



HAL
open science

New insights into patterns of integration in the femur and pelvis among catarrhines

Quentin Cosnefroy, Gilles Berillon, Emmanuel Gilissen, Pauline Brige, Kathia
Chaumoître, Franck Lamberton, François Marchal

► **To cite this version:**

Quentin Cosnefroy, Gilles Berillon, Emmanuel Gilissen, Pauline Brige, Kathia Chaumoître, et al.. New insights into patterns of integration in the femur and pelvis among catarrhines. *American Journal of Biological Anthropology*, 2024, 10.1002/ajpa.24931 . hal-04510495

HAL Id: hal-04510495

<https://hal.science/hal-04510495v1>

Submitted on 7 Nov 2024

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 New insights into patterns of integration in the femur 2 and pelvis among catarrhines

3 Quentin Cosnefroy¹, Gilles Berillon², Emmanuel Gilissen^{3,4}, Pauline Brige^{5,6},
4 Kathia Chaumoître^{1,7}, Franck Lambertson⁸, François Marchal¹

5

6 ¹UMR 7268 ADES, Aix-Marseille Univ-CNRS-EFS, Marseille, France

7 ²UMR 7194 HNHP, CNRS-MNHN-UPVD, Paris, France

8 ³Department of African Zoology, Royal Museum for Central Africa, Tervuren, Belgium

9 ⁴Laboratory of Histology and Neuropathology, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium

10 ⁵Aix-Marseille Univ, CNRS, CERIMED, Marseille, France

11 ⁶Assistance Publique – Hôpitaux de Marseille, Pôle Pharmacie, Radiopharmacie, Marseille, France

12 ⁷Assistance Publique Hôpitaux de Marseille, Hôpital Nord, Aix-Marseille Univ, Service d’Imagerie Médicale,
13 Marseille, France

14 ⁸CERMEP-imagerie du vivant, 6977, Bron, France

15 Abstract

16 Objectives

17 Integration reflects the level of coordinated variation of the phenotype. The integration of
18 postcranial elements can be studied from a functional perspective, especially with regards to
19 locomotion. This study investigates the link between locomotion, femoral structural properties
20 and femur-pelvis complex morphology.

21 Material and Methods

22 We measured (1) morphological integration between femoral and pelvic morphologies using
23 geometric morphometrics, and (2) covariation between femoral/pelvic morphologies and
24 femoral diaphyseal cross-sectional properties, which we defined as morpho-structural
25 integration. Morphological and morpho-structural integration patterns were measured among
26 humans (n=19), chimpanzees and bonobos (n=16), and baboons (n=14), whose locomotion are
27 distinct.

28 Results

29 Baboons shows the highest magnitude of morphological integration and the lowest of morpho-
30 structural integration. Chimpanzees and bonobos show intermediate magnitude of
31 morphological and morpho-structural integration. Yet, body size seems to have a considerable
32 influence on both integration patterns, limiting the interpretations. Finally, humans present the
33 lowest morphological integration and the highest morpho-structural integration between
34 femoral morphology and structural properties but not between pelvic morphology and femur.

35 Discussion

36 Morphological and morpho-structural integration depict distinct strategies among the samples.
37 A strong morphological integration among baboon's femur-pelvis module might highlights
38 evidence for long-term adaptation to quadrupedalism. In humans, it is likely that distinct
39 selective pressures associated with the respective function of the pelvis and the femur tend to
40 decrease morphological integration. Conversely, high mechanical loading on the hindlimbs
41 during bipedal locomotion might result in specific combination of structural and morphological
42 features within the femur.

43 **Keywords:** morpho-structural integration, biomechanics, locomotion, primates

44 1 Introduction

45 The tendency of morphological traits to exhibit coordinated variation is defined as
46 morphological integration (Olson & Miller, 1958). Its study provides insights into a range of
47 evolutionary trajectories of the phenotype (Ackermann, 2009; Goswami, Smaers, Soligo, &
48 Polly, 2014; Anjali Goswami & Polly, 2010). Over the last few decades, this approach has been
49 widely applied to investigate the link between skeletal morphological adaptations and
50 locomotion. Among primates, integration of postcranial skeletal elements is more prominent in
51 quadrupeds than in climbers and hominoids (Agosto & Auerbach, 2022; Jung, Simons, &
52 Cramon-Taubadel, 2021; Villmoare, Fish, & Jungers, 2011). This is particularly apparent in the
53 appendicular skeleton, either between homologous forelimb and hindlimb elements (humerus-
54 femur), or between articulated elements within a limb (humerus-ulna / femur-tibia) (Conaway
55 & von Cramon-Taubadel, 2022; Young, Wagner, & Hallgrímsson, 2010). The relatively low
56 integration within the postcranial skeleton in hominoids has been interpreted as the result of
57 functional dissociation between the lower and upper limbs during locomotion (Young et al.,
58 2010). This independent variation of skeletal elements reflects some phenotypic plasticity
59 among hominoids (Hansen & Houle, 2008; Wagner, Pavlicev, & Cheverud, 2007).

60 Generally, morphological integration defines semi-autonomous units, or modules, that are parts
61 of an organism that present higher magnitude of integration between themselves than with other
62 parts of the organism (Cheverud, 1996; Wagner, 1996; Wagner et al., 2007). Although there
63 are many kinds of module (e.g. variational, anatomical, developmental, functional, see for
64 examples Hallgrímsson et al., 2009; Klingenberg, 2008; Wagner et al., 2007), if one want to
65 focus on the study of locomotion, there is a need to identify functional modules, meaning a
66 module composed of features that act together to perform a specific function. Due to the shared
67 muscles, ligaments or articular surfaces, it is generally considered that morphological
68 integration between bones in the same joint chain results from functional interactions (Fabre,
69 Goswami, Peigné, & Cornette, 2014; Hallgrímsson, Willmore, & Hall, 2002; Hanot, Herrel,
70 Guintard, & Cornette, 2018; Klingenberg, 2009). From this perspective, the femur-pelvis
71 module can be considered as functional module in which all elements are intimately linked to
72 the locomotor function.

73 The degree of integration within the femur-pelvis module as a functional one was measured
74 from geometric morphometrics data based on 3D anatomical landmarks among crab-eating
75 macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*) and compared to other anatomical modules (Conaway,
76 Schroeder, & von Cramon-Taubadel, 2018). The results of this study indicate greater
77 integration within the femur-pelvis module than the humerus-scapula module. To our

78 knowledge, there has been no interspecies comparison of morphological integration within the
79 femur-pelvis module that considers the overall morphology of both bones.

80 This study therefore proposes to measure morphological integration between the femur and
81 pelvis among groups of primates with distinct positional repertoires. We furthermore propose
82 an exploratory approach that incorporates bone structural properties, which are also related to
83 locomotion. Integration is here a tool to quantify and assess the coordination of morphological
84 and structural variation in the femur-pelvis module. Our aim is to investigate whether there are
85 different levels of coordination in external morphology, and whether there is another facet of
86 integration that do not only rely on external morphology within the femur-pelvis module.

87 1.1 Morpho-structural integration

88 The external morphology refers to the form and shape of bones (*i.e* its architecture) that can be
89 measured morphometrically. This morphology is integrated and is primarily the result of long-
90 term changes linked to the evolutionary trajectories at a species level, and largely influenced
91 by its ancestral state. In the other hand, the internal structure on bones refers to both the
92 trabecular organization (anisotropy of the network, thickness of the trabeculae, BV/TV) and
93 cortical bone distribution (cortical thickness and orientation). The internal structure is manly
94 considered to reflect the actual behaviours at an individual's level (Ruff, Holt, & Trinkaus,
95 2006). Because of bone plasticity and remodelling process, the internal structure of long bones
96 is a biomechanical indicator related to the stresses experienced by the skeleton, of which
97 locomotion is a primary source (Biewener & Taylor, 1986; Lanyon & Rubin, 1984; Rubin &
98 Lanyon, 1982). Concerning the cortical bone, the analysis of the cross-sectional geometric
99 parameters of the diaphyseal sections (CSG) accounts theoretically for the structural response
100 of the bone to mechanical loading due to locomotion (Burr, Ruff, & Johnson, 1989; Demes,
101 Jungers, & Selpien, 1991; Lieberman, Polk, & Demes, 2004; Ruff, 2002a). In a palaeontological
102 context, analysis of femoral diaphyseal CSG allows assumptions as to specific locomotor
103 behaviours in specific environments (Daver et al., 2022; Marchi et al., 2016; Rodríguez,
104 Carretero, García-González, & Arsuaga, 2018; Ruff, Burgess, Ketcham, & Kappelman, 2016).

