

How Does Masticatory Muscle Architecture Covary with Mandibular Shape in Domestic Dogs?

Colline Brassard, Marilaine Merlin, Elodie Monchâtre-Leroy, Claude Guintard, Jacques Barrat, Cécile Callou, Raphael Cornette, Anthony Herrel

► To cite this version:

Colline Brassard, Marilaine Merlin, Elodie Monchâtre-Leroy, Claude Guintard, Jacques Barrat, et al.. How Does Masticatory Muscle Architecture Covary with Mandibular Shape in Domestic Dogs?. Evolutionary Biology, 2020, 47 (2), pp.133-151. 10.1007/s11692-020-09499-6 . hal-02984503

HAL Id: hal-02984503 https://hal.science/hal-02984503

Submitted on 31 Oct 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1	How does masticatory muscle architecture covary with mandibular shape in domestic
2	dogs?

3	Colline Brassard ^{1,2,*} , Marilaine Merlin ¹ , Elodie Monchâtre-Leroy ³ , Claude Guintard ^{4,5} ,
4	Jacques Barrat ³ , Cécile Callou ² , Raphaël Cornette ⁶ , Anthony Herrel ¹ .

¹ UMR 7179 Mécanismes Adaptatifs et Evolution (CNRS, MNHN), Muséum national

- 6 d'Histoire naturelle, 55 rue Buffon, Paris, France.
- ⁷ ² Archéozoologie, archéobotanique : sociétés, pratiques et environnements (AASPE),
- 8 Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, CNRS, CP55, 57 rue Cuvier 75005 Paris, France
- 9 ³ ANSES, Laboratoire de la rage et de la faune sauvage, Station expérimentale d'Atton,

10	Malzéville, France.

- ⁴ Laboratoire d'Anatomie comparée, Ecole Nationale Vétérinaire, de l'Agroalimentaire et de
- 12 l'Alimentation, Nantes Atlantique ONIRIS, Nantes Cedex 03, France.

⁵ GEROM, UPRES EA 4658, LABCOM ANR NEXTBONE, Faculté de santé de l'Université
 d'Angers, France.

- ⁶ UMR 7205 Institut de Systématique, Evolution, Biodiversité (CNRS, MNHN, UPMC,
- 16 EPHE), Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle, Paris, France.
- 17 * Corresponding author: <u>colline.brassard@mnhn.fr</u>

18 Abstract

19 Despite the considerable scientific interest in the variability and patterns of integration in the dog skull, how these patterns impact or are driven by function remains largely unexplored. 20 21 Since the mandible is directly involved in mastication, it can be expected to be directly related 22 to the development of the adductor and abductor muscles. Here, we explore whether variation 23 in the architecture and size of the masticatory muscles is associated with the variation in mandibular shape in dogs. We obtained muscle data from the dissection of 48 dogs from 24 25 different breeds and morphotypes to explore the architecture of the muscles and used 3D geometric morphometric approaches to quantify the shape of the mandible. Covariations 26 27 between the masticatory muscles and mandibular shape were explored using two-block partial least square analyses (2B-PLS). Our results show there is a strong covariation between 28 mandibular shape and masticatory muscles mass (rPLS from 0.70 to 0.74 for the first axis 29 representing more than 90% of the total covariance) and physiological cross-sectional area 30 (rPLS from 0.64 to 0.73 for the first axis representing more than 80% of the total covariance), 31 irrespective of whether size is taken into account or not. These results suggest muscle size and 32 thus attachment area requirements for individual muscles are likely drivers of mandibular 33 shape. Moreover, mandible shape is likely to be a good predictor of muscle force. Finally, it 34 appears that domestication of dogs has not resulted in a disuse phenotype characterized by a 35 decoupling between form and function. 36

37 Key words: dog; geometric morphometrics; jaw muscle; mandible; masticatory system

38 Introduction

As a consequence of several thousand years of artificial selection and inbreeding, the

40 domestic dog has the highest variability in skull shape within the Carnivora (Drake and

41 Klingenberg 2010; Selba et al. 2019) and encompasses over 400 breeds according to kennel

42 clubs. The shapes extend beyond the variability of wild species (Drake and Klingenberg

43 2010), varying from elongated and narrow skull shapes (dolichocephalic) to short and wide

44 (brachycephalic) skulls. This diversification is the result of a slight relaxation of natural and

45 functional selection pressures (Drake et al. 2015, 2017; Curth et al. 2017), but more

46 importantly, depends on anthropogenic selection pressures driven by aesthetic considerations

47 or the selection of animals for particular skills such as hunting or defense (Drake and

48 Klingenberg 2008).

The genetic mechanisms underlying this diversity are well known (Fondon and Garner 2004; 49 50 Bannasch et al. 2010; Boyko et al. 2010; Marchant et al. 2017). For example, the mutation of BMP3 has been shown to be involved in brachycephaly (Schoenebeck et al. 2012). Integration 51 and modularity have also been extensively studied within the skull and even the mandible 52 53 (Drake and Klingenberg 2010; Meloro et al. 2011; Curth et al. 2017; Curth 2018; Machado et al. 2018; Selba et al. 2019). However, the functional impact of this extraordinary variability in 54 shape has received less attention in dogs (but see Ström et al. 1988; Endo et al. 1999; Koch et 55 al. 2003; Ellis et al. 2008, 2009). Given that artificial selection can have indirect functional 56 consequences in wild canids such as the red fox (Trut 1999; Trut et al. 2009; Dugatkin 2018), 57 and since these selection pressures are strong, the resulting morphological changes may have 58 occurred extremely rapidly (Johnston and Selander 1964; Reznick et al. 1997; Hendry and 59 Kinnison 1999; Huey et al. 2000; Grant and Grant 2006; Trut et al. 2009; Dugatkin 2018). In 60 most vertebrates species variation in the shape of the skull and the mandible is linked to 61 variation in the jaw adductor muscles (Watt and Williams 1951; He and Kiliaridis 2003; 62 Cornette et al. 2013; Cornette, Tresset, Houssin, et al. 2015; Fabre et al. 2018). Indeed, the 63 jaw adductors and abductors and the skull and mandible are parts of the same functional unit 64 with bones providing skeletal struts and levers that are moved by the forces generated by 65 muscles (Frost and Schönau 2000; Herring et al. 2001; Frost 2003). In addition to the need for 66 providing muscular attachment, bones are also modified due to the loads imposed by muscle 67 68 contraction in addition to external forces such as bite and joint forces (Frost 2001, 2003;

Schoenau 2005; Sharir et al. 2011; Brotto and Bonewald 2015). For the jaw system to 69 function, the muscles and bones need to be coordinated to achieve effective mastication and 70 biting. As such the system can be expected to be functionally integrated (Olson and Miller 71 1951; Van Valen 1965; Klingenberg 2014). The quantitative interplay between jaw muscles 72 and the bones of the skull remains poorly described in domestic dogs (but see Liebman and 73 Kussick, 1965), in contrast to other mammals (Crompton 1963; Weijs and Hillen 1986; 74 Hylander et al. 1992, 1998; Herring et al. 2001; Lieberman et al. 2004; Ross and Metzger 75 2004; Ross et al. 2005; Herring 2007; Ravosa et al. 2007, 2016; Bourke et al. 2008; Cornette 76 77 et al. 2013; Cornette, Tresset, and Herrel 2015; Penrose et al. 2016; Fabre et al. 2018) rendering our understanding of the functional consequences of the tremendous morphological 78 79 variation in the skull of domestic dogs limited.

Prior studies of *in vivo* bite forces and jaw-muscle electromyography in dogs (Lindner et al. 80 1995; Ellis et al. 2008; Kim et al. 2018), as well as estimations obtained from the dry-skull 81 method (Thomason 1991; Ellis et al. 2009) have suggested that differences in morphology are 82 related to differences in bite force, mainly because of space constraints around the skull, and 83 because of differences in the length of the in and out-levers of the masticatory apparatus. 84 However, no study has focused on the architecture of the jaw muscles (fiber length, pennation 85 86 angle or muscle mass) in domestic dogs rendering estimates of bite force difficult. In the dry skull method, the three-dimensional architecture of the jaw muscles is not incorporated 87 88 (Schumacher 1961; Miller et al. 1965; Thomason 1991; Ellis et al. 2009), which can result in 89 underestimates of maximal bite force.

The great morphological diversity present in the cranium of dogs provides a unique 90 opportunity to understand the relationships between morphological variation and muscle 91 development. Moreover, understanding these relationships would permit better inferences on 92 the functional impact of selection in dogs. Here we focus on the mandible as this bone is 93 implicated in a single function: mastication. We expect there to be a direct link between 94 muscle attachment area and jaw shape, that means, in other words, significant covariations 95 between jaw muscles architecture (mass and physiological cross-sectional area) and 96 97 mandibular shape. However, as recent dog breeds have been selected largely for aesthetic reasons, we predict that these covariations are likely low. Finally, as the posterior part of the 98 mandible both serves as the area for muscle insertion and is more strongly impacted by the 99

- need for muscle attachement, we expect patterns of covariation to be stronger for the
- 101 mandibular ramus.

102 Materials and Methods

103 Specimens

Specimens were obtained from the Veterinary School of Nantes (France), the Veterinary 104 School of Maisons Alfort (France), and the laboratory of rabies and wildlife disease studies in 105 Nancy – Anses (France). The dataset is composed of the mandibles of 59 dogs (*Canis lupus* 106 familiaris) from various breeds (Table 1, see Supplementary material Table S1 for details). 107 The breeds were estimated based on their similarity to existing standards, but crossbreeding is 108 important and as such these animals may not represent 'pure' breeds. Because accurate ages 109 were unknown, we estimated ages based on tooth wear, bone texture, and the aspect of the 110 cranial sutures (degree of closure). The two dogs in the group 'A' (a beagle and a bull terrier) 111 represent the youngest individuals with molars still erupting, a very porous mandible and 112 unclosed cranial sutures (4-6 months according to Barone, 2010). The beagle in group 'B' has 113 114 its spenobasilar suture still open (<8-10 months for the dog according to Barone, 2010) and the mandible is still porous. The 22 individuals from the group 'D' are older, with a closed 115 interfrontal suture and worn denture (>3-4 years). The 33 other dogs, from the group 'C', are 116 117 intermediate adults (from 10 months to 3 years). We chose to keep the youngest individuals in our analyses to increase the morphological variability in the sample. There is no geriatric dog. 118

119

120 Dissections

121 Specimens were either dissected when still fresh or frozen and then defrosted (48 dogs). If

122 preserved in formol, the head was not dissected but directly prepared for shape analyses (an

additional 11 beagles). Dissection of the constituent bellies of the jaw adductor muscles were

done in accordance with the description provided by Penrose et al. (2016), following the

nomenclature of previous authors (Turnbull 1970; Ström et al. 1988; Tomo et al. 1993;

126 Druzinsky et al. 2011). However the anterior and posterior parts of the

127 zygomaticomandibularis were separated and the digastric was dissected as well. Since the

128 lateral pterygoid is very small in carnivores (Turnbull 1970; Herring 2007; Penrose et al.

