenetic analyses (e.g., Begun et al., 2012), but not others (e.g., Alba et al., 2015), and their position appears sensitive to analytical assumptions (Young and MacLatchy, 2004; Worthington, 2012). Given the ongoing controversy regarding the affinities of the European “dryopiths” (see Benoit and Thackeray, 2017; Fuss et al., 2018; Almécija et al., 2021), we follow Gilbert et al. (2020) in viewing them as Hominoidea incertae sedis, and do not use them as the oldest record of Homininae. Instead, we use the slightly younger *Chororapithecus abyssinicus*, which we recognize as a crown hominine (stem gorillin), with an age range of 8.33-7.5 Ma (see “Crown Homininae” below).

Comments Roos et al. (2019) used *Kenyapithecus wickeri* (with a maximum age of 14.9 Ma) as their maximum bound on this node, but given that Nengo et al. (2017) and Gilbert et al. (2020) found *Kenyapithecus* to be a pongine, this may be overly restrictive, and we take a more conservative approach, instead using the maximum age of the oldest stem-hominoid *Rukwapithecus fleaglei* for setting the soft maximum bound. Benton et al. (2015), meanwhile, used a maximum of 33.9 Ma based on the age of the oldest known crown anthropoids from the L-41 Quarry of the Fayum, Egypt (see “Crown Anthropoidea” above), which seems excessively conservative given the diversity of stem hominoids but absence of crown forms in the early Miocene African record (see “Crown Hominoidea” above).

1707

5.21 Crown Homininae = Gorillini-Hominini split

Calibrating taxon *Chororapithecus abyssinicus*

Specimen CHO-BT 4 (holotype), a right M2, from the Chorora Formation at Beticha, Ethiopia (Suwa et al., 2007).

1712 Phylogenetic justification Although *Chororapithecus* has not, to our knowledge, been included
1713 in a formal phylogenetic analysis, Suwa et al. (2007) discussed a number of apomorphic dental
1714 features that are shared by *Chororapithecus* and *Gorilla* (albeit that are less derived in the fossil
1715 taxon), and they noted that no other fossil hominoid besides the enigmatic *Oreopithecus* from the
1716 Miocene of Italy exhibits the same combination of apomorphies. Some subsequent authors (e.g.,
1717 Begun et al., 2012; Fuss et al., 2018) have concluded that the relationship between
1718 *Chororapithecus* and *Gorilla* is questionable based on the limited fossil evidence, and Suwa et
1719 al. (2007) themselves noted that the derived resemblances may be homoplastic. However, in the
1720 absence of specific evidence to the contrary (such as a formal phylogenetic analysis that includes
1721 *Chororapithecus*, *Gorilla*, and a suitably dense sampling of other crown and stem hominoids and
1722 appropriate outgroups), we tentatively accept that *C. abyssinicus* is a stem gorillin, following
1723 Suwa et al. (2007).

1724 Hard minimum bound 7.5 Ma

1725 Soft maximum bound 15 Ma

1726 Suggested prior distribution uniform

1727 Age justifications In their original description of *Chororapithecus abyssinicus*, Suwa et al.
1728 (2007) identified the Beticha locality as being 10.5-10.1 Ma old. Subsequent radiometric dating
1729 now indicates a maximum of 8.33 Ma and a minimum of 7.5 Ma for this locality (Katoh et al.,
1730 2016; see “Crown Cercopithecinae” above), and we use the latter date as our minimum bound.
1731 For our maximum bound, we use the same 15 Ma date as for crown Colobinae and crown
1732 Cercopithecinae (see above), reflecting the generally poor record of primates in Africa 15-6 Ma
1733 (Rossie et al., 2013), and the fact that stem hominoids were diverse but crown hominoids were
1734 apparently absent in Africa during the early Miocene prior to 15 Ma.

1735 Although we do not use this specimen for calibration purposes, Pickford and Senut's
 1736 (2005) report of a ~12.5 Ma isolated lower molar from the Ngorora Formation that they suggest
 1737 may belong to the *Pan* lineage (but which Kunimatsu et al. (2007) considered resembles *Gorilla*)
 1738 raises the possibility that this divergence may be markedly older than our minimum bound.
 1739 Katoh et al. (2016), meanwhile, suggested that the ~9.8 Ma old *Nakalipithecus nakayamai* may
 1740 be directly ancestral to *Chororapithecus*; given the limited evidence in support of this
 1741 relationship provided by Katoh et al. (2016), we have not used *Nakalipithecus* to calibrate this
 1742 node, but we recognize that it may indicate a markedly earlier time for this divergence than
 1743 specified by our minimum bound. Considering these issues, and again taking into account the
 1744 generally poor African primate record 15-6 Ma (Rossie et al., 2013), we consider that this
 1745 calibration is most appropriately modelled as a uniform prior distribution.

1746 Additional CladeAge calibration We recognize *Chororapithecus abyssinicus* as the oldest
 1747 gorillin. The oldest member of the *Homo* lineage that is supported by robust dating and
 1748 phylogenetic analyses is *Ardipithecus ramidus* (see “*Homo-Pan* split” below). The oldest well-
 1749 dated *A. ramidus* material is 4.799-4.631 Ma old (Semaw et al., 2005; Simpson et al., 2019; see
 1750 “*Homo* lineage-*Pan* lineage split” below), and provides our additional CladeAge calibration for
 1751 this node.

1752 Comments Benton et al. (2015) did not calibrate this node, but both dos Reis et al. (2018) and
 1753 Roos et al. (2019) used a similar minimum bound to that proposed here, based on
 1754 *Chororapithecus*. However, both dos Reis et al. (2018) and Roos et al. (2019) based their
 1755 maximum bound on the age of *Sivapithecus*, and we argue that *Sivapithecus* and other Eurasian
 1756 hominoids do not provide a clear basis for constraining the crown Homininae or crown Hominini
 1757 nodes, both of which probably took place in Africa, hence our decision to use the African fossil

1758 record to inform our maximum bound (see “*Homo-Pan* split” below for more detailed
 1759 discussion).
 1760
 1761 5.22 *Homo-Pan split*
 1762 Calibrating taxon *Ardipithecus ramidus*
 1763 Specimen WMN5sw/P56, a mandibular ramus and partial dentition (p3-m3) from GMW5sw
 1764 locality in Gona, Ethiopia (Semaw et al., 2005; Simpson et al., 2019).
 1765 Phylogenetic justification Although *Ardipithecus ramidus* preserves numerous similarities to the
 1766 chimpanzee condition in cranial, dental and postcranial material, White et al. (1995) argued that
 1767 some, if not all, of these are primitive retentions from the last common ancestor of chimpanzees
 1768 and humans. Notable features of *A. ramidus* that appear to be synapomorphies placing it as a
 1769 member of the *Homo* lineage include the more incisiform canines, an anteriorly located foramen
 1770 magnum, and a proximal ulnar morphology that is shared with *Australopithecus* species (White
 1771 et al., 1995, 2009; Suwa et al., 2009a, 2009b; but see Harrison, 2010c). This interpretation has
 1772 been tested in phylogenetic analyses by Dembo et al. (2015, 2016), Mongle et al. (2019), and
 1773 Püschel et al. (2021), who all recovered *A. ramidus* as sister taxon to all later members of the
 1774 *Homo* lineage. Although *Ardipithecus kadabba* is slightly older than *A. ramidus* (5.8-5.2 Ma,
 1775 Haile-Selassie, 2001; WoldeGabriel et al., 2001; 2004), we refrain from using this species to
 1776 calibrate this node as it has not been included in any of these phylogenetic analyses, most likely
 1777 due to the scarcity of *Ardipithecus kadabba* material. The phylogenetic analyses of Dembo et al.
 1778 (2015, 2016), Mongle et al. (2019), and Püschel et al. (2021) all placed *Sahelanthropus* closer to
 1779 *Homo* than to *Pan*, but doubts over the stratigraphic provenance of *Sahelanthropus*, and hence its
 1780 age, mean that we do not use it as our calibrating taxon here (see “Comments” below).

1781 Hard minimum bound 4.631 Ma

1782 Soft maximum bound 15 Ma

1783 Suggested prior distribution uniform

1784 Age justifications The oldest *A. ramidus* localities (GMW1, GMW5sw, and GWM9) have been

1785 assigned to the C3n.2r magnetozone (Simpson et al., 2019) which corresponds to an age of

1786 4.799-4.631 Ma (Hilgen et al., 2012). We have already discussed the relevance of the poor

1787 record of fossil primates in Africa 15-6 Ma (Rossie et al., 2013), and the ~12.5 Ma old Ngorora

1788 tooth that Pickford and Senut (2005) suggested might be a member of the *Pan* lineage. Based on

1789 these factors, we again prefer to take a conservative approach for this node and suggest the same

1790 maximum bound as for Homininae (see “Crown Homininae” above). For the same reason, we

1791 also suggest a uniform bound is the appropriate prior distribution for this node.

1792 Additional CladeAge calibration We recognize *Ardipithecus ramidus* as the oldest known

1793 member of the *Homo* lineage that has a well-constrained age. The fossil record of its sister-clade,

1794 the *Pan* lineage, is extremely limited. To date, the oldest fossils are specimens that have been

1795 referred to the modern genus *Pan* from the Kapthurin Formation of Kenya (although this was

1796 questioned by Harrison, 2010b, who instead argued that they may belong to *Homo*), the age of is

1797 constrained by $^{40}\text{Ar}/^{39}\text{Ar}$ dates of 545 ± 3 kyr for deposits underlying the fossils and 284 ± 12

1798 kyr for deposits overlying them (Deino and McBrearty, 2002; McBrearty and Jablonski, 2005).

1799 The fossils are located most closely to the underlying deposit, and McBrearty and Jablonski

1800 (2005) argued that their age is likely to be close to 0.5 Ma. However, we prefer to use the entire

1801 age range (including confidence intervals) for this record, giving an additional CladeAge

1802 calibration for this node of 0.548-0.272 Ma.

Comments Unlike us, Benton et al. (2015), dos Reis et al. (2018), and Roos et al. (2019) all used the age of *Sahelanthropus* to provide a minimum bound of 6.2 Ma (Roos et al., 2019), 6.5 Ma (Benton et al., 2015), or 7.5 Ma (dos Reis et al., 2018) on this divergence. *Sahelanthropus* has various synapomorphies in its cranial morphology placing it closer to the *Homo* lineage than the *Pan* lineage (see e.g., Brunet et al., 2002; Zollikofer et al., 2005; MacLatchy et al., 2010; Emonet et al., 2014). This has been questioned by some authors (Wolpoff et al., 2002; Wolpoff and Pickford, 2006), but recent phylogenetic analyses by Dembo et al. (2015, 2016), Mongle et al. (2019), and Püschel et al. (2021) have consistently placed *Sahelanthropus* closer to *Homo* than to *Pan*, as the basalmost member of the *Homo* lineage among the taxa included in these analyses. However, questions have been raised about the stratigraphic origin of *Sahelanthropus* material (Beauvilain, 2008), and thereby on its reported age of 7.2-6.8 Ma (Lebatard et al., 2008). Ahern (2018) concluded that the fossil material of *Sahelanthropus* is most likely of late Miocene age, but suggested that its age could not be constrained more accurately than 7.5-5.0 Ma based on available data. We accept that *Sahelanthropus* is most likely a member of the *Homo* lineage, but due to the uncertainty surrounding its age we prefer to take a more conservative approach and use the more securely dated *Ardipithecus ramidus* for calibrating this node. However, if more securely constrained *Sahelanthropus* material is reported that predates the age of *A. ramidus*, the minimum age of this calibration will need to be updated.

Benton et al. (2015) proposed a maximum bound of 10 Ma on this node, given that “a range of ape taxa, *Ankarapithecus* from Turkey (10 Ma), *Gigantopithecus* from China (8–0.3 Ma), *Lufengopithecus* from China (10 Ma), *Ouranopithecus* from Greece (10–9 Ma), and *Sivapithecus* from Pakistan (10–7 Ma) give maximum ages of 10 Ma, early in the late Miocene, and these deposits have yielded no fossils attributable to either chimps or humans”. Importantly,

1826 however, all of these taxa are Eurasian not African, and current evidence supports relatively
1827 limited dispersal of hominoids out of Africa (Gilbert et al., 2020). In particular, it seems likely
1828 that the split between the *Homo* and *Pan* lineages occurred in Africa (but see Fuss et al., 2018),
1829 with members of the *Homo* lineage probably not dispersing out of Africa until the early
1830 Pleistocene (Trifonov et al., 2019), and members of the *Pan* lineage apparently never doing so.
1831 Thus, the absence of members of the *Homo* and *Pan* lineages in ~10 Ma old Eurasian deposits
1832 would still be expected even if the split between these lineages had already occurred by this time,
1833 and so there seems no compelling reason to use this as a maximum bound on this node. Roos et
1834 al. (2019), meanwhile, assumed a maximum bound of 8 Ma based on the stem-gorillin
1835 *Chororapithecus*, and dos Reis et al. (2018) also used *Chororapithecus* to provide a maximum
1836 bound on this divergence, but assumed a 10 Ma age for *Chororapithecus* based on the initial
1837 report by Suwa et al. (2007), whereas its age has now been revised down to 7.5-8.33 Ma (Kato
1838 et al., 2016). Regardless, we consider use of *Chororapithecus* to inform the maximum bound on
1839 this node to be excessively restrictive, given the ~12.5 Ma potential *Pan* relative described by
1840 Pickford and Senut (2005), and the overall poor African record of primates 15-6 Ma (Rossie et
1841 al., 2013), discussed above.

1842

1843 *5.23 Crown Platyrrhini = Pitheciidae-(Aotidae+Atelidae+Callitrichidae+Cebidae) split*

1844 Calibrating taxon *Stirtonia victoriae*

1845 Specimen Duke/INGEOMINAS 85-400 (holotype), a right maxilla preserving erupted dP2-dP4

1846 M1-M2, and mineralized but unerupted C and P2-P4, from Duke Locality 28, La Venta,

1847 Colombia (Kay et al., 1987).

1848 Phylogenetic justification In our tip-dated total evidence phylogenetic analyses, the oldest well
 1849 supported member of crown Platyrrhini is *Stirtonia*, which was strongly supported as sister to
 1850 *Alouatta*, within crown Atelidae (Figures 1-2). The only potentially older taxon placed within
 1851 crown Platyrrhini in our analyses was the 19.76-10.4 Ma old *Proteropithecium neuquenensis* from
 1852 the Collón Curá Formation of Argentina (Kay et al., 1998; Kay and Perry, 2019, see
 1853 Supplementary Online Material for discussion of the age of this specimen). However, support for
 1854 placing *Proteropithecium* within crown Platyrrhini was very low (BPP = 0.30), and in fact there
 1855 was greater support for placing it outside the crown clade (see “Results” and “Discussion”
 1856 above). All older fossil platyrrhines, including *Panamacebus transitus* (which has been found to
 1857 be a cebid in some other published analyses; (Bloch et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019), were placed
 1858 outside the crown clade (see “Results” and “Discussion” above).
 1859 Hard minimum bound 13.363 Ma
 1860 Soft maximum bound none
 1861 Suggested prior distribution not applicable (minimum bound only)
 1862 Age justifications *Stirtonia victoriae* is currently the oldest *Stirtonia* species known, with all
 1863 known material from Duke Locality 28 at La Venta, approximately 290m below the stratigraphic
 1864 level from where specimens of the younger *S. tatacoensis* have been collected (Kay et al., 1987).
 1865 According to Guerrero (1997, fig. 2.8), Duke Locality 28 is within the Cerro Gordo Beds of the
 1866 La Victoria Formation. Montes et al. (2021, fig. 3) indicated that the Cerro Gordo Beds, the
 1867 overlying Chunchullo Beds, and the underlying San Alfonso Beds all lie within Chron C5ABn,
 1868 which spans from 13.608 to 13.363 Ma (Gradstein et al., 2012), with the latter providing our
 1869 minimum bound.

1870 For less inclusive divergences within crown Platyrrhini (primarily divergences within families;
1871 see the calibrations that follow), we have proposed a maximum bound based on the maximum
1872 reported age of the oldest probable stem platyrrhine specimens, which is 34.5 Ma (Antoine et al.,
1873 2021), although we note that this date has been questioned (Campbell et al., 2021). The ancestor
1874 of crown Platyrrhini was probably a very small (~400g), insectivore-frugivore (Lynch Alfaro,
1875 2017; Silvestro et al., 2019b) that morphologically is likely to have been little different from the
1876 specimens described by Antoine et al. (2021). This, together with the overall poor record of
1877 platyrrhines, means that it is difficult to rule out an early (pre-Oligocene) origin for crown
1878 Platyrrhini on fossil grounds alone; for this reason, we do not propose a maximum bound for this
1879 calibration.

1880 Additional CladeAge calibration *Stirtonia victoriae* is the oldest known atelid (and is, in fact, a
1881 crown form, closer to the alouattine *Alouatta* than to atelines), and so is the oldest known
1882 member of the Aotidae+Atelidae+Callitrichidae+Cebidae clade. Ignoring *Proteropithecina* for the
1883 reasons already discussed (see “Results and “Discussion” above), the oldest known member of
1884 its sister clade, Pitheciidae, is the crown pitheciid *Cebupithecina sarmientoi*, which is 13.183-
1885 13.032 Ma old (see “Crown Pitheciidae” below).

1886 Comments Benton et al. (2015) did not calibrate this node, but dos Reis et al. (2018) proposed a
1887 minimum of 15.7 Ma based on the age of *Proteropithecina* reported by Kay et al. (1998); as noted
1888 above, our total evidence tip-dating analyses do not clearly support *Proteropithecina* as a crown
1889 platyrrhine. dos Reis et al.’s (2018) maximum bound was 33 Ma, based on the age of the oldest
1890 crown anthropoid, the stem catarrhine *Catopithecus* (see “Crown Anthroidea” above).

1891 However, if the 34.5 Ma date reported by Antoine et al. (2021) is correct, then the oldest record
1892 of probable platyrrhines predates this (although we accept that these are almost certainly stem

forms). Overall, we consider the platyrrhine fossil record to be too incomplete to confidently apply a maximum bound on this node.

5.24 Crown Pitheciidae = Callicebinae-Pitheciinae split

Calibrating taxon *Cebupithecia sarmientoi*

Specimen UCMP 38762 (holotype), a nearly complete skull, mandible, axial skeleton, and limb bones, from the Monkey Beds at La Venta, Colombia (Stirton and Savage, 1951).