105 However, this opposition between an external morphology as a result of long-terms changes at
106 the species level and an internal structure as a result of short-term changes at the individual
107 level should be tempered. For instance, the external morphology of hindlimb also undergo
108 development throughout an individual's life. A notable example is the bicondylar angle in the
109 distal femur in humans, which changes with age under the influence of mechanical stimuli
110 linked to the initiation of a bipedal gait (Tardieu & Damsin, 1997; Tardieu, 1994). In hominins,
111 the external morphology of the hindlimb is both driven by (phylo)genetic and mechanical
112 influence to fulfill a given locomotion (Shelfbine, Tardieu, & Carter, 2002; Tardieu, 1999). It
113 should be the same among other primate species. Also, the internal structure is also driven by
114 genetic process since the cross-sectional shape and cortical distribution appear to be shared by
115 individuals with distinct positional behavior and loading regime at both intra- (Cosnefroy et al.,
116 2022; Hansen, Bredbenner, Nicolella, Mahaney, & Havill, 2009; Morimoto, De León, &
117 Zollikofer, 2011) and inter (Morimoto, Nakatsukasa, Ponce de León, & Zollikofer, 2018;
118 Morimoto, Zollikofer, & Ponce de León, 2012) specific levels among primates.

119 The changes in internal structure of long bones during the individual's life are the results of
120 combined external and internal forces that are influenced by a multitude of factors, including
121 body size and shape, sex, age, hormones, phylogeny, and biomechanical loading (Cowgill,

122 Harrington, MacKinnon, & Kurki, 2023; Frost, 2001; Libanati, Baylink, Lois-Wenzel,
123 Srinivasan, & Mohan, 1999; Parfitt, 2002; Ruff et al., 2006). The CSG therefore may vary
124 between species with a given locomotion. This applies particularly to humans in which
125 differences in taxonomy (Puymeraill et al., 2012; Trinkaus & Ruff, 2012) or lifestyle (Marchi,
126 2008; Saers et al., 2021; Shaw & Stock, 2013; Villotte, Samsel, & Sparacello, 2017) affect the
127 geometry of the femoral diaphyseal section. Thus, the same CSG that are used to discriminate
128 between locomotor modes (especially second moment of area) can be used to identify activity
129 patterns within the same mode (Ruff, 2018). Conversely, some primates with different
130 positional repertoires exhibit comparable CSG diaphyseal properties, both intra-specifically
131 and inter-specifically (e.g. Cosnefroy et al., 2022; Nadell, Elton, & Kovarovic, 2021). As
132 hypothesized by Carlson and colleagues, it is also likely that some locomotor modes do not
133 meet the mechanical requirements to significantly modify the shape of diaphyseal sections
134 (Carlson et al., 2006). Although CSG remain reliable tool for inferring bone loading (Pearson
135 & Lieberman, 2004; Ruff, Holt, & Trinkaus, 2006), strict equivalence between CSG and
136 positional repertoire remain discussed (Morimoto et al., 2011).

137 Thus, it appears that the phenotype adaptations to positional behaviours are reflected by both
138 the in the external morphology and internal structure; under the combined influence of both
139 long-term (phylo)genetic and short-term mechanical constraints. One may therefore ask how
140 these external and internal features are combined to achieve a morpho-structural adaptation.
141 However, only a few studies have explored so far the link between internal structure and
142 morphological features. For example, Kubicka and Myszka have shown that there is no
143 correlation between the CSG of the humeral diaphysis and the strength of the entheses of the
144 upper limb in humans (Kubicka & Myszka, 2020). In addition, comparison between the CSG
145 and the bi-acetabular width or neck anteversion angle has shown that the mediolateralization of
146 cortical bone distribution across the femoral shaft in hominins may be a structural response to
147 the lateral tilt of the centre of gravity associated with pelvic enlargement during bipedal walking
148 (Ruff, 1995).

149 The relationship between morphological and structural variations and their connection with
150 locomotion is still not well understood. To better assess this relationship in the context of an
151 exploratory study, it is necessary to combine analyses that optimally quantify morphology and
152 structure. In order to quantify morphology of the pelvis and the femur, we used landmark-based
153 geometric morphometrics. Geometric morphometrics is an approach based on coordinates from
154 homologous landmarks that are taken on specific structures which enables statistical
155 comparison of their morphology (Bookstein, 1996; Mitteroecker & Gunz, 2009). This approach
156 has been broadly used in biological anthropology to describe and quantify morphology of
157 several anatomical features (for a review see Mitteroecker & Schaefer, 2022). Furthermore, the
158 use of geometric morphometrics datasets is common in the study of integration (Agosto &
159 Auerbach, 2022; Hanot et al., 2018; Klingenberg, 2009; Komza, Viola, Netten, & Schroeder,
160 2022; Neaux et al., 2017; Torres-Tamayo et al., 2020).

161 We applied three-dimensional landmark geometric morphometrics to provide quantitative
162 morphological data from the pelvis and femur. We statistically compared these quantitative
163 morphological data to CSG from the femoral diaphysis, which are also quantitative structural
164 data. This allows us to assess covariation between femoral or pelvic morphology and the
165 structural properties of the femoral shaft in order to describe what we call morpho-structural

166 integration. In this study, this refers to the evaluation of covariation between the morphology
167 of the femur or pelvis, and the structural properties of the femoral shaft.

168 1.2 Object and aims of the study

169 The purpose of this study is to explore the morphological and morpho-structural integration
170 within the femur-pelvis module and their relation to the positional repertoire (*i.e* posture and
171 locomotion) in primates. To do so we use three models of primates that exhibit distinct
172 positional repertoires (Table 1): (1) humans (*Homo sapiens*) of which the positional repertoire
173 is almost restricted to bipedalism with a fully orthograde posture in adults (but see
174 Venkataraman, Kraft, & Dominy, 2013); (2) olive baboons (*Papio anubis*) considered as mainly
175 terrestrial and quadrupedal with a pronograde posture in adults (Druelle, Aerts, & Berillon,
176 2017; Hunt, 2016; Rose, 1977); (3) chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) and bonobos (*P. paniscus*)
177 that exhibit a wider positional repertoire (*i.e* more diversity) than humans and baboons,
178 including knuckle-walking, arboreal climbing and suspensory behaviours and both orthograde
179 and pronograde posture (Doran, 1992; Hunt, 1992; Williams, Prang, Russo, Young, & Gebo,
180 2023). For each three models, we explore potential patterns of integration at three levels:

- 181 - the magnitude of morphological integration between the external morphology of the
182 pelvis and that of the femur. This allows us to test if morphological integration in the
183 femur-pelvis module is common or differ between these models and if it is linked to
184 their positional repertoire' characteristics.
185
- 186 - the magnitude of morpho-structural integration between the CSG of the femoral
187 diaphysis and the external morphology of the femur. This allows us to test if morpho-
188 structural integration within the femur is common or differ between these models and if
189 it is linked to their positional repertoire' characteristics.
190
- 191 - the magnitude of morpho-structural integration between the CSG of the femoral
192 diaphysis and the external morphology of the pelvis. This allows us to test if morpho-
193 structural integration between the femur and the pelvis is common or differ between
194 these models and if it is linked to their positional repertoire' characteristics.
195

196 Uncovering these patterns of integration would enable the detection and description of complex
197 adaptations to positional repertoires that are based on potentially integrated morphological and
198 structural variations of the postcranial skeleton, using three primate models with distinct
199 behaviours.

200 2 Material and methods

201 2.1 Material

202 The sample contains 55 femora and right hemi-pelves from individuals of the genera *Homo*,
203 *Pan*, and *Papio*. The bones were either reconstructed from surface scans or segmented from
204 CT-scans. The humans sample consists in CT-scans of hospital patients living in Marseille were
205 collected from the PACS (Picture Archiving and Communication System, McKesson Medical
206 Imaging Group, Richmond, BC, Canada) of the Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Marseille
207 (AP-HM). All CT images and personal patient information were anonymized before collection

208 following the personal privacy standards of the French National Ethical Committee and the
 209 Helsinki Declaration of 1975, revised in 1983. This procedure is the standard protocol for
 210 retrospective research studies involving medical images. The baboon sample encompasses CT-
 211 scan of adults specimens in captivity (< 4.5 years old) all originating from a single population
 212 housed at the Station de Primatologie of the Centre national de la Recherche Scientifique at
 213 Rousset-sur-Arc, France (see more information about this population in former publications:
 214 e.g. Berillon et al., 2010; Boulinguez-Ambroise et al., 2021; Cosnefroy et al., 2022; Druelle,
 215 Aerts, D’Août, Moulin, & Berillon, 2017). Finally, the chimpanzees and bonobos sample
 216 contains both surface scan (for the pelvis only) and CT-scans (for both the pelvis and the femur)
 217 that were obtained from open online databases or originating from the Musée Royal de
 218 l’Afrique Centrale of Tervuren, Belgium (see more individual information in supplementary
 219 material).

220 We only include adults and both sexes are considered. In order to avoid juveniles in non-human
 221 primates samples for which we do not have precise age (*i.e* the *Pan* specimens), only specimens
 222 that present a fully erupted third molar to the occlusal surface on their associated cranial remain
 223 were considered. Common chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) and bonobos (*P. paniscus*) are
 224 combined into a single group to enable more robust statistical analyses, and because of the
 225 slight locomotor differences between the two species documented repertoire (D’Aout et al.,
 226 2004; Perrot, Narat, & Druelle, 2022).