- 129 2016), we considered medial and lateral pterygoids as one single muscle mass.
- 130 The following muscles were removed layer by layer: the digastric (Dig), the superficial
- 131 masseter (MS), the deep masseter (MP), the anterior part of the zygomaticomandibularis

- 132 (ZMA), the posterior part of the zygomaticomandibularis (ZMP), the suprazygomatic part of
- the temporalis (SZ), the superficial temporalis (TS), the deep temporalis (TP), and the
- 134 pterygoids (P). The origins and insertions of the nine muscle layers dissected are illustrated in
- 135 Fig.1 and described in Supplementary material Table S2.

136 Quantification of jaw muscles architecture

- 137 After dissection, all muscle divisions were weighed using a digital scale (Mettler Toledo
- AE100). Fiber length and pennation angles were measured directly on the muscle after
- 139 sectioning the muscles along their line of action. Several measurements were taken for each
- 140 measurement at different location in the muscle, and we used the mean for our calculations.
- 141 The reduced Physiological Cross-Section Area (PCSA), which represents a proxy of the
- 142 intrinsic strength of the muscles, was calculated for each muscle muscle following the
- 143 definition of Haxton (1944), and using a muscle density of 1,06 g/cm3 (Méndez and Keys144 1960).
- 145 We used the following formula: $PCSA = \frac{mass(g) * cos(angle of pennation(rad))}{1,06(g.cm^{-3}) * fiber length(cm)}$.

146 *Photogrammetry*

147 After dissection, bones were cleaned and dried. One hundred photographs per right hemi-

- 148 mandible were taken while turning around the specimen (Fau et al. 2016). Photos were taken
- using a Nikon D5500 Camera (24,2 effective megapixels) with a 60mm lense. The Agisoft
- 150 PhotoScan software (© 2014 Agisoft LLC, 27 Gzhatskaya st., St. Petersburg, Russia) was
- used for the 3D reconstructions of the mandibles.

152 Landmarking and geometric morphometrics

- 153 Geometric morphometric analysis was used to quantify patterns of morphological variation.
- 154 Twenty-five homologous anatomical landmarks and 190 sliding semilandmarks on curves
- were placed on each specimen using the software Landmark version 3.0.0.6 (© IDAV 2002-
- 156 2005; Wiley et al. 2005). Landmark locations are provided in Fig. 2 and Table 2.
- 157 A template was also created following the method of Cornette et al. (2013) to patch 185
- slinding semilandmarks on the mandible surface of all specimens (Fig. 2). The
- three- dimensional coordinates for all sets of landmarks were then imported into R version
- 160 3.6.0 (2019-04-26). The Morpho package (version 2.7) implemented in R (Schlager 2013)

- 161 was used for most of the following analyses. A 3D sliding semilandmark procedure
- 162 (Bookstein 1997; Gunz et al. 2005) was performed. According to this iterative procedure,
- sliding semilandmarks on surfaces are projected from the template onto each specimen using
- a thin plate spline deformation (Klingenberg et al. 2002; Gunz et al. 2005; Schlager 2012,
- 165 2013). Next, landmarks are slid iteratively while minimizing the bending energy. All sliding
- semilandmarks were constrained by homologous landmarks (Gunz et al. 2005) and allowed to
- slide along the predefined curves and surfaces. The sliding semilandmarks are consequently
- 168 transformed into spatially homologous landmarks. Landmarks coordinates of all specimens
- 169 can then be compared using traditional geometric morphometric methods.

170 Variability in mandibular shape and jaw muscles

A Generalized Procrustes Analysis (GPA – Rohlf and Slice, 1990) was performed using the 171 function procSym (Klingenberg et al. 2002; Gunz et al. 2005; Dryden and Mardia 2016). The 172 173 importance and significance of the correlations between mandibular shape and centroid size and between muscle morphology (PCSA and mass) and centroid size were explored using the 174 function "cor.test". Allometry-free coordinates and visualisations were obtained using the 175 176 functions "CAC" (Mitteroecker et al. 2004) and "showPC". Allometry-free coordinates of Log₁₀-transformed muscle data were calculated using the function "Im". Principal Component 177 Analyses (PCA) were performed using the function "prcomp" based on the coordinates of all 178 aligned specimens, on allometry-free coordinates, on the PCSA of all muscles, on the scaled 179 180 PCSA of all muscles, on muscle mass and, on scaled muscle mass. The deformation of the mandible of a beagle to the consensus of the GPA was used as a reference for all further 181 visualisations. The beagle was chosen because it was the dog that was closest to center of the 182 PCA describing variation in mandibular shape. 183

184 Covariations between mandible shape and jaw muscles

185 To explore the patterns of covariation between the mandibular shape and the PCSA or mass of

the jaw muscles, we performed a two-block partial least square analyses (2B-PLS) with the

- 187 function "pls2B" (Rohlf and Corti, 2000). We did not consider phylogeny (Parker et al. 2004)
- 188 in our analyses because we had no indication of pure race membership.

2B-PLS calculates singular values and creates new axes by looking for linear combinations in each block that maximise the covariance between blocks (the variation of PCSA or mass of all the muscles and mandibular shape). For each axis a PLS coefficient is generated (intensity of the covariation) and p-values are calculated by comparing the singular value to those obtained from 1000 permuted blocks (significance of the covariation).

The mandibular ramus is likely to be more closely associated with space constraints related to the volume of jaw muscles than the mandibular body. To test whether the covariation was higher between muscles and the ramus of the mandible only, we explored both covariations with the complete mandible shape, and with a subset of landmarks and sliding semilandmarks of curves representing the posterior part of the mandible only.

199 A total of twelve 2B-PLS analyses were conducted: mandibular shape – PCSA, mandibular

shape – scaled PCSA, allometry-free mandibular shape – scaled PCSA, ramus shape – PCSA,

201 ramus shape – scaled PCSA, allometry-free ramus shape – scaled PCSA, mandibular shape –

202 mass, mandibular shape – scaled mass, allometry-free mandibular shape – scaled mass, ramus

shape – mass, ramus shape – scaled mass, allometry-free ramus shape – scaled mass.

A Z-score was finally calculated to compare PLS coefficients with the function "compare.pls"from the package geomorph.

206 **Results**

207 Variability in mandibular shape

208 Results of the Principal Component Analyses and correlation tests for exploring allometries209 are detailed in Supplementary material Table S3.

210 The first two axes of the PCA represents 46.1% of the variability in mandibular shape. The next axes each represent a very small part of the total variability (8.9% for axis 3). Only the 211 morphological variations related to axis 1 and axis 2 – that are the most informative – will 212 therefore be described (Fig. 3). The mandibular shape varies greatly depending on the 213 morphotype, and variation is also important within a single breed (beagles). Especially 214 noticeable is the variation in robustness, the shape of the coronoid process, and the ventral 215 216 curvature of the mandibular body. Along the first axis of the PCA, the 217 molossoid/brachycephalic dogs are generally opposed to dolichocephalic/lupoid dogs. The first axis is mainly explained by differences in size (r=0.51; P<0.001) with the biggest 218 mandibles being positioned to right of the scatterplot. Mesocephalic and dolichocephalic dogs 219 220 are not clearly distinguishable and overlap towards the left part of the scatterplot. Most of these morphological changes are explained by size, since allometry is moderately strong 221 $(R^2=0.44; P<0.001, Fig. S1)$. Molossoid dogs – which most often correspond to large 222 mandible sizes - have shorter and more robust and laterally curved mandibles, with more 223 224 developed coronoid, condylar, and angular processes. The rostral part of the mandible is more 225 ventrally curved and the condyle tends to be at a straight angle to the sagittal plane in 226 molossoid dogs (Figs 3A, S1). Variation along axis two is observed for dogs of the same breed, as is the case for the Beagle which occupies the entire upper left quadrant of the 227 scatterplot. This variation is not related to size (P>0.05) and describes the rostro-ventral 228 curvature of the mandible and the orientation of the coronoid process. The two first axes are 229 not correlated with the age of the dogs (P>0.05). The PCA performed on allometry-free 230 231 shapes (Fig. 3B) show that dolichocephalic and brachycephalic dogs oppose themselves along the first axis with the mesocephalic dogs at the very center. The variation along this axis 232 233 involves the ventral and lateral curvature of the mandibular body, the width of the coronoid process and the relative size of the condyle and angular processes. The two youngest dogs are 234 235 included in the same morphospace as the adults. Interestingly, the "juvenile" bull terrier is located in the same part of the scatterplot as the other molossoid dogs when analyses are 236

performed on allometry-free shapes (Fig. 3B). The "juvenile" Beagle remains positionedclose to the adult Beagles.

239 Variability in jaw muscle architecture

Muscle data are given in Supplementary material Table S1 and the results of the statistical
analyses (PCA and correlation tests exploring allometries) are detailed in Supplementary
material Table S3.

The angles of pennation are around 0° in the digastric, $30-40^{\circ}$ in the temporalis and masseter 243 and 40° in the pterygoids. Muscles from the temporal complex have very long muscle fibers 244 (up to 60 mm; mean around 30mm) compared to muscles from the masseteric and pterygoid 245 complexes (up to 30mm; mean around 15-20mm). The temporal complex represents 64% 246 247 (min=55%; max=71%) of the total volume and 50% (min=40%; max=61%) of the total PCSA of the adductor muscles. The masseteric complex represents 27% (min=22%; max=32%) of 248 249 the total volume and 36% (min=29%; max=46%) of the total PCSA of the adductor muscles. The pterygoid complex represents only 9.6% (min=6%; max=13%) of the total volume and 250 14% (min=6%; max=24%) of the total PCSA of the adductor muscles. The mass of the lateral 251 pterygoid muscles represents only around 7% of the mass of the pterygoid complex in the 252 domestic dog (min=2.5%; max=20.4%) and 0.67% of the total mass of the adductor muscles 253 254 (min=0.20%; max=2.4%).