Phylogenetic justification Numerous synapomorphies support *Cebupithecia* as a pitheciine (Stirton and Savage, 1951; Orlosky, 1974; Rosenberger, 1979; Kay, 1990), and it has been consistently placed within crown Pitheciidae as a stem pitheciine in published phylogenetic analyses (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019; Ni et al., 2019: fig. S1). Our own tip-dating analyses also support *Cebupithecia* as a stem-pitheciine, with relatively strong support (see “Results” and “Discussion” above). A second fossil platyrrhine from La Venta, *Nuciraptor rubricae*, has also been consistently placed as a stem pitheciine in published phylogenetic analyses (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019), including the mandibular analysis presented here. However, material of *Nuciraptor* is from the El Cardon Red Beds, which are younger than the Monkey Beds (12.829-12.272 Ma; Montes et al., 2021). A potentially older taxon, 19.76-10.4 Ma old *Proteropithecia neuquenensis* from the Collón Curá Formation of Argentina (Kay et al., 1998; Kay and Perry, 2019, see Supplementary Online Material for discussion of the age of this specimen) was found to be a stem pitheciine in recent phylogenetic analyses (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019). However, as noted above (see “Results” and “Discussion”), our mandibular analysis did not robustly support pitheciine affinities for *Proteropithecia*, and in any

1916 case the minimum age for this taxon is younger than for *Cebupithecia* (see Supplementary
 1917 Online Material). Thus, we have not used *Proteropithecia* to calibrate this node.
 1918 Hard minimum bound 13.032 Ma
 1919 Soft maximum bound 34.5 Ma
 1920 Suggested prior distribution uniform
 1921 Age justifications The type specimen of *Cebupithecia sarmientoi* comes from the Monkey Beds
 1922 at La Venta that correspond to the normal interval of Chron C5AA (Flynn et al., 1996; Kay and
 1923 Madden, 1997). This interval spans from 13.183 to 13.032 Ma (Gradstein et al., 2012), with the
 1924 latter date providing our hard minimum bound.
 1925 Our total evidence tip-dating analyses suggest that the most recent common ancestor of crown
 1926 Platyrrhini is ~21-28 Ma old, but the oldest known crown platyrrhines (including *Cebupithecia*)
 1927 are some 10-15 Ma younger; all fossil platyrrhines older than ~14 Ma are placed outside the
 1928 crown in our analyses (see “Results” and “Discussion” above). Thus, the early stages of the
 1929 evolution of crown Platyrrhini appear to be currently unsampled, probably because they occurred
 1930 in northern South America, where the fossil record for this time period remains poor (although
 1931 ongoing research is starting to improve this; e.g., Antoine et al., 2012, 2017; Bond et al., 2015;
 1932 Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019). For this reason, we suggest a
 1933 conservative maximum bound of 34.5 Ma, based on the maximum reported age of the oldest
 1934 platyrrhine specimens from TAR-21 site, Shapaja, Peru (Antoine et al., 2021); these specimens
 1935 appear to be highly plesiomorphic, and similar to the better preserved *Perupithecus* (Antoine et
 1936 al., 2021), which has been dated to 29.6 ± 0.08 Ma (Campbell et al., 2021). Campbell et al.
 1937 (2021) questioned the late Eocene age for TAR-21, and presented tip-dating analyses of fossil
 1938 rodents suggesting an Oligocene age for this and other Shapaja sites. However, pending further

1939 exploration of this issue, we prefer to use the older age for TAR-21 as the maximum bound of
 1940 this calibration as a conservative maximum. Given the obvious incompleteness of the fossil
 1941 record, we also suggest that this should be modelled as a uniform distribution. We propose the
 1942 same maximum bound and uniform prior distribution for all other divergences within Platyrrhini.
 1943 Additional CladeAge calibration We recognize *Cebupithecia sarmientoi* as the oldest stem
 1944 pitheciine. The fossil taxon *Miocallicebus villaviejai* has been described as being dentally similar
 1945 to, but much larger than, *Callicebus sensu lato* (= the currently recognized modern callicebine
 1946 genera *Callicebus*, *Plecturocebus* and *Cheracebus*; (Takai et al., 2001; Kay, 2015). The only
 1947 known specimen (IGM-KU 97001) is a partial maxilla preserving only a single fully intact tooth
 1948 (M2), which is heavily worn, and its affinities have not been tested via formal phylogenetic
 1949 analysis. Nevertheless, we consider the available evidence sufficient to recognize *Miocallicebus*
 1950 as a fossil callicebine, and so we propose it as an additional CladeAge calibration here. IGM-KU
 1951 97001 comes from the Bolivia Site at La Venta, which is just above the Tatacoa Beds, towards
 1952 the top of the La Victoria Formation. According to Montes et al. (2021, fig. 3), the base of the
 1953 Tatacoa Beds is within Chron C5ABr, whilst the top of the La Victoria Formation is within
 1954 Chron C5AAn. Following Gradstein et al. (2012), this gives an age range of 13.363-13.032 Ma
 1955 for *Miocallicebus villaviejai*, which we use as our CladeAge calibration for the oldest record of
 1956 Callicebinae.
 1957
 1958 *5.25 Callitrichidae-Cebidae split*
 1959 Calibrating taxon *Lagonimico conclucatus*

1960 Specimen IGM 184531 (holotype), a crushed skull with partial upper dentition present and a near
 1961 complete mandible with most of the mandibular dentition from Duke/INGEOMINAS locality 90
 1962 in the Victoria Formation, La Venta, Colombia (Kay, 1994).
 1963 Phylogenetic justification *Lagonimico* shares a number of dental synapomorphies with extant
 1964 crown callitrichids (Kay, 1994: table 7), and recent phylogenetic analyses consistently place it as
 1965 a stem-callitrichid (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019). We
 1966 found a similar result in our tip-dating analyses, with *Lagonimico* strongly supported as sister to
 1967 crown-callitrichids in both the mandibular and maxillary analysis, and so it is suitable for
 1968 calibrating this divergence. Our analyses, as well as several others (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al.,
 1969 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019) suggest that two other taxa from La Venta -
 1970 *Mohanamico hershkovitzi* (Luchterhand et al., 1986) and “*Aotus*” *dindensis* (originally described
 1971 as an aotid; Setoguchi and Rosenberger, 1987; see also Ni et al., 2019 fig. S1) - may also be stem
 1972 callitrichids, but both are from the “Monkey Beds”, which are stratigraphically younger than
 1973 Duke/INGEOMINAS locality 90 (Flynn et al., 1996; Montes et al., 2021; see below).
 1974 Hard minimum bound 13.183 Ma
 1975 Soft maximum bound 34.5 Ma
 1976 Suggested prior distribution uniform
 1977 Age justifications Duke/INGEOMINAS locality 90, source of IGM 184531, is located
 1978 stratigraphically between the overlying Tatacoa Beds and underlying Chunchullo Beds of the
 1979 Victoria Formation (Kay, 1994, Table 7; Montes et al., 2021). According to Montes et al. (2021,
 1980 fig. 3), the base of the Tatacoa Beds is within Chron C5ABr, whilst the Chunchullo Beds are
 1981 entirely within Chron C5ABn, as are the Cerro Gordo Beds that underlie them. Thus,
 1982 Duke/INGEOMINAS Locality 90 must be younger than the base of Chron C5ABn, and older

1983 than the top of Chron C5ABr, which gives an age range of 13.608 to 13.183 Ma, with the latter
 1984 providing our minimum bound.

1985 Based on the poor record of crown Platyrrhini (see “Crown Pitheciidae” above), we suggest a
 1986 conservative maximum bound of 34.5 Ma for this node, based on the maximum reported age of
 1987 the oldest probable platyrrhine specimens described to date (Antoine et al., 2021), and a uniform
 1988 prior distribution.

1989 Additional CladeAge calibration *Lagonimico conclucatus* is the oldest known callitrichid. The
 1990 sister taxon of Callitrichidae is either Cebidae, Aotidae, or Cebidae+Aotidae, as the precise
 1991 relationships of *Aotus* have proven difficult to resolve (Osterholz et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2012;
 1992 Valencia et al., 2018; Schrago and Seuánez, 2019; X. Wang et al., 2019; Vanderpool et al.,
 1993 2020). Considering the fossil record of cebids and aotids together, the oldest well-supported
 1994 representative of either family is *Neosaimiri*, which has been consistently proposed to be closely
 1995 related to the modern *Saimiri* from its original description by Stirton (1951) onwards (e.g.,
 1996 Rosenberger et al., 1991; Takai, 1994). Congruent with this, recent phylogenetic analyses
 1997 support *Neosaimiri* as a crown cebid, sister to *Saimiri* (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux
 1998 et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019), and we found the same relationship in our tip-dating analyses. The
 1999 oldest *Neosaimiri* material, including the holotype UCMP 39205, comes from the Monkey Beds
 2000 in the Villavieja Formation (see “Crown Cebidae” below), which 13.183 to 13.032 Ma (see
 2001 “Crown Pitheciidae” above), and this age range provides our additional CladeAge calibration.

2002 Comments Kay (2015) discussed records of two possible crown callitrichids from La Venta: an
 2003 isolated upper incisor (IGM-KU 8402) and a lower fourth premolar (IGM-KU 8403) from the
 2004 “Monkey Beds” that Setoguchi and Rosenberger (1985) tentatively referred to *Micodon kiotensis*
 2005 (see also Rosenberger et al., 1990); and the holotype of *Patasola magdalenae* (IGM 184332), a

2006 partial lower jaw preserving the deciduous premolars and the molars from the stratigraphically
 2007 older Duke Locality 40 (Kay and Meldrum, 1997), which is in the interval between the overlying
 2008 Chunchullo Beds and underlying Cerro Gordo beds (and so appears to fall within Chron C5ABn;
 2009 Montes et al., 2021). However, as discussed by Setoguchi and Rosenberger (1985), Rosenberger
 2010 et al. (1990) and Kay and Meldrum (1997), the evidence for referring GM-KU 8402 and 8403 to
 2011 Callitrichidae (whether stem or crown) is weak, and this proposed relationship has not been
 2012 tested via formal phylogenetic analysis. By contrast, Kay and Meldrum (1997) did formally test
 2013 the relationships of *Patasola* via maximum parsimony analysis of 55 dental characters and found
 2014 that it fell within crown Callitrichidae. However, the overall topology for extant callitrichids
 2015 recovered by Kay and Meldrum (1997) - namely
 2016 (*Callimico*,(*Leontopithecus*,(*Saguinus*,*Callithrix*))) - is highly incongruent with molecular data
 2017 (e.g., Garbino and Martins-Junior, 2018), which strongly supports
 2018 (*Saguinus*,(*Leontopithecus*,(*Callimico*,*Callithrix*)). Given this incongruence, which is likely to
 2019 have a major impact on the polarities of the dental characters used by Kay and Meldrum (1997)
 2020 to place *Patasola*, we do not consider the phylogenetic analysis of Kay and Meldrum (1997) to
 2021 be strong evidence that *Patasola* is a crown callitrichid. We prefer not to propose calibrations for
 2022 any divergences within crown Callitrichidae.

2023

2024 *5.26 Crown Cebidae = Cebinae-Saimirinae split*

2025 Calibrating taxon *Neosaimiri fieldsi*

2026 Specimen UCMP 39205 (holotype), comprising a left hemi-mandible preserving p2-m2, and a
 2027 right hemi-mandible preserving i2-m2, from UCMP locality V4517 in the “Monkey Beds” of the
 2028 Villavieja Formation at La Venta, Colombia (Stirton, 1951).

2029 Phylogenetic justification As already discussed (see “Callitrichidae-Cebidae split” above),
 2030 *Neosaimiri* has been consistently identified as a close relative of the extant saimirine genus
 2031 *Saimiri* since its original description. Indeed, Rosenberger et al. (1991) concluded that
 2032 *Neosaimiri* could be synonymized with *Saimiri*, although Takai (1994) argued that the two
 2033 genera should be maintained as distinct. Regardless, a close relationship between *Neosaimiri* and
 2034 *Saimiri* to the exclusion of *Cebus*, within crown Cebidae, has been a consistent feature of recent
 2035 published phylogenetic analyses (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et
 2036 al., 2019). Our own tip-dating total evidence analyses find very strong support for a
 2037 *Saimiri*+*Neosaimiri* clade to the exclusion of *Cebus* (see “Results” and “Discussion” above). The
 2038 ~20.9 Ma old *Panamacebus transitus* has also been placed within crown Cebidae in some
 2039 published phylogenetic analyses (Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019), but
 2040 it fell outside crown Platyrrhini in our tip-dating analyses (see “Results” and “Discussion”
 2041 above), and we do not use this taxon for calibrating purposes here.
 2042 Hard minimum bound 13.032 Ma
 2043 Soft maximum bound 34.5 Ma
 2044 Suggested prior distribution uniform
 2045 Age justifications As already discussed (see “Crown Pitheciidae” above), the age of the
 2046 “Monkey Beds” at La Venta can be constrained to between 13.183 and 13.032 Ma. We propose
 2047 the same maximum bound and uniform prior distribution as for crown Pitheciidae and the
 2048 Callitrichidae-Cebidae split (see above).
 2049 Additional CladeAge calibration As discussed, we consider *Neosaimiri fieldsi* to be the oldest
 2050 well-supported saimirine. If *Panamacebus* is discounted, the oldest well-supported member of
 2051 Cebinae is *Acrecebus fraileyi* (Kay and Cozzuol, 2006) which has been consistently placed sister

2052 to *Cebus* in recent published phylogenetic analyses (Kay, 2015; Bloch et al., 2016; Marivaux et
 2053 al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019). We recovered the same relationship in our tip-dating analyses.
 2054 *Acrecebus fraileyi* is known from a specimen, LACM 134880 (a left M2) from locality LACM
 2055 5158 (“Bandeira”), Solimoes Formation, Acre River, Acre, Brazil. The age of the Acre
 2056 vertebrate fauna of the Solimoes Formation has been controversial and remains poorly
 2057 constrained (Cozzuol, 2006). The Patos locality, which is near to the Bandeira locality (Negri et
 2058 al., 2010, fig. 15.1), has recently been proposed to be no older than 7 Ma based on palynological
 2059 data (Leite et al., 2021). However, in the absence of more precise stratigraphic evidence, we
 2060 follow Kay and Cozzuol (2006) and (2006; Tomassini et al., 2013) (2013) in assigning the Acre
 2061 vertebrate fauna to the Huayquerian SALMA, which is 9.0-5.28 Ma following Prevosti and
 2062 Forasiepi (2018), and provides our CladeAge calibration.
 2063
 2064 5.27 Crown *Atelidae* = *Alouattinae*-*Atelinae* split
 2065 Calibrating taxon *Stirtonia victoriae*
 2066 Specimen Duke/INGEOMINAS 85-400 (holotype), a right maxilla preserving erupted dP2-dP4
 2067 M1-M2, and mineralized but unerupted C and P2-P4, from Duke Locality 28, La Venta,
 2068 Colombia (Kay et al., 1987).
 2069 Phylogenetic justification Numerous authors have noted that *Stirtonia* shares numerous dental
 2070 similarities (at least some of them derived) with the modern genus *Alouatta* (Stirton, 1951;
 2071 Rosenberger, 1979; Setoguchi et al., 1981; Kay and Cozzuol, 2006), and a *Stirtonia*+*Alouatta*
 2072 clade has been recovered in several recent phylogenetic analyses (Kay and Cozzuol, 2006; Bloch
 2073 et al., 2016; Marivaux et al., 2016; Kay et al., 2019). Our own total evidence tip-dating analyses
 2074 also support this.

2075 Hard minimum bound 13.363 Ma

2076 Soft maximum bound 34.5 Ma

2077 Suggested prior distribution uniform

2078 Age justifications See “Crown Platyrrhini” above for discussion of the age of *Stirtonia victoriae*.

2079 Additional CladeAge calibration *Stirtonia victoriae* is the oldest known alouattine. Kay and

2080 Cozzuol (2006) named *Solimoea acrensis* based on an isolated left m1 (the holotype, UFAC-LPP

2081 5177) and an isolated right maxillary fragment preserving P3-4 (UFAC-LPP 5178) from the

2082 Patos locality (equivalent to LACM 4611) in the Solimoes Formation and identified it as an

2083 ateline. They also carried out a four different maximum parsimony analyses based of 57 dental

2084 characters (although only 25 of these were parsimony informative; Kay and Cozzuol, 2006: table

2085 1) and using a molecular scaffold that was based on the studies of Meireles et al. (1999 b; Carla

2086 M. Meireles et al., 1999 a) but which is still in agreement with current molecular evidence (e.g.

2087 dos Reis et al., 2018): in all four analyses, *Solimoea* formed a clade with living atelines, with

2088 moderate-to-high (57-86%) bootstrap support depending on the analysis. Kay (2015)

2089 subsequently stated that he considered *Solimoea* to be specifically related to *Lagothrix* within

2090 crown Atelinae, although Kay and Cozzuol (2006) found that *Solimoea* fell outside crown

2091 Atelinae in three out of four of their phylogenetic analyses. Rosenberger et al. (2015) argued that

2092 *Solimoea* is more likely an alouattine, and cast doubt on whether the holotype m1 and the

2093 referred maxillary fragment represent the same taxon. However, in the absence of formal

2094 phylogenetic analysis supporting alternative relationships for *Solimoea*, we tentatively accept it

2095 as the oldest known ateline. Based on palynological evidence, the Patos locality is 7 Ma or

2096 younger (Leite et al., 2021); given that we accept a Huayquerian age for the Acre vertebrate

2097 fauna as a whole (see “Crown Cebidae” above) which is 9-5.28 Ma, we assign *Solimoea acrensis*
2098 an age range of 7-5.28 Ma for our additional CladeAge calibration.

2099

2100 **6. Conclusion**

2101 Marjanović (2021) noted that compendia of fossil calibrations quickly go out of date, due both to
2102 the discovery of new fossils and to reinterpretation and reanalysis of those already known.
2103 However, the impact of this on analyses that need to use fossil calibration information can (we
2104 hope) be lessened by careful consideration of the appropriate prior distribution for each
2105 calibrated node, to adequately reflect our current uncertainty and to take into account the likely
2106 impact of future discoveries. For example, it is certainly possible, or even probable, that crown
2107 primates older than *Teilhardina brandti* will be discovered, but we think it highly unlikely that
2108 they will be found in the Cretaceous, an assumption that is taken into account by our suggested
2109 prior distribution on the age of crown Primates. Thus, we expect that improvements in the
2110 primate fossil record will lead to tighter constraints on the ages of particular nodes (mainly due
2111 to older minimum bounds), but not ones that actively conflict with those proposed here. In turn,
2112 revisions to this list should lead to more precise, but not contradictory, estimates of divergence
2113 times in future node-dating analyses.

2114

2115 **7. References**

2116 Agnini, C., Backman, J., Boscolo-Galazzo, F., Condon, D.J., Fornaciari, E., Galeotti, S.,
2117 Giusberti, L., Grandesso, P., Lanci, L., Luciani, V., Monechi, S., Muttoni, G., Pălike, H.,
2118 Pampaloni, M.L., Papazzoni, C.A., Pearson, P.N., Pignatti, J., Silva, I.P., Raffi, I., Rio, D.,
2119 Rook, L., Sahy, D., Spofforth, D.J.A., Stefani, C., Wade, B.S., 2020. Proposal for the

2120 Global Boundary Stratotype Section and Point (GSSP) for the Priabonian Stage (Eocene) at
 2121 the Alano section (Italy). *Episodes*. 44, 151–173.

2122 Ahern, J.C.M., 2018. *Sahelanthropus*. The International Encyclopedia of Biological
 2123 Anthropology.

2124 Alba, D.M., 2012. Fossil apes from the Vallès-Penedès Basin. *Evolutionary Anthropology*. 21,
 2125 254–269.

2126 Alba, D.M., Delson, E., Carnevale, G., Colombero, S., Delfino, M., Giuntelli, P., Pavia, M.,
 2127 Pavia, G., 2014a. New cercopithecoid remains from Moncucco Torinese and the taxonomic
 2128 identity of the earliest papionins from Europe. In: XII EAVP Meeting – Torino 24-28 June
 2129 2014 – Abstract Book. Presented at the XII EAVP Meeting, p. 4.