227 Surface scan acquisitions were performed by the authors using EinScan Pro Fixed Scan with
 228 turntable and 0.04 mm of accuracy, and the segmentations from CT-scans were performed with
 229 Avizo 7.1 (Thermo Fisher Scientific).

230

231 *Table 1 : Study sample description. Percentages are average values of locomotor bouts. †Climbing bouts can also be*
 232 *considered at the species level (Kraft, Venkataraman, & Dominy, 2014; Venkataraman et al., 2013); ‡data for Pan: (Doran,*
 233 *1992, 1997; Hunt, 1992; Sarringhaus et al., 2014) ; §data for Papio: (Druelle et al. 2017; Hunt, 2016; Rose, 1977).*

Genera	species	Number of specimens (F/M/Indet)	Positional repertoire
<i>Homo</i>	<i>sapiens</i>	19 (9/10/0)	Bipedalism (almost 100%) [†]
<i>Pan</i>	<i>troglodytes,</i> <i>paniscus</i>	16 (6/6/4), 6 (2/4)	Knuckle-walking (mean 83%), vertical climbing (mean 8,5%), bipedalism (mean 1,2%), others (mean 7,3%) [‡]
<i>Papio</i>	<i>anubis</i>	14 (12/2/0)	Quadrupedalism (mean 98,7%), vertical climbing (mean 1%), others (mean 0,3%), [§]

234

235 2.2 Methods

236 2.2.1 Geometric morphometrics

237 The external morphology of both the femur and the pelvis are assessed in each sample by
238 landmark-based geometric morphometrics. For each specimen, the landmark datasets consist
239 of 27 femoral and 34 pelvic landmarks of type I (true anatomical) and II (reproducible). Type
240 I landmarks are derived from the set proposed by Weaver which serve as published reference
241 for anatomical landmarks used to compare external morphology and cross-sectional geometry
242 (see Weaver, 2003). From this basis 250 surface semi-landmarks are projected on the femoral
243 surface, and 217 curve semi-landmarks and 50 surface semi-landmarks on the pelvic surface
244 (Figure 1). Pelvic landmarks are generated with Viewbox 4.1 (dhal.com) and femoral
245 landmarks with the *Morpho* R-package v2.9 (Schlager, 2017). Once set, the semi-landmarks
246 are slid using the least squares method to maximize the homology between individuals
247 landmark configurations (Gunz, Mitteroecker, & Bookstein, 2005). For each group, we then
248 perform Generalized Procrustes analysis (GPA) on the landmarks configurations to separate
249 shape from overall size, position and orientation (Bookstein, 1996, 2017; Rohlf & Slice, 1990).
250 The Procrustes coordinates that result from this analysis are used to assess both morphological
251 and morpho-structural integration.

252 All statistical analyses are performed using Morpho J (Klingenberg, 2011), *geomorph* v4.0.2
253 (Adams, Collyer, Kaliontzopoulou, & Sherratt, 2016; Baken, Collyer, Kaliontzopoulou, &
254 Adams, 2021) and *Morpho* v2.9 (Schlager, 2017) R packages.

255 2.2.2 Allometry

256 The variation in body size and mass, mainly due to sexual dimorphism in primates, can
257 influence both external morphology and internal structure and lead to overestimate phenotypic
258 variation (e.g. Bastir et al., 2017; Carlson, 2005; Klingenberg & Marugán-Lobón, 2013;
259 Lacoste Jeanson, Santos, Villa, Banner, & Brůžek, 2018; Ruff, 2002b). In our study, body mass
260 and size should therefore influence magnitude of morphological and morpho-structural
261 integrations. We evaluate the impact of body mass and size in both by using allometry in
262 external morphological data. To do so, we create another dataset of geometric morphometrics
263 from which allometry has been removed. To remove allometry, we calculate the centroid size
264 and extract residuals from multivariate regressions of Procrustes coordinates on the logarithm
265 of the centroid size for each landmark conformation (Monteiro, 1999). The centroid size is a
266 measure of scale for landmark configurations classically used to assess allometry in geometric
267 morphometrics analyses (Bookstein, 1992; Mitteroecker and Gunz, 2009). Here, the centroid-
268 size is calculated from the entire landmark configuration encompassing both anatomical and
269 semi-landmarks. Allometric residuals are used in addition to Procrustes coordinates to assess
270 both morphological and morpho-structural integration.

271 2.2.3 Morphological integration

272 The magnitude of morphological integration is assessed by the Covariance Ratio (CR) using
273 the *modularity.test* function in *geomorph* (Adams, 2016). The CR compares the ratio of the sum
274 of squared covariances within a set of variables to that between different sets of variables (S_1
275 and S_2) in order to quantify the modular structure of the whole (Adams, 2016).

276 The CR of datasets S_1 and S_2 is calculated as follows:

277

$$CR = \sqrt{\frac{\text{trace}(S_{12}S_{21})}{\sqrt{\text{trace}(S^*_{11}S^*_{11})\text{trace}(S^*_{22}S^*_{22})}}}$$

278 Where S^*_{11} and S^*_{22} are the covariance matrices within S_1 and S_2 respectively, and S_{12} and S_{21}
279 the covariance matrices between S_1 and S_2 respectively. In this study, we consider the Procrustes
280 coordinates (or allometric residuals) from the pelvis as the first set (S_1), and the landmark
281 Procrustes coordinates (or allometric residuals) from the femur as the second set (S_2). The CR
282 is calculated within each sample (Table 2). Unlike other integration measures (e.g. Escoffier's
283 RV coefficient), the CR is less sensitive to the sample size and number of variables and is
284 therefore suited to geometric morphometrics datasets (e.g. Adams & Collyer, 2018; Evans et
285 al., 2021; Janin, 2021). Higher CR values indicate higher integration (or lower modular signal)
286 between the two sets of morphometric variables (Adams, 2016).

287 For intergroup comparisons, we used the CR effect size difference which evaluate the difference
288 between two integration effect sizes (Adams & Collyer, 2016, 2019). This difference was
289 assessed either based on Procrustes coordinates or allometric residuals using the *compare.CR*
290 function in *geomorph* (Adams & Collyer, 2019). This function allows to statistically compare
291 the modular signal between pairs of datasets (here the *Homo*, *Pan* and *Papio* samples) and is
292 here used to determine which group present the highest magnitude of morphological integration
293 (Table 3).

294 2.2.4 Morpho-structural integration

295 To our knowledge, there have been no studies focusing on the morpho-structural integration
296 between external morphology and internal structure by evaluating it through the covariation
297 between landmark-based geometric morphometrics datasets and CSG of long bone. In the
298 absence of any reference to evaluate this integration statistically, we assess morpho-structural
299 integration using 2-block Partial Least Squares (2b-PLS). This method enables evaluation of
300 the covariation between different types of variables, including landmark conformations (Rohlf
301 & Corti, 2000). For each group separately, the first block of the 2b-PLS consists in external
302 morphological variables, and the second block consists in internal structure variables.

303 The external morphology is assessed via the geometric morphometrics variables that are either
304 the whole set of Procrustes coordinates from the GPA, or the allometric residuals from both the
305 femur and the pelvis. To consider more localized morphological variation that can impact the
306 morpho-structural integration with CSG, we also perform intra-group Principal Component
307 Analysis on Procrustes coordinates and allometric residuals. The first two Principal Component
308 that account for more than 10% of variance (meaning PC1 and PC2 for Procrustes coordinates
309 and rPC1 and rPC2 for allometric residuals) are used to identify these specific morphological
310 variations; and also account as external morphology variables in 2b-PLS along with CSG.

311 The internal structure is assessed via CSG of the femoral diaphysis. CSG are measured for the
312 entire femoral shaft (61 sections from 20% to 80% of the biomechanical length), but also locally
313 on shaft portions (15 sections at distal: 20%-35%, mid-distal: 35%-50%, mid-proximal: 50%-
314 65%, and proximal: 65%-80%). The CSG for the femoral shaft include the ratio of second
315 moments of area relative to the anteroposterior and mediolateral axes (I_x/I_y) and the ratio of
316 maximum/minimum second moments of area (I_{max}/I_{min}). These CSG account for the
317 distribution of cortical bone within a section (Carlson et al., 2006; Ruff, 1995; Sarringhaus,
318 MacLatchy, & Mitani, 2016), and are indicators of bending rigidity which is prevalent loading

319 during locomotion (Lieberman et al., 2004; Ruff, Trinkaus, Walker, & Larsen, 1993; Schaffler,
320 Burr, Jungers, & Ruff, 1985). The use ratios are chosen to avoid further standardization of the
321 CSG data. The CSG are extracted using the R *morphomap* package v1.3 (Profico, Bondioli,
322 Raia, O’Higgins, & Marchi, 2020).