255 Whereas the mass and PCSA of jaw muscles vary greatly depending on breeds, significant

variation is also observed among Beagles. Their morphological space stretches along axis 1,

but mainly along axis 2. Since similar results were observed for mass and PCSA, only the

258 PCA with muscle PCSAs will be described here (Fig. 4). The PCA with muscle masses is

available in the supplementary material (Supplementary Fig. S2).

The first axis of the PCA performed on the raw or scaled PCSA (representing 76.5% or 51.3% of the total variation, respectively) or mass data (91.7% for raw mass and 71.8% for scaled mass) loads strongly with the temporalis and masseter muscles. The second axis of the same analyses explains only a small amount of the total variation (PCSA: 5.5% for raw data and 10.5% for scaled data; mass: 2.3% for raw data and 7.5% for scaled data), and is driven by variation in the anterior part of the zygomaticomandibularis and the temporalis pars suprazygomatica, for our analyses of PCSA, or by variation in the masseter group (above allthe anterior part of the zygomaticomandibularis) for the PCA on mass.

The PCAs with raw muscle data reflect differences in the size of the head. Molossoid dogs – most often with larger heads – have more powerful jaw muscles than most of the other dogs. On the opposite, dogs from the Toy group (Chihuahua, Papillon) – characterized by very small heads – have the smaller and less forceful muscles. Statistical analyses showed that the variation in muscle volume and force is strongly corelated to variation in mandibular size (mass: r=0.89, P<0.001; PCSA: r=0.83, P<0.001).

The PCAs performed on scaled PCSA and scaled mass show that the dogs with biggest and 274 strongest jaw muscles for their size are large molossoid dogs, represented by a Leonberg, an 275 276 American Staffordshire, Mastiffs, a Cane corso, and more markedly the two Rottweillers, the 277 Pitbull and the two Bulldogs. Surprisingly, the Chihuahua in our sample also has very strong 278 and voluminous muscles for its size and is positioned close to the Cane Corso, the Rottweiler 279 and the American stafforshire. The hunting and shepherds dogs (including the German Shepherd), the Papillon and the Boxers of our sample have medium to low muscle masses and 280 281 rather weak muscles for their size. The Cavalier King Charles has masticatory muscle masses that are larger than the average of our sample when corrected for differences in size (close to 282 283 the Cane Corso) but muscle strength is not impacted. Although the small sample size and the low intra-breed diversity of our sample does not allow us to draw conclusions about breed-284 specific diversity our results suggest that this would a fruitful avenue for further research. 285

286 Covariation between mandibular shape and jaw muscle architecture

A summary of the results of the 2B-PLS is given in Table 3. Detailed results are available in
Supplementary material Table S4. Only the main results are detailed below.

289 The covariation between mandibular shape and the masticatory muscles is highly significant,

- 290 whether size is taken into account or not (Table 3). The coefficients of covariation are high,
- and they do not significantly differ between muscle masses and muscle PCSAs, and between
- scaled and raw muscle data. The coefficients of covariation obtained for the shape of the
- ramus only are not higher than the ones for the complete mandible.

Here we focus on the covariations between mandibular shape and the scaled muscle data, 294 since the centroid size is an important driver of covariation (but see supplementary material 295 for further visualisations and results for the raw data: Figs S3 to S6). The covariation between 296 scaled PCSA and mandibular shape was significant (Fig. 5), for the first PLS axis (PCSA: 297 PLS1 88% of the covariance, rPLS1=0.64, P<0.001). Similar results were observed for scaled 298 masses (PLS-1 95% of the covariance, rPLS1=0.70, P<0.001, Zscore=0.75; P=0.23, 299 Supplementary Fig. S7). The first PLS axis (accounting for 88% of the covariance) shows that 300 lupoid, graioid and bracoid dogs are situated at the positive part of the scatterplot and oppose 301 302 molossoid breeds at the negative part of the scatterplot. All muscles strongly covary with mandibular shape. The positive part of the scatterplot corresponds to the breeds with a low 303 304 PCSA of these muscles and a gracile mandible with a strait and flat body that curves outward, a higher ventral part of the ramus, a thin, reduced and slightly tilted outwards coronoid 305 306 process with a shallow masseteric fossa, a small condyle and a small and straight angular process. Dogs at the negative part of the scatterplot have robust mandibles with a very 307 308 ventrally curved and thick body, a lower ventral part of the ramus, a taller coronoid process 309 with a deep masseteric fossa, and a large, medially and caudally extended and less medio-310 lateraly oblique condyle.

The covariations between scaled muscle data and ramus shape are significant only on 311 secondary axes, explaining less than 16% of the covariance. The 2B-PLS between the 312 313 mandible ramus shape and the scaled masses of the jaw muscles (PLS-2 21% of covariation, 314 r-PLS2=0.63, P=0.006, Fig. 6) shows that dogs with more voluminous deep masseter muscles and less voluminous temporal muscles and superficial masseters for their size have a more 315 316 curved coronoid process with a deeper masseteric fossa and a lower and less curved angular process (and vice versa). Similar results were observed for the third axis of the 2B-PLS 317 318 between ramus shape and the scaled PCSA (Supplementary Fig. S8) and for the second axis 319 of the 2B-PLS between allometry-free ramus shape and scaled masses (Supplementary Fig. 320 S9).

Similar results were observed for allometry-free mandibular shape and scaled PCSA (Fig. 7) or scaled mass (Fig. S9). Changes in the body of the mandible along the first PLS axis are the same as those previously described except some more specific anatomical features for the coronoid process. For a given size of the coronoid process dogs with less forceful muscles

- have a more caudally curved and narrower coronoid process (with a shallower masseteric
- fossa) contrary to dogs with stronger muscles which have a wider and thicker coronoid
- 327 process (with a deeper masseteric fossa).
- 328 Significant covariations between allometry-free shape of the mandible ramus and scaled
- masses show that a more caudally curved coronoid process and a less pronounced and curved
- angular process are related to proportionally more developed deep masseter muscles and a
- proportionally less developed superficial masseter muscle (Fig. S10).

332 Discussion

333 Variations in mandibular shape and masticatory muscles

The general shape of the mandibular ramus and the relative importance of masticatory 334 muscles in dogs reflects the specialization towards vertical movements as in other canids. 335 Indeed, the condyle is cylinder-shaped, mediolaterally elongated, curved backwards, and at a 336 right angle to the sagittal plane. Moreover, the temporal and masseteric complexes 337 responsible for the vertical movements of the jaw are by far the most strongly developed in 338 canids since they represent around 90% of the mass and intrinsic strength of the adductor 339 muscles. This corroborates descriptions of previous authors (Schumacher 1961; Turnbull 340 1970; Noble 1973; Ström et al. 1988). The pterygoid muscles – that have a more medio-lateral 341 line of action – are small and the shape of the condyle permits only limited medio-lateral 342 343 rotational movements that function to bring the blades of the carnassials into close contact 344 (Ström et al. 1988; Ewer 1998). The lateral pterygoid is very small (it represents less than 3% of the of the total mass of the adductor muscles) and its role is ambiguous because it could be 345 involved in both mandibular protraction and adduction (Turnbull 1970; Tomo et al. 1993; 346 347 Evans and DeLahunta 2010).

The proportions in volume and PCSA of the different muscles were not the same. For 348 349 example, even though the pterygoid complex always represents less than 13% of the total mass of the adductor muscles, it can represents up to 24% of the total intrinsic strength of the 350 351 adductor muscles, indicating that these muscles are optimized for force production. This is because muscles with longer fibers (temporal) are in proportion 'disadvantaged' compared to 352 muscles with shorter fibers (pterygoids or masseter). This reflects an architectural trade-off 353 between PCSA and fiber length: a muscle cannot be optimized for both force production and 354 contraction velocity (Gans and Bock 1965; Taylor and Vinyard 2013). The PCSA data 355 provided here are further of interest as they may provide better estimations of bite force than 356 estimations obtained from models using the 'dry-skull' method (Thomason 1991; Ellis et al. 357 2009). However, muscle PCSAs are only general proxies of maximal intrinsic muscle force. 358 Muscle loads on the mandible will also depend on the size and position of the attachment sites 359 of the jaw muscles on the skull and mandible, on the unbalanced and uncomplete recruitment 360 of the muscle during biting (Kim et al. 2018), and on the nature of the muscle fibers 361 (Grünheid et al. 2009; Kim et al. 2018). 362

15

Extreme variation has already been demonstrated for the skull (Drake and Klingenberg 2010; 363 Selba et al. 2019) and is generally considerd to be the result of intensive dog breeding and 364 artificial selection for aesthetic reasons. Our study demonstrates that the masticatory muscles 365 and the shape of the mandible also show important variation related to variation in the size of 366 the individuals and the type of breed. Breeds represented by several individuals, such as 367 Beagles, also showed unexpected levels of variation. Although we had too few young 368 individuals to assess the effect of ontogeny this is also likely to contribute to the overall 369 370 diversity in both mandible shape and muscle architecture.