2130 Alba, D.M., Delson, E., Carnevale, G., Colombero, S., Delfino, M., Giuntelli, P., Pavia, M.,
 2131 Pavia, G., 2014b. First joint record of *Mesopithecus* and cf. *Macaca* in the Miocene of
 2132 Europe. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 67, 1–18.

2133 Alba, D.M., Montoya, P., Pina, M., Rook, L., Abella, J., Morales, J., Delson, E., 2015. First
 2134 record of *Mesopithecus* (Cercopithecidae, Colobinae) from the Miocene of the Iberian
 2135 Peninsula. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 88, 1–14.

2136 Allentoft, M.E., Collins, M., Harker, D., Haile, J., Oskam, C.L., Hale, M.L., Campos, P.F.,
 2137 Samaniego, J.A., Gilbert, M.T.P., Willerslev, E., Zhang, G., Scofield, R.P., Holdaway,
 2138 R.N., Bunce, M., 2012. The half-life of DNA in bone: measuring decay kinetics in 158
 2139 dated fossils. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 279, 4724–4733.

2140 Almécija, S., Hammond, A.S., Thompson, N.E., Pugh, K.D., Moyà-Solà, S., Alba, D.M., 2021.
 2141 Fossil apes and human evolution. *Science*. 372, eabb4363.

2142 Álvarez, A., Arévalo, R.L.M., Verzi, D.H., 2017. Diversification patterns and size evolution in

2143 caviomorph rodents. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society*. 121, 907–922.

2144 Antoine, P.-O., Marivaux, L., Croft, D.A., Billet, G., Ganerød, M., Jaramillo, C., Martin, T.,
 2145 Orliac, M.J., Tejada, J., Altamirano, A.J., Duranthon, F., Fanjat, G., Rousse, S., Gismondi,
 2146 R.S., 2012. Middle Eocene rodents from Peruvian Amazonia reveal the pattern and timing
 2147 of caviomorph origins and biogeography. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
 2148 *Sciences*. 279, 1319–1326.

2149 Antoine, P.-O., Salas-Gismondi, R., Pujos, F., Ganerød, M., Marivaux, L., 2017. Western
 2150 Amazonia as a hotspot of mammalian biodiversity throughout the Cenozoic. *Journal of*
 2151 *Mammalian Evolution*. 24, 5–17.

2152 Antoine, P.-O., Yans, J., Castillo, A.A., Stutz, N., Abello, M.A., Adnet, S., Custódio, M.A.,
 2153 Benites-Palomino, A., Billet, G., Boivin, M., Herrera, F., Jaramillo, C., Martínez, C.,
 2154 Moreno, F., Navarrete, R.E., Negri, F.R., Parra, F., Pujos, F., Rage, J.-C., Ribeiro, A.M.,
 2155 Robinet, C., Roddaz, M., Tejada-Lara, J.V., Varas-Malca, R., Ventura Santos, R., Salas-
 2156 Gismondi, R., Marivaux, L., 2021. Biotic community and landscape changes around the
 2157 Eocene–Oligocene transition at Shapaja, Peruvian Amazonia: Regional or global drivers?
 2158 *Global and Planetary Change*. 202, 103512.

2159 Arambourg, C., 1959. *Vertébrés continentaux du Miocène supérieur de l’Afrique du Nord*.
 2160 *Publications du Service de la carte geologique de l’Algerie (Paleontologie Memoire)*. 4, 5–
 2161 159.

2162 Archibald, J.D., Zhang, Y., Harper, T., Cifelli, R.L., 2011. *Protungulatum*, confirmed Cretaceous
 2163 occurrence of an otherwise Paleocene eutherian (placental?) mammal. *Journal of*
 2164 *Mammalian Evolution*. 18, 153–161.

2165 Asher, R.J., Smith, M.R., Rankin, A., Emry, R.J., 2019. Congruence, fossils and the evolutionary

2166 tree of rodents and lagomorphs. Royal Society Open Science. 6, 190387.

2167 Bajpai, S., Kay, R.F., Williams, B.A., Das, D.P., Kapur, V.V., Tiwari, B.N., 2008. The oldest
 2168 Asian record of Anthropoidea. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
 2169 United States of America. 105, 11093–11098.

2170 Bapst, D.W., Wright, A.M., Matzke, N.J., Lloyd, G.T., 2016. Topology, divergence dates, and
 2171 macroevolutionary inferences vary between different tip-dating approaches applied to fossil
 2172 theropods (Dinosauria). Biology Letters. 12, 20160237.

2173 Beard, K.C., 2008. The oldest North American primate and mammalian biogeography during the
 2174 Paleocene–Eocene Thermal Maximum. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences
 2175 of the United States of America. 105, 3815–3818.

2176 Beauvilain, A., 2008. The contexts of discovery of *Australopithecus bahrelghazali* (Abel) and of
 2177 *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* (Toumaï): unearthed, embedded in sandstone, or surface
 2178 collected?: commentary. South African Journal of Science. 104, 165–168.

2179 Beck, R.M.D., Lee, M.S.Y., 2014. Ancient dates or accelerated rates? Morphological clocks and
 2180 the antiquity of placental mammals. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
 2181 Sciences. 281, 20141278.

2182 Beck, R.M.D., Taglioretti, M.L., 2020. A nearly complete juvenile skull of the marsupial
 2183 *Sparassocynus derivatus* from the Pliocene of Argentina, the affinities of “sparassocynids”,
 2184 and the diversification of opossums (Marsupialia; Didelphimorphia; Didelphidae). Journal
 2185 of Mammalian Evolution. 27, 385–417.

2186 Beck, R.M.D., Voss, R., Jansa, S., 2021. Craniodental morphology and phylogeny of marsupials.
 2187 Paleorxiv preprint, rph78.

2188 Begun, D.R., 2015. Fossil record of Miocene hominoids. Handbook of Paleoanthropology (2nd

2189 ed.). 2, 921–977.

2190 Begun, D.R., Nargolwalla, M.C., Kordos, L., 2012. European Miocene hominids and the origin
2191 of the African ape and human clade. *Evolutionary Anthropology*. 21, 10–23.

2192 Benoit, J., Thackeray, F.J., 2017. A cladistic analysis of *Graecopithecus*. *South African Journal*
2193 of Science. 113, 1–2.

2194 Benton, M.J., Donoghue, P.C.J., 2007. Paleontological evidence to date the tree of life.
2195 *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 24, 26–53.

2196 Benton, M.J., Donoghue, P.C.J., Asher, R.J., 2009. Calibrating and constraining molecular
2197 clocks. In: Hedges, S.B., Kumar, S. (Eds.), *The Timetree of Life*. Oxford University Press,
2198 Oxford, pp. 35–86.

2199 Benton, M.J., Donoghue, P.C.J., Asher, R.J., Friedman, M., Near, T.J., Vinther, J., 2015.
2200 Constraints on the timescale of animal evolutionary history. *Palaeontologia Electronica*. 18,
2201 1–106.

2202 Bertrand, O.C., Flynn, J.J., Croft, D.A., Wyss, A.R., 2012. Two new taxa (Caviomorpha,
2203 Rodentia) from the early Oligocene Tinguiririca Fauna (Chile). *American Museum*
2204 *Novitates*. 2012, 1–36.

2205 Billet, G., Bardin, J., 2019. Serial homology and correlated characters in morphological
2206 phylogenetics: Modeling the evolution of dental crests in placentals. *Systematic Biology*.
2207 68, 267–280.

2208 Bininda-Emonds, O.R., Beck, R.M.D., MacPhee, R.D.E., 2012. Rocking clocks and clocking
2209 rocks: a critical look at divergence time estimation in mammals. In: Asher, R.J., Müller, J.
2210 (Eds.), *From Clone to Bone: The Synergy of Morphological and Molecular Tools in*
2211 *Palaeobiology*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 38–82.

2212 Bishop, W.W., Miller, J.A., Fitch, F.J., 1969. New potassium-argon age determinations relevant
 2213 to the Miocene fossil mammal sequence in east Africa. *American Journal of Science*. 267,
 2214 669–699.

2215 Bi, S., Zheng, X., Wang, X., Cignetti, N.E., Yang, S., Wible, J.R., 2018. An Early Cretaceous
 2216 eutherian and the placental–marsupial dichotomy. *Nature*. 558, 390–395.

2217 Blair Hedges, S., Kumar, S., 2009. *The Timetree of Life*. Oxford University Press, Oxford.

2218 Bloch, J.I., Silcox, M.T., Boyer, D.M., Sargis, E.J., 2007. New Paleocene skeletons and the
 2219 relationship of plesiadapiforms to crown-clade primates. *Proceedings of the National*
 2220 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 104, 1159–1164.

2221 Bloch, J.I., Woodruff, E.D., Wood, A.R., Rincon, A.F., Harrington, A.R., Morgan, G.S., Foster,
 2222 D.A., Montes, C., Jaramillo, C.A., Jud, N.A., Jones, D.S., MacFadden, B.J., 2016. First
 2223 North American fossil monkey and early Miocene tropical biotic interchange. *Nature*. 533,
 2224 243–246.

2225 Boivin, M., Marivaux, L., Antoine, P.-O., 2019. L’apport du registre paléogène d'Amazonie sur
 2226 la diversification initiale des Caviomorpha (Hystricognathi, Rodentia): implications
 2227 phylogénétiques, macroévolutives et paléobiogéographiques. *Geodiversitas*. 41, 143–245.

2228 Boivin, M., Marivaux, L., Orliac, M.J., Pujos, F., 2017. Late middle Eocene caviomorph rodents
 2229 from Contamana, Peruvian Amazonia. *Palaeontologia Electronica*. 20.1.19A, 1–50.

2230 Bond, M., Tejedor, M.F., Campbell, K.E., Jr, Chornogubsky, L., Novo, N., Goin, F., 2015.
 2231 Corrigendum: Eocene primates of South America and the African origins of New World
 2232 monkeys. *Nature*. 525, 552.

2233 Bown, T.M., Rose, K.D., 1987. Patterns of dental evolution in early Eocene anaptomorphine
 2234 primates (Omomyidae) from the Bighorn Basin, Wyoming. *Paleontological Society*

2235 Memoir. 23, 1–162.

2236 Boyer, D.M., Seiffert, E.R., Simons, E.L., 2010. Astragalar morphology of *Afradapis*, a large
2237 adapiform primate from the earliest late Eocene of Egypt. *American Journal of Physical*
2238 *Anthropology*. 143, 383–402.

2239 Boyer, D.M., Toussaint, S., Godinot, M., 2017. Postcrania of the most primitive euprimate and
2240 implications for primate origins. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 111, 202–215.

2241 Brunet, M., Guy, F., Pilbeam, D., Mackaye, H.T., Likius, A., Ahounta, D., Beauvilain, A.,
2242 Blondel, C., Bocherens, H., Boisserie, J.-R., De Bonis, L., Coppens, Y., Dejax, J., Denys,
2243 C., Düringer, P., Eisenmann, V., Fanone, G., Fronty, P., Geraads, D., Lehmann, T.,
2244 Lihoreau, F., Louchart, A., Mahamat, A., Merceron, G., Mouchelin, G., Otero, O., Pelaez
2245 Campomanes, P., Ponce De Leon, M., Rage, J.-C., Sapanet, M., Schuster, M., Sudre, J.,
2246 Tassy, P., Valentin, X., Vignaud, P., Viriot, L., Zazzo, A., Zollikofer, C., 2002. A new
2247 hominid from the Upper Miocene of Chad, Central Africa. *Nature*. 418, 145–151.

2248 Buckner, J.C., Lynch Alfaro, J.W., Rylands, A.B., Alfaro, M.E., 2015. Biogeography of the
2249 marmosets and tamarins (Callitrichidae). *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*. 82, 413–
2250 425.

2251 Burney, D.A., Vasey, N., Godfrey, L.R., Jungers, W.L., Ramilisonina, Ramarolahy, M.F.,
2252 Raharivony, L.L., 2008. New findings at Andrahomana Cave, southeastern Madagascar.
2253 *Journal of Cave and Karst Studies*. 70, 13–24.

2254 Button, D.J., Zanno, L.E., 2020. Repeated evolution of divergent modes of herbivory in non-
2255 avian dinosaurs. *Current Biology*. 30, 158–168.e4.

2256 Byron, C.D., 2001. Hard tissue evidence for Asian colobine phylogeny. *American Journal of*
2257 *Physical Anthropology*. 114, 46–47.

2258 Campbell, K.E., Jr, O’Sullivan, P.B., Fleagle, J.G., de Vries, D., Seiffert, E.R., 2021. An Early
 2259 Oligocene age for the oldest known monkeys and rodents of South America. Proceedings of
 2260 the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 118, e2105956118.
 2261 Casanovas-Vilar, I., Alba, D.M., Garcés, M., Robles, J.M., Moyà-Solà, S., 2011. Updated
 2262 chronology for the Miocene hominoid radiation in Western Eurasia. Proceedings of the
 2263 National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 108, 5554–5559.
 2264 Chatterjee, H.J., Ho, S.Y.W., Barnes, I., Groves, C., 2009. Estimating the phylogeny and
 2265 divergence times of primates using a supermatrix approach. BMC Evolutionary Biology. 9,
 2266 259.
 2267 Chester, S.G.B., Bloch, J.I., Boyer, D.M., Clemens, W.A., 2015. Oldest known euarchontan
 2268 tarsals and affinities of Paleocene *Purgatorius* to Primates. Proceedings of the National
 2269 Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 112, 1487–1492.
 2270 Chester, S.G.B., Williamson, T.E., Bloch, J.I., Silcox, M.T., Sargis, E.J., 2017. Oldest skeleton
 2271 of a plesiadapiform provides additional evidence for an exclusively arboreal radiation of
 2272 stem primates in the Palaeocene. Royal Society Open Science. 4, 170329.
 2273 Cohen, J.E., Cifelli, R.L., 2015. The first eutherian mammals from the early Late Cretaceous of
 2274 North America. In: 75th Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Annual Meeting. Presented at
 2275 the 75th Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Annual Meeting, Society of Vertebrate
 2276 Paleontology, p. 108.
 2277 Condamine, F.L., Nagalingum, N.S., Marshall, C.R., Morlon, H., 2015. Origin and
 2278 diversification of living cycads: a cautionary tale on the impact of the branching process
 2279 prior in Bayesian molecular dating. BMC Evolutionary Biology. 15, 65.
 2280 Cooke, S.B., Rosenberger, A.L., Turvey, S., 2011. An extinct monkey from Haiti and the origins

2281 of the Greater Antillean primates. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the
 2282 United States of America. 108, 2699–2704.

2283 Cote, S., Kingston, J., Deino, A., Winkler, A., Kityo, R., MacLatchy, L., 2018. Evidence for
 2284 rapid faunal change in the early Miocene of East Africa based on revised biostratigraphic
 2285 and radiometric dating of Bukwa, Uganda. Journal of Human Evolution. 116, 95–107.

2286 Cozzuol, M.A., 2006. The Acre vertebrate fauna: Age, diversity, and geography. Journal of
 2287 South American Earth Sciences. 21, 185–203.

2288 Dashzeveg, D., Russell, D.E., 1988. Paleocene and Eocene Mixodontia (Mammalia, Glires) of
 2289 Mongolia and China. Palaeontology. 31, 129–164.

2290 de Bonis, L., Bouvrain, G., Geraads, D., Koufos, G., 1990. New remains of *Mesopithecus*
 2291 (Primates, Cercopithecoidea) from the late Miocene of Macedonia (Greece), with the
 2292 description of a new species. Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology. 10, 473–483.

2293 Deino, A.L., McBrearty, S., 2002. 40Ar/39Ar dating of the Kapthurin Formation, Baringo,
 2294 Kenya. Journal of Human Evolution. 42, 185–210.

2295 Deino, A.L., Tauxe, L., Monaghan, M., Hill, A., 2002. 40Ar/39Ar geochronology and
 2296 paleomagnetic stratigraphy of the Lukeino and lower Chemeron Formations at Tabarin and
 2297 Kapcheberek, Tugen Hills, Kenya. Journal of Human Evolution. 42, 117–140.

2298 Delson, E., 1975. Evolutionary history of the Cercopithecidae. Contributions to Primatology. 5,
 2299 167–217.

2300 Delson, E., 1980. Fossil macaques, phyletic relationships and a scenario of deployment. In:
 2301 Lindburg, D.G. (Ed.), The Macaques: Studies in Ecology, Behavior and Evolution. Van
 2302 Nostrand Reinhold, New York, pp. 10–30.

2303 Dembo, M., Matzke, N.J., Mooers, A.Ø., Collard, M., 2015. Bayesian analysis of a

2304 morphological supermatrix sheds light on controversial fossil hominin relationships.
 2305 Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 282, 20150943.

2306 Dembo, M., Radovčić, D., Garvin, H.M., Laird, M.F., Schroeder, L., Scott, J.E., Brophy, J.,
 2307 Ackermann, R.R., Musiba, C.M., de Ruiter, D.J., Mooers, A.Ø., Collard, M., 2016. The
 2308 evolutionary relationships and age of *Homo naledi*: An assessment using dated Bayesian
 2309 phylogenetic methods. Journal of Human Evolution. 97, 17–26.

2310 dos Reis, M., Gunnell, G.F., Barba-Montoya, J., Wilkins, A., Yang, Z., Yoder, A.D., 2018.
 2311 Using phylogenomic data to explore the effects of relaxed clocks and calibration strategies
 2312 on divergence time estimation: Primates as a test case. Systematic Biology. 67, 594–615.

2313 Drummond, A.J., Stadler, T., 2016. Bayesian phylogenetic estimation of fossil ages.
 2314 Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 371, 20150129.

2315 Emonet, E.-G., Andossa, L., Taïssio Mackaye, H., Brunet, M., 2014. Subocclusal dental
 2316 morphology of *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* and the evolution of teeth in hominins. American
 2317 Journal of Physical Anthropology. 153, 116–123.

2318 Estravís, C., 2000. Nuevos mamíferos del Eoceno Inferior de Silveirinha (Baixo Mondego,
 2319 Portugal). Coloquios de Paleontología. 51, 281–311.

2320 Flynn, J.J., Guerrero, J., Swisher, C.C., 1996. Geochronology of the Honda Group. In: RF Kay,
 2321 RH Madden, RL Cifelli, JJ Flynn (Ed.), Vertebrate Paleontology in the Neotropics: The
 2322 Miocene Fauna of La Venta, Colombia. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

2323 Flynn, J.J., Wyss, A.R., Croft, D.A., Charrier, R., 2003. The Tinguiririca fauna, Chile:
 2324 Biochronology, paleoecology, biogeography, and a new earliest Oligocene South American
 2325 land mammal “age.” Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology. 195, 229–259.

2326 Flynn, L.J., Morgan, M.E., 2005. New lower primates from the Miocene Siwaliks of Pakistan.

2327 In: Lieberman, D., Smith, R.W., Kelley, J. (Eds.), Interpreting the Past: Essays on Human,
 2328 Primate, and Mammal Evolution in Honor of David Pilbeam. Brill Academic Publishers,
 2329 Boston, pp. 81–102.

2330 Foley, N.M., Springer, M.S., Teeling, E.C., 2016. Mammal madness: is the mammal tree of life
 2331 not yet resolved? Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences.
 2332 371.

2333 Fostowicz-Frelik, Ł., 2017. Convergent and Parallel Evolution in Early Glires (Mammalia). In:
 2334 Pontarotti, P. (Ed.), Evolutionary Biology: Self/Nonself Evolution, Species and Complex
 2335 Traits Evolution, Methods and Concepts. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 199–
 2336 216.