323 To resume, in both the femur and the pelvis the morpho-structural integration is analysed
324 through 2b-PLS of (Tables 4 and 5):

- 325 - Block 1: Procrustes coordinates/Allometric residuals (whole set) vs Block 2: Ix/Iy on
326 the entire diaphysis (61 sections)
- 327 - Block 1: Procrustes coordinates/Allometric residuals (whole set) vs Block 2: Imax/Imin
328 on the entire diaphysis (61 sections)
- 329 - Block 1: Procrustes coordinates/Allometric residuals (whole set) vs Block 2: Ix/Iy on
330 shaft portions (15 sections)
- 331 - Block 1: Procrustes coordinates/Allometric residuals (whole set) vs Block 2: Imax/Imin
332 on shaft portions (15 sections)
- 333 - Block 1: PC1/rPC1 vs Block 2: Ix/Iy on the entire diaphysis (61 sections)
- 334 - Block 1: PC1/rPC1 vs Block 2: Imax/Imin on the entire diaphysis (61 sections)
- 335 - Block 1: PC1/rPC1 vs Block 2: Ix/Iy on shaft portions (15 sections)
- 336 - Block 1: PC1/rPC1 vs Block 2: Imax/Imin on shaft portions (15 sections)
- 337 - Block 1: PC2/rPC2 vs Block 2: Ix/Iy on the entire diaphysis (61 sections)
- 338 - Block 1: PC2/rPC2 vs Block 2: Imax/Imin on the entire diaphysis (61 sections)
- 339 - Block 1: PC2/rPC2 vs Block 2: Ix/Iy on shaft portions (15 sections)
- 340 - Block 1: PC2/rPC2 vs Block 2: Imax/Imin on shaft portions (15 sections)

341 3 Results

342 The detailed results from the geometric morphometrics analyses and the CSG values are
343 presented in the supplementary material.

344 3.1 Morphological integration in the femur-pelvis module

345 CR analysis from Procrustes coordinates reveal the lowest value in humans and the highest
346 value in baboons (Table 2, Figure 2). Between taxa, humans show significant differences with
347 baboons and chimpanzees (Table 3). The CR effect size between baboons and chimpanzees is
348 not statistically significantly different (Table 3).

349 Analysis of CR from allometric residuals again produces the lowest values in humans and
350 higher values in baboons and chimpanzees (Table 2, Figure 2). Here, humans show significant
351 differences with baboons but not with chimpanzees and the CR effect size between baboons
352 and chimpanzees differs significantly (Table 3).

353

354
355

Table 2: Covariance Ratio based on data on the morphometric shape of the femur and the pelvis in each dataset. First line: CR based on Procrustes coordinates; second line in parentheses: CR based on allometric residuals.

Group	CR	p-value	Confidence Interval		CR effect size
<i>Homo</i>	0.5525 (0.573)	0.001 (0.001)	0.5694 (0.5756)	0.7919 (0.807)	-28.6216 (-28.6743)
<i>Papio</i>	0.7179 (0.7106)	0.001 (0.001)	0.7132 (0.71)	0.9307 (0.9079)	-24.9152 (-27.0324)
<i>Pan</i>	0.6758 (0.6422)	0.001 (0.001)	0.6476 (0.6219)	0.8647 (0.8409)	-26.7606 (-26.3538)

356

357
358

Table 3: CR effect size difference obtained for each pair of samples. First line: CR effect size difference from CR based on Procrustes coordinates; second line in parentheses: CR effect size difference from CR based on allometric residuals.

Pairs of samples	CR effect size difference	p-value
<i>Homo-Pan</i>	1.880 (0.186)	0.04 (0.853)
<i>Homo-Papio</i>	2.916 (2.6029)	0.004 (0.0092)
<i>Pan-Papio</i>	1.063 (2.305)	0.288 (0.021)

359

360

361 3.2 Morpho-structural integration

362 3.2.1 *Homo*

363 In humans, femoral morphology (entire set of Procrustes coordinates) covaries with Ix/Iy taken
364 from the entire diaphysis (Table 4). The femoral morphology also covaries with Ix/Iy locally in
365 the mid-distal and mid-proximal portions and with I_{max}/I_{min} locally in the proximal portion
366 (Table 4). When allometry is corrected, the integration between femoral morphology (entire set
367 of allometric residuals) and CSG is similar to that without correction (Table 4), since allometry
368 do not significantly affect femoral morphological variation in our human sample (predicted:
369 2.27%, $p = 0.87$). The morphology captured by the PC2 (not PC1) of the femoral morphometric
370 analysis covaries with both Ix/Iy and I_{max}/I_{min} taken from the entire diaphysis (Figure 2, Table
371 4). PC2 of the femur also covaries with Ix/Iy locally in the mid-distal, mid-proximal and
372 proximal portions and with I_{max}/I_{min} locally in the distal portion (Figure 2, Table 4). The PC2
373 of the femur represents variations in the neck-shaft angle, projection of the greater trochanter,
374 mediolateral curvature of the diaphysis and posterolateral projection of the lateral condyle
375 (Figure 2). When allometry is corrected, the integration between rPC2 and CSG is similar to
376 that with PC2 which captured the same morphology (Figure 2, Table 4).

377 Concerning the pelvis, pelvic morphology and pelvic morphology principal components do not
378 covary with any CSG, whether allometry is corrected or not (Table 5).

379 3.2.2 *Pan*

380 In *Pan* genus, femoral morphology does not covary with any CSG, whether the allometry is
381 corrected or not (Table 4). Conversely, PC1 of the femoral morphometric analysis covaries with
382 Ix/Iy taken from the entire diaphysis (Figure 2, Table 4). PC1 of the femur represents variation
383 in the superior-inferior projection of the epiphyses and height of the greater trochanter (Figure
384 2). When allometry is corrected (predicted: 2.90%, $p = 0.72$), the integration between rPC1 and
385 CSG is similar to that with PC1 which captured the same morphology (Figure 2). Additionally,
386 PC2 of the femoral morphometric analysis covaries with I_{max}/I_{min} when taken locally in the
387 mid-distal diaphysis (Figure 2, Table 4). PC2 of the femur represents variation in the femoral
388 head dimensions, anteroposterior and mediolateral curvatures, mediolateral width of the distal
389 epiphysis (Figure 2). When allometry is corrected, the integration between rPC2 and CSG is
390 similar to that with PC2 which captured the same morphology (Figure 2, Table 4).

391 Concerning the pelvic morphology, it covaries with I_{max}/I_{min} taken from the entire diaphysis
392 (Table 5). Allometry had a significant impact on pelvic morphology variation in the *Pan* sample
393 (predicted: 10.60%, $p = 0.007$). When allometry is corrected, the pelvic morphology does not
394 covary with any CSG when taken from the entire diaphysis (Table 5). Conversely, pelvic
395 morphology covaries with Ix/Iy when taken locally in the mid-distal diaphysis whether the
396 allometry is corrected or not. The PC1 of the pelvic morphometric analysis covaries with Ix/Iy
397 when taken from the entire diaphysis (Figure 3, Table 5). PC1 of the pelvis also covaries with
398 Ix/Iy locally in the mid-proximal and proximal portions and with I_{max}/I_{min} in the mid-
399 proximal diaphysis (Figure 3, Table 5). The PC1 of the pelvis represents variation in the
400 acetabulum width, length of the lower pubic ramus and width of the ilium (Figure 3). When
401 allometry is corrected, rPC do not covary with any CSG (Figure 3, Table 5).

403 In olive baboons, femoral morphology and femoral morphology principal components do not
404 covary with any CSG, whether allometry is corrected or not (Table 4).

405 Concerning the pelvic morphology, it does not covary with any CSG, whether allometry is
406 corrected or not (Table 5). However, the PC1 of the of the pelvic morphometric analysis
407 covaries with Ix/Iy but only locally in the mid-distal portion (Figure 3, Table 5). The PC1 of
408 the pelvis represents the length of the inferior pubic ramus, dimensions of the acetabulum and
409 the relative height of the sacro-lumbar joint (Figure 3). Although allometry do not significantly
410 affect the morphological variation of the pelvis in our baboon sample (predicted: 8.87%, $p =$
411 0.27), this specific and localized integration between PC1 and Ix/Iy is not present with rPC1
412 (Figure 3, Table 5).