The different muscle layers show an important diversity in mass, but also in intrinsic muscle 371 372 strength due to the great variation in fiber length and pennation angles (Supplementary material Table S1), making the architecture of the jaw muscles complex. Our results indicate 373 374 that the masticatory muscles scale isometrically relative to mandibular size, which corroborates the results of Penrose et al. (2016). The molossoid dogs of our sample generally 375 have the strongest and most voluminous muscles. On the contrary, the dogs from the Toy 376 group of our sample (the Chihuahua, the King Charles and the Papillon) have very small 377 muscles, logically resulting in a lower intrinsic force generation capacity. However our 378 analyses suggest that some dogs of very small breeds such as the Chihuahua - the smallest 379 380 breed recognized by kennel clubs – tend to have muscles that are as imposing and as powerful as those of some specimens of Cane Corso, Rottweiller or American Staffordshire when size 381 382 is taken into account. However, the low intrabreed diversity in our sample does not allow us 383 to explicitly test for differences between breeds. Future studies are needed to explore this further. In our study, the only German Shepherd is included within the variability of the other 384 385 shepherd dogs in our sample, with less voluminous and powerful muscles irrespective of variation in size. As stated above, our sample does not allow to draw conclusions on breed-386 387 specific diversity but it would be interesting to test whether German Shepherd dogs are 388 grouped with other shepherd dogs or with breeds dedicated to protection . Indeed, the German 389 Shepherd is a very "multi-skilled" breed, that has been modified as an army or police dog but that was originally designed to be a working sheepherder (Parker et al. 2004). 390

391 Relations between mandibular shape and the development of masticatory muscles

As predicted, we found significant covariation between the shape of the mandible and thedevelopment of the masticatory muscles irrespective of whether size is taken into account or

not. This study logically suggests that there is a strong association between muscle volume 394 and mandibular form. The coefficient of covariation of the 2B-PLS with allometry-free shape 395 and/or scaled muscle data is not different from the 2B-PLS on raw data and remains elevated. 396 397 Therefore, size alone is not enough to explain the existing covariation. The dispersion of the individuals along the PLS axis for the 2B-PLS with scaled muscle data (Fig. 5-7, 398 Supplementary Fig. S7-S10) shows, however, that similar mandibular morphologies can 399 correspond to different relative muscle volumes or strength. For example, among the three 400 dogs from the Toy group of our sample, the Chihuahua and the Papillon have very similar 401 402 mandibular shapes but the Chihuahua dog has much more powerful and voluminous muscles than the Papillon when size is removed. This suggests significant differences in muscle 403 404 architecture among dogs with similar morphotypes.

405 Morphological changes that appear directly related to muscle volume and strength involve areas of insertion of the masticatory muscles: the size and shape of the coronoid process, the 406 depth of the masseteric fossa and the size and curvature of the angular process. This suggests 407 that the attachment area requirements for individual muscles likely drive mandibular shape. 408 Muscle volume and strength are also related to changes in general features, such as the 409 robustness of the mandible, the ventral and lateral curvature of the body and the size of the 410 411 condyle. Surprisingly, covariations are not significantly different when considering the posterior part of the mandible only relative to the entire mandible. This suggests that the 412 413 curvature and thickness of the body where no muscles attach and which bears the dental 414 alveoli, also covaries with the shape of the ramus. Indeed, the body and the ramus together form an integrated system adapted to the mechanical constraints of biting and chewing. The 415 416 shape associated with low (scaled or not scaled) muscle masses and PCSAs is characterised by a relatively long and flat body, a small coronoid process curved at its posterior tip, a 417 418 shallow masseteric fossa, and a small and ventromedial oblique condyle. On the contrary, 419 shapes related to large and strong muscles correspond to robust mandibles with a relatively 420 large, wide coronoid process with a deep masseteric fossa, a laterally and ventrally curved ramus, and a (medially) long and large condyle. All these changes can be explained by muscle 421 422 volume, conditioning the space available for those muscles and responses to loading of the mandible at the teeth. Accordingly, for dogs with big and strong muscles (mainly large 423 brachycephalic dogs), the mandible is more curved in the medio-lateral plane. This temporo-424 mandibular joint axis rotation has been described by Curth et al. (2017) and interpreted as a 425

result of reduced space availability in short-faced skulls. However, this could also be a 426 mechanical adaptation to the volume occupied by the temporal and masseter muscles. An 427 inclined mandible is more suite to allow large muscles to pass between the skull and the 428 429 mandible and goes hand-in-hand with wider zygomatic arches in brachycephalic breeds. The slightly opposing orientations of the coronoid process and mandibular body (medially inclined 430 condyle and body anteriorly curved outwards in dolichocephalic dogs) seem to reflect a 431 compromise in shape to distribute the forces exerted on the mandible, allowing both muscle 432 433 attachement and vertical opening/closing movements. Thus the change in the angle between 434 the coronoid process and the condyle could be a mechanical response to the reaction forces 435 and important for joint stabilisation.

All muscles covary together on the first axis of the 2B-PLS with the complete mandible 436 (explaining more than 80% of the covariation; Figs 5, 7, S3, S4, S7, S9) but the secondary 437 axis of the 2B-PLS performed with the mandible ramus only (explaining up to 20% of the 438 covariation; Fig. 6, Supplementary Figs S5, S6, S8, S10) allowed us to describe more specific 439 variations. We observed that the more the superficial masseter, the temporal complex and the 440 pterygoid muscles were developed, the straighter the coronoid process was. On the opposite, 441 the bigger the deep masseter and zygomaticomandibularis, the more caudally curved the 442 coronoid process. Liebman and Kussick (1965) described variation in the morphology of the 443 mandible depending on the removal of the temporal or masseter on one side of the head of a 444 445 dog. They report that the variation in shape of the angular process is likely to be due to 446 variation in both the pterygoid and masseter muscles. Indeed, the angular process tended to be straight rather than curved when the masseter muscle was removed. This description is 447 448 consistent with our observations (Figs 6, S8, S10). For these authors, the shape of the coronoid process is more probably linked to the temporal muscle. They observed that the 449 450 coronoid process tended to be straighter after removing the temporal muscle, whereas on the normal side the coronoid process was more caudally oriented. Our own observations, 451 452 however, do not support these results (Figs 6, S8, S10). This could be due to a balance between the masseteric and temporal complexes. Liebman and Kussick (1965) completely 453 454 removed one of the two complexes so their observations do not take these interactions into account. In our 2B-PLS showing opposing loadings (Figs 6, S8, S10), both complexes play a 455 role in the construction of the PLS-1 axis. The less developed the temporal complex is, the 456 more developed the deep masseter, including the zygomaticomandibularis. As the 457

zygomaticomandibularis anterior inserts mainly on the anterior part of the masseteric fossa to
the tip of the coronoid process, a bigger muscle would involve a more important surface area.
This could explain why we observed more caudally curved coronoid process in dogs with a
relatively more imposing zygomaticomandibularis.

462 However, our study did not allow to explore the mechanical relations between mandible shape and muscle loading per se. Further investigations would be needed to explore the connection 463 between bone resistance and muscle force through, for example, finite element analyses (e.g. 464 465 Bourke et al. 2008; Kim et al. 2018; Penrose et al. under review). An interesting and complementary approach may be to investigate the link between mandible shape and bone 466 467 cortical thickness and its degree of biomineralization to track functional variation according to load resistance (Ross et al. 2005; Kupczik et al. 2007; Rayfield 2007; Cox et al. 2015). 468 Indeed, even though the shape of the mandible is the combined result of phylogeny and 469 developmental constraints, its shape also depends on mechanical loading (Weijs and Hillen 470 1986; Wolff 1986; Hannam and Wood 1989; Raadsheer et al. 1999; Currey 2002, 2003; 471 Daegling and Hotzman 2003; Mavropoulos et al. 2004; Ravosa et al. 2007; Sharir et al. 2011; 472 Slizewski et al. 2013). Furthermore, it has been shown that the relationship between bone 473 morphology and muscle force is reciprocal, as the shape of a bone determines the load that it 474 can tolerate (Weiner and Wagner 1998; Frost 2001). As a result, the mandible is plastic: it is 475 constantly modeled throughout life to be able to resist the changes in the mechanical 476 477 environment, that is the muscle forces and external forces exerted upon it during chewing 478 (Frost 2001; Currey 2002; Fabre et al. 2018). Accordingly, it has been demonstrated that increased physical activity affects the geometry and composition of bones, whereas decreased 479 480 loads due to enforced rest or muscle dysfunctions result in thinner bones (Schoenau 2005; Ward et al. 2006). Among other external constraints, diet is likely to play a significant role in 481 482 mandible shape. We had no information about the diet of the individuals in our sample, but 483 further studies exploring the influence of food texture on mandible shape and the mechanical 484 properties of the cortical bone of the mandible would be of interest. Indeed, it has been demonstrated that food mechanical properties influence cortical bone modelling and 485 486 remodelling (Bouvier and Hylander 1981, 1984; Lieberman et al. 2004; Ionova-Martin et al. 2011; Scott et al. 2014a, 2014b; Ravosa et al. 2015, 2016). The study of Scott et al (2014a) on 487 rabbits lead them to suggest that mammals may be very plastic even at late life-history stages. 488 All these elements might explain the observed differences among the different dogs in our 489

study (Bouvier and Hylander 1981, 1984). Moreover it would be interesting to study how 490 pathologies that impact muscle development (dysplasia and jaw locking) affect mandible 491 shape (Robins and Grandage 1977; Johnson 1979; Thomas 1979; Hoppe and Svalastoga 492 1980; Ström et al. 1988). Indeed, according to He and Kiliaridis (2003), the alteration of 493 masticatory muscle function can affect the morphology of certain regions of the skull and face 494 in ferrets. Additionnaly, we could not explore the role of ontogeny because we had too few 495 juveniles to test for the effect of age. Future studies could explore the evolution of the 496 interplay between bone and jaw muscles in dogs through postnatal development, as it has 497 498 been done in other mammals (Swiderski and Zelditch 2013). Indeed, muscle 499 provides growth factors for bone tissue throughout postnatal development independently of forces imparted to bones. This can significantly impact bone formation at attachment areas 500 501 and might thus be a source of the observed patterns of covariation between muscle size and 502 the shape of the mandibular ramus.

503 Domestication and integration in the masticatory apparatus

As predicted, jaw muscle architecture covaries with mandibular shape, but we did not expectsuch a strong covariation.