2337 Fostowicz-Frelik, Ł., 2020. Most Successful Mammals in the Making: A Review of the
 2338 Paleocene Glires. In: Pontarotti, P. (Ed.), Evolutionary Biology—A Transdisciplinary
 2339 Approach. Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 99–116.

2340 Frost, S.R., Gilbert, C.C., Pugh, K.D., Guthrie, E.H., Delson, E., 2015. The hand of
 2341 *Cercopithecoides williamsi* (Mammalia, Primates): Earliest evidence for thumb reduction
 2342 among colobine monkeys. PLoS ONE. 10, e0125030.

2343 Frost, S.R., Ward, C.V., Manthi, F.K., Plavcan, J.M., 2020. Cercopithecoid fossils from Kanapoi,
 2344 West Turkana, Kenya (2007–2015). Journal of Human Evolution. 140, 102642.

2345 Fuss, J., Spassov, N., Böhme, M., Begun, D., 2018. Response to Benoit and Thackeray (2017):
 2346 “A cladistic analysis of *Graecopithecus*.” South African Journal of Science. 114, 1–2.

2347 Garbino, G.S.T., Martins-Junior, A.M.G., 2018. Phenotypic evolution in marmoset and tamarin
 2348 monkeys (Cebidae, Callitrichinae) and a revised genus-level classification. Molecular
 2349 Phylogenetics and Evolution. 118, 156–171.

2350 Gavryushkina, A., Welch, D., Stadler, T., Drummond, A.J., 2014. Bayesian inference of sampled
 2351 ancestor trees for epidemiology and fossil calibration. *PLoS Computational Biology*. 10,
 2352 e1003919.

2353 Gheerbrant, E., 1998. The oldest known proboscidean and the role of Africa in the radiation of
 2354 modern orders of placentals. *Bulletin of the Geological Society of Denmark*. 44, 181–185.

2355 Gilbert, C.C., Bibi, F., Hill, A., Beech, M.J., 2014. Early guenon from the late Miocene
 2356 Baynunah Formation, Abu Dhabi, with implications for cercopithecoid biogeography and
 2357 evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
 2358 *America*. 111, 10119–10124.

2359 Gilbert, C.C., Goble, E.D., Hill, A., 2010. Miocene Cercopithecoidea from the Tugen Hills,
 2360 Kenya. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 59, 465–483.

2361 Gilbert, C.C., Ortiz, A., Pugh, K.D., Campisano, C.J., Patel, B.A., Singh, N.P., Fleagle, J.G.,
 2362 Patnaik, R., 2020. New Middle Miocene Ape (Primates: Hylobatidae) from Ramnagar,
 2363 India fills major gaps in the hominoid fossil record. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B:*
 2364 *Biological Sciences*. 287, 20201655.

2365 Gingerich, P.D., 1993a. Early Eocene *Teilhardina brandti*: oldest omomyid primate from North
 2366 America. *Contributions from the Museum of Paleontology, the University of Michigan*. 28,
 2367 321–326.

2368 Gingerich, P.D., 1993b. Oligocene age of the Gebel Qatrani Formation, Fayum, Egypt. *Journal*
 2369 *of Human Evolution*. 24, 207–218.

2370 Godfrey, L.R., Jungers, W.L., Burney, D.A., 2010. Subfossil lemurs of Madagascar. In:
 2371 Werdelin, L., Sanders, W.J. (Eds.), *Cenozoic Mammals of Africa*. University of California
 2372 Press, Berkeley, pp. 351–367.

2373 Godfrey, L.R., Samonds, K.E., Baldwin, J.W., Sutherland, M.R., Kamilar, J.M., Allfisher, K.L.,
 2374 2020. Mid-Cenozoic climate change, extinction, and faunal turnover in Madagascar, and
 2375 their bearing on the evolution of lemurs. *BMC Evolutionary Biology*. 20, 97.
 2376 Godinot, M., 1978. Un nouvel adapidé (primate) de L'éocène inférieur de Provence. . *Comptes*
 2377 *Rendus de l'Académie des Sciences de Paris, Série D*. 286, 1869–1872.
 2378 Godinot, M., 1994. Early North African primates and their significance for the origin of
 2379 Simiiformes (= Anthropoidea). In: Fleagle, J.G., Kay, R.F. (Eds.), *Anthropoid Origins*.
 2380 Springer US, Boston, pp. 235–295.
 2381 Godinot, M., 1998. A Summary of adapiform systematics and phylogeny. *Folia Primatologica*.
 2382 69, 218–249.
 2383 Godinot, M., 2006. Lemuriform origins as viewed from the fossil record. *Folia Primatologica*.
 2384 77, 446–464.
 2385 Godinot, M., 2015. Fossil record of the primates from the Paleocene to the Oligocene. In: W., H.,
 2386 Tattersall, I. (Eds.), *Handbook of Paleoanthropology*. Springer, Heidelberg New York
 2387 Dordrecht London, pp. 1137–1259.
 2388 Godinot, M., 2017. Paleocene and Eocene Primates. *The International Encyclopedia of*
 2389 *Primateology*.
 2390 Godinot, M., Senut, B., Pickford, M., 2018. Primitive Adapidae from Namibia sheds light on the
 2391 early primate radiation in Africa. *Communications of the Geological Survey of Namibia*.
 2392 18, 140–162.
 2393 Goswami, A., Prasad, G.V.R., Upchurch, P., Boyer, D.M., Seiffert, E.R., Verma, O., Gheerbrant,
 2394 E., Flynn, J.J., 2011. A radiation of arboreal basal eutherian mammals beginning in the Late
 2395 Cretaceous of India. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States*

2396 of America. 108, 16333–16338.

2397 Gradstein, F.M., Ogg, J.G., Schmitz, M.D., Ogg, G.M., 2012. The Geologic Time Scale 2012.

2398 Elsevier.

2399 Gremyatskii, M.A., 1961. The main line of higher primate evolution in the Neogene. *Voprosy*

2400 *Antropologii*. 7, 3–8.

2401 Guerrero, J., 1997. Stratigraphy, sedimentary environments, and the Miocene uplift of the

2402 Colombian Andes. In: Kay, R.F., Madden, R.H., Cifelli, R.L., Flynn, J.J. (Eds.), *Vertebrate*

2403 *Paleontology in the Neotropics: The Miocene Fauna of La Venta, Colombia*. Smithsonian

2404 Institution Press, Washington, D.C., pp. 15–43.

2405 Guillerme, T., Cooper, N., 2016a. Assessment of available anatomical characters for linking

2406 living mammals to fossil taxa in phylogenetic analyses. *Biology Letters*. 12, 20151003.

2407 Guillerme, T., Cooper, N., 2016b. Effects of missing data on topological inference using a Total

2408 Evidence approach. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*. 94, 146–158.

2409 Gunnell, G.F., Boyer, D.M., Friscia, A.R., Heritage, S., Manthi, F.K., Miller, E.R., Sallam, H.M.,

2410 Simmons, N.B., Stevens, N.J., Seiffert, E.R., 2018. Fossil lemurs from Egypt and Kenya

2411 suggest an African origin for Madagascar’s aye-aye. *Nature Communications*. 9, 3193.

2412 Gunnell, G.F., Miller, E.R., 2018. Anthropoid origins. *The International Encyclopedia of*

2413 *Biological Anthropology*.

2414 Haile-Selassie, Y., 2001. Late Miocene hominids from the Middle Awash, Ethiopia. *Nature*. 412,

2415 178–181.

2416 Haile-Selassie, Y., Suwa, G., White, T.D., 2004. Late Miocene teeth from Middle Awash,

2417 Ethiopia, and early hominid dental evolution. *Science*. 303, 1503–1505.

2418 Harrison, L.B., Larsson, H.C.E., 2015. Among-character rate variation distributions in

2419 phylogenetic analysis of discrete morphological characters. *Systematic Biology*. 64, 307–
 2420 324.

2421 Harrison, T., 2010a. Later Tertiary Lorisiformes (Strepsirrhini, Primates). In: Werdelin, L.,
 2422 Sanders, W.J. (Eds.), *Cenozoic Mammals of Africa*. University of California Press,
 2423 Berkeley, pp. 333–349.

2424 Harrison, T., 2010b. Dendropithecoidea, Proconsuloidea, and Hominoidea. In: Werdelin, L.,
 2425 Sanders, W.J. (Eds.), *Cenozoic Mammals of Africa*. University of California Press,
 2426 Berkeley, pp. 429–470.

2427 Harrison, T., 2010c. Anthropology. Apes among the tangled branches of human origins. *Science*.
 2428 327, 532–534.

2429 Harrison, T., 2011. Galagidae (Lorisoidea, Primates). In: Harrison, T. (Ed.), *Paleontology and*
 2430 *Geology of Laetoli: Human Evolution in Context: Volume 2: Fossil Hominins and the*
 2431 *Associated Fauna*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 75–81.

2432 Hasegawa, M., Kishino, H., Yano, T., 1985. Dating of the human-ape splitting by a molecular
 2433 clock of mitochondrial DNA. *Journal of Molecular Evolution*. 22, 160–174.

2434 Heath, T.A., Huelsenbeck, J.P., 2014. The fossilized birth–death process for coherent calibration
 2435 of divergence-time estimates. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
 2436 *United States of America*. 111, E2957–E2966.

2437 Hermesen, E.J., Hendricks, J.R., 2008. W(h)ither fossils? Studying morphological character
 2438 evolution in the age of molecular sequences. *Annals of the Missouri Botanical Garden*. 95,
 2439 72–100.

2440 Herrera, J.P., 2017. Primate diversification inferred from phylogenies and fossils. *Evolution*. 71,
 2441 2845–2857.

2442 Herrera, J.P., Dávalos, L.M., 2016. Phylogeny and divergence times of lemurs inferred with
 2443 Recent and ancient Fossils in the tree. *Systematic Biology*. 65, 772–791.

2444 Hilgen, F.J., Lourens, L.J., Van Dam, J.A., Beu, A.G., Boyes, A.F., Cooper, R.A., Krijgsman,
 2445 W., Ogg, J.G., Piller, W.E., Wilson, D.S., 2012. The Neogene Period. In: Gradstein, F.M.,
 2446 Ogg, J.G., Schmitz, M., Ogg, G. (Eds.), *The Geologic Time Scale 2012*. Elsevier, Boston,
 2447 pp. 923–978.

2448 Hill, A., Leakey, M., Kingston, J.D., Ward, S., 2002. New cercopithecoids and a hominoid from
 2449 12.5 Ma in the Tugen Hills succession, Kenya. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 42, 75–93.

2450 Hooker, J.J., Russell, D.E., Phélizon, A., 1999. A new family of Plesiadapiformes (Mammalia)
 2451 from the Old World Lower Paleogene. *Palaeontology*. 42, 377–407.

2452 Ho, S.Y.W., 2021. *The Molecular Evolutionary Clock: Theory and Practice*. Springer
 2453 International Publishing.

2454 Ho, S.Y.W., Phillips, M.J., 2009. Accounting for calibration uncertainty in phylogenetic
 2455 estimation of evolutionary divergence times. *Systematic Biology*. 58, 367–380.

2456 Houben, A.J.P., Bijl, P.K., Sluijs, A., Schouten, S., Brinkhuis, H., 2019. Late Eocene southern
 2457 ocean cooling and invigoration of circulation preconditioned Antarctica for full-scale
 2458 glaciation. *Geochemistry, Geophysics, Geosystems*. 20, 2214–2234.

2459 Huelsenbeck, J.P., Ronquist, F., 2001. MRBAYES: Bayesian inference of phylogenetic trees.
 2460 *Bioinformatics*. 17, 754–755.

2461 Hunt, G., Slater, G., 2016. Integrating paleontological and phylogenetic approaches to
 2462 macroevolution. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*. 47, 189–213.

2463 Jablonski, N.G., 1998. The evolution of the doucs and snub-nosed monkeys and the question of
 2464 the phyletic unity of the odd-nosed colobines. In: Jablonski, N.G. (Ed.), *The Natural History*

2465 of the Doucs and Snub-Nosed Monkeys, Recent Advances in Human Biology. World
 2466 Scientific, pp. 13–52.

2467 Jablonski, N.G., Frost, S.R., 2010. Cercopithecoidea. In: Werdelin, L., Sanders, W.J. (Eds.),
 2468 Cenozoic Mammals of Africa. University of California Press, Berkeley, pp. 393–428.

2469 Jablonski, N.G., Ji, X., Kelley, J., Flynn, L.J., Deng, C., Su, D.F., 2020. *Mesopithecus pentelicus*
 2470 from Zhaotong, China, the easternmost representative of a widespread Miocene
 2471 cercopithecoid species. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 146, 102851.

2472 Jacobs, L.L., 1981. Miocene lorid primates from the Pakistan Siwaliks. *Nature*. 289, 585–587.

2473 Jaeger, J.-J., Chavasseau, O., Lazzari, V., Naing Soe, A., Sein, C., Le Maître, A., Shwe, H.,
 2474 Chaimanee, Y., 2019. New Eocene primate from Myanmar shares dental characters with
 2475 African Eocene crown anthropoids. *Nature Communications*. 10, 3531.

2476 Jaeger, J.-J., Sein, C., Gebo, D.L., Chaimanee, Y., Nyein, M.T., Oo, T.Z., Aung, M.M.,
 2477 Suraprasit, K., Rugbumrung, M., Lazzari, V., Soe, A.N., Chavasseau, O., 2020.
 2478 Amphipithecine primates are stem anthropoids: cranial and postcranial evidence.
 2479 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 287, 20202129.

2480 Jameson, N.M., Hou, Z.-C., Sterner, K.N., Weckle, A., Goodman, M., Steiper, M.E., Wildman,
 2481 D.E., 2011. Genomic data reject the hypothesis of a prosimian primate clade. *Journal of*
 2482 *Human Evolution*. 61, 295–305.

2483 Jansa, S.A., Barker, F.K., Voss, R.S., 2014. The early diversification history of didelphid
 2484 marsupials: a window into South America’s “Splendid Isolation.” *Evolution*. 68, 684–695.

2485 Ji, Q., Luo, Z.-X., Yuan, C.-X., Wible, J.R., Zhang, J.-P., Georgi, J.A., 2002. The earliest known
 2486 eutherian mammal. *Nature*. 416, 816–822.

2487 Kappelman, J., Kelley, J., Pilbeam, D., Sheikh, K.A., Ward, S., Anwar, M., Barry, J.C., Brown,

2488 B., Hake, P., Johnson, N.M., Raza, S.M., Shah, S.M.I., 1991. The earliest occurrence of
 2489 *Sivapithecus* from the middle Miocene Chinji Formation of Pakistan. *Journal of Human*
 2490 *Evolution*. 21, 61–73.

2491 Kappelman, J., Rasmussen, D.T., Sanders, W.J., Feseha, M., Bown, T., Copeland, P., Crabaugh,
 2492 J., Fleagle, J., Glantz, M., Gordon, A., Jacobs, B., Maga, M., Muldoon, K., Pan, A., Pyne,
 2493 L., Richmond, B., Ryan, T., Seiffert, E.R., Sen, S., Todd, L., Wiemann, M.C., Winkler, A.,
 2494 2003. Oligocene mammals from Ethiopia and faunal exchange between Afro-Arabia and
 2495 Eurasia. *Nature*. 426, 549–552.

2496 Katoh, S., Beyene, Y., Itaya, T., Hyodo, H., Hyodo, M., Yagi, K., Gouzu, C., WoldeGabriel, G.,
 2497 Hart, W.K., Ambrose, S.H., Nakaya, H., Bernor, R.L., Boissarie, J.-R., Bibi, F., Saegusa,
 2498 H., Sasaki, T., Sano, K., Asfaw, B., Suwa, G., 2016. New geological and palaeontological
 2499 age constraint for the gorilla–human lineage split. *Nature*. 530, 215–218.

2500 Kay, R.F., 1990. The phyletic relationships of extant and fossil Pitheciinae (Platyrrhini,
 2501 Anthropoidea). In: Fleagle, J.G., Rosenberger, A.L. (Eds.), *The Platyrrhine Fossil Record*.
 2502 Academic Press, pp. 175–208.

2503 Kay, R.F., 1994. “Giant” tamarin from the Miocene of Colombia. *American journal of physical*
 2504 *anthropology*. 95, 333–353.

2505 Kay, R.F., 2010. A new primate from the early Miocene of Gran Barranca, Chubut Province,
 2506 Argentina: Paleoecological implications. *The Paleontology of Gran Barranca: Evolution and*
 2507 *Environmental Change through the Middle Cenozoic of Patagonia*. Cambridge University
 2508 Press, Cambridge. 220–239.

2509 Kay, R.F., 2015. Biogeography in deep time - What do phylogenetics, geology, and paleoclimate
 2510 tell us about early platyrrhine evolution? *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*. 82, 358–

2511 374.

2512 Kay, R.F., Cozzuol, M.A., 2006. New platyrrhine monkeys from the Solimões Formation (late
2513 Miocene, Acre State, Brazil). *Journal of Human Evolution*. 50, 673–686.

2514 Kay, R.F., Gonzales, L.A., Salenbien, W., Martinez, J.-N., Cooke, S.B., Valdivia, L.A., Rigsby,
2515 C., Baker, P.A., 2019. *Parvimico materdei* gen. et sp. nov.: A new platyrrhine from the
2516 Early Miocene of the Amazon Basin, Peru. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 134, 102628.

2517 Kay, R.F., Jeffrey Meldrum, D., Takai, M., 2013. Pitheciidae and other platyrrhine seed
2518 predators. In: Veiga, L.M., Barnett, A.A., Ferrari, S.F., Norconk, M.A. (Eds.), *Evolutionary
2519 Biology and Conservation of Titis, Sakis and Uacaris*. Cambridge University Press,
2520 Cambridge, pp. 3–12.

2521 Kay, R.F., Johnson, D., Meldrum, D.J., 1998. A new pitheciin primate from the middle Miocene
2522 of Argentina. *American Journal of Primatology*. 45, 317–336.

2523 Kay, R.F., Madden, R.H., 1997. Mammals and rainfall: paleoecology of the middle Miocene at
2524 La Venta (Colombia, South America). *Journal of Human Evolution*. 32, 161–199.

2525 Kay, R.F., Madden, R.H., Plavcan, J.M., Cifelli, R.L., Díaz, J.G., 1987. *Stirtonia victoriae*, a new
2526 species of Miocene Colombian primate. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 16, 173–196.

2527 Kay, R.F., Meldrum, D.J., 1997. A new small platyrrhine and the phyletic position of
2528 Callitrichinae. In: Kay, R.F., Madden, R.H., Cifelli, R.L., Flynn, J.J. (Eds.), *Vertebrate
2529 Paleontology in the Neotropics: The Miocene Fauna of La Venta, Colombia*, 435–458.
2530 Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

2531 Kay, R.F., Perry, J.M.G., 2019. New primates the Río Santa Cruz and Río Bote (Early--Middle
2532 Miocene), Santa Cruz Province, Argentina. *Publicacion Electronica de la Asociacion
2533 Paleontologica Argentina*. 19, 230–238.