413 *Table 4: Detailed results of the 2b-PLS tests between femoral geometric morphometrics data and cross-sectional geometry*
414 *parameters, measured on the whole diaphysis (the 61 sections between 20% and 80% of the biomechanical length) and on*
415 *diaphyseal portions (15 sections each). The Procrustes coordinates (or allometric residuals) provide overall external femoral*
416 *morphology, the principal components (PC or rPC) indicate a specific morphology depicted in supplementary materials*
417 *figures. First line: 2b-PLS based on Procrustes coordinates; second line in parentheses: 2b-PLS based on allometric residuals.*
418 *Highlighted boxes show the diaphyseal stages with a significant result, bold mentions represent significant 2b-PLS.*

Morphostructural integration: FEMUR vs CSG		Entire diaphysis		20% to 35% of length		35% to 50% of length		50% to 65% of length		65% to 80% of length	
		r-PLS	p-value	r-PLS	p-value	r-PLS	p-value	r-PLS	p-value	r-PLS	p-value
Femoral Procrust coordinates (allometric residuals) vs Ix/Iy	<i>Homo</i>	0.685 (0.707)	0.041 (0.024)	0.507 (0.45)	0.345 (0.504)	0.706 (0.738)	0.031 (0.017)	0.7 (0.716)	0.036 (0.02)	0.59 (0.606)	0.136 (0.094)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.553 (0.546)	0.981 (0.977)	0.55 (0.567)	0.904 (0.788)	0.561 (0.558)	0.871 (0.814)	0.623 (0.61)	0.688 (0.648)	0.747 (0.65)	0.177 (0.447)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.528 (0.448)	0.374 (0.713)	0.535 (0.443)	0.335 (0.666)	0.539 (0.514)	0.335 (0.395)	0.653 (0.465)	0.062 (0.572)	0.534 (0.438)	0.355 (0.704)
Femoral Procrust coordinates (allometric residuals) vs I _{max} /I _{min}	<i>Homo</i>	0.635 (0.632)	0.141 (0.136)	0.497 (0.492)	0.406 (0.403)	0.488 (0.468)	0.438 (0.462)	0.438 (0.413)	0.583 (0.644)	0.718 (0.752)	0.044 (0.026)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.706 (0.73)	0.519 (0.34)	0.633 (0.631)	0.641 (0.545)	0.638 (0.678)	0.622 (0.36)	0.674 (0.676)	0.478 (0.366)	0.667 (0.672)	0.501 (0.39)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.589 (0.493)	0.234 (0.643)	0.545 (0.487)	0.284 (0.495)	0.599 (0.49)	0.161 (0.49)	0.511 (0.383)	0.42 (0.907)	0.557 (0.531)	0.259 (0.287)
PC1 (rPC1) FEMUR vs Ix/Iy	<i>Homo</i>	0.126 (0.125)	0.974 (0.975)	0.098 (0.237)	0.904 (0.44)	0.132 (0.075)	0.831 (0.964)	0.052 (0.059)	0.951 (0.937)	0.107 (0.104)	0.876 (0.876)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.36 (0.42)	0.849 (0.648)	0.378 (0.4)	0.276 (0.248)	0.324 (0.389)	0.376 (0.253)	0.154 (0.203)	0.98 (0.894)	0.074 (0.14)	0.954 (0.985)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.546 (0.582)	0.028 (0.017)	0.42 (0.407)	0.075 (0.08)	0.293 (0.268)	0.189 (0.252)	0.214 (0.195)	0.428 (0.47)	0.195 (0.246)	0.433 (0.287)

PC1 (rPC1) FEMUR vs Imax/Imin	<i>Homo</i>	0.566 (0.566)	0.092 (0.089)	0.437 (0.417)	0.103 (0.123)	0.481 (0.472)	0.068 (0.078)	0.1 (0.108)	0.852 (0.823)	0.139 (0.12)	0.886 (0.936)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.55 (0.601)	0.238 (0.147)	0.412 (0.456)	0.24 (0.17)	0.529 (0.573)	0.074 (0.057)	0.463 (0.51)	0.195 (0.137)	0.337 (0.364)	0.415 (0.332)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.477 (0.478)	0.157 (0.15)	0.395 (0.384)	0.128 (0.131)	0.464 (0.46)	0.053 (0.054)	0.462 (0.473)	0.082 (0.067)	0.084 (0.098)	0.963 (0.923)
PC2 (rPC2) FEMUR vs Ix/Iy	<i>Homo</i>	0.586 (0.585)	0.018 (0.018)	0.343 (0.328)	0.21 (0.241)	0.604 (0.615)	0.017 (0.014)	0.606 (0.605)	0.012 (0.008)	0.466 (0.458)	0.044 (0.047)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.442 (0.452)	0.529 (0.508)	0.462 (0.54)	0.157 (0.076)	0.255 (0.277)	0.532 (0.48)	0.423 (0.43)	0.231 (0.215)	0.353 (0.368)	0.437 (0.4)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.31 (0.288)	0.417 (0.492)	0.192 (0.187)	0.584 (0.592)	0.128 (0.112)	0.679 (0.742)	0.318 (0.295)	0.183 (0.765)	0.324 (0.299)	0.164 (0.215)
PC2 (rPC2) FEMUR vs Imax/Imin	<i>Homo</i>	0.66 (0.646)	0.025 (0.025)	0.51 (0.485)	0.043 (0.061)	0.356 (0.35)	0.261 (0.276)	0.243 (0.242)	0.37 (0.379)	0.51 (0.516)	0.113 (0.107)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.516 (0.522)	0.357 (0.343)	0.446 (0.537)	0.166 (0.077)	0.208 (0.215)	0.74 (0.723)	0.277 (0.297)	0.682 (0.627)	0.453 (0.463)	0.195 (0.181)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.425 (0.425)	0.251 (0.253)	0.26 (0.258)	0.389 (0.396)	0.56 (0.579)	0.01 (0.007)	0.196 (0.197)	0.664 (0.657)	0.157 (0.159)	0.714 (0.703)

419

420

421 Table 5: Detailed results of the 2b-PLS tests between pelvic geometric morphometrics data and cross-sectional geometry
 422 parameters, measured on the whole diaphysis (the 61 sections between 20% and 80% of the biomechanical length) and on
 423 diaphyseal portions (15 sections each). The Procrustes coordinates (or allometric residuals) provide overall external pelvic
 424 morphology, the principal components (PC or rPC) indicate a specific morphology depicted in supplementary materials
 425 figures. First line: 2b-PLS based on Procrustes coordinates; second line in parentheses: 2b-PLS based on allometric residuals.
 426 Highlighted boxes show the diaphyseal stages with a significant result, bold mentions represent significant 2b-PLS.

Morphostructural integration: PELVIS vs CSG		Entire diaphysis		20% to 35% of length		35% to 50% of length		50% to 65% of length		65% to 80% of length	
		r-PLS	p-value	r-PLS	p-value	r-PLS	p-value	r-PLS	p-value	r-PLS	p-value
Pelvic Procrust coordinates (allometric residuals) vs Ix/Iy	<i>Homo</i>	0.66 (0.662)	0.829 (0.778)	0.769 (0.65)	0.287 (0.796)	0.673 (0.654)	0.768 (0.811)	0.623 (0.615)	0.929 (0.918)	0.708 (0.692)	0.611 (0.632)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.82 (0.734)	0.476 (0.811)	0.822 (0.816)	0.318 (0.207)	0.84 (0.646)	0.214 (0.922)	0.864 (0.746)	0.131 (0.574)	0.743 (0.738)	0.737 (0.612)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.711 (0.774)	0.307 (0.158)	0.67 (0.724)	0.473 (0.332)	0.835 (0.856)	0.013 (0.007)	0.714 (0.739)	0.3 (0.282)	0.719 (0.69)	0.304 (0.538)
Pelvic Procrust coordinates (allometric residuals) vs I _{max} /I _{min}	<i>Homo</i>	0.707 (0.696)	0.648 (0.642)	0.687 (0.67)	0.73 (0.721)	0.672 (0.687)	0.748 (0.617)	0.734 (0.702)	0.468 (0.562)	0.761 (0.717)	0.356 (0.525)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.664 (0.657)	0.987 (0.973)	0.714 (0.722)	0.873 (0.696)	0.815 (0.686)	0.352 (0.812)	0.662 (0.645)	0.967 (0.915)	0.699 (0.697)	0.905 (0.773)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.81 (0.809)	0.031 (0.053)	0.695 (0.702)	0.353 (0.44)	0.651 (0.756)	0.572 (0.187)	0.723 (0.764)	0.241 (0.15)	0.678 (0.722)	0.479 (0.38)
PC1 (rPC1) PELVIS vs Ix/Iy	<i>Homo</i>	0.429 (0.433)	0.141 (0.143)	0.412 (0.211)	0.105 (0.534)	0.455 (0.389)	0.073 (0.158)	0.264 (0.346)	0.272 (0.157)	0.304 (0.433)	0.257 (0.077)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.535 (0.432)	0.26 (0.561)	0.577 (0.224)	0.04 (0.704)	0.271 (0.209)	0.467 (0.717)	0.445 (0.284)	0.176 (0.588)	0.514 (0.569)	0.112 (0.077)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.537 (0.402)	0.029 (0.166)	0.213 (0.216)	0.481 (0.464)	0.225 (0.139)	0.354 (0.625)	0.463 (0.364)	0.031 (0.107)	0.505 (0.411)	0.013 (0.076)
PC1 (rPC1) PELVIS vs I _{max} /I _{min}	<i>Homo</i>	0.482 (0.374)	0.204 (0.558)	0.318 (0.375)	0.314 (0.197)	0.232 (0.239)	0.592 (0.564)	0.098 (0.138)	0.864 (0.732)	0.438 (0.465)	0.162 (0.115)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.484 (0.519)	0.419 (0.332)	0.232 (0.265)	0.667 (0.553)	0.412 (0.339)	0.198 (0.361)	0.431 (0.449)	0.268 (0.222)	0.404 (0.447)	0.272 (0.183)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.411 (0.415)	0.291 (0.286)	0.161 (0.238)	0.755 (0.456)	0.209 (0.08)	0.47 (0.93)	0.488 (0.34)	0.035 (0.252)	0.262 (0.259)	0.35 (0.334)
PC2 (rPC2) PELVIS vs Ix/Iy	<i>Homo</i>	0.286 (0.256)	0.576 (0.653)	0.449 (0.263)	0.066 (0.353)	0.209 (0.099)	0.637 (0.937)	0.173 (0.157)	0.549 (0.59)	0.201 (0.207)	0.555 (0.538)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.422 (0.423)	0.625 (0.616)	0.425 (0.426)	0.211 (0.21)	0.257 (0.267)	0.577 (0.54)	0.251 (0.253)	0.747 (0.737)	0.277 (0.278)	0.672 (0.674)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.174 (0.227)	0.841 (0.647)	0.192 (0.296)	0.542 (0.242)	0.118 (0.141)	0.725 (0.614)	0.155 (0.152)	0.65 (0.687)	0.143 (0.169)	0.63 (0.535)
	<i>Homo</i>	0.409	0.426	0.378	0.208	0.074	0.985	0.106	0.843	0.11	0.882