Integration is produced by the sharing of biological processes such as the same developmental 506 origin or the implementation of the same function (Olson and Miller 1951, 1958, 1999). This 507 strong integration makes sense given that bone is a living and plastically remodelled tissue, 508 causing changes in the shape of the mandible in direct response to muscle and jaw loading. 509 510 However we expected the extreme diversity in shapes due to artificial selection to interfere 511 with this functional integration, as many domestic dogs are not under strong functional constraints for chewing or biting. This is even more surprinsing as a low integration has been 512 513 documented in strepsirrhine primates, which are, on the contrary, subject to strong natural selection and dietary constraints (Fabre et al. 2018). 514

515 We suggest that this strong integration is perhaps determined by a strong interaction between 516 genes responsible for the mandibular shape and genes responsible for the development of jaw 517 muscles. Muscle development would therefore be intrinsically linked to bone development. 518 Consequently, selection on morphology would therefore produce a correlated response in the 519 functional abilities (Cheverud 1982; Klingenberg 2010, 2014). Muscles and bones indeed

share common genetic determinants (Karasik and Kiel 2008; Blank 2014) and cells derive 520 from a common mesenchymal precursor. Multiple loci overlapping between the two traits and 521 several genes with possible pleiotropic effects on both bones and muscles have been 522 523 indentified (Kaji 2014). As a consequence, it is possible that some genes may trigger changes in bone anatomy, and as a result, affect muscle architecture (Karasik and Kiel 2008). It is also 524 plausible that slight changes of systemic control factors occurs during development and 525 impact both muscle and bone (e.g., small modulations of the growth hormone; Karasik and 526 Kiel, 2008). Genetic muscle disorders provide an opportunity to learn how muscle and bone 527 528 interact. For example, a myostatin deficiency (growth differentiation factor 8 [GDF8]) is observed in the whippet dog breed (Mosher et al. 2007) and results in a 'bully' whippet, with 529 530 an approximate doubling of muscle mass and resulting in more robust bones. Observed 531 allometries in muscle data and covariations between muscle data and shape supports the 532 genetic influence on both bone and muscle, as well as integration (Karasik and Kiel 2010). However, more investigations on the genetic and molecular interplay between jaw muscles 533 and the mandible are needed to better understand the drivers of variation in the masticatory 534 apparatus. 535

Morover, our study seems to suggest that dogs show different patterns of integration
according to their function. Breeds first selected for hunting or herding differ from the dogs
that were first selected for human or herd protection. It seems that the selection for different
biting abilities has resulted in different patterns of integration. Further studies focusing on a
much larger sample are, however, needed to investigate whether dog breed selection is related
to specialisations towards specific patterns of covariation between muscle and bones.

Our results raise the question of whether artificial selection produces a reorganization of the 542 integration patterns in order to allow morphological traits to vary, as proposed by Hanot et al. 543 (2018). Karasik and Kiel (2010) suggested that natural selection tends to favour alleles whose 544 pleiotropic effects contribute to the attainment of appropriate proportions between muscles 545 and bones, and the pattern of covariation is expected to evolve to match fitness demands. As a 546 consequence, one would expect stronger integration among wild species since it responds to 547 environmental selection pressures driving the jaw system towards an 'optimum' 548 corresponding to the ecological context, and resulting in less morphological variability, 549 especially for the wolf (Curth et al. 2017). We had no wolves in our sample which would be 550

- essential to test this hypothesis, but comparing our results with those non-domestic canids
- could help understand whether the phenotypic diversification of dogs is responsible for a
- change in integration pattern, and how integration may constrain changes in morphology or
- 554 jaw muscle development.

555 Conclusion

Our study assessed the impact of the dramatic variation in mandible shape in domestic dogs 556 on the development and architecture of the masticatory muscles. Our results suggest that jaw 557 558 muscles and mandible shape form a highly integrated system in dogs. This could be the 559 consequence of genes controlling both muscle and bone development, as well as epigenetic 560 effects driving variation in muscles and bones (Iinuma et al. 1991) or the interaction between genetic mecanisms and plasticity (Hanot et al. 2017). Our results provide a better 561 562 understanding of jaw function in dogs which despite its general interest remains rather poorly understood (Ellis et al. 2008, 2009). To further test whether mandibular form is driven by 563 564 attachment area requirements and/or load resistance, finite element approaches may be of interest. The strong integration of the lower jaw offers the possibility to infer the functional 565 566 consequences of morphological changes in fossil or archaeological specimens. Despite this strong integration, the question remains wether integration is stronger in wild or commensal 567 canids, and whether domestication has lead to a disruption of the natural integration between 568 form and function as suggested previously. 569

570 Acknowledgements

We thank the Veterinary school ONIRIS-Nantes (France) and Anses (Nancy, France) for providing dog heads for dissection. We are grateful to Manuel Comte, Mickaël Godet and Frederic Lebatard for their help in managing specimens and their helpful discussions about the preparation of the skulls. We also thank Arnaud Delapré for his help with photogrammetry and Fabien Belhaoues for his constructive feedback on a first draft of this manuscript. We thank two anonymous reviewers who contributed to the improvement of an earlier version of this manuscript by their valuable comments and suggestions.

578 Funding

This research was funded by the Ministère de l'Enseignement supérieur, de la Recherche et del'Innovation.

581 Conflict of interest

582 The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

23

583 **References**

- Bannasch, D., Young, A., Myers, J., Truvé, K., Dickinson, P., Gregg, J., et al. (2010). 584 Localization of canine brachycephaly using an across breed mapping approach. *PloS* 585 One, 5(3), e9632. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0009632 586 Barone, R. (2010). Anatomie comparée des mammifères domestiques : Tome 1, Ostéologie (5e 587 édition.). Paris: Vigot. 588 589 Blank, R. D. (2014). Bone and Muscle Pleiotropy: The Genetics of Associated Traits. Clinical reviews in bone and mineral metabolism, 12(2), 61-65. 590 591 https://doi.org/10.1007/s12018-014-9159-4 Bookstein, F. L. (1997). Morphometric tools for landmark data: geometry and biology. 592 Cambridge University Press. 593 Bourke, J., Wroe, S., Moreno, K., McHenry, C., & Clausen, P. (2008). Effects of gape and 594 tooth position on bite force and skull stress in the dingo (Canis lupus dingo) using a 3-595 dimensional finite element approach. PLoS One, 3(5), e2200. 596 597 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0002200
- Bouvier, M., & Hylander, W. L. (1981). Effect of bone strain on cortical bone structure in
 macaques (Macaca mulatta). *Journal of Morphology*, *167*(1), 1–12.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/jmor.1051670102
- Bouvier, M., & Hylander, W. L. (1984). The effect of dietary consistency on gross and
 histologic morphology in the craniofacial region of young rats. *American Journal of Anatomy*, *170*(1), 117–126. https://doi.org/10.1002/aja.1001700109
- Boyko, A. R., Quignon, P., Li, L., Schoenebeck, J. J., Degenhardt, J. D., Lohmueller, K. E., et
 al. (2010). A Simple Genetic Architecture Underlies Morphological Variation in Dogs. *PLOS Biology*, 8(8), e1000451. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.1000451
- Brotto, M., & Bonewald, L. (2015). Bone and muscle: Interactions beyond mechanical. *Bone*,
 80, 109–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2015.02.010
- Budras, K.-D. (Ed.). (2007). Anatomy of the dog (5., rev. ed.). Hannover: Schlüter.
- Cheverud, J. M. (1982). Phenotypic, Genetic, and Environmental Morphological Integration
 in the Cranium. *Evolution*, *36*(3), 499–516. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.15585646.1982.tb05070.x
- Christiansen, P., & Adolfssen, J. S. (2005). Bite forces, canine strength and skull allometry in
 carnivores (Mammalia, Carnivora). *Journal of Zoology*, 266(2), 133–151.
 https://doi.org/10.1017/S0952836905006643
- Cornette, R., Baylac, M., Souter, T., & Herrel, A. (2013). Does shape co-variation between
 the skull and the mandible have functional consequences? A 3D approach for a 3D
 problem. *Journal of Anatomy*, 223(4), 329–336. https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12086
- 619 Cornette, R., Tresset, A., & Herrel, A. (2015). The shrew tamed by Wolff's law: do functional
 620 constraints shape the skull through muscle and bone covariation? *Journal of*621 *Morphology*, 276(3), 301–309. https://doi.org/10.1002/jmor.20339
- 622 Cornette, R., Tresset, A., Houssin, C., Pascal, M., & Herrel, A. (2015). Does bite force
 623 provide a competitive advantage in shrews? The case of the greater white-toothed

shrew. Biological Journal of the Linnean Society, 114(4), 795–807. 624 https://doi.org/10.1111/bij.12423 625 Cox, P. G., Rinderknecht, A., & Blanco, R. E. (2015). Predicting bite force and cranial 626 627 biomechanics in the largest fossil rodent using finite element analysis. Journal of Anatomy, 226(3), 215–223. https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12282 628 Crompton, A. W. (1963). The Evolution of the Mammalian Jaw. Evolution, 17(4), 431-439. 629 630 https://doi.org/10.2307/2407093 Currey, J. D. (2002). Bones: structure and mechanics. (Princeton University Press.). 631 https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400849505 632 Currey, J. D. (2003). How Well Are Bones Designed to Resist Fracture? Journal of Bone and 633 Mineral Research, 18(4), 591–598. https://doi.org/10.1359/jbmr.2003.18.4.591 634 Curth, S. (2018). Modularity and Integration in the Skull of Canis lupus (Linnaeus 1758): A 635 Geometric Morphometrics Study on Domestic Dogs and Wolves, 78. 636 Curth, S., Fischer, M. S., & Kupczik, K. (2017). Can skull form predict the shape of the 637 638 temporomandibular joint? A study using geometric morphometrics on the skulls of wolves and domestic dogs. Annals of Anatomy - Anatomischer Anzeiger, 214, 53-62. 639 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aanat.2017.08.003 640 Daegling, D. J., & Hotzman, J. L. (2003). Functional significance of cortical bone distribution 641 in anthropoid mandibles: an in vitro assessment of bone strain under combined loads. 642 643 American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 122(1), 38–50. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10225 644 Drake, A. G., Coquerelle, M., & Colombeau, G. (2015). 3D morphometric analysis of fossil 645 canid skulls contradicts the suggested domestication of dogs during the late 646 647 Paleolithic. Scientific Reports, 5, 82-99. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep08299 Drake, A. G., Coquerelle, M., Kosintsev, P. A., Bachura, O. P., Sablin, M., Gusev, A. V., et 648 al. (2017). Three-Dimensional Geometric Morphometric Analysis of Fossil Canid 649 Mandibles and Skulls. Scientific Reports, 7(1), 9508. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-650 651 017-10232-1 Drake, A. G., & Klingenberg, C. P. (2008). The pace of morphological change: historical 652 transformation of skull shape in St Bernard dogs. Proceedings. Biological sciences, 653 275(1630), 71-76. https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2007.1169 654 Drake, A. G., & Klingenberg, C. P. (2010). Large- Scale Diversification of Skull Shape in 655 656 Domestic Dogs: Disparity and Modularity. The American Naturalist, 175(3), 289-301. https://doi.org/10.1086/650372 657 Druzinsky, R. E., Doherty, A. H., & De Vree, F. L. (2011). Mammalian Masticatory Muscles: 658 Homology, Nomenclature, and Diversification. Integrative and Comparative Biology, 659 51(2), 224–234. https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/icr067 660 Dryden, I. L., & Mardia, K. V. (2016). Statistical Shape Analysis: With Applications in R. 661 John Wiley & Sons. 10.1002/9781119072492 662 Dugatkin, L. A. (2018). The silver fox domestication experiment. Evolution: Education and 663 Outreach, 11(1), 16. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12052-018-0090-x 664 Ellis, J. L., Thomason, J. J., Kebreab, E., & France, J. (2008). Calibration of estimated biting 665 forces in domestic canids: comparison of post- mortem and in vivo measurements. 666