- 2534 Kelley, J., Andrews, P., Alpagut, B., 2008. A new hominoid species from the middle Miocene
2535 site of Paşalar, Turkey. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 54, 455–479.
- 2536 Khin Zaw, Meffre, S., Takai, M., Suzuki, H., Burrett, C., Thaung Htike, Zin Maung Maung
2537 Thein, Tsubamoto, T., Egi, N., Maung Maung, 2014. The oldest anthropoid primates in SE
2538 Asia: Evidence from LA-ICP-MS U–Pb zircon age in the Late Middle Eocene Pondaung
2539 Formation, Myanmar. *Gondwana Research*. 26, 122–131.
- 2540 Kielan-Jaworowska, Z., Cifelli, R.L., Luo, Z.-X., 2004. *Mammals from the Age of Dinosaurs:*
2541 *Origins, Evolution, and Structure*. Columbia University Press.
- 2542 King, B., 2021. Bayesian tip-dated phylogenetics in paleontology: topological effects and
2543 stratigraphic fit. *Systematic Biology*. 70, 283–294.
- 2544 King, B., Beck, R.M.D., 2020. Tip dating supports novel resolutions of controversial
2545 relationships among early mammals. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
2546 *Sciences*. 287, 20200943.
- 2547 Klopstein, S., Ryer, R., Coiro, M., Spasojevic, T., 2019. Mismatch of the morphology model is
2548 mostly unproblematic in total-evidence dating: insights from an extensive simulation study.
2549 *bioRxiv*.
- 2550 Koufos, G.D., 2009. The Neogene cercopithecids (Mammalia, Primates) of Greece.
2551 *Geodiversitas*. 31, 817–850.
- 2552 Koufos, G.D., 2016. Primates. *Geobios*. 49, 45–51.
- 2553 Koufos, G.D., 2019. Late Turolian *Mesopithecus* (Mammalia: Cercopithecidae) from Axios
2554 Valley (Macedonia, Greece): earliest presence of *M. monspessulanus* in Europe. *Comptes*
2555 *Rendus Palevol*. 18, 1057–1072.
- 2556 Koufos, G.D., Kostopoulos, D.S., Vlachou, T.D., 2016. Revision of the Nikiti 1 (NKT) fauna

2557 with description of new material. *Geobios*. 49, 11–22.

2558 Kunimatsu, Y., Nakatsukasa, M., Sakai, T., Saneyoshi, M., Sawada, Y., Nakaya, H., 2017. A
 2559 newly discovered galagid fossil from Nakali, an early Late Miocene locality of East Africa.
 2560 *Journal of Human Evolution*. 105, 123–126.

2561 Kunimatsu, Y., Nakatsukasa, M., Sawada, Y., Sakai, T., Hyodo, M., Hyodo, H., Itaya, T.,
 2562 Nakaya, H., Saegusa, H., Mazurier, A., Saneyoshi, M., Tsujikawa, H., Yamamoto, A.,
 2563 Mbua, E., 2007. A new Late Miocene great ape from Kenya and its implications for the
 2564 origins of African great apes and humans. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
 2565 *Sciences of the United States of America*. 104, 19220–19225.

2566 Lanfear, R., Frandsen, P.B., Wright, A.M., Senfeld, T., Calcott, B., 2017. PartitionFinder 2: New
 2567 methods for selecting partitioned models of evolution for molecular and morphological
 2568 phylogenetic analyses. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 34, 772–773.

2569 Lawrence, B.N., Bennett, V.L., Churchill, J., Juckes, M., Kershaw, P., Pascoe, S., Pepler, S.,
 2570 Pritchard, M., Stephens, A., 2013. Storing and manipulating environmental big data with
 2571 JASMIN. In: 2013 IEEE International Conference on Big Data. ieeexplore.ieee.org, pp. 68–
 2572 75.

2573 Leakey, L.S.B., 1961. A new Lower Pliocene fossil primate from Kenya. *Annals and Magazine*
 2574 *of Natural History*. 4, 689–696.

2575 Leakey, L.S.B., 1962. The mammalian fauna and geomorphological relations of the Napak
 2576 Volcanics, Karamoja: Primates. *Records of the Geological Survey of Uganda*. 1957–1958.

2577 Leakey, M.G., Teaford, M.F., Ward, C.V., 2003. *Cercopithecidae from Lothagam. Lothagam:*
 2578 *The Dawn of Humanity in Eastern Africa*. Columbia University Press, New York. 201–248.

2579 Lebatard, A.-E., Bourlès, D.L., Braucher, R., Arnold, M., Düringer, P., Jolivet, M., Moussa, A.,

2580 Deschamps, P., Roquin, C., Carcaillet, J., Others, 2010. Application of the authigenic
 2581 $^{10}\text{Be}/^{9}\text{Be}$ dating method to continental sediments: reconstruction of the Mio-Pleistocene
 2582 sedimentary sequence in the early hominid fossiliferous areas of the northern Chad Basin.
 2583 Earth and Planetary Science Letters. 297, 57–70.

2584 Lebatard, A.-E., Bourlès, D.L., Durringer, P., Jolivet, M., Braucher, R., Carcaillet, J., Schuster,
 2585 M., Arnaud, N., Monié, P., Lihoreau, F., Likius, A., Mackaye, H.T., Vignaud, P., Brunet,
 2586 M., 2008. Cosmogenic nuclide dating of *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* and *Australopithecus*
 2587 *bahrelghazali*: Mio-Pliocene hominids from Chad. Proceedings of the National Academy of
 2588 Sciences of the United States of America. 105, 3226–3231.

2589 Lee, M.S.Y., 2020. Clock models for evolution of discrete phenotypic characters. In: Ho, S.Y.W.
 2590 (Ed.), The Molecular Evolutionary Clock: Theory and Practice. Springer International
 2591 Publishing, Cham, pp. 101–113.

2592 Lee, M.S.Y., Yates, A.M., 2018. Tip-dating and homoplasy: reconciling the shallow molecular
 2593 divergences of modern gharials with their long fossil record. Proceedings of the Royal
 2594 Society B: Biological Sciences. 285, 20181071.

2595 Le Gros Clark, E.W., 1956. A Miocene lemuroid skull from East Africa. In: Fossil Mammals of
 2596 Africa, No. 9. British Museum (Natural History), London.

2597 Le Gros Clark, W., Thomas, D.P., 1952. The Miocene Lemuroids of East Africa. In: Fossil
 2598 Mammals of Africa 5. British Museum (Natural History), London, pp. 1–20.

2599 Leite, F.P.R., Silva-Caminha, S.A.F. da, D’Apolito, C., 2021. New Neogene index pollen and
 2600 spore taxa from the Solimões Basin (Western Amazonia), Brazil. Palynology. 45, 115–141.

2601 Lemmon, A.R., Brown, J.M., Stanger-Hall, K., Lemmon, E.M., 2009. The effect of ambiguous
 2602 data on phylogenetic estimates obtained by maximum likelihood and Bayesian inference.

2603 Systematic Biology. 58, 130–145.

2604 Lewis, P.O., 2001. A likelihood approach to estimating phylogeny from discrete morphological

2605 character data. Systematic Biology. 50, 913–925.

2606 Li, C., 1977. Paleocene eurymyloids (Anagalida, Mammalia) of Qianshan, Anhui. Vertebrata

2607 PalAsiatica. 15, 116–118.

2608 Li, C.K., Ting, S.Y., 1993. New cranial and postcranial evidence for the affinities of the

2609 eurymylids (Rodentia) and mimotonids (Lagomorpha). In: Szalay, F.S., Novacek, M.J.,

2610 McKenna, M.C. (Eds.), Mammal Phylogeny. Placentals. Springer, Berlin, pp. 151–158.

2611 Li, C.K., Wang, Y.Q., Zhang, Z.Q., Mao, F.-Y., Meng, J., 2016. A new mimotonidan *Mina hui*

2612 (Mammalia, Glires) from the Middle Paleocene of Qianshan, Anhui, China. Vertebrata

2613 PalAsiatica. 54, 121–136.

2614 Li, Q., Ni, X., 2016. An early Oligocene fossil demonstrates treeshrews are slowly evolving

2615 “living fossils.” Scientific Reports. 6, 18627.

2616 Lloyd, G.T., Slater, G.J., 2021. A total-group phylogenetic metatree for Cetacea and the

2617 importance of fossil data in diversification analyses. Systematic Biology. 70, 922–939.

2618 Locke, E.M., Benefit, B.R., Kimock, C.M., Miller, E.R., Nengo, I., 2020. New dentognathic

2619 fossils of *Noropithecus bulukensis* (Primates, Victoriapithecidae) from the late Early

2620 Miocene of Buluk, Kenya. Journal of Human Evolution. 148, 102886.

2621 López-Torres, S., Fostowicz-Frelik, Ł., 2018. A new Eocene anagalid (Mammalia:

2622 Euarchontoglires) from Mongolia and its implications for the group’s phylogeny and

2623 dispersal. Scientific Reports. 8, 13955.

2624 López-Torres, S., Selig, K.R., Burrows, A.M., Silcox, M.T., 2020. The toothcomb of *Karanisia*

2625 *clarki*. In: Nekaris, K. A. I., Burrows, A. M. (Ed.), Evolution, Ecology and Conservation of

2626 Lorises and Pottos. pp. 67–75.
 2627 López-Torres, S., Silcox, M.T., 2020. What we know (and don't know) about the fossil records
 2628 of lorises. In: Nekaris, K.A.I., Burrows, A.M. (Eds.), *Evolution, Ecology and Conservation*
 2629 of Lorises and Pottos. pp. 33–46.
 2630 Loss-Oliveira, L., Aguiar, B.O., Schrago, C.G., 2012. Testing synchrony in historical
 2631 biogeography: the case of New World primates and Hystricognathi rodents. *Evolutionary*
 2632 *Bioinformatics*. 8, 127–137.
 2633 Luchterhand, K., Kay, R.F., Madden, R.H., 1986. *Mohanamico herskovitzi*, gen. et sp. nov., un
 2634 primate du Miocène moyen d'Amérique du Sud. *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des*
 2635 *sciences. Série 2, Mécanique, Physique, Chimie, Sciences de l'univers, Sciences de la Terre*.
 2636 303, 1753–1758.
 2637 Luo, A., Duchêne, D.A., Zhang, C., Zhu, C.-D., Ho, S.Y.W., 2019. A simulation-based
 2638 evaluation of tip-dating under the fossilized birth–death process. *Systematic Biology*. 69,
 2639 325–344.
 2640 Luo, Z.-X., Yuan, C.-X., Meng, Q.-J., Ji, Q., 2011. A Jurassic eutherian mammal and divergence
 2641 of marsupials and placentals. *Nature*. 476, 442–445.
 2642 Lynch Alfaro, J., 2017. The monkeying of the Americas: primate biogeography in the
 2643 Neotropics. *Annual Review of Anthropology*. 46, 317–336.
 2644 MacLatchy, L.M., DeSilva, J., Sanders, W.J., Wood, B., 2010. Hominini. In: Werdelin, L.,
 2645 Sanders, W.J. (Eds.), *Cenozoic Mammals of Africa*. University of California Press,
 2646 Berkeley, pp. 471–540.
 2647 MacPhee, R.D.E., Cartmill, M., Rose, K.D., 1989. Craniodental morphology and relationships of
 2648 the supposed Eocene dermopteran *Plagiomene* (Mammalia). *Journal of Vertebrate*

2649 Paleontology. 9, 329–349.
 2650 MacPhee, R.D.E., Jacobs, L.L., 1986. *Nycticeboides simpsoni* and the morphology, adaptations,
 2651 and relationships of Miocene Siwalik Lorisidae. Rocky Mountain Geology. 24, 131–161.
 2652 Marivaux, L., 2006. The eosimiid and amphipithecoid primates (Anthropoidea) from the
 2653 Oligocene of the Bugti Hills (Balochistan, Pakistan): new insight into early higher primate
 2654 evolution in South Asia. Palaeovertebrata. 34, 29–109.
 2655 Marivaux, L., Adnet, S., Altamirano-Sierra, A.J., Boivin, M., Pujos, F., Ramdarshan, A., Salas-
 2656 Gismondi, R., Tejada-Lara, J.V., Antoine, P.-O., 2016. Neotropics provide insights into the
 2657 emergence of New World monkeys: New dental evidence from the late Oligocene of
 2658 Peruvian Amazonia. Journal of Human Evolution. 97, 159–175.
 2659 Marivaux, L., Aguirre-Diaz, W., Benites-Palomino, A., Billet, G., Boivin, M., Pujos, F., Salas-
 2660 Gismondi, R., Tejada-Lara, J.V., Varas-Malca, R.M., Antoine, P.-O., 2020a. New record of
 2661 *Neosaimiri* (Cebidae, Platyrrhini) from the late Middle Miocene of Peruvian Amazonia.
 2662 Journal of Human Evolution. 146, 102835.
 2663 Marivaux, L., Bocat, L., Chaimanee, Y., Jaeger, J.-J., Marandat, B., Srisuk, P., Tafforeau, P.,
 2664 Yamee, C., Welcomme, J.-L., 2006a. Cynocephalid dermopterans from the Palaeogene of
 2665 South Asia (Thailand, Myanmar and Pakistan): systematic, evolutionary and
 2666 palaeobiogeographic implications. Zoologica Scripta. 35, 395–420.
 2667 Marivaux, L., Chaimanee, Y., Tafforeau, P., Jaeger, J.-J., 2006b. New strepsirrhine primate from
 2668 the late Eocene of Peninsular Thailand (Krabi Basin). American Journal of Physical
 2669 Anthropology. 130, 425–434.
 2670 Marivaux, L., Ramdarshan, A., Essid, E.M., Marzougui, W., Khayati Ammar, H., Lebrun, R.,
 2671 Marandat, B., Merzeraud, G., Tabuce, R., Vianey-Liaud, M., 2013. *Djebelemur*, a tiny pre-

2672 tooth-combed primate from the Eocene of Tunisia: a glimpse into the origin of crown
 2673 strepsirhines. PLoS ONE. 8, e80778.

2674 Marivaux, L., Vélez-Juarbe, J., Merzeraud, G., Pujos, F., Viñola López, L.W., Boivin, M.,
 2675 Santos-Mercado, H., Cruz, E.J., Grajales, A., Padilla, J., Vélez-Rosado, K.I., Philippon, M.,
 2676 Léticée, J.-L., Münch, P., Antoine, P.-O., 2020b. Early Oligocene chinchilloid caviomorphs
 2677 from Puerto Rico and the initial rodent colonization of the West Indies. Proceedings of the
 2678 Royal Society B: Biological Sciences. 287, 20192806.

2679 Marivaux, L., Welcomme, J.L., Antoine, P.O., Métais, G., Baloch, I.M., Benammi, M.,
 2680 Chaimanee, Y., Ducrocq, S., Jaeger, J.J., 2001. A fossil lemur from the Oligocene of
 2681 Pakistan. Science. 294, 587–591.

2682 Marjanović, D., 2021. The making of calibration sausage exemplified by recalibrating the
 2683 transcriptomic timetree of jawed vertebrates. Frontiers in Genetics. 12, 521693.

2684 Marshall, C.R., 2008. A simple method for bracketing absolute divergence times on molecular
 2685 phylogenies using multiple fossil calibration points. The American Naturalist.

2686 Mason, V.C., Li, G., Minx, P., Schmitz, J., Churakov, G., Doronina, L., Melin, A.D., Dominy,
 2687 N.J., Lim, N.T.-L., Springer, M.S., Wilson, R.K., Warren, W.C., Helgen, K.M., Murphy,
 2688 W.J., 2016. Genomic analysis reveals hidden biodiversity within colugos, the sister group to
 2689 primates. Science Advances. 2, e1600633.

2690 Matschiner, M., 2019. Selective sampling of species and fossils influences age estimates under
 2691 the fossilized birth–death model. Frontiers in Genetics. 10, 1064.

2692 Matschiner, M., Musilová, Z., Barth, J.M.I., Starostová, Z., Salzburger, W., Steel, M., Bouckaert,
 2693 R., 2017. Bayesian phylogenetic estimation of clade ages supports trans-Atlantic dispersal
 2694 of cichlid fishes. Systematic Biology. 66, 3–22.

- 2695 McBrearty, S., Jablonski, N.G., 2005. First fossil chimpanzee. *Nature*. 437, 105–108.
- 2696 McCrossin, M.L., 1992. New species of bushbaby from the middle Miocene of Maboko Island,
2697 Kenya. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 89, 215–233.
- 2698 McCrossin, M.L., 1999. Phylogenetic relationships and paleoecological adaptations of a new
2699 bushbaby from the middle Miocene of Kenya. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*.
2700 108, 195–196.
- 2701 Mein, P., Ginsburg, L., 1997. Les mammifères du gisement miocène inférieur de Li Mae Long,
2702 Thaïlande: systématique, biostratigraphie et paléoenvironnement. *Geodiversitas*. 19, 783–
2703 844.
- 2704 Meireles, C.M., Czelusniak, J., Ferrari, S.F., Schneider, M.P.C., Goodman, M., 1999.
2705 Phylogenetic relationships among Brazilian howler monkeys, genus *Alouatta* (Platyrrhini,
2706 Atelidae), based on α -globin pseudogene sequences. *Genetics and Molecular Biology*. 22,
2707 337–344.
- 2708 Meireles, C.M., Czelusniak, J., Schneider, M.P.C., Muniz, J.A.P.C., Brigido, M.C., Ferreira,
2709 H.S., Goodman, M., 1999. Molecular phylogeny of ateline New World monkeys
2710 (Platyrrhini, Atelinae) based on γ -globin gene sequences: evidence that *Brachyteles* is the
2711 sister group of *Lagothrix*. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*. 12, 10–30.
- 2712 Meng, J., Hu, Y., Li, C., 2003. The osteology of *Rhombomylus* (Mammalia, Glires): implications
2713 for phylogeny and evolution of Glires. *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural*
2714 History. 275, 1–247.
- 2715 Meredith, R.W., Janečka, J.E., Gatesy, J., Ryder, O.A., Fisher, C.A., Teeling, E.C., Goodbla, A.,
2716 Eizirik, E., Simão, T.L.L., Stadler, T., Rabosky, D.L., Honeycutt, R.L., Flynn, J.J., Ingram,
2717 C.M., Steiner, C., Williams, T.L., Robinson, T.J., Burk-Herrick, A., Westerman, M.,

2718 Ayoub, N.A., Springer, M.S., Murphy, W.J., 2011. Impacts of the Cretaceous Terrestrial
 2719 Revolution and KPg extinction on mammal diversification. *Science*. 334, 521–524.
 2720 Millar, C.D., Lambert, D.M., 2013. Ancient DNA: Towards a million-year-old genome. *Nature*.
 2721 Miller, E.R., Benefit, B.R., McCrossin, M.L., Plavcan, J.M., Leakey, M.G., El-Barkooky, A.N.,
 2722 Hamdan, M.A., Abdel Gawad, M.K., Hassan, S.M., Simons, E.L., 2009. Systematics of
 2723 early and middle Miocene Old World monkeys. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 57, 195–211.
 2724 Miller, K.G., Browning, J.V., Aubry, M.-P., Wade, B.S., Katz, M.E., Kulpecz, A.A., Wright,
 2725 J.D., 2008. Eocene–Oligocene global climate and sea-level changes: St. Stephens Quarry,
 2726 Alabama. *GSA Bulletin*. 120, 34–53.
 2727 Mitchell, K.J., Pratt, R.C., Watson, L.N., Gibb, G.C., Llamas, B., Kasper, M., Edson, J.,
 2728 Hopwood, B., Male, D., Armstrong, K.N., Meyer, M., Hofreiter, M., Austin, J., Donnellan,
 2729 S.C., Lee, M.S.Y., Phillips, M.J., Cooper, A., 2014. Molecular phylogeny, biogeography,
 2730 and habitat preference evolution of marsupials. *Molecular Biology and Evolution*. 31,
 2731 2322–2330.
 2732 Mongle, C.S., Strait, D.S., Grine, F.E., 2019. Expanded character sampling underscores
 2733 phylogenetic stability of *Ardipithecus ramidus* as a basal hominin. *Journal of Human*
 2734 *Evolution*. 131, 28–39.
 2735 Montes, C., Silva, C.A., Bayona, G.A., Villamil, R., Stiles, E., Rodriguez-Corcho, A.F., Beltran-
 2736 Triviño, A., Lamus, F., Muñoz-Granados, M.D., Pérez-Angel, L.C., Hoyos, N., Gomez, S.,
 2737 Galeano, J.J., Romero, E., Baquero, M., Cardenas-Rozo, A.L., von Quadt, A., 2021. A
 2738 Middle to Late Miocene Trans-Andean Portal: Geologic Record in the Tatacoa Desert.
 2739 *Frontiers in Earth Science*. 8, 643.
 2740 Morgan, M.E., Lewton, K.L., Kelley, J., Otárola-Castillo, E., Barry, J.C., Flynn, L.J., Pilbeam,

2741 D., 2015. A partial hominoid innominate from the Miocene of Pakistan: description and
 2742 preliminary analyses. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
 2743 *States of America.* 112, 82–87.

