

# ZOOTAXA

1600

**Anatomy of anuran tadpoles from lentic water bodies:  
systematic relevance and correlation with feeding habits**

M. FLORENCIA VERA CANDIOTI



Magnolia Press  
Auckland, New Zealand

M. FLORENCIA VERA CANDIOTI

**Anatomy of anuran tadpoles from lentic water bodies: systematic relevance and correlation with feeding habits**

(*Zootaxa* 1600)

175 pp.; 30 cm.

28 Sept. 2007

ISBN 978-1-86977-157-7 (paperback)

ISBN 978-1-86977-158-4 (Online edition)

FIRST PUBLISHED IN 2007 BY

Magnolia Press

P.O. Box 41-383

Auckland 1346

New Zealand

e-mail: [zootaxa@mapress.com](mailto:zootaxa@mapress.com)

<http://www.mapress.com/zootaxa/>

© 2007 Magnolia Press

All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored, transmitted or disseminated, in any form, or by any means, without prior written permission from the publisher, to whom all requests to reproduce copyright material should be directed in writing.

This authorization does not extend to any other kind of copying, by any means, in any form, and for any purpose other than private research use.

ISSN 1175-5326 (Print edition)

ISSN 1175-5334 (Online edition)



## Anatomy of anuran tadpoles from lentic water bodies: systematic relevance and correlation with feeding habits

M. FLORENCIA VERA CANDIOTI

CONICET, Instituto de Herpetología, Fundación Miguel Lillo, Miguel Lillo 251, Tucumán, Argentina. florivc@yahoo.com

### Table of contents

ABSTRACT .....	5
INTRODUCTION .....	5
MATERIALS AND METHODS .....	7
Specimens .....	7
Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	7
Musculature .....	9
Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	9
Gut content .....	10
Data analysis .....	10
Morphological variation. Geometric morphometrics. Relative warp analysis .....	10
Gut content variation. Correspondence analysis .....	11
Gut content-morphology relationship. Partial canonical phylogenetic ordination .....	11
RESULTS .....	13
Morphological descriptions .....	13
Bufonidae .....	13
<i>Chaunus arenarum</i> .....	13
<i>Chaunus spinulosus</i> .....	19
Ceratophryidae .....	26
<i>Ceratophrys cranwelli</i> .....	26
<i>Lepidobatrachus llanensis</i> .....	32
<i>Telmatobius cf. atacamensis</i> .....	37
Hylidae .....	43
<i>Dendropsophus microcephalus</i> .....	43
<i>Dendropsophus nanus</i> .....	49
<i>Hypsiboas rosenbergi</i> .....	54
<i>Lysapsus limellum</i> .....	61
<i>Phyllomedusa hypochondrialis</i> .....	67
<i>Phyllomedusa sauvagii</i> .....	72
<i>Pseudis paradoxus</i> .....	78
<i>Scinax boulengeri</i> .....	83
<i>Scinax nasicus</i> .....	89
Leiuperidae .....	96
<i>Physalaemus santafecinus</i> .....	96
Microhylidae .....	102
<i>Chiasmocleis panamensis</i> .....	102
<i>Dermatonotus muelleri</i> .....	107
<i>Elachistocleis bicolor</i> .....	113
Pipidae .....	119
<i>Xenopus laevis</i> .....	119
Morphological variation. Geometric morphometrics. Relative warp analysis .....	124
Gut content variation. Correspondence analysis .....	128
Gut content-morphology relationship. Partial canonical phylogenetic ordination .....	130

DISCUSSION .....	132
Interspecific variation. Morphology .....	132
Interspecific variation. Diet .....	144
Ecomorphological considerations .....	147
CONCLUSIONS AND PERSPECTIVES .....	162
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	166
REFERENCES .....	166