PC2 (rPC2) PELVIS vs Imax/Imin		(0.366)	(0.601)	(0.313)	(0.349)	(0.201)	(0.7)	(0.255)	(0.352)	(0.375)	(0.316)
	<i>Papio</i>	0.395 (0.39)	0.726 (0.732)	0.304 (0.306)	0.478 (0.474)	0.432 (0.423)	0.199 (0.216)	0.199 (0.2)	0.885 (0.88)	0.176 (0.257)	0.855 (0.652)
	<i>Pan</i>	0.348 (0.343)	0.496 (0.514)	0.145 (0.284)	0.808 (0.339)	0.216 (0.202)	0.415 (0.493)	0.361 (0.29)	0.195 (0.373)	0.332 (0.273)	0.165 (0.311)

427

428 Our results suggest that the magnitude of morphological integration within the femur-pelvis
429 module is higher in baboons than in humans while intermediate in chimpanzees (Figure 4). In
430 the latter, the magnitude of morphological integration falls closer to baboons when allometry is
431 not corrected, and closer to humans when allometry is corrected. Morpho-structural integration
432 is not significantly present in baboons, more often present and with higher magnitude in humans
433 (at least concerning the femur) and appears to be intermediate in chimpanzees (Figure 4).
434 Among the groups, different integration strategies for phenotypic variation can be depicted,
435 depending on whether integration is more morphologically based or more morpho-structurally
436 based: the weaker the morphological integration, the higher morpho-structural integration
437 seems to be.

438 4 Discussion

439 4.1 Patterns of integration and positional repertoires

440 4.1.1 *Papio*

441 Among baboons, the femur-pelvis module exhibits a relatively high magnitude of
442 morphological integration. Baboons and other primates mainly engage in quadrupedal
443 locomotion; also it is the most extensive locomotor mode among non-primate mammal species,
444 and has been considered as ancestral locomotor mode of primates when compared to its derived
445 form in knuckle-walking, or to other more recent locomotor behaviours such as bipedalism
446 (Hunter, 2016; Richmond, Begun, & Strait, 2001; Simpson, Latimer, & Lovejoy, 2018;
447 Thompson, Rubinstein, & Larson, 2018; Thorpe, Holder, & Crompton, 2007). Although
448 quadrupedalism in primates differs from that in other mammals (e.g. diagonal gaits and
449 compliant walk, see Shapiro and Raichlen, 2006; Schmitt, 1999), this mode is considered as a
450 conservative locomotor mode. This conservative nature of quadrupedalism in several primate
451 species could therefore be reflected into a highly integrated morphology in of appendicular
452 skeleton. Conversely, morpho-structural integration within the femur-pelvis module is not
453 statistically detected among baboons (Figure 4).

454 In the context of a terrestrial quadrupedal primate, integration within the femur-pelvis module
455 likely relies on the coordination of morphological variations, and not (or very little) on
456 structural parameters. Since terrestrial quadrupedal gait in baboons leads to a balanced loading
457 between forelimbs and hindlimbs (Druelle et al., 2019), an interesting perspective would be to
458 also evaluate the patterns of integration in the forelimb. In comparison, macaques that are
459 predominantly arboreal quadrupeds and which engage in more frequent leaping behaviours that
460 predominantly load the hindlimb, present higher magnitude of morphological integration within
461 the pelvis-femur module than within the scapula-humerus module (Conaway et al., 2018).
462 Macaques also exhibit more pronounced femoral bending rigidity than baboons (Burr,

463 Piotrowski, & Miller, 1981; Ruff, 2003). The prevalence of hindlimb dominance in both
464 morphological integration and internal structure in macaques suggests potential morpho-
465 structural integration in the hindlimbs among quadrupedal primates displaying a more
466 pronounced hindlimb dominance than baboons. However, the patterns of integration in the fore-
467 and hind limb of more arboreal and terrestrial quadrupedal primates need to be investigated to
468 draw further conclusions.

469 4.1.2 *Pan*

470 Among chimpanzees, the magnitude of morphological integration is intermediate between
471 baboons and humans. It is closer to baboons when allometry is present, and closer to humans
472 when allometry is corrected. Morpho-structural integration occurs mainly between the CSG and
473 the pelvic morphology, and most notably in the proximal $\frac{3}{4}$ of the diaphysis, where the
474 diaphyseal sections show much greater mediolateral cortical distribution than in baboons and
475 humans. This means that the mediolateral orientation of the cortical bone in the femora of
476 chimpanzees (as in other apes but not humans, e.g. Carlson et al., 2006; Nadell et al., 2021;
477 Lauren A. Sarringhaus et al., 2016) is related to the morphology of the pelvis, more specifically
478 to pubis length and to ilium and acetabulum width. However, these traits are highly dependent
479 on body size and mass (Moffett, 2021). The reasons for this allometric relationship in the *Pan*
480 genus are not necessarily related to the positional repertoire, and further investigations are
481 needed, particularly into the possible influence of sexual dimorphism on morpho-structural
482 integration. Some femoral traits, including the proportions of the femoral head and distal
483 epiphysis, are also related to the CSG of the proximal diaphysis and not influenced by size. This
484 morpho-structural integration occurs once again precisely where diaphyseal cross-sections
485 show more prominent mediolateral cortical distribution than in baboons and humans (Figures
486 2, 3, S1 and S2).

487 In the context of a semi-arboreal positional repertoire dominated by knuckle-walking,
488 chimpanzees show both morphological and morpho-structural integration that includes specific
489 femoral and pelvic morphological traits. As discussed for the baboons, the difference in limb
490 loading can potentially explain these patterns of integration. In chimpanzees, the hindlimb is
491 more loaded than the forelimb during knuckle-walking gait (Druelle et al., 2018; Schoonaert,
492 D'Août and Aerts, 2007). Therefore, both external morphology and internal structure of the
493 hindlimb might covariate to better respond to this asymmetric limb loading pattern. However,
494 both the magnitude of morphological integration and the presence of morpho-structural
495 integration in *Pan* are attenuated when the allometry is corrected, which greatly limits further
496 interpretations.

497 4.1.3 *Homo*

498 Among humans, the femur-pelvis module shows a relatively low magnitude of morphological
499 integration. This is probably due to differences in the selective pressures on the pelvis and the
500 femur. While the femoral morphology largely depends on locomotion, the pelvic morphology
501 of modern humans is constrained by both locomotion and parturition (Frémondrière, Thollon,
502 & Marchal, 2021; Grabowski, 2013; Huseynov et al., 2016; Ruff, 2017; Tardieu, 1994). Among
503 primates, intra-pelvic morphological integration has been described as limited (Lewton, 2012).
504 In humans, a low magnitude of morphological integration in the obstetric pelvis when compared
505 to the locomotor pelvis led to interpret a low phenotypic covariation in the entire pelvis
506 relatively to other primates (Grabowski, 2013; Ricklan, Decrausaz, Wells, & Stock, 2021). It is

507 therefore likely that pelvic morphology in humans is the product of different selection pressures.
508 Similarly, the distinct selective pressures relative to functional distinction between the pelvis
509 and the femur in humans probably results the reduced magnitude of morphological integration
510 between the two elements that our results highlight. Moreover, some authors have shown that
511 in humans, pelvic morphology displays integration with other anatomical areas. Examples
512 include elements of the shoulder girdle and rib cage (Agosto & Auerbach, 2022; Torres-Tamayo
513 et al., 2020), and even proposed covariation with skull size in relation to obstetrical selection
514 pressure (Fischer & Mitteroecker, 2015). Comparable morphological integrations are not
515 documented in chimpanzees and baboons.

516 Concerning morpho-structural integration, it occurs with high magnitude between the CSG and
517 femoral morphology. It is particularly present in the proximal $\frac{3}{4}$ of the diaphysis, where the
518 CSG exhibit anteroposterior cortical distribution, a specific feature of modern humans (Ruff &
519 Hayes, 1983; Trinkaus & Ruff, 1999, 2012). It has been hypothesized that a large biacetabular
520 width and a long femoral neck tend to increase mediolateral cortical distribution (relatively to
521 anteroposterior) in the femoral shaft in hominins (Ruff, 1995). Our results suggest that the
522 anteroposterior distribution of cortical bone in the human femoral diaphysis is associated with
523 morphological traits such as neck-shaft angle, orientation of the femoral head and diaphyseal
524 curvature.