2744 Morse, P.E., Chester, S.G.B., Boyer, D.M., Smith, T., Smith, R., Gigase, P., Bloch, J.I., 2019.
 2745 New fossils, systematics, and biogeography of the oldest known crown primate *Teilhardina*
 2746 from the earliest Eocene of Asia, Europe, and North America. *Journal of Human Evolution.*
 2747 128, 103–131.

2748 Nakatsukasa, M., Mbua, E., Sawada, Y., Sakai, T., Nakaya, H., Yano, W., Kunimatsu, Y., 2010.
 2749 Earliest colobine skeletons from Nakali, Kenya. *American Journal of Physical*
 2750 *Anthropology.* 143, 365–382.

2751 Negri, F.R., Bocquentin-Villanueva, J., Ferigolo, J., Antoine, P.-O., 2010. A review of Tertiary
 2752 mammal faunas and birds from western Amazonia. In: C. Hoorn, F.P.W. (Ed.), *Amazonia:*
 2753 *Landscape and Species Evolution: A Look into the Past.* Wiley Online Library, pp. 243–
 2754 258.

2755 Nengo, I., Tafforeau, P., Gilbert, C.C., Fleagle, J.G., Miller, E.R., Feibel, C., Fox, D.L.,
 2756 Feinberg, J., Pugh, K.D., Berruyer, C., Mana, S., Engle, Z., Spoor, F., 2017. New infant
 2757 cranium from the African Miocene sheds light on ape evolution. *Nature.* 548, 169–174.

2758 Nguyen, J.M.T., Ho, S.Y.W., 2020. Calibrations from the fossil record. In: Ho, S.Y.W. (Ed.),
 2759 *The Molecular Evolutionary Clock: Theory and Practice.* Springer International Publishing,
 2760 Cham, pp. 117–133.

2761 Ni, X., Flynn, J.J., Wyss, A.R., Zhang, C., 2019. Cranial endocast of a stem platyrrhine primate
 2762 and ancestral brain conditions in anthropoids. *Science Advances.* 5, eaav7913.

2763 Ni, X., Gebo, D.L., Dagosto, M., Meng, J., Tafforeau, P., Flynn, J.J., Beard, K.C., 2013. The

2764 oldest known primate skeleton and early haplorhine evolution. *Nature*. 498, 60–64.
 2765 Ni, X., Li, Q., Li, L., Beard, K.C., 2016. Oligocene primates from China reveal divergence
 2766 between African and Asian primate evolution. *Science*. 352, 673–677.
 2767 Ni, X., Li, Q., Zhang, C., Samiullah, K., Zhang, L., Yang, Y., Cao, W., 2020. Paleogene
 2768 mammalian fauna exchanges and the paleogeographic pattern in Asia. *Science China Earth*
 2769 *Sciences*. 63, 202–211.
 2770 Ni, X., Qiu, Z., 2012. Tupaiine tree shrews (Scandentia, Mammalia) from the Yuanmou
 2771 *Lufengpithecus* locality of Yunnan, China. *Swiss Journal of Palaeontology*. 131, 51–60.
 2772 Novo, N.M., Tejedor, M.F., González-Ruiz, L.R., Fleagle, J.G., Brandoni, D., Krause, M., 2021.
 2773 Primate diversity in the early Miocene Pinturas Formation, southern Patagonia, Argentina.
 2774 *Anais da Academia Brasileira de Ciencias*. 93, e20201218.
 2775 Nowak, M.D., Smith, A.B., Simpson, C., Zwickl, D.J., 2013. A simple method for estimating
 2776 informative node age priors for the fossil calibration of molecular divergence time analyses.
 2777 *PLoS ONE*. 8, e66245.
 2778 O’Leary, M.A., Bloch, J.I., Flynn, J.J., Gaudin, T.J., Giallombardo, A., Giannini, N.P., Goldberg,
 2779 S.L., Kraatz, B.P., Luo, Z.-X., Meng, J., Ni, X., Novacek, M.J., Perini, F.A., Randall, Z.S.,
 2780 Rougier, G.W., Sargis, E.J., Silcox, M.T., Simmons, N.B., Spaulding, M., Velazco, P.M.,
 2781 Weksler, M., Wible, J.R., Cirranello, A.L., 2013. The placental mammal ancestor and the
 2782 post-K-Pg radiation of placentals. *Science*. 339, 662–667.
 2783 O’Reilly, J.E., Donoghue, P.C.J., 2016. Tips and nodes are complementary not competing
 2784 approaches to the calibration of molecular clocks. *Biology Letters*. 12, 20150975.
 2785 O’Reilly, J.E., Donoghue, P.C.J., 2018. The efficacy of consensus tree methods for summarizing
 2786 phylogenetic relationships from a posterior sample of trees estimated from morphological

2787 data. *Systematic Biology*. 67, 354–362.

2788 O'Reilly, J.E., Donoghue, P.C.J., 2019. The effect of fossil sampling on the estimation of
2789 divergence times with the fossilized birth–death process. *Systematic Biology*. 69, 124–138.

2790 O'Reilly, J.E., Dos Reis, M., Donoghue, P.C.J., 2015. Dating tips for divergence-time
2791 estimation. *Trends in Genetics*. 31, 637–650.

2792 Orlosky, F.J., 1974. Comparative dental morphology of extant and extinct Cebidae (PhD
2793 dissertation). University of Washington.

2794 Osterholz, M., Walter, L., Roos, C., 2009. Retropositional events consolidate the branching order
2795 among New World monkey genera. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution*. 50, 507–513.

2796 Pallas, L., Daver, G., Mackaye, H.T., Likius, A., Vignaud, P., Guy, F., 2019. A window into the
2797 early evolutionary history of Cercopithecidae: Late Miocene evidence from Chad, Central
2798 Africa. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 132, 61–79.

2799 Pan, R., Groves, C., Oxnard, C., 2004. Relationships between the fossil colobine *Mesopithecus*
2800 *pentelicus* and extant cercopithecoids, based on dental metrics. *American Journal of*
2801 *Primatology*. 62, 287–299.

2802 Parham, J.F., Donoghue, P.C.J., Bell, C.J., Calway, T.D., Head, J.J., Holroyd, P.A., Inoue, J.G.,
2803 Irmis, R.B., Joyce, W.G., Ksepka, D.T., Patané, J.S.L., Smith, N.D., Tarver, J.E., van
2804 Tuinen, M., Yang, Z., Angielczyk, K.D., Greenwood, J.M., Hipsley, C.A., Jacobs, L.,
2805 Makovicky, P.J., Müller, J., Smith, K.T., Theodor, J.M., Warnock, R.C.M., Benton, M.J.,
2806 2012. Best practices for justifying fossil calibrations. *Systematic Biology*. 61, 346–359.

2807 Parins-Fukuchi, C., Brown, J.W., 2017. What drives results in Bayesian morphological clock
2808 analyses? Biorxiv preprint.

2809 Patel, B.A., Seiffert, E.R., Boyer, D.M., Jacobs, R.L., St Clair, E.M., Simons, E.L., 2012. New

2810 primate first metatarsals from the Paleogene of Egypt and the origin of the anthropoid big
 2811 toe. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 63, 99–120.

2812 Perelman, P., Johnson, W.E., Roos, C., Seuánez, H.N., Horvath, J.E., Moreira, M.A.M., Kessing,
 2813 B., Pontius, J., Roelke, M., Rumpler, Y., Schneider, M.P.C., Silva, A., O'Brien, S.J., Pecon-
 2814 Slattery, J., 2011. A molecular phylogeny of living primates. *PLoS Genetics*. 7, e1001342.

2815 Perez, S.I., Klaczko, J., dos Reis, S.F., 2012. Species tree estimation for a deep phylogenetic
 2816 divergence in the New World monkeys (Primates: Platyrrhini). *Molecular Phylogenetics*
 2817 *and Evolution*. 65, 621–630.

2818 Phillips, M.J., 2016. Geomolecular dating and the origin of placental mammals. *Systematic*
 2819 *Biology*. 65, 546–557.

2820 Phillips, M.J., Fruciano, C., 2018. The soft explosive model of placental mammal evolution.
 2821 *BMC Evolutionary Biology*. 18, 104.

2822 Pickford, M., 1985. A new look at *Kenyapithecus* based on recent discoveries in Western Kenya.
 2823 *Journal of Human Evolution*. 14, 113–143.

2824 Pickford, M., 2012. Lorisine primate from the late Miocene of Kenya. *Journal of Biological*
 2825 *Research - Bollettino della Società Italiana di Biologia Sperimentale*. 85, 47–52.

2826 Pickford, M., Sawada, Y., Tayama, R., Matsuda, Y.-K., Itaya, T., Hyodo, H., Senut, B., 2006a.
 2827 Refinement of the age of the Middle Miocene Fort Ternan Beds, Western Kenya, and its
 2828 implications for Old World biochronology. *Comptes Rendus Geoscience*. 338, 545–555.

2829 Pickford, M., Senut, B., 2005. Hominoid teeth with chimpanzee- and gorilla-like features from
 2830 the Miocene of Kenya: implications for the chronology of ape-human divergence and
 2831 biogeography of Miocene hominoids. *Anthropological Science*. 113, 95–102.

2832 Pickford, M., Senut, B., Morales, J., Mein, P., Sanchez, I.M., 2008. Mammalia from the Lutetian

2833 of Namibia. *Memoirs of the Geological Survey of Namibia*. 20, 465–514.

2834 Pickford, M., Wanas, H., Soliman, H., 2006b. Indications for a humid climate in the Western
2835 Desert of Egypt 11–10 Myr ago: evidence from Galagidae (Primates, Mammalia). *Comptes*
2836 *Rendus Palevol.* 5, 935–943.

2837 Pilgrim, E.G., 1910. Notices of new mammalian genera and species from the Tertiaries of India.
2838 *Records of the Geological Survey of India*. 40, 63–71.

2839 Plavcan, J.M., Ward, C.V., Kay, R.F., Manthi, F.K., 2019. A diminutive Pliocene guenon from
2840 Kanapoi, West Turkana, Kenya. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 135, 102623.

2841 Poux, C., Chevret, P., Huchon, D., de Jong, W.W., Douzery, E.J.P., 2006. Arrival and
2842 diversification of caviomorph rodents and platyrrhine primates in South America.
2843 *Systematic Biology*. 55, 228–244.

2844 Poux, C., Madsen, O., Marquard, E., Vieites, D.R., de Jong, W.W., Vences, M., 2005.
2845 Asynchronous colonization of Madagascar by the four endemic clades of primates, tenrecs,
2846 carnivores, and rodents as inferred from nuclear genes. *Systematic Biology*. 54, 719–730.

2847 Pozzi, L., Disotell, T.R., Masters, J.C., 2014. A multilocus phylogeny reveals deep lineages
2848 within African galagids (Primates: Galagidae). *BMC Evolutionary Biology*. 14, 72.

2849 Pozzi, L., Nekaris, K.A.-I., Perkin, A., Bearder, S.K., Pimley, E.R., Schulze, H., Streicher, U.,
2850 Nadler, T., Kitchener, A., Zischler, H., Zinner, D., Roos, C., 2015. Remarkable ancient
2851 divergences amongst neglected lorisiform primates. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean*
2852 *Society*. 175, 661–674.

2853 Prevosti, F.J., Forasiepi, A.M., 2018. Evolution of South American Mammalian Predators
2854 During the Cenozoic: Paleobiogeographic and Paleoenvironmental Contingencies. Springer.

2855 Pugh, K.D., Gilbert, C.C., 2018. Phylogenetic relationships of living and fossil African

2856 papionins: Combined evidence from morphology and molecules. *Journal of Human*
 2857 *Evolution*. 123, 35–51.

2858 Püschel, H.P., Bertrand, O.C., O'Reilly, J.E., Bobe, R., Püschel, T.A., 2021. Divergence-time
 2859 estimates for hominins provide insight into encephalization and body mass trends in human
 2860 evolution. *Nature ecology & evolution*.

2861 Püschel, H.P., O'Reilly, J.E., Pisani, D., Donoghue, P.C.J., 2020. The impact of fossil
 2862 stratigraphic ranges on tip-calibration, and the accuracy and precision of divergence time
 2863 estimates. *Palaeontology*. 63, 67–83.

2864 Puttick, M.N., Thomas, G.H., Benton, M.J., 2016. Dating Placentalia: Morphological clocks fail
 2865 to close the molecular fossil gap. *Evolution*. 70, 873–886.

2866 Pyron, R.A., 2011. Divergence time estimation using fossils as terminal taxa and the origins of
 2867 Lissamphibia. *Systematic Biology*. 60, 466–481.

2868 Pyron, R.A., 2017. Novel approaches for phylogenetic inference from morphological data and
 2869 total-evidence dating in squamate reptiles (lizards, snakes, and amphisbaenians). *Systematic*
 2870 *Biology*. 66, 38–56.

2871 Ramdarshan, A., Godinot, M., Bédécarrats, S., Tabuce, R., 2015. Holotype specimen of
 2872 *Donrussellia magna*, an adapiform primate from the early Eocene (MP7) of Southern
 2873 France. *MorphoMuseum*. 1, e2.

2874 Rankin, A.H., Emry, R.J., Asher, R.J., 2020. Anatomical sciuromorphy in “protrogomorph”
 2875 rodents. *Palaeontologia Electronica*. 23.

2876 Rasmussen, D.T., Friscia, A.R., Gutierrez, M., Kappelman, J., Miller, E.R., Muteti, S., Reynoso,
 2877 D., Rossie, J.B., Spell, T.L., Tabor, N.J., Gierlowski-Kordesch, E., Jacobs, B.F., Kyongo,
 2878 B., Macharwas, M., Muchemi, F., 2019. Primitive Old World monkey from the earliest

2879 Miocene of Kenya and the evolution of cercopithecoid bilophodonty. Proceedings of the
 2880 National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 116, 6051–6056.
 2881 Raza, S.M., Barry, J.C., Pilbeam, D., Rose, M.D., Shah, S.M.I., Ward, S., 1983. New hominoid
 2882 primates from the middle Miocene Chinji Formation, Potwar Plateau, Pakistan. Nature. 306,
 2883 52–54.
 2884 Ronquist, F., Klopstein, S., Vilhelmsen, L., Schulmeister, S., Murray, D.L., Rasnitsyn, A.P.,
 2885 2012a. A total-evidence approach to dating with fossils, applied to the early radiation of the
 2886 Hymenoptera. Systematic Biology. 61, 973–999.
 2887 Ronquist, F., Lartillot, N., Phillips, M.J., 2016. Closing the gap between rocks and clocks using
 2888 total-evidence dating. Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological
 2889 Sciences. 371, 20150136.
 2890 Ronquist, F., Teslenko, M., van der Mark, P., Ayres, D.L., Darling, A., Höhna, S., Larget, B.,
 2891 Liu, L., Suchard, M.A., Huelsenbeck, J.P., 2012b. MrBayes 3.2: efficient Bayesian
 2892 phylogenetic inference and model choice across a large model space. Systematic Biology.
 2893 61, 539–542.
 2894 Roos, C., Kothe, M., Alba, D.M., Delson, E., Zinner, D., 2019. The radiation of macaques out of
 2895 Africa: Evidence from mitogenome divergence times and the fossil record. Journal of
 2896 Human Evolution. 133, 114–132.
 2897 Rose, K.D., 2006. The Beginning of the Age of Mammals. Johns Hopkins University Press.
 2898 Rose, K.D., Chester, S.G.B., Dunn, R.H., Boyer, D.M., Bloch, J.I., 2011. New fossils of the
 2899 oldest North American euprimate *Teilhardina brandti* (Omomyidae) from the Paleocene–
 2900 Eocene Thermal Maximum. American Journal of Physical Anthropology. 146, 281–305.
 2901 Rose, K.D., Dunn, R.H., Kumar, K., Perry, J.M.G., Prufrock, K.A., Rana, R.S., Smith, T., 2018.

2902 New fossils from Tadkeshwar Mine (Gujarat, India) increase primate diversity from the
 2903 early Eocene Cambay Shale. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 122, 93–107.
 2904 Rose, K.D., Rana, R.S., Sahni, A., Kumar, K., Missiaen, P., Singh, L., Smith, T., 2009. Early
 2905 Eocene primates from Gujarat, India. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 56, 366–404.
 2906 Rosenberger, A.L., 1979. Phylogeny, evolution and classification of New World monkeys
 2907 (Platyrrhini, Primates). PhD Dissertation, City University of New York.
 2908 Rosenberger, A.L., 2010. Platyrrhines, PAUP, parallelism, and the Long Lineage Hypothesis: a
 2909 reply to Kay et al. (2008). *Journal of Human Evolution*. 59, 218–222.
 2910 Rosenberger, A.L., 2011. Evolutionary morphology, platyrrhine evolution, and systematics.
 2911 *Anatomical Record*. 294, 1955–1974.
 2912 Rosenberger, A.L., 2019. *Dolichocebus gaimanensis* is not a stem platyrrhine. *Folia*
 2913 *Primatologica*. 90, 494–506.
 2914 Rosenberger, A.L., 2020. *New World Monkeys: The Evolutionary Odyssey*. Princeton
 2915 University Press.
 2916 Rosenberger, A.L., Cooke, S.B., Halenar, L.B., Tejedor, M.F., Hartwig, W.C., Novo, N.M.,
 2917 Muñoz-Saba, Y., 2015. Fossil alouattines and the origins of *Alouatta*: craniodental diversity
 2918 and interrelationships. In: Kowalewski, M.M., Garber, P.A., Cortés-Ortiz, L., Urbani, B.,
 2919 Youlatos, D. (Eds.), *Howler Monkeys: Adaptive Radiation, Systematics, and Morphology*.
 2920 Springer New York, New York, NY, pp. 21–54.
 2921 Rosenberger, A.L., Halenar, L., Cooke, S.B., Hartwig, W.C., 2008. Morphology and evolution of
 2922 the spider monkey, genus *Ateles*. In: Campbell, C.J. (Ed.), *Spider Monkeys: Behaviour,*
 2923 *Ecology and Evolution of the Genus Ateles*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp.
 2924 19–49.