## Index of Figures per species

Figure 4. <i>Chaunus arenarum</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	14
Figure 5. <i>Chaunus arenarum</i> . Musculature .....	17
Figure 6. <i>Chaunus arenarum</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	18
Figure 7. <i>Chaunus spinulosus</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	20
Figure 8. <i>Chaunus spinulosus</i> . Musculature .....	23
Figure 9. <i>Chaunus spinulosus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	24
Figure 10. <i>Chaunus spinulosus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies .....	25
Figure 11. <i>Ceratophrys cranwelli</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	26
Figure 12. <i>Ceratophrys cranwelli</i> . Musculature .....	29
Figure 13. <i>Ceratophrys cranwelli</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	30
Figure 14. <i>Ceratophrys cranwelli</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies .....	31
Figure 15. <i>Lepidobatrachus llanensis</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	32
Figure 16. <i>Lepidobatrachus llanensis</i> . Musculature .....	35
Figure 17. <i>Lepidobatrachus llanensis</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	36
Figure 18. <i>Lepidobatrachus llanensis</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies .....	37
Figure 19. <i>Telmatobius</i> cf. <i>atacamensis</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	38
Figure 20. <i>Telmatobius</i> cf. <i>atacamensis</i> . Musculature .....	41
Figure 22. <i>Telmatobius</i> cf. <i>atacamensis</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	43
Figure 23. <i>Dendropsophus microcephalus</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	44
Figure 24. <i>Dendropsophus microcephalus</i> . Musculature .....	47
Figure 25. <i>Dendropsophus microcephalus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	48
Figure 26. <i>Dendropsophus nanus</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	49
Figure 27. <i>Dendropsophus nanus</i> . Musculature .....	52
Figure 28. <i>Dendropsophus nanus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	53
Figure 29. <i>Dendropsophus nanus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies .....	54
Figure 30. <i>Hypsiboas rosenbergi</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	55
Figure 31. <i>Hypsiboas rosenbergi</i> . Musculature .....	58
Figure 32. <i>Hypsiboas rosenbergi</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	59
Figure 33. <i>Hypsiboas rosenbergi</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies .....	60
Figure 34. <i>Lysapsus limellum</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	61
Figure 35. <i>Lysapsus limellum</i> . Musculature .....	65
Figure 36. <i>Lysapsus limellum</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	66
Figure 37. <i>Phyllomedusa hypochondrialis</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	68
Figure 38. <i>Phyllomedusa hypochondrialis</i> . Musculature .....	69
Figure 39. <i>Phyllomedusa hypochondrialis</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	72
Figure 40. <i>Phyllomedusa sauvagii</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	73
Figure 41. <i>Phyllomedusa sauvagii</i> . Musculature .....	76
Figure 42. <i>Phyllomedusa sauvagii</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	77
Figure 43. <i>Pseudis paradoxus</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	79
Figure 43. <i>Pseudis paradoxus</i> . Musculature .....	82
Figure 45. <i>Pseudis paradoxus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	83
Figure 46. <i>Scinax boulengeri</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	84
Figure 47. <i>Scinax boulengeri</i> . Musculature .....	85
Figure 48. <i>Scinax boulengeri</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	88
Figure 49. <i>Scinax boulengeri</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies .....	89
Figure 50. <i>Scinax nasicus</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	90
Figure 51. <i>Scinax nasicus</i> . Musculature .....	93
Figure 52. <i>Scinax nasicus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	94
Figure 53. <i>Scinax nasicus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies .....	95
Figure 54. <i>Physalaemus santafecinus</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton .....	96
Figure 55. <i>Physalaemus santafecinus</i> . Musculature .....	99
Figure 56. <i>Physalaemus santafecinus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity .....	100
Figure 57. <i>Physalaemus santafecinus</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies .....	101