- 667 *Journal of Anatomy*, 212(6), 769–780. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-
- 668 7580.2008.00911.x
- Ellis, J. L., Thomason, J., Kebreab, E., Zubair, K., & France, J. (2009). Cranial dimensions
 and forces of biting in the domestic dog. *Journal of Anatomy*, 214(3), 362–373.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2008.01042.x
- Endo, H., Taru, H., Nakamura, K., Koie, H., Yamaya, Y., & Kimura, J. (1999). MRI
 Examination of the Masticatory Muscles in the Gray Wolf (Canis lupus), with Special
 Reference to the M. temporalis. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Science*, *61*(6), 581–
 586. https://doi.org/10.1292/jvms.61.581
- Evans, H. E., & DeLahunta, A. (2010). *Guide to the dissection of the dog* (7th ed.). St. Louis,
 Mo: Saunders/Elsevier.
- Ewer, R. F. (1998). *The Carnivores*. Cornell University Press.
- Fabre, A.-C., Perry, J. M. G., Hartstone-Rose, A., Lowie, A., Boens, A., & Dumont, M.
 (2018). Do Muscles Constrain Skull Shape Evolution in Strepsirrhines? *The Anatomical Record*, 301(2), 291–310. https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.23712
- Fau, M., Cornette, R., & Houssaye, A. (2016). Photogrammetry for 3D digitizing bones of
 mounted skeletons: Potential and limits. *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, *15*(8), 968–977.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crpv.2016.08.003
- Flahive, M. A. (2015). *Evaluating Muscle Fiber Architecture*. Master's thesis, University of
 South Carolina. https://scholarcommons.sc.edu/etd/3632
- Fondon, J. W., & Garner, H. R. (2004). Molecular origins of rapid and continuous
 morphological evolution. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *101*(52),
 18058. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0408118101
- Frost, H. M. (2001). From Wolff's law to the Utah paradigm: Insights about bone physiology
 and its clinical applications. *The Anatomical Record*, 262(4), 398–419.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.1049
- Frost, H. M. (2003). Bone's mechanostat: a 2003 update. *The Anatomical Record Part A: Discoveries in Molecular, Cellular, and Evolutionary Biology: An Official Publication of the American Association of Anatomists*, 275(2), 1081–1101.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.a.10119
- Frost, H. M., & Schönau, E. (2000). The" muscle-bone unit" in children and adolescents: a
 2000 overview. *Journal of pediatric endocrinology and metabolism*, *13*(6), 571–590.
 https://doi.org/10.1515/JPEM.2000.13.6.571
- Gans, C., & Bock, W. J. (1965). The functional significance of muscle architecture--a
 theoretical analysis. *Ergebnisse Der Anatomie Und Entwicklungsgeschichte*, 38, 115–
 142.
- Grant, P. R., & Grant, B. R. (2006). Evolution of character displacement in Darwin's finches.
 Science (New York, N.Y.), *313*(5784), 224–226.
 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1128374
- Grünheid, T., Langenbach, G. E. J., Korfage, J. A. M., Zentner, A., & van Eijden, T. M. G. J.
 (2009). The adaptive response of jaw muscles to varying functional demands.
- *European Journal of Orthodontics*, *31*(6), 596–612. https://doi.org/10.1093/ejo/cjp093

709	Gunz, P., Mitteroecker, P., & Bookstein, F. L. (2005). Semilandmarks in Three Dimensions.
710	In D. E. Slice (Ed.), Modern Morphometrics in Physical Anthropology (pp. 73–98).
711	Boston, MA: Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-27614-9_3
712	Hamrick, M. W., McNeil, P. L., & Patterson, S. L. (2010). Role of muscle-derived growth
713	factors in bone formation. Journal of Musculoskeletal & Neuronal Interactions, 10(1),
714	64–70.
715	Hannam, A. G., & Wood, W. W. (1989). Relationships between the size and spatial
716	morphology of human masseter and medial pterygoid muscles, the craniofacial
717	skeleton, and jaw biomechanics. American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 80(4),
718	429-445. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330800404
719	Hanot, P., Herrel, A., Guintard, C., & Cornette, R. (2017). Morphological integration in the
720	appendicular skeleton of two domestic taxa: the horse and donkey. Proceedings of the
721	Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 284(1864), 20171241.
722	https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.1241
723	Hanot, P., Herrel, A., Guintard, C., & Cornette, R. (2018). The impact of artificial selection
724	on morphological integration in the appendicular skeleton of domestic horses. Journal
725	of Anatomy, 232(4), 657-673. https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12772
726	Hartstone-Rose, A., Perry, J. M. G., & Morrow, C. J. (2012). Bite Force Estimation and the
727	Fiber Architecture of Felid Masticatory Muscles. The Anatomical Record, 295(8),
728	1336–1351. https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.22518
729	Haxton, H. A. (1944). Absolute muscle force in the ankle flexors of man. The Journal of
730	physiology, 103(3), 267–273.
731	He, T., & Kiliaridis, S. (2003). Effects of masticatory muscle function on craniofacial
732	morphology in growing ferrets (Mustela putorius furo). European Journal of Oral
733	Sciences, 111(6), 510-517. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0909-8836.2003.00080.x
734	Hendry, A. P., & Kinnison, M. T. (1999). Perspective: The Pace of Modern Life: Measuring
735	Rates of Contemporary Microevolution. Evolution, 53(6), 1637–1653.
736	https://doi.org/10.2307/2640428
737	Herring, S. W. (2007). Masticatory muscles and the skull: a comparative perspective.
738	Archives of Oral Biology, 52(4), 296–299.
739	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.archoralbio.2006.09.010
740	Herring, S. W., Rafferty, K. L., Liu, Z. J., & Marshall, C. D. (2001). Jaw muscles and the
741	skull in mammals: the biomechanics of mastication. Comparative Biochemistry and
742	Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology, 131(1), 207–219.
743	https://doi.org/10.1016/S1095-6433(01)00472-X
744	Hoppe, F., & Svalastoga, E. (1980). Temporomandibular dysplasia in American Cocker
745	Spaniels. Journal of Small Animal Practice, 21(12), 675-678.
746	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5827.1980.tb05960.x
747	Huey, R. B., Gilchrist, G. W., Carlson, M. L., Berrigan, D., & Serra, § Luís. (2000). Rapid
748	Evolution of a Geographic Cline in Size in an Introduced Fly. Science, 287(5451),
749	308. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.287.5451.308

Hung, M.-L., Chou, C., Chen, C.-H., & Own, Z.-Y. (2010). Learner readiness for online 750 learning: Scale development and student perceptions. Computers & Education, 55(3), 751 1080-1090. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.05.004 752 753 Hylander, W. L., Johnson, K. R., & Crompton, A. (1992). Muscle force recruitment and biomechanical modeling: an analysis of masseter muscle function during mastication 754 in Macaca fascicularis. American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 88(3), 365-387. 755 756 https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330880309 Hylander, W. L., Ravosa, M. J., Ross, C. F., & Johnson, K. R. (1998). Mandibular corpus 757 strain in primates: further evidence for a functional link between symphyseal fusion 758 and jaw- adductor muscle force. American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 107(3), 759 257-271. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1096-8644(199811)107:3<257::AID-760 AJPA3>3.0.CO;2-6 761 Iinuma, M., Yoshida, S., & Funakoshi, M. (1991). Development of masticatory muscles and 762 oral behavior from suckling to chewing in dogs. Comparative biochemistry and 763 764 physiology. A, Comparative physiology, 100(4), 789–794. https://doi.org/10.1016/0300-9629(91)90293-1 765 Ionova-Martin, S. S., Wade, J. M., Tang, S., Shahnazari, M., Ager, J. W., Lane, N. E., et al. 766 (2011). Changes in cortical bone response to high-fat diet from adolescence to 767 adulthood in mice. Osteoporosis international: a journal established as result of 768 cooperation between the European Foundation for Osteoporosis and the National 769 Osteoporosis Foundation of the USA, 22(8), 2283–2293. 770 https://doi.org/10.1007/s00198-010-1432-x 771 Johnson, K. A. (1979). Temporomandibular joint dysplasia in an Irish Setter. Journal of Small 772 773 Animal Practice, 20(4), 209–218. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5827.1979.tb06708.x Johnston, R. F., & Selander, R. K. (1964). House Sparrows: Rapid Evolution of Races in 774 North America. Science, 144(3618), 548-550. 775 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.144.3618.548 776 777 Kaji, H. (2014). Interaction between Muscle and Bone. Journal of bone metabolism, 21(1), 29-40. https://doi.org/10.11005/jbm.2014.21.1.29 778 Karasik, D., & Kiel, D. P. (2008). Genetics of the Musculoskeletal System: A Pleiotropic 779 Approach. Journal of Bone and Mineral Research, 23(6), 788–802. 780 781 https://doi.org/10.1359/jbmr.080218 Karasik, D., & Kiel, D. P. (2010). Evidence for pleiotropic factors in genetics of the 782 musculoskeletal system. Bone, 46(5), 1226–1237. 783 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2010.01.382 784 Kim, S. E., Arzi, B., Garcia, T. C., & Verstraete, F. J. M. (2018). Bite Forces and Their 785 Measurement in Dogs and Cats. Frontiers in Veterinary Science, 5. 786 https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2018.00076 787 Klingenberg, C. P. (2010). Evolution and development of shape: integrating quantitative 788 789 approaches. Nature Reviews. Genetics, 11(9), 623-635. 790 https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2829