2925 Rosenberger, A.L., Hartwig, W.C., Takai, M., Setoguchi, T., Shigehara, N., 1991. Dental
 2926 variability in *Saimiri* and the taxonomic status of *Neosaimiri fieldsi*, an early squirrel
 2927 monkey from La Venta, Colombia. *International Journal of Primatology*. 12, 291–301.
 2928 Rosenberger, A.L., Setoguchi, T., Shigehara, N., 1990. The fossil record of callitrichine
 2929 primates. In: Fleagle, J.G., Rosenberger, A.L. (Eds.), *The Platyrrhine Fossil Record*.
 2930 Academic Press, pp. 209–236.
 2931 Rosenberger, A.L., Tejedor, M.F., 2013. The misbegotten: long lineages, long branches and the
 2932 interrelationships of *Aotus*, *Callicebus* and the saki-uacaris. In: Veiga, L.M., Barnett, A.A.,
 2933 Ferrari, S.F., Norconk, M.A. (Eds.), *Evolutionary Biology and Conservation of Titis, Sakis*
 2934 *and Uacaris*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 13–22.
 2935 Rosenberger, A.L., Tejedor, M.F., Cooke, S.B., Pekar, S., 2009. Platyrrhine ecophylogenetics in
 2936 space and time. In: Garber, P.A., Estrada, A., Bicca-Marques, J.C., Heymann, E.W., Strier,
 2937 K.B. (Eds.), *South American Primates: Comparative Perspectives in the Study of Behavior,*
 2938 *Ecology, and Conservation*. Springer New York, New York, NY, pp. 69–113.
 2939 Rossie, J.B., Gilbert, C.C., Hill, A., 2013. Early cercopithecoid monkeys from the Tugen Hills,
 2940 Kenya. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*.
 2941 110, 5818–5822.
 2942 Rossie, J.B., Ni, X., Beard, K.C., 2006. Cranial remains of an Eocene tarsier. *Proceedings of the*
 2943 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 103, 4381–4385.
 2944 Rowe, D.L., Dunn, K.A., Adkins, R.M., Honeycutt, R.L., 2010. Molecular clocks keep dispersal
 2945 hypotheses afloat: evidence for trans-Atlantic rafting by rodents. *Journal of Biogeography*.
 2946 37, 305–324.
 2947 Sallam, H.M., Seiffert, E.R., 2020. Revision of Oligocene “*Paraphiomys*” and an origin for

2948 crown Thryonomyoidea (Rodentia: Hystricognathi: Phiomorpha) near the Oligocene--
 2949 Miocene boundary in Africa. *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society*. 190, 352–371.
 2950 Sallam, H.M., Seiffert, E.R., Steiper, M.E., Simons, E.L., 2009. Fossil and molecular evidence
 2951 constrain scenarios for the early evolutionary and biogeographic history of hystricognathous
 2952 rodents. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*.
 2953 106, 16722–16727.
 2954 Sarich, V.M., Wilson, A.C., 1967. Immunological time scale for hominid evolution. *Science*.
 2955 158, 1200–1203.
 2956 Scally, A., Durbin, R., 2012. Revising the human mutation rate: implications for understanding
 2957 human evolution. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 13, 745–753.
 2958 Schrago, C.G., Mello, B., Soares, A.E.R., 2013. Combining fossil and molecular data to date the
 2959 diversification of New World primates. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*. 26, 2438–2446.
 2960 Schrago, C.G., Seuánez, H.N., 2019. Large ancestral effective population size explains the
 2961 difficult phylogenetic placement of owl monkeys. *American Journal of Primatology*. 81,
 2962 e22955.
 2963 Schrago, C.G., Voloch, C.M., 2013. The precision of the hominid timescale estimated by relaxed
 2964 clock methods. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*. 26, 746–755.
 2965 Schwartz, J.H., Tattersall, I., 1985. Evolutionary relationships of living lemurs and lorises
 2966 (Mammalia, Primates) and their potential affinities with European Eocene Adapidae.
 2967 *Anthropological Papers of the American Museum of Natural History*. 60, 1–100.
 2968 Seiffert, E.R., 2006. Revised age estimates for the later Paleogene mammal faunas of Egypt and
 2969 Oman. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*.
 2970 103, 5000–5005.

2971 Seiffert, E.R., 2010. Chronology of Paleogene mammal localities. In: Cenozoic Mammals of
 2972 Africa Werdelin, Lars; Sanders, W J. University of California Press, Berkeley, pp. 19–26.
 2973 Seiffert, E.R., Boyer, D.M., Fleagle, J.G., Gunnell, G.F., Heesy, C.P., Perry, J.M.G., Sallam,
 2974 H.M., 2018. New adapiform primate fossils from the late Eocene of Egypt. Historical
 2975 Biology. 30, 204–226.
 2976 Seiffert, E.R., Costeur, L., Boyer, D.M., 2015. Primate tarsal bones from Egerkingen,
 2977 Switzerland, attributable to the middle Eocene adapiform *Caenopithecus lemuroides*. PeerJ.
 2978 3, e1036.
 2979 Seiffert, E.R., Perry, J.M.G., Simons, E.L., Boyer, D.M., 2009. Convergent evolution of
 2980 anthropoid-like adaptations in Eocene adapiform primates. Nature. 461, 1118–1121.
 2981 Seiffert, E.R., Simons, E.L., 2001. Astragalar morphology of late Eocene anthropoids from the
 2982 Fayum Depression (Egypt) and the origin of catarrhine primates. Journal of Human
 2983 Evolution. 41, 577–606.
 2984 Seiffert, E.R., Simons, E.L., Attia, Y., 2003. Fossil evidence for an ancient divergence of lorises
 2985 and galagos. Nature. 422, 421–424.
 2986 Seiffert, E.R., Simons, E.L., Boyer, D.M., Perry, J.M.G., Ryan, T.M., Sallam, H.M., 2010a. A
 2987 fossil primate of uncertain affinities from the earliest late Eocene of Egypt. Proceedings of
 2988 the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 107, 9712–9717.
 2989 Seiffert, E.R., Simons, E.L., Fleagle, J.G., Godinot, M., 2010b. Paleogene anthropoids. In:
 2990 Werdelin, L., Sanders, W.J. (Eds.), Cenozoic Mammals of Africa. University of California
 2991 Press, Berkeley, pp. 369–391.
 2992 Seiffert, E.R., Tejedor, M.F., Fleagle, J.G., Novo, N.M., Cornejo, F.M., Bond, M., de Vries, D.,
 2993 Campbell, K.E., Jr, 2020. A parapithecoid stem anthropoid of African origin in the Paleogene

- 2994 of South America. *Science*. 368, 194–197.
- 2995 Semaw, S., Simpson, S.W., Quade, J., Renne, P.R., Butler, R.F., McIntosh, W.C., Levin, N.,
 2996 Dominguez-Rodrigo, M., Rogers, M.J., 2005. Early Pliocene hominids from Gona,
 2997 Ethiopia. *Nature*. 433, 301–305.
- 2998 Sen, S., Koufos, G.D., Kondopoulou, D., De Bonis, L., 2000. Magnetostratigraphy of the late
 2999 Miocene continental deposits of the lower Axios valley, Macedonia, Greece. *Geological*
 3000 *Society of Greece, Special Publications*. 9, 197–206.
- 3001 Setoguchi, T., Rosenberger, A.L., 1985. Miocene marmosets: First fossil evidence. *International*
 3002 *Journal of Primatology*. 6, 615–625.
- 3003 Setoguchi, T., Rosenberger, A.L., 1987. A fossil owl monkey from La Venta, Colombia. *Nature*.
 3004 326, 692–694.
- 3005 Setoguchi, T., Watanabe, T., Mouri, T., 1981. The upper dentition of *Stirtonia* (Ceboidea,
 3006 Primates) from the Miocene of Colombia, South America and the origin of the postero-
 3007 internal cusp of upper molars of howler monkeys (*Alouatta*). *Kyoto University Overseas*
 3008 *Research Reports of New World Monkeys*.
- 3009 Sigé, B., Jaeger, J.J., Sudre, J., 1990. *Altiasius koulchii* n. gen., et sp., primate omomyidé du
 3010 Paléocène supérieur du Maroc, et les origines des Euprimates. *Palaeontographica Abteilung*
 3011 *A*. A214, 31–56.
- 3012 Silcox, M.T., 2008. The biogeographic origins of Primates and Euprimates: East, west, north, or
 3013 south of Eden? In: Sargis, E.J., Dagosto, M. (Eds.), *Mammalian Evolutionary Morphology:*
 3014 *A Tribute to Frederick S. Szalay*. Springer Netherlands, Dordrecht, pp. 199–231.
- 3015 Silcox, M.T., Bloch, J.I., Boyer, D.M., Chester, S.G.B., López-Torres, S., 2017. The
 3016 evolutionary radiation of plesiadapiforms. *Evolutionary Anthropology*. 26, 74–94.

3017 Silvestro, D., Salamin, N., Antonelli, A., Meyer, X., 2019a. Improved estimation of
 3018 macroevolutionary rates from fossil data using a Bayesian framework. *Paleobiology*. 45,
 3019 546–570.

3020 Silvestro, D., Salamin, N., Schnitzler, J., 2014. PyRate: a new program to estimate speciation and
 3021 extinction rates from incomplete fossil data. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*. 5, 1126–
 3022 1131.

3023 Silvestro, D., Tejedor, M.F., Serrano-Serrano, M.L., Loiseau, O., Rossier, V., Rolland, J., Zizka,
 3024 A., Höhna, S., Antonelli, A., Salamin, N., 2019b. Early arrival and climatically-linked
 3025 geographic expansion of New World monkeys from tiny African ancestors. *Systematic*
 3026 *Biology*. 68, 78–92.

3027 Simmons, M.P., 2012. Radical instability and spurious branch support by likelihood when
 3028 applied to matrices with non-random distributions of missing data. *Molecular Phylogenetics*
 3029 *and Evolution*. 62, 472–484.

3030 Simmons, M.P., 2014. A confounding effect of missing data on character conflict in maximum
 3031 likelihood and Bayesian MCMC phylogenetic analyses. *Molecular Phylogenetics and*
 3032 *Evolution*. 80, 267–280.

3033 Simões, T.R., Caldwell, M.W., Pierce, S.E., 2020. Sphenodontian phylogeny and the impact of
 3034 model choice in Bayesian morphological clock estimates of divergence times and
 3035 evolutionary rates. *BMC Biology*. 18, 191.

3036 Simons, E.L., 1989. Description of two genera and species of late Eocene Anthroipoidea from
 3037 Egypt. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*.
 3038 86, 9956–9960.

3039 Simons, E.L., 1990. Discovery of the oldest known anthropoidean skull from the Paleogene of

3040 Egypt. Science. 247, 1567–1569.

3041 Simons, E.L., 1992. Diversity in the early Tertiary anthropoidean radiation in Africa.

3042 Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America. 89,

3043 10743–10747.

3044 Simons, E.L., Rasmussen, D.T., 1994. A remarkable cranium of *Plesiopithecus teras* (Primates,

3045 Prosimii) from the Eocene of Egypt. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of

3046 the United States of America. 91, 9946–9950.

3047 Simons, E.L., Rasmussen, D.T., 1996. Skull of *Catopithecus browni*, an early tertiary catarrhine.

3048 American Journal of Physical Anthropology. 100, 261–292.

3049 Simpson, S.W., Levin, N.E., Quade, J., Rogers, M.J., Semaw, S., 2019. *Ardipithecus ramidus*

3050 postcrania from the Gona Project area, Afar Regional State, Ethiopia. Journal of Human

3051 Evolution. 129, 1–45.

3052 Smith, T., Rose, K.D., Gingerich, P.D., 2006. Rapid Asia–Europe–North America geographic

3053 dispersal of earliest Eocene primate *Teilhardina* during the Paleocene–Eocene thermal

3054 maximum. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of

3055 America. 103, 11223–11227.

3056 Solé, F., Falconnet, J., Vidalenc, D., 2015. New fossil Hyaenodonta (Mammalia, Placentalia)

3057 from the Ypresian and Lutetian of France and the evolution of the Proviverrinae in southern

3058 Europe. Palaeontology. 58, 1049–1072.

3059 Springer, M.S., Foley, N.M., Brady, P.L., Gatesy, J., Murphy, W.J., 2019. Evolutionary models

3060 for the diversification of placental mammals across the KPg Boundary. Frontiers in

3061 Genetics. 10, 1241.

3062 Springer, M.S., Meredith, R.W., Gatesy, J., Emerling, C.A., Park, J., Rabosky, D.L., Stadler, T.,

3063 Steiner, C., Ryder, O.A., Janečka, J.E., Fisher, C.A., Murphy, W.J., 2012.
 3064 Macroevolutionary dynamics and historical biogeography of primate diversification inferred
 3065 from a species supermatrix. PLoS ONE. 7, e49521.
 3066 Springer, M.S., Scally, M., Madsen, O., de Jong, W.W., Douady, C.J., Stanhope, M.J., 2004. The
 3067 use of composite taxa in supermatrices. Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution. 30, 883–
 3068 884.
 3069 Stadler, T., 2010. Sampling-through-time in birth–death trees. Journal of Theoretical Biology.
 3070 267, 396–404.
 3071 Stamatakis, A., 2014. RAxML version 8: a tool for phylogenetic analysis and post-analysis of
 3072 large phylogenies. Bioinformatics . 30, 1312–1313.
 3073 Steiner, C., Tilak, M.-K., Douzery, E.J.P., Catzeflis, F.M., 2005. New DNA data from a
 3074 transthyretin nuclear intron suggest an Oligocene to Miocene diversification of living South
 3075 America opossums (Marsupialia: Didelphidae). Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution. 35,
 3076 363–379.
 3077 Stevens, N.J., Seiffert, E.R., O’Connor, P.M., Roberts, E.M., Schmitz, M.D., Krause, C.,
 3078 Gorscak, E., Ngasala, S., Hieronymus, T.L., Temu, J., 2013. Palaeontological evidence for
 3079 an Oligocene divergence between Old World monkeys and apes. Nature. 497, 611–614.
 3080 Stirton, R.A., 1951. Ceboid monkeys from the Miocene of Colombia. University of California
 3081 Publications in Geological Sciences. 28, 315–356.
 3082 Stirton, R.A., Savage, D.E., 1951. A new monkey from the La Venta Miocene of Colombia.
 3083 Compilación de los Estudios Geológicos Oficiales en Colombia. 7, 345–356.
 3084 Suwa, G., Asfaw, B., Kono, R.T., Kubo, D., Lovejoy, C.O., White, T.D., 2009a. The
 3085 *Ardipithecus ramidus* skull and its implications for hominid origins. Science. 326, 68e1–7.

3086 Suwa, G., Beyene, Y., Nakaya, H., Bernor, R.L., Boissarie, J.-R., Bibi, F., Ambrose, S.H., Sano,
 3087 K., Katoh, S., Asfaw, B., 2015. Newly discovered cercopithecoid, equid and other
 3088 mammalian fossils from the Chorora Formation, Ethiopia. *Anthropological Science*. 123,
 3089 19–39.

3090 Suwa, G., Kono, R.T., Katoh, S., Asfaw, B., Beyene, Y., 2007. A new species of great ape from
 3091 the late Miocene epoch in Ethiopia. *Nature*. 448, 921–924.

3092 Suwa, G., Kono, R.T., Simpson, S.W., Asfaw, B., Lovejoy, C.O., White, T.D., 2009b.
 3093 Paleobiological implications of the *Ardipithecus ramidus* dentition. *Science*. 326, 94–99.

3094 Szalay, F.S., Delson, E., 1979. *Evolutionary History of the Primates*. Academic Press.

3095 Tabuce, R., Marivaux, L., Lebrun, R., Adaci, M., Bensalah, M., Fabre, P.-H., Fara, E., Gomes
 3096 Rodrigues, H., Hautier, L., Jaeger, J.-J., Lazzari, V., Mebrouk, F., Peigné, S., Sudre, J.,
 3097 Tafforeau, P., Valentin, X., Mahboubi, M., 2009. Anthropoid versus strepsirrhine status of
 3098 the African Eocene primates *Algeripithecus* and *Azibius*: craniodental evidence.
 3099 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 276, 4087–4094.

3100 Takai, M., 1994. New specimens of *Neosaimiri fieldsi* from La Venta, Colombia: a middle
 3101 Miocene ancestor of the living squirrel monkeys. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 27, 329–
 3102 360.

3103 Takai, M., Anaya, F., Suzuki, H., Shigehara, N., Setoguchi, T., 2001. A new platyrrhine from the
 3104 Middle Miocene of La Venta, Colombia, and the phyletic position of Callicebinae.
 3105 *Anthropological Science*. 109, 289–307.

3106 Tauxe, L., 1979. A new date for *Ramapithecus*. *Nature*. 282, 399–401.

3107 Tauxe, L., Opdyke, N.D., 1982. A time framework based on magnetostratigraphy for the Siwalik
 3108 sediments of the Khaur area, Northern Pakistan. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*

3109 Palaeoecology. 37, 43–61.

3110 Tejedor, M.F., Novo, N.M., 2016. Evolución y paleobiogeografía de los primates platirrinos. In:

3111 Agnolin, F.L., Lio, G.L., Brissón Egli, F., Chimento, N.R., Novas, F.E. (Eds.), Historia

3112 Evolutiva Y Paleobiogeográfica de Los Vertebrados de América Del Sur. Museo Argentino

3113 de Ciencias Naturales “Bernardino Rivadavia,” pp. 385–393.

3114 Thein, Z.M.M., Takai, M., Uno, H., Wynn, J.G., Egi, N., Tsubamoto, T., Thaung-Htike, Soe,

3115 A.N., Sein, M., Maung, M., Takai, M., 2017. Review of the investigation of primate fossils

3116 in Myanmar. Geological Society, London, Memoirs. 48, 185–206.

3117 Tomassini, R.L., Montalvo, C.I., Deschamps, C.M., Manera, T., 2013. Biostratigraphy and

3118 biochronology of the Monte Hermoso Formation (early Pliocene) at its type locality,

3119 Buenos Aires Province, Argentina. Journal of South American Earth Sciences. 48, 31–42.

3120 Tong, Y., 1988. Fossil tree shrews from the Eocene Hetaoyuan formation of Xichuan, Henan.

3121 Vertebrata Palasiatica. 26, 4–20.

3122 Trifonov, V.G., Tesakov, A.S., Simakova, A.N., Bachmanov, D.M., 2019. Environmental and

3123 geodynamic settings of the earliest hominin migration to the Arabian-Caucasus region: A

3124 review. Quaternary International. 534, 116–137.

3125 Turner, A.H., Pritchard, A.C., Matzke, N.J., 2017. Empirical and Bayesian approaches to fossil-

3126 only divergence times: A study across three reptile clades. PLoS ONE. 12, e0169885.

3127 Upham, N.S., Patterson, B.D., 2012. Diversification and biogeography of the Neotropical

3128 caviomorph lineage Octodontoidea (Rodentia: Hystricognathi). Molecular Phylogenetics

3129 and Evolution. 63, 417–429.