Figure 58. <i>Chiasmocleis panamensis</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton	102
Figure 59. <i>Chiasmocleis panamensis</i> . Musculature	105
Figure 60. <i>Chiasmocleis panamensis</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity	106
Figure 61. <i>Chiasmocleis panamensis</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity. SEM micrographies	107
Figure 62. <i>Dermatonotus muelleri</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton	108
Figure 63. <i>Dermatonotus muelleri</i> . Musculature	111
Figure 64. <i>Dermatonotus muelleri</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity	112
Figure 66. <i>Elachistocleis bicolor</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton	114
Figure 67. <i>Elachistocleis bicolor</i> . Musculature	117
Figure 68. <i>Elachistocleis bicolor</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity	118
Figure 69. <i>Xenopus laevis</i> . Chondrocranium and hyobranchial skeleton	119
Figure 70. <i>Xenopus laevis</i> . Musculature	122
Figure 71. <i>Xenopus laevis</i> . Oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity	123

## Abstract

I studied anatomy, gut content, and the relationship among these traits in a set of anuran tadpoles. Larval stages (mainly Gosner stages 31–36) of nineteen species from various lentic environments were selected. Morphological characters from the skeleton, musculature, oral apparatus and buccopharyngeal cavity were recorded, and a gut content analysis was performed, with emphasis on food size distribution. Ordination techniques were applied in order to find patterns of similarity in morphology and gut content. Canonical ordination methods were used to investigate the relationship among gut content, morphology, and phylogeny in the species considered. The results show that several skeletal, muscular, and buccal characters are relatively maintained within genera. Other features, which have appeared independently in different lineages, reflect convergence phenomena in some cases related to ecological aspects. The configuration of the hyobranchial skeleton, the development of the buccal floor depressor and levator muscles, and mouth gape width correlate with prey size. In some species, morphology is clearly related with feeding. Tadpoles that ingest large food particles relative to their body length present morphological traits attributable to macrophagy. Taxonomically unrelated tadpoles of *Dendropsophus nanus*, *D. microcephalus* and *Ceratophrys cranwelli* possess hyobranchial skeletons with robust, rostrocaudally long ceratohyals and reduced branchial baskets with short ceratobranchials devoid of lateral projections and spicules. *Lepidobatrachus llanensis* tadpoles have laterally extended ceratohyals which, along with the lateral extension of the jaws, result in a very wide oral apparatus and an ample buccopharyngeal cavity that allows the tadpole to ingest large and whole prey; the branchial basket, although its ceratobranchials lack lateral projections and spicules, is slightly reduced in area. The four species mentioned have a noticeable development of the buccal floor depressor muscles, and buccal cavities with scarce filtering and entrapping structures. In *Elachistocleis bicolor*, *Dermatonotus muelleri*, *Chiasmocleis panamensis*, and *Xenopus laevis* tadpoles, the branchial basket occupies >70% of the total hyobranchial skeleton area, and the hypobranchial plates are highly reduced; the buccal floor levator muscles are well-developed, with an increased site of attachment on the ventral expansion of the lateral process of the ceratohyal; the scarcity of the filtering structures in the buccopharyngeal cavity are balanced with the great development of the branchial filters and secretory zones; all these features relate to a diet based on small particles not significantly different from those of most other species; however, experimental studies show that species with similar hyobranchial apparatus and muscles are the most efficient when retaining minute particles. Finally, a large group of species present generalized morphological characters, such as a branchial basket occupying about 50% of the total hyobranchial apparatus, intermediate values of mouth gape width and buccal floor levator / depressor muscles ratio, and abundant filtering structures in the buccopharyngeal cavity; these species feed frequently on food particles between 1–30% of the tadpole body length; however, in some of the species, macrophagous diets are also reported in the literature, indicating that this morphology is flexible in more ample prey size ranges.

**Key words:** tadpoles; chondrocranium; hyobranchial skeleton; musculature; oral apparatus; buccopharyngeal cavity; gut content; interspecific variation; ecomorphology

## Introduction

Morphological diversity in anuran larvae and its relationship with spatial and trophic features lead to convergence phenomena, and this allowed researchers to group some species according to morphological and eco-