Klingenberg, C. P. (2014). Studying morphological integration and modularity at multiple 791 levels: concepts and analysis. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B:* 792 Biological Sciences, 369(1649), 20130249. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0249 793 794 Klingenberg, C. P., Barluenga, M., & Meyer, A. (2002). Shape Analysis of Symmetric 795 Structures: Quantifying Variation Among Individuals and Asymmetry. Evolution, 56(10). 1909–1920. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2002.tb00117.x 796 797 Koch, D. A., Arnold, S., Hubler, M., & Montavon, P. M. (2003). Brachycephalic Syndrome in Dogs. VetLearn.com, 25(1), 48-55. 798 Kupczik, K., Dobson, C., Fagan, M., Crompton, R., Oxnard, C., & O'Higgins, P. (2007). 799 800 Assessing mechanical function of the zygomatic region in macaques: validation and sensitivity testing of finite element models. Journal of Anatomy, 210(1), 41-53. 801 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2006.00662.x 802 803 Lieberman, D. E., Krovitz, G. E., Yates, F. W., Devlin, M., & St. Claire, M. (2004). Effects of food processing on masticatory strain and craniofacial growth in a retrognathic face. 804 805 Journal of Human Evolution, 46(6), 655–677. 806 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2004.03.005 807 Liebman, F. M., & Kussick, L. (1965). An Electromyographic Analysis of Masticatory Muscle Imbalance with Relation to Skeletal Growth in Dogs. Journal of Dental 808 Research, 44(4), 768–774. https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345650440042401 809 810 Lindner, D., Marretta, S., Pijanowski, G., Johnson, A., & Smith, C. (1995). Measurement of bite force in dogs: a pilot study. Journal of veterinary dentistry, 12(2), 49-52. 811 Machado, F. A., Zahn, T. M. G., & Marroig, G. (2018). Evolution of morphological 812 integration in the skull of Carnivora (Mammalia): Changes in Canidae lead to 813 814 increased evolutionary potential of facial traits. Evolution, 72(7), 1399–1419. https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13495 815 Marchant, T. W., Johnson, E. J., McTeir, L., Johnson, C. I., Gow, A., Liuti, T., et al. (2017). 816 Canine Brachycephaly Is Associated with a Retrotransposon-Mediated Missplicing of 817 818 SMOC2. Current biology: CB, 27(11), 1573-1584.e6. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2017.04.057 819 Mavropoulos, A., Kiliaridis, S., Bresin, A., & Ammann, P. (2004). Effect of different 820 masticatory functional and mechanical demands on the structural adaptation of the 821 822 mandibular alveolar bone in young growing rats. Bone, 35(1), 191–197. 823 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2004.03.020 Meloro, C., Raia, P., Carotenuto, F., & Cobb, S. N. (2011). Phylogenetic signal, function and 824 integration in the subunits of the carnivoran mandible. Evolutionary Biology, 38(4), 825 465-475. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-011-9135-6 826 Méndez, J. V., & Keys, A. (1960). Density and composition of mammalian muscle. 827 Metabolism-clinical and Experimental, 9, 184–188. 828 Miller, M. E., Christensen, G. C., & Evans, H. E. (1965). Anatomy of the Dog. Academic 829 830 *Medicine*, 40(4), 400. Mitteroecker, P., Gunz, P., Bernhard, M., Schaefer, K., & Bookstein, F. L. (2004). 831 Comparison of cranial ontogenetic trajectories among great apes and humans. Journal 832 of Human Evolution, 46(6), 679-698. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2004.03.006 833

- Mosher, D. S., Quignon, P., Bustamante, C. D., Sutter, N. B., Mellersh, C. S., Parker, H. G.,
 & Ostrander, E. A. (2007). A mutation in the myostatin gene increases muscle mass
 and enhances racing performance in heterozygote dogs. *PLoS genetics*, *3*(5), e79–e79.
 https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.0030079
- Noble, H. W. (1973). Comparative functional anatomy of temporomandibular joint. *Oral Sciences Reviews*, 2(0), 3–28.
- Olson, E. C., & Miller, R. L. (1951). A Mathematical Model Applied to a Study of the
 Evolution of Species. *Evolution*, 5(4), 325–338. https://doi.org/10.2307/2405677
- Olson, E. C., & Miller, R. L. (1958). *Morphological integration*. Chicago : University of
 Chicago Press.
- Olson, E. C., & Miller, R. L. (1999). *Morphological Integration*. University of Chicago Press.
- Parker, H. G., Kim, L. V., Sutter, N. B., Carlson, S., Lorentzen, T. D., Malek, T. B., et al.
 (2004). Genetic Structure of the Purebred Domestic Dog. *Science*, *304*(5674), 1160–
 1164. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3836878
- Penrose, F., Cox, P., Kemp, G., & Jeffery, N. (under review). Functional morphology of the
 jaw adductor muscles in the Canidae. *The Anatomical Record*.
- Penrose, F., Kemp, G. J., & Jeffery, N. (2016). Scaling and Accommodation of Jaw Adductor
 Muscles in Canidae. *The Anatomical Record*, 299(7), 951–966.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.23355
- Raadsheer, M. C., van Eijden, T. M. G. J., van Ginkel, F. C., & Prahl-Andersen, B. (1999).
 Contribution of Jaw Muscle Size and Craniofacial Morphology to Human Bite Force
 Magnitude. *Journal of Dental Research*, 78(1), 31–42.
- 856 https://doi.org/10.1177/00220345990780010301
- Ravosa, M. J., Kunwar, R., Stock, S. R., & Stack, M. S. (2007). Pushing the limit: masticatory
 stress and adaptive plasticity in mammalian craniomandibular joints. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, *210*(4), 628–641. https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.02683
- Ravosa, M. J., Menegaz, R. A., Scott, J. E., Daegling, D. J., & McAbee, K. R. (2016).
 Limitations of a morphological criterion of adaptive inference in the fossil record. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical Society*, *91*(4), 883–898.
 https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12199
- Ravosa, M. J., Scott, J. E., McAbee, K. R., Veit, A. J., & Fling, A. L. (2015). Chewed out: an
 experimental link between food material properties and repetitive loading of the
 masticatory apparatus in mammals. *PeerJ*, *3*. https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1345
- Rayfield, E. J. (2007). Finite element analysis and understanding the biomechanics and
 evolution of living and fossil organisms. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.*, *35*, 541–576.
 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.earth.35.031306.140104
- Reznick, null, Shaw, null, Rodd, null, & Shaw, null. (1997). Evaluation of the Rate of
 Evolution in Natural Populations of Guppies (Poecilia reticulata). *Science (New York, N.Y.*), 275(5308), 1934–1937. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.275.5308.1934
- 873 Robins, G., & Grandage, J. (1977). Temporomandibular joint dysplasia and open-mouth jaw
- locking in the dog. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, *171*(10),
 1072–1076.

- Rohlf, F. J., & Corti, M. (2000). Use of two-block partial least-squares to study covariation in
 shape. *Systematic Biology*, 49(4), 740–753.
 https://doi.org/10.1080/106351500750049806
- Ross, C. F., & Metzger, K. A. (2004). Bone strain gradients and optimization in vertebrate
 skulls. *Annals of Anatomy Anatomischer Anzeiger*, *186*(5), 387–396.
 https://doi.org/10.1016/S0940-9602(04)80070-0
- Ross, C. F., Patel, B. A., Slice, D. E., Strait, D. S., Dechow, P. C., Richmond, B. G., &
- Spencer, M. A. (2005). Modeling masticatory muscle force in finite element analysis:
 sensitivity analysis using principal coordinates analysis. *The Anatomical Record Part*
- 885 A: Discoveries in Molecular, Cellular, and Evolutionary Biology: An Official
- *Publication of the American Association of Anatomists*, 283(2), 288–299.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.a.20170
- Schlager, S. (2012). Sliding semi-landmarks on symmetric structures in three dimensions.
 Presented at the The 81st Annual Meeting of the American Association of Physical
- 890 Anthropologists, Portland, OR, Anthropology, University of Freiburg, Germany.
- Schlager, S. (2013). Soft-tissue reconstruction of the human nose : population differences and
 sexual dimorphism.
- Schoenau, E. (2005). From mechanostat theory to development of the 'Functional MuscleBone-Unit'. *J Musculoskelet Neuronal Interact*, (3), 232–238.
- Schoenebeck, J. J., Hutchinson, S. A., Byers, A., Beale, H. C., Carrington, B., Faden, D. L., et
 al. (2012). Variation of BMP3 Contributes to Dog Breed Skull Diversity. *PLoS Genetics*, 8(8), e1002849. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pgen.1002849
- 898 Schumacher, G.-H. (1961). Funktionelle Morphologie der Kaumuskulatur. Jena: Fischer.
- Scott, J. E., McAbee, K. R., Eastman, M. M., & Ravosa, M. J. (2014a). Teaching an old jaw
 new tricks: diet-induced plasticity in a model organism from weaning to adulthood. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 217(22), 4099–4107.
- 902 https://doi.org/10.1242/jeb.111708
- Scott, J. E., McAbee, K. R., Eastman, M. M., & Ravosa, M. J. (2014b). Experimental
 perspective on fallback foods and dietary adaptations in early hominins. *Biology Letters*, 10(1), 20130789. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2013.0789
- Selba, M. C., Oechtering, G. U., Gan Heng, H., & DeLeon, V. B. (2019). The Impact of
 Selection for Facial Reduction in Dogs: Geometric Morphometric Analysis of Canine
 Cranial Shape. *The Anatomical Record*, 0(ja). https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.24184
- Sharir, A., Stern, T., Rot, C., Shahar, R., & Zelzer, E. (2011). Muscle force regulates bone
 shaping for optimal load-bearing capacity during embryogenesis. *Development*, *138*(15), 3247–3259. https://doi.org/10.1242/dev.063768
- Slizewski, A., Schönau, E., Shaw, C., & Harvati, K. (2013). Muscle area estimation from
 cortical bone. *The Anatomical Record*, 296(11), 1695–1707.
 https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.22788
- Ström, D., Holm, S., Clemensson, E., Haraldson, T., & Carlsson, G. E. (1988). Gross anatomy
 of the craniomandibular joint and masticatory muscles of the dog. *Archives of Oral Biology*, *33*(8), 597–604. https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-9969(88)90135-5