525 In the context of bipedal/orthograde locomotion, loads are all transmitted through the lower
526 limb at some point. Patterns of integration within the human femur-pelvis module seem to rely
527 more on strong coordination between variations in the internal structure and morphology of the
528 femur, without integrating pelvic morphology.

529 4.2 The significance of morpho-structural integration

530 Highlighting morpho-structural integration in groups with distinct positional repertoires
531 enabled us to describe (1) the presence of an elaborate type of covariation that does not rely
532 solely on morphological traits (2) different strategies producing integration patterns in the
533 femur-pelvis module, which are strictly morphological in baboons and morpho-structural in
534 humans, and (3) a positive correlation between the presence of morpho-structural integration
535 and hindlimb stress during locomotion.

536 Our results suggest that morpho-structural integration is found at the mid and proximal
537 diaphysis, which is precisely where CSG are distinctive between our groups (see Figure 2, 3
538 and in supplementary). Conversely, the CSG of the distal diaphysis are not distinctive, either in
539 our sample or in all catarrhines (Nadell, 2017). This suggests fewer mechanical stresses on the
540 distal diaphysis when compared to the mid and proximal shaft. It is likely, however, that few
541 variations in CSG or in morphology variables disabled the detection of morpho-structural
542 integration. In baboons for example, CSG exhibit three times less variation than in humans at
543 the mid-proximal diaphysis (see Table S1, and see also Cosnefroy et al., 2022; Puymerail,
544 2011). A low CSG variation at intraspecies level and in some diaphyseal portions probably
545 limits their covariation with morphometric data. As a result, morpho-structural integration is
546 not discernible.

547 Caution might be needed in the interpretation of morpho-structural results, since this study
548 constitutes the first attempt to measure this. For instance, the approach used to evaluate morpho-
549 structural integration using 2b-PLS on Procrustes coordinates or allometric residuals and cross-

550 sectional properties present a high p/N ratio because of the relatively low samples size and high
551 numbers of morphometric variables (O’Keefe, Meachen, & Polly, 2022). For example, in
552 humans the p/N ratio is about 50.74 for the morpho-structural integration between CSG and the
553 pelvic morphology and about 48.53 for the morpho-structural integration between CSG and the
554 femoral morphology. However, the approach presented in this study to measure morpho-
555 structural integration between CSG and principal component scores from the geometric
556 morphometric analysis presents several noteworthy advantages. From a statistical perspective,
557 this approach considerably reduces the p/N ratio (about 3.27 in humans for morpho-structural
558 integration between CSG and a single PC/rPC, and even lower if CSG are only taken from
559 diaphyseal portions of 15% of length). This reduction enhances the reliability of 2b-PLS results
560 interpretation. Importantly also, employing PC/rPC scores to assess their integration with CSG
561 provides clear and precise representation of the specific morphological variations on the
562 skeleton associated with distinct variation in structural properties (Figures 2 and 3). Therefore,
563 morpho-structural integration between PC/rPC and CSG represents a promising approach to
564 understanding complex anatomical variations, offering future perspectives for a comprehensive
565 examination of the form-function relationship (Murray, 2022).

566 As an example, the measurement of morpho-structural integration using CSG and PC/rPC helps
567 us to describe the potential connection between the anteroposterior reinforcement observed in
568 the shaft and curvature in the modern human femur. This results implies that this unique
569 structural feature of *Homo sapiens* among both extant primates and fossil hominins (e.g.
570 Carlson et al., 2006; Ruff, 2002a; Trinkaus & Ruff, 2012) covary with the variation in femoral
571 curvature and epiphyseal shape, which are two morphological features respectively associated
572 with developmental loading resistance during locomotion (e.g. Bertram & Biewener, 1988; De
573 Groote, 2011; Milne & Granatosky, 2021; Shackelford & Trinkaus, 2002) and the response to
574 bipedal mechanical stimuli during growth (e.g. Shefelbine et al., 2002; Tardieu, 1994, 1999).
575 This specific example of morpho-structural integration in modern humans implies a distinct
576 adaptation and potential complex selective pressure in the human femur that might contribute
577 to distinctive bipedal specialization.

578 Also, extending the morpho-structural integration approach to other anatomical regions, such
579 as the scapula-humerus module, as well as to other taxa and locomotor groups, would also
580 clarify the interpretations presented in this study.

581 Conclusion

582 Our study explores, for the first time, the integration between external morphology and internal
583 structural properties in the postcranial skeleton and their link to positional repertoires. Our
584 results corroborate the presence of stronger morphological integration of elements in the femur-
585 pelvis module in cercopithecoids than in hominoids. In baboons, the patterns of integration
586 appears to be based solely on morphology since morphological integration is high and while
587 morpho-structural integration is not statistically detected. In chimpanzees, morpho-structural
588 integration between internal structure of the femoral diaphysis and the morphology of both
589 femur and pelvis seem to be integrated. Nevertheless, both morphological and morpho-
590 structural integration seem to be largely related to the allometry measured within the pelvis
591 among chimpanzees. In humans, the various selective pressures that tend to affect pelvic
592 morphology led to a decrease in morphological integration in the femur-pelvis module.

593 Conversely, measures of morpho-structural integration reveal strong covariation between
594 internal structure and morphology within the femur in humans. The results on morpho-
595 structural integration in the human femur provides valuable insights and constitutes a basis for
596 future investigations into the form-function paradigm by using a more comprehensive
597 perspective than traditionally employed methods. Further exploration of the relationship
598 between the internal structure and morphological traits of the femur, such as femoral curvature,
599 would be of particular interest for studies taking an evolutionary perspective.

600 Acknowledgements

601 This research is realized in the frame of a doctoral contract of the Aix-Marseille University,
602 Doctoral School ED251. Additional financial support for the data acquisition was provided by
603 the CNRS-INEE International Research Network no. GDRI0870 Bipedal Equilibrium and the
604 French National Agency ANR-18-CE27-0010-01 HoBiS. The authors wish to thank CT-scan
605 providers: the Pôle Imagerie Médicale de l'Assistance Publique des Hôpitaux de Marseille
606 (Marseille, France), the Centre Européen de Recherche en Imagerie Médicale (Marseille,
607 France), Voxscan (Dommartin, France), the Primate Research Institute (Kyoto, Japan) and the
608 American Museum of Natural History (NYC, USA). The authors want to thank the Royal
609 Museum of Central Africa (Tervuren, Belgium) for providing access to the primate collection
610 of the institute. The authors also warmly thank Ilona Bossanyi for her proofreading of the
611 language, and Lisa Gaignard and Aurore Issartel for their help in the data acquisition. Finally,
612 the authors also wish to thank Nicole Torres-Tamayo for her constructive comments and
613 feedback.

614 Orcid

615 Quentin Cosnefroy: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3033-8734>

616 Gilles Berillon: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7159-3104>

617 François Marchal : <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7479-2360>

618 Conflict of interest

619 The authors declare no competing interest.

620 Data availability statement

621 R-script and datasets including Procrustes coordinates, PC scores, allometric residuals, rPC
622 scores and CSG values are available on GitHub at [https://github.com/QCosnefroy/Morpho-
623 structural-integration](https://github.com/QCosnefroy/Morpho-structural-integration).

624 References

- 625 Ackermann, R. R. (2009). Morphological Integration and the Interpretation of Fossil Hominin
626 Diversity. *Evolutionary Biology*, 36(1), 149-156. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-009-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-009-9050-2)
627 9050-2
- 628 Adams, D. C. (2016). Evaluating modularity in morphometric data : Challenges with the RV
629 coefficient and a new test measure. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 7(5), 565-572.
630 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12511>
- 631 Adams, D. C., Collyer, M., Kaliontzopoulou, A., & Sherratt, E. (2016). *geomorph : Software*
632 *for geometric morphometric analyses*. Consulté à l'adresse [https://rune-](https://runeuat.une.edu.au/web/handle/1959.11/21330)
633 uat.une.edu.au/web/handle/1959.11/21330
- 634 Adams, D. C., & Collyer, M. L. (2016). On the comparison of the strength of morphological
635 integration across morphometric datasets. *Evolution*, 70(11), 2623-2631.
636 <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13045>
- 637 Adams, D. C., & Collyer, M. L. (2018). Multivariate Phylogenetic Comparative Methods :
638 Evaluations, Comparisons, and Recommendations. *Systematic Biology*, 67(1), 14-31.
639 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syx055>
- 640 Adams, D. C., & Collyer, M. L. (2019). Comparing the strength of modular signal, and
641 evaluating alternative modular hypotheses, using covariance ratio effect sizes with
642 morphometric data. *Evolution*, 73(12), 2352-2367. <https://doi.org/10.1111/evo.13867>
- 643 Agosto, E. R., & Auerbach, B. M. (2022). Morphological integration and evolutionary potential
644 of the primate shoulder : Variation among taxa and implications for genetic covariances
645 with the basicranium, pelvis, and arm. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 169, 103221.
646 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2022.103221>