3130 Upham, N.S., Patterson, B.D., 2015. Evolution of caviomorph rodents: a complete phylogeny

3131 and timetree for living genera. In: Vassallo, A.I., Antenucci, D. (Eds.), Biology of

3132 Caviomorph Rodents: Diversity and Evolution. SAREM Series A, Buenos Aires, pp. 63–
3133 120.

3134 Urciuoli, A., Zanolli, C., Almécija, S., Beaudet, A., Dumoncel, J., Morimoto, N., Nakatsukasa,
3135 M., Moyà-Solà, S., Begun, D.R., Alba, D.M., 2021. Reassessment of the phylogenetic
3136 relationships of the late Miocene apes *Hispanopithecus* and *Rudapithecus* based on
3137 vestibular morphology. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United
3138 States of America. 118, e2015215118.

3139 Valencia, L.M., Martins, A., Ortiz, E.M., Di Fiore, A., 2018. A RAD-sequencing approach to
3140 genome-wide marker discovery, genotyping, and phylogenetic inference in a diverse
3141 radiation of primates. PLoS ONE. 13, e0201254.

3142 Van Couvering, J.A., Delson, E., 2020. African Land Mammal Ages. Journal of Vertebrate
3143 Paleontology. 40, e1803340.

3144 Vanderpool, D., Minh, B.Q., Lanfear, R., Hughes, D., Murali, S., Harris, R.A., Raveendran, M.,
3145 Muzny, D.M., Hibbins, M.S., Williamson, R.J., Gibbs, R.A., Worley, K.C., Rogers, J.,
3146 Hahn, M.W., 2020. Primate phylogenomics uncovers multiple rapid radiations and ancient
3147 interspecific introgression. PLoS Biology. 18, e3000954.

3148 Vangengeim, E., Tesakov, A.S., 2013. Late Miocene Mammal Localities of Eastern Europe and
3149 Western Asia. In: Wang, X., Flynn, L.J., Fortelius, M. (Eds.), Fossil Mammals of Asia:
3150 Neogene Biostratigraphy and Chronology. Columbia University Press, pp. 521–537.

3151 Vilela, J.F., Alves de Oliveira, J., Russo, C.A. de M., 2015. The diversification of the genus
3152 *Monodelphis* and the chronology of Didelphidae (Didelphimorphia). Zoological Journal of
3153 the Linnean Society. 174, 414–427.

3154 Voloch, C.M., Vilela, J.F., Loss-Oliveira, L., Schrago, C.G., 2013. Phylogeny and chronology of

3155 the major lineages of New World hystricognath rodents: insights on the biogeography of the
 3156 Eocene/Oligocene arrival of mammals in South America. *BMC Research Notes*. 6, 160.
 3157 Walker, A., 1987. Fossil Galaginae from Laetoli. In: Leakey, M.D., Harris, J.M. (Eds.), *Laetoli,*
 3158 *A Pliocene Site in Northern Tanzania*. Clarendon Press, pp. 85–90.
 3159 Walker, J.D., Geissman, J.W., Bowring, S.A., Babcock, L.E., 2018. GSA Geological Time Scale
 3160 v. 5.0. Geological Society of America.
 3161 Wang, X., Lim, B.K., Ting, N., Hu, J., Liang, Y., Roos, C., Yu, L., 2019. Reconstructing the
 3162 phylogeny of New World monkeys (Platyrrhini): evidence from multiple non-coding loci.
 3163 *Current Zoology*. 65, 579–588.
 3164 Wang, Y., Li, Q., Bai, B., Jin, X., Mao, F., Meng, J., 2019. Paleogene integrative stratigraphy
 3165 and timescale of China. *Science China Earth Sciences*. 62, 287–309.
 3166 Wang, Y.Q., Li, C.K., Li, Q., Li, D.S., 2016. A synopsis of Paleocene stratigraphy and vertebrate
 3167 paleontology in the Qianshan Basin, Anhui, China. *Vertebrata Palasiatica*. 54, 89–120.
 3168 Warnock, R.C.M., Parham, J.F., Joyce, W.G., Lyson, T.R., Donoghue, P.C.J., 2015. Calibration
 3169 uncertainty in molecular dating analyses: there is no substitute for the prior evaluation of
 3170 time priors. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*. 282, 20141013.
 3171 Warnock, R.C.M., Yang, Z., Donoghue, P.C.J., 2012. Exploring uncertainty in the calibration of
 3172 the molecular clock. *Biology Letters*. 8, 156–159.
 3173 Welker, F., 2018. Palaeoproteomics for human evolution studies. *Quaternary Science Reviews*.
 3174 190, 137–147.
 3175 Wesselman, H.B., 1984. *The Omo Micromammals. Systematics and Paleoecology of Early Man*
 3176 *Sites from Ethiopia: 7 (Contributions to Vertebrate Evolution)*. John Wiley & Sons.
 3177 White, T.D., Asfaw, B., Beyene, Y., Haile-Selassie, Y., Lovejoy, C.O., Suwa, G., WoldeGabriel,

3178 G., 2009. *Ardipithecus ramidus* and the paleobiology of early hominids. *Science*. 326, 75–
3179 86.

3180 White, T.D., Suwa, G., Asfaw, B., 1995. *Australopithecus ramidus*, a new species of early
3181 hominid from Aramis, Ethiopia. *Nature*. 375, 88.

3182 Wible, J.R., Rougier, G.W., Novacek, M.J., Asher, R.J., 2007. Cretaceous eutherians and
3183 Laurasian origin for placental mammals near the K/T boundary. *Nature*. 447, 1003–1006.

3184 Wible, J.R., Rougier, G.W., Novacek, M.J., Asher, R.J., 2009. The eutherian mammal *Maelestes*
3185 *gobiensis* from the Late Cretaceous of Mongolia and the phylogeny of Cretaceous Eutheria.
3186 *Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History*. 2009, 1–123.

3187 Wiens, J.J., Fetzner, J.W., Parkinson, C.L., Reeder, T.W., 2005. Hylid frog phylogeny and
3188 sampling strategies for speciose clades. *Systematic Biology*. 54, 778–807.

3189 Wilkinson, R.D., Steiper, M.E., Soligo, C., Martin, R.D., Yang, Z., Tavaré, S., 2011. Dating
3190 primate divergences through an integrated analysis of palaeontological and molecular data.
3191 *Systematic Biology*. 60, 16–31.

3192 Wilson, G.P., 2014. Mammalian extinction, survival, and recovery dynamics across the
3193 Cretaceous-Paleogene boundary in northeastern Montana, USA. *Geological Society of*
3194 *America Special Papers*. 503, 365–392.

3195 Wilson Mantilla, G.P., Chester, S.G.B., Clemens, W.A., Moore, J.R., Sprain, C.J., Hovatter,
3196 B.T., Mitchell, W.S., Mans, W.W., Mundil, R., Renne, P.R., 2021. Earliest Palaeocene
3197 purgatoriids and the initial radiation of stem primates. *Royal Society Open Science*. 8,
3198 210050.

3199 WoldeGabriel, G., Haile-Selassie, Y., Renne, P.R., Hart, W.K., Ambrose, S.H., Asfaw, B.,
3200 Heiken, G., White, T., 2001. *Geology and palaeontology of the Late Miocene Middle*

3201 Awash valley, Afar rift, Ethiopia. *Nature*. 412, 175–178.

3202 Wolpoff, M.H., Pickford, M., 2006. An ape or *the* ape: Is the Toumaï cranium TM 266 a

3203 hominid? *PaleoAnthropology*. 2006, 36–50.

3204 Wolpoff, M.H., Senut, B., Pickford, M., Hawks, J., 2002. *Sahelanthropus* or “*Sahelpithecus*”?

3205 *Nature*. 419, 581–582.

3206 Woods, R., Barnes, I., Brace, S., Turvey, S.T., 2021. Ancient DNA suggests single colonization

3207 and within-archipelago diversification of Caribbean caviomorph rodents. *Molecular*

3208 *Biology and Evolution*. 38, 84–95.

3209 Woods, R., Turvey, S.T., Brace, S., MacPhee, R.D.E., Barnes, I., 2018. Ancient DNA of the

3210 extinct Jamaican monkey *Xenothrix* reveals extreme insular change within a

3211 morphologically conservative radiation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*

3212 of the United States of America. 115, 12769–12774.

3213 Worthington, S., 2012. New approaches to late Miocene hominoid systematics: Ranking

3214 morphological characters by phylogenetic signal (PhD dissertation). New York University.

3215 Wright, A.M., 2019. A systematist’s guide to estimating Bayesian phylogenies from

3216 morphological data. *Insect Systematics and Diversity*. 3, 2.

3217 Wright, A.M., Lloyd, G.T., Hillis, D.M., 2016. Modeling character change heterogeneity in

3218 phylogenetic analyses of morphology through the use of priors. *Systematic Biology*. 65,

3219 602–611.

3220 Wyss, A.R., Flynn, J.J., Norell, M.A., Swisher, C.C., Charrier, R., Novacek, M.J., McKenna,

3221 M.C., 1993. South America’s earliest rodent and recognition of a new interval of

3222 mammalian evolution. *Nature*. 365, 434–437.

3223 Wyss, A.R., Norell, M.A., Flynn, J.J., Novacek, M.J., Charrier, R., McKenna, M.C., Swisher,

3224 C.C., Frassinetti, D., Salinas, P., Jin, M., 1990. A new early Tertiary mammal fauna from
 3225 central Chile: implications for Andean stratigraphy and tectonics. *Journal of Vertebrate*
 3226 *Paleontology*. 10, 518–522.

3227 Xia, X., 2014. Phylogenetic bias in the likelihood method caused by missing data coupled with
 3228 among-site rate variation: An analytical approach. In: *Bioinformatics Research and*
 3229 *Applications*. Springer International Publishing, pp. 12–23.

3230 Yans, J., Strait, S.G., Smith, T., Dupuis, C., Steurbaut, E., Gingerich, P.D., 2006. High-resolution
 3231 carbon isotope stratigraphy and mammalian faunal change at the Paleocene-Eocene
 3232 boundary in the Honeycombs area of the southern Bighorn Basin, Wyoming. *American*
 3233 *Journal of Science*. 306, 712–735.

3234 Yapuncich, G., Boyer, D., Secord, R., Bloch, J., 2011. The first dentally associated skeleton of
 3235 Plagiomenidae (Mammalia, ?Dermoptera) from the Late Paleocene of Wyoming. *Journal of*
 3236 *Vertebrate Paleontology*. 31, 218.

3237 Young, N.M., MacLatchy, L., 2004. The phylogenetic position of *Morotopithecus*. *Journal of*
 3238 *Human Evolution*. 46, 163–184.

3239 Zalmout, I.S., Sanders, W.J., Maclatchy, L.M., Gunnell, G.F., Al-Mufarreah, Y.A., Ali, M.A.,
 3240 Nasser, A.-A.H., Al-Masari, A.M., Al-Sobhi, S.A., Nadhra, A.O., Matari, A.H., Wilson,
 3241 J.A., Gingerich, P.D., 2010. New Oligocene primate from Saudi Arabia and the divergence
 3242 of apes and Old World monkeys. *Nature*. 466, 360–364.

3243 Zeebe, R.E., Lourens, L.J., 2019. Solar System chaos and the Paleocene–Eocene boundary age
 3244 constrained by geology and astronomy. *Science*. 365, 926–929.

3245 Zhang, C., Stadler, T., Klopstein, S., Heath, T.A., Ronquist, F., 2016. Total-evidence dating
 3246 under the fossilized birth-death process. *Systematic Biology*. 65, 228–249.

3247 Zhong, Y., Huyskens, M.H., Yin, Q.-Z., Wang, Y., Ma, Q., Xu, Y.-G., 2021. High-precision
3248 geochronological constraints on the duration of “Dinosaurs Pompeii” and the Yixian
3249 Formation. *National Science Review*. 8, nwab063.

3250 Zollikofer, C.P.E., Ponce de León, M.S., Lieberman, D.E., Guy, F., Pilbeam, D., Likius, A.,
3251 Mackaye, H.T., Vignaud, P., Brunet, M., 2005. Virtual cranial reconstruction of
3252 *Sahelanthropus tchadensis*. *Nature*. 434, 755–759.

3253

3254 **Figure legends**

3255 Figure 1. “Allcompat” majority rule consensus of post-burn-in trees that results from tip-dating
3256 Bayesian analysis of our “maxillary” total evidence dataset using MrBayes. Divergence dates are
3257 median posterior estimates, and blue bars are 95% Highest Posterior Density (HPD) intervals.

3258 Figure 2. “Allcompat” majority rule consensus of post-burn-in trees that results from tip-dating
3259 Bayesian analysis of our “mandibular” total evidence dataset using MrBayes. Divergence dates
3260 are median posterior estimates, and blue bars are 95% Highest Posterior Density (HPD)
3261 intervals.

3262

Maxillary dataset

Mandibular dataset

Table 1

Molecular partitioning scheme for total evidence tip-dating analyses in MrBayes based on PartitionFinder output, Partitions were identified using the Bayesian Information Criterion for model selection and assuming linked branch lengths.

Partitions	Nuclear loci	Model
1 (3297 bp)	ADORA3 (412 bp), CREM (419 bp), RPGRIP1 (667 bp), RAG1 (1071 bp), FAM123B (728 bp)	K80+G
2 (3465 bp)	MBD5 (553 bp), RAG2 (502 bp), APP (647 bp), SGMS1 (580 bp), MAPKAP1 (644 bp), NEGR1 (539 bp)	HKY+G
3 (1105 bp)	FES (431 bp), DENND5A (674 bp)	K80+G
4 (2367 bp)	DEMRT1 (522 bp), NPAS3 (596 bp), ERC2 (713 bp), FOXP1 (536 bp)	GTR+G

bp = base pairs

Table 2

Divergence dates estimated for selected clades in our total evidence tip-dating analyses. The “maxillary” analysis excluded fossil taxa known only from mandibular specimens; the “mandibular” analysis excluded fossil taxa for which the mandible and lower dentition are unknown.

Values are median posterior estimates, followed by 95% Highest Posterior Density (HPD) intervals in brackets.

Clade	Split	Maxillary	Mandibular
crown Platyrrhini	Pitheciidae- (Aotidae+Atelidae+Callitrichidae+Cebidae)	23.6 (20.7-27.0)	24.7 (21.4-28.2)
crown Pitheciidae	Pitheciinae-Callicebinae	20.7 (17.2-24.1)	22.0 (19.0-25.9)
crown Pitheciinae	<i>Pithecia</i> -(<i>Chiropotes</i> + <i>Cacajao</i>)	10.4 (6.2-14.7)	10.0 (6.1-14.5)
<i>Callicebus</i> + Caribbean platyrrhines	<i>Callicebus</i> -(<i>Xenothrix</i> + <i>Antillothrix</i> + <i>Paralouatta</i>)	16.3 (12.3-20.9)	17.5 (12.7-22.9)
Caribbean platyrrhines	<i>Xenothrix</i> -(<i>Antillothrix</i> + <i>Paralouatta</i>)	9.3 (3.5-15.2)	10.5 (4.4-16.8)
Atelidae + Aotidae + Callitrichidae + Cebidae	Atelidae-(Aotidae+Callitrichidae+Cebidae)	21.9 (19.4-24.6)	22.9 (20.1-26.5)
crown Atelidae	Alouattinae-Atelinae	15.5 (13.3-18.4)	16.0 (13.5-19.2)
crown Atelinae	<i>Lagothrix</i> -(<i>Brachyteles</i> + <i>Ateles</i>)	9.3 (5.9-12.9)	9.5 (5.5-13.3)

crown Callitrichidae	<i>Saguinus-(Leontopithecus+Cebuella+Callithrix+Callimico)</i>	12.0 (8.2-15.5)	11.7 (8.2-15.2)
crown Cebidae	Cebinae-Saimirinae	16.2 (13.9-19.2)	16.2 (13.5-19.3)

Table 3

Summary of fossil calibrations proposed here. Values are in millions of years. “CladeAge1” and “CladeAge2” are the ages of the oldest representatives of the two daughter lineages originating after a particular split. See text for full details.

Clade	Split	Prior distribution	Minimum bound	Maximum bound	CladeAge1	CladeAge2
Crown Euarchontoglires	Euarchonta-Glires	offset exponential	65.79	125.816	66.095-65.79	66-62.22
Crown Glires	Rodentia-Lagomorpha	offset exponential	62.22	66	66-62.22	66-62.22
Crown Euarchonta	Primateomorpha-Scandentia	offset exponential	65.79	125.816	66.095-65.79	34
Crown Primateomorpha	Primates-Dermoptera	minimum bound only	55.935	NA	56.035-55.935	40.31-40.22
Crown Primates	Haplorhini-Strepsirhini	offset exponential	55.935	66.095	56.035-55.935	55.8-55.12
Crown Strepsirhini	Lorisiformes-(Lemuriformes+Chiromyiformes)	uniform	37	55.8	37.5-37	33.4
Lemuriformes+ Chiromyiformes	Lemuriformes-Chiromyiformes	uniform	33.4	55.8	33.4	0.0075
Crown Lorisiformes	Lorisidae-Galagidae	uniform	18.5	55.8	22.5-18.5	8.9
Crown Lorisidae	Lorisinae-Perodicticinae	uniform	8.9	37.5	8.9	6.1
<i>Galagoides</i> + <i>Galago</i> + <i>Paragalago</i> + <i>Otolemur</i> + <i>Sciurocheirus</i>	<i>Galagoides</i> - (<i>Galago</i> + <i>Paragalago</i> + <i>Otolemur</i> + <i>Sciurocheirus</i>)	uniform	10	33.4	12.8-10	3.42
Crown Haplorhini	Anthropoidea-Tarsiiformes	minimum bound only	41	NA	47.8-41	40.31-40.22
Crown Anthropoidea	Catarrhini-Platyrrhini	uniform	33.4	56.035	33.4	29.68-29.52
Crown Catarrhini	Cercopithecoidea-Hominoidea	uniform	25.193	33.4	25.335-25.193	25.335-25.193
Crown Cercopithecidae	Cercopithecinae-Colobinae	offset exponential	12.47	25.235	12.51-12.47	8.33-7.5
Crown Colobinae	Colobini-Presbytini	uniform	8.2	15	8.2	7.2-6.8
Crown Cercopithecinae	Cercopithecini-Papionini	uniform	6.5	15	8.0-6.5	6.1
Crown Papionini	Macacina-Papionina	uniform	5.33	12.51	5.4-5.33	4.2-4.1
Crown Cercopithecini	uncertain	uniform	6.5	12.51	8.0-6.5	NA

Crown Hominoidea	Hominidae-Hylobatidae	offset exponential	13.4	25.235	14.0-13.4	13.8-12.5
Crown Hominidae	Homininae-Ponginae	offset exponential	12.3	25.235	12.3	8.33-7.5
Crown Homininae	Gorillini-Homini	uniform	7.5	15	8.33-7.5	4.799-4.631
<i>Homo+Pan</i>	<i>Homo-Pan</i>	uniform	4.631	15	4.799-4.631	0.548-0.272
Crown Platyrrhini	Pitheciidae- (Aotidae+Atelidae+Callitrichidae+Cebidae)	minimum bound only	13.363	NA	13.608- 13.363	13.183- 13.032
Crown Pitheciidae	Callicebinae-Pitheciinae	uniform	13.032	34.5	13.183- 13.032	13.363- 13.032
Callitrichidae+Cebidae	Callitrichidae-Cebidae	uniform	13.183	34.5	13.608- 13.183	13.183- 13.032
Crown Cebidae	Cebinae-Saimirinae	uniform	13.032	34.5	13.183- 13.032	9.0-5.28
Crown Atelidae	Alouattinae-Atelinae	uniform	13.363	34.5	13.608- 13.363	7-5.28