Swiderski, D. L., & Zelditch, M. L. (2013). The complex ontogenetic trajectory of mandibular 918 shape in a laboratory mouse. Journal of Anatomy, 223(6), 568-580. 919 https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12118 920 Taylor, A. B., & Vinyard, C. J. (2013). The relationships among jaw-muscle fiber 921 architecture, jaw morphology, and feeding behavior in extant apes and modern 922 humans. American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 151(1), 120–134. 923 924 https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.22260 Thomas, R. E. (1979). Temporo-mandibular joint dysplasia and open-mouth jaw locking in a 925 Bassett Hound: a case report. The Journal of Small Animal Practice, 20(11), 697-701. 926 927 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5827.1979.tb06684.x Thomason, J. J. (1991). Cranial strength in relation to estimated biting forces in some 928 mammals. Canadian Journal of Zoology, 69(9), 2326-2333. 929 https://doi.org/10.1139/z91-327 930 Tomo, S., Hirakawa, T., Nakajima, K., Tomo, I., & Kobayashi, S. (1993). Morphological 931 932 classification of the masticatory muscles in dogs based on their innervation. Annals of 933 Anatomy - Anatomischer Anzeiger, 175(4), 373-380. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0940-9602(11)80047-6 934 Trut, L. (1999). Early Canid Domestication: The Farm-Fox Experiment: Foxes bred for 935 tamability in a 40-year experiment exhibit remarkable transformations that suggest an 936 interplay between behavioral genetics and development. American Scientist, 87(2), 937 160-169. 938 Trut, L., Oskina, I., & Kharlamova, A. (2009). Animal evolution during domestication: the 939 domesticated fox as a model. *Bioessays*, 31(3), 349-360. 940 941 https://doi.org/10.1002/bies.200800070 Turnbull, W. D. (1970). Mammalian masticatory apparatus, 18(2), 149-356. 942 Van Valen, L. (1965). The study of morphological integration. Evolution, 19(3), 347–349. 943 https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1558-5646.1965.tb01725.x 944 945 Ward, K. A., Caulton, J. M., Adams, J., & Mughal, M. Z. (2006). Perspective: cerebral palsy as a model of bone development in the absence of postnatal mechanical factors. 946 Journal of musculoskeletal & neuronal interactions, 6(2), 154–159. 947 Watt, D. G., & Williams, C. H. (1951). The effects of the physical consistency of food on the 948 949 growth and development of the mandible and the maxilla of the rat. American Journal 950 of Orthodontics, 37(12), 895–928. Weijs, W. A., & Hillen, B. (1986). Correlations between the cross-sectional area of the jaw 951 muscles and craniofacial size and shape. American Journal of Physical Anthropology, 952 70(4), 423–431. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330700403 953 Weiner, S., & Wagner, H. D. (1998). THE MATERIAL BONE: Structure-Mechanical 954 Function Relations. Annual Review of Materials Science, 28(1), 271–298. 955 https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.matsci.28.1.271 956 Wiley, D. F., Amenta, N., Alcantara, D. A., Ghosh, D., Kil, Y. J., Delson, E., et al. (2005). 957 Evolutionary morphing. In VIS 05. IEEE Visualization, 2005. (pp. 431–438). 958 Presented at the VIS 05. IEEE Visualization, 2005. 959 https://doi.org/10.1109/VISUAL.2005.1532826 960 32

Wolff, J. (1986). *The Law of Bone Remodelling*. Berlin Heidelberg: Springer-Verlag. doi:
 https://10.1007/978-3-642-71031-5

963 Figure legends

964 Fig. 1

Schematic illustration of the jaw muscles dissected in this study. Muscles in medial tomandible are rendered transparent.

967 **Fig. 2**

Position of the landmarks used in this study and mandible features following Budras (2007), 968 969 Barone (2010), Evans and DeLahunta (2010). Anatomical landmarks are indicated in red, 970 sliding semi-landmarks of curves are in blue and sliding semi-landmarks on the surface are in 971 green. AM: angle of mandible; B: body of mandible; R : ramus of mandible; con: condyloid process; cor: coronoid process; ang: angular process; is: intermandibular suture; n: mandibular 972 973 notch; he: head of mandible; ne: condylar neck; vb: ventral border; fos: masseteric fossa; conc: condyloid crest; corc: coronoid crest; manf: mandibular foramen; menf: main mental 974 975 foramen; can: canine; car: carnassial (M1).

976 **Fig. 3**

977 First two axes of the PCA describing variation in: A) mandibular shape; B) allometry-free

978 mandibular shape. The mesh of the consensus is represented in white. Illustrations represent

979 the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in lateral, dorsal and caudal

views for PC1 and in lateral view for PC2. Ages are indicated by colors. Beagles are in green

and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.

982 Fig. 4

PCA describing variation in A) PCSA or B) scaled PCSA of the jaw muscles. Histograms
represent the loadings of the original variables on the axes. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars
superficialis; MP: masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis
anterior; ZMP: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars
suprazygomatica; TS: temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P:
pterygoids. Ages are indicated by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are
indicated following Table 1.

990 Fig. 5

2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between mandibular shape and the scaled PCSA of jaw
muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis.

- 993 Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in
- 994 lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP:
- 995 masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP:
- 996 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS:
- 997 temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated
- by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.
- 999 Fig. 6
- 1000 2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between the shape of the ramus and the scaled mass of
- 1001 jaw muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis.
- 1002 Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in
- 1003 lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP:
- 1004 masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP:
- 1005 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS:
- 1006 temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated
- 1007 by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.
- 1008 Fig. 7

2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between allometry-free mandibular shape and the 1009 1010 scaled PCSA of jaw muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis. Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of 1011 1012 the axis in lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; 1013 MP: masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP: 1014 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS: temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated 1015 by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1. 1016

- 1017
- 1018
- 1019

1020 Supplementary material

- 1021 The online version of this article contains supplementary material, which is available to
- authorized users.

1023 Supplementary material Table S1

1024 Details of the specimen used in this study including raw jaw muscles data and PCSAs.

1025 Supplementary material Table S2

- 1026 Origin and insertion of the jaw muscles dissected in this study, after a synthesis of
- nomenclatures proposed by Schumacher (1961), Turnbull (1970), Ström et al. (1988), Tomo
- total et al. (1993), Christiansen and Adolfssen (2005), Budras (2007), Barone (2010), Evans and
- 1029 DeLahunta (2010), Hung et al. (2010), Druzinsky et al. (2011), Hartstone-Rose et al. (2012),
- 1030 Flahive (2015), Penrose et al. (2016).

1031 Supplementary material Table S3

- 1032 Results of the statistical analyses exploring allometries (sheet 1) and the variability (sheet 2)
- 1033 in mandibular shape and muscle data.

1034 Supplementary material Table S4

- 1035 Results of the 2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses (sheet 1) and P-values and Z-scores of
- the comparison tests (sheet 2). S: shape of the mandible; rS: shape of the ramus; a: allometry-
- 1037 free (shape or shape of the ramus); M: mass; PCSA: PCSA; s: scaled (mass or PCSA).
- 1038 Sigificant results (p-value < 0.05) are indicated in bold.

1039 Supplementary Fig. S1

- 1040 Distribution of the specimens along the allometric slope with a visualisation of the differences
- 1041 between large and small specimens relative to consensus shape. Ages are indicated by colors.
- 1042 Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.

1043 Supplementary Fig. S2

- 1044 PCA describing variation in A) mass or B) scaled mass of the jaw muscles. Histograms
- 1045 represent the loadings of the original variables on the axes. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars
- superficialis; MP: masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis
- 1047 anterior; ZMP: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars
- 1048 suprazygomatica; TS: temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P:

pterygoids. Ages are indicated by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names areindicated following Table 1.

1051 Supplementary Fig. S3

1052 2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between mandibular shape and the PCSA of jaw 1053 muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis. 1054 Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP: 1055 1056 masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS: 1057 1058 temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1. 1059

1060 Supplementary Fig. S4

1061 2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between mandibular shape and the mass of jaw muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis. 1062 Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in 1063 1064 lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP: masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP: 1065 1066 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS: temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated 1067 1068 by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.

1069 Supplementary Fig. S5

1070 2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between the shape of the ramus and the PCSA of jaw

1071 muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis.

1072 Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in

1073 lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP:

1074 masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP:

1075 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS:

- 1076 temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated
- 1077 by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.

1078 Supplementary Fig. S6

- 1079 2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between the shape of the ramus and the mass of jaw
- 1080 muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis.
- 1081 Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in
- 1082 lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP:
- 1083 masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP:
- 1084 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS:
- 1085 temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated
- 1086 by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.

1087 Supplementary Fig. S7

- 1088 2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between mandibular shape and the scaled mass of jaw
- 1089 muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis.
- 1090 Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in
- 1091 lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP:
- 1092 masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP:
- 1093 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS:
- 1094 temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated
- by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.

1096 Supplementary Fig. S8

2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between the shape of the ramus and the scaled PCSA 1097 1098 of jaw muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of the PLS axis. Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the axis in 1099 1100 lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP: 1101 masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP: 1102 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS: 1103 temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1. 1104

1105 Supplementary Fig. S9

2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between between allometry-free mandibular shape and
the scaled mass of jaw muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and
maximum of the PLS axis. Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the
extreme of the axis in lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars

- 1110 superficialis; MP: masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis
- 1111 anterior; ZMP: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars
- suprazygomatica; TS: temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P:
- 1113 pterygoids. Ages are indicated by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are
- 1114 indicated following Table 1.

1115 Supplementary Fig. S10

- 1116 2-Block Partial Least Square Analyses between the allometry-free shape of the ramus and the
- scaled mass of jaw muscles, with muscle vectors and shapes at the minimum and maximum of
- the PLS axis. Illustrations represent the deformations from the consensus to the extreme of the
- 1119 axis in lateral, dorsal and caudal views. Dig: Digastric; MS: masseter pars superficialis; MP:
- 1120 masseter pars profunda; ZMA: masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis anterior; ZMP:
- 1121 masseter pars zygomaticomandibularis posterior; SZ: temporalis pars suprazygomatica; TS:
- 1122 temporalis pars superficialis; TP: temporalis pars profunda; P: pterygoids. Ages are indicated
- by colors. Beagles are in green and other breed names are indicated following Table 1.