- 647 Baken, E. K., Collyer, M. L., Kaliontzopoulou, A., & Adams, D. C. (2021). geomorph v4.0 and
648 gmShiny: Enhanced analytics and a new graphical interface for a comprehensive
649 morphometric experience. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 12(12), 2355-2363.
650 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13723>
- 651 Bastir, M., García-Martínez, D., Williams, S. A., Recheis, W., Torres-Sánchez, I., Ríó, F. G.,
652 Oishi, M., Ogihara, N. (2017). 3D geometric morphometrics of thorax variation and
653 allometry in Hominoidea. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 113, 10-23.
654 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2017.08.002>
- 655 Berillon, G., Daver, G., D'Août, K., Nicolas, G., de la Villetanet, B., Multon, F., Digrandi, G.,
656 Dubreuil, G. (2010). Bipedal versus Quadrupedal Hind Limb and Foot Kinematics in a
657 Captive Sample of *Papio anubis*: Setup and Preliminary Results. *International Journal*
658 *of Primatology*, 31(2), 159-180. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-010-9398-2>
- 659 Bertram, J. E. A., & Biewener, A. A. (1988). Bone curvature: Sacrificing strength for load
660 predictability? *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 131(1), 75-92.
661 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193\(88\)80122-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-5193(88)80122-X)
- 662 Biewener, A. A., & Taylor, C. R. (1986). Bone strain: A determinant of gait and speed?
663 *Journal of Experimental Biology*, (123), 383-400.
- 664 Bookstein, F. L. (1992). *Morphometric Tools for Landmark Data: Geometry and Biology* (1^{re}
665 éd.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511573064>
- 666 Bookstein, F. L. (1996). Biometrics, biomathematics and the morphometric synthesis. *Bulletin*
667 *of Mathematical Biology*, 58(2), 313-365. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02458311>
- 668 Bookstein, F. L. (2017). A method of factor analysis for shape coordinates. *American Journal*
669 *of Physical Anthropology*, 164(2), 221-245. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23277>

670 Boulinguez-Ambroise, G., Herrel, A., Berillon, G., Young, J. W., Cornette, R., Meguerditchian,
671 A., Cazeau, C., Bellaiche, L., Pouydebat, E. (2021). Increased performance in juvenile
672 baboons is consistent with ontogenetic changes in morphology. *American Journal of*
673 *Physical Anthropology*, 175(3), 546-558. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24235>

674 Burr, D. B., Piotrowski, G., & Miller, G. J. (1981). Structural strength of the macaque femur.
675 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 54(3), 305-319.

676 Burr, D. B., Ruff, C. B., & Johnson, C. (1989). Structural adaptations of the femur and humerus
677 to arboreal and terrestrial environments in three species of macaque. *American Journal*
678 *of Physical Anthropology*, 79, 357-367. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330790312>

679 Carlson, K. J. (2005). Investigating the form-function interface in African apes : Relationships
680 between principal moments of area and positional behaviors in femoral and humeral
681 diaphyses. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 127(3), 312-334.

682 Carlson, K. J., Doran-Sheehy, D. M., Hunt, K. D., Nishida, T., Yamanaka, A., & Boesch, C.
683 (2006). Locomotor behavior and long bone morphology in individual free-ranging
684 chimpanzees. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 50(4), 394-404.
685 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2005.10.004>

686 Cheverud, J. M. (1996). Developmental Integration and the Evolution of Pleiotropy. *American*
687 *Zoologist*, 36(1), 44-50. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/36.1.44>

688 Conaway, M. A., Schroeder, L., & von Cramon-Taubadel, N. (2018). Morphological
689 integration of anatomical, developmental, and functional postcranial modules in the
690 crab-eating macaque (*Macaca fascicularis*). *American Journal of Physical*
691 *Anthropology*, 166(3), 661-670. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23456>

692 Conaway, M. A., & von Cramon-Taubadel, N. (2022). Morphological integration of the
693 hominoid postcranium. *Journal of Human Evolution*, *171*, 103239.
694 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2022.103239>

695 Cosnefroy, Q., Marchal, F., Bellaiche, L., Carlier, R., Cazeau, C., Lamberton, F., Perrier, A.,
696 Theil, J-C., Berillon, G. (2022). Do femoral biomechanical properties follow locomotor
697 changes in primates? An ontogenetic study of olive baboons (*Papio anubis*). *American*
698 *Journal of Biological Anthropology*, *179*(2), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24629>

699 Cowgill, L., Harrington, L., MacKinnon, M., & Kurki, H. K. (2023). Gains in relative cortical
700 area during growth and their relationship to nutrition, body size, and physical activity.
701 *American Journal of Biological Anthropology*, *ajpa.24805*.
702 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24805>

703 D'Aout, K., Vereecke, E., Schoonaert, K., De Clercq, D., Van Elsacker, L., & Aerts, P. (2004).
704 Locomotion in bonobos (*Pan paniscus*): Differences and similarities between bipedal
705 and quadrupedal terrestrial walking, and a comparison with other locomotor modes.
706 *Journal of Anatomy*, *204*(5), 353-361. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8782.2004.00292.x)
707 [8782.2004.00292.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-8782.2004.00292.x)

708 Daver, G., Guy, F., Mackaye, H. T., Likius, A., Boisserie, J.-R., Moussa, A., Pallas, L.,
709 Vignaud, P., Clarisse, N. D. (2022). Postcranial evidence of late Miocene hominin
710 bipedalism in Chad. *Nature*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-022-04901-z>

711 De Groote, I. (2011). Femoral curvature in Neanderthals and modern humans: A 3D geometric
712 morphometric analysis. *Journal of Human Evolution*, *60*(5), 540-548.

713 Demes, B., Jungers, W. L., & Selpien, K. (1991). Body size, locomotion, and long bone cross-
714 sectional geometry in indriid primates. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*,
715 *86*(4), 537-547.

716 Doran, D. M. (1992). The ontogeny of chimpanzee and pygmy chimpanzee locomotor
717 behavior : A case study of paedomorphism and its behavioral correlates. *Journal of*
718 *Human Evolution*, 23(2), 139-157. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2484\(92\)90104-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2484(92)90104-H)

719 Doran, D. M. (1997). Ontogeny of locomotion in mountain gorillas and chimpanzees. *Journal*
720 *of Human Evolution*, 32(4), 323-344. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jhev.1996.0095>

721 Druelle, F. (2017). *Locomotor anatomy and behaviour in olive baboons : Intergrative analysis*
722 *from early infancy to autonomy*. Univeristeit Antwerpen, Antwerp.

723 Druelle, F., Aerts, P., & Berillon, G. (2017). The origin of bipedality as the result of a
724 developmental by-product: The case study of the olive baboon (*Papio anubis*). *Journal*
725 *of Human Evolution*, 113, 155-161. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2017.07.010>

726 Druelle, F., Aerts, P., D'Août, K., Moulin, V., & Berillon, G. (2017). Segmental morphometrics
727 of the olive baboon (*Papio anubis*) : A longitudinal study from birth to adulthood.
728 *Journal of Anatomy*, 230(6), 805-819. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12602>

729 Druelle, F., Schoonaert, K., Aerts, P., Nauwelaerts, S., Stevens, J. M. G., & D'Août, K. (2018).
730 Segmental morphometrics of bonobos (*Pan paniscus*) : Are they really different from
731 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*)? *Journal of Anatomy*, 233(6), 843-853.
732 <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12894>

733 Evans, K. M., Larouche, O., Watson, S.-J., Farina, S., Habegger, M. L., & Friedman, M. (2021).
734 Integration drives rapid phenotypic evolution in flatfishes. *Proceedings of the National*
735 *Academy of Sciences*, 118(18), e2101330118. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2101330118>

736 Fabre, A.-C., Goswami, A., Peigné, S., & Cornette, R. (2014). Morphological integration in the
737 forelimb of musteloid carnivorans. *Journal of Anatomy*, 225(1), 19-30.
738 <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12194>

- 739 Fischer, B., & Mitteroecker, P. (2015). Covariation between human pelvis shape, stature, and
740 head size alleviates the obstetric dilemma. *Proceedings of the National Academy of*
741 *Sciences*, 112(18), 5655-5660. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1420325112>
- 742 Frémondrière, P., Thollon, L., & Marchal, F. (2021). Pelvic and neonatal size correlations in
743 light of evolutionary hypotheses. *American Journal of Human Biology*.
744 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23619>
- 745 Frost, H. M. (2001). From Wolff's law to the Utah paradigm : Insights about bone physiology
746 and its clinical applications. *The Anatomical Record*, 262(4), 398-419.
747 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.1049>
- 748 Goswami, A., Smaers, J. B., Soligo, C., & Polly, P. D. (2014). The macroevolutionary
749 consequences of phenotypic integration: From development to deep time.
750 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 369(1649),
751 20130254. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2013.0254>
- 752 Goswami, Anjali, & Polly, P. D. (2010). Methods for Studying Morphological Integration and
753 Modularity. *The Paleontological Society Papers*, 16, 213-243.
754 <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1089332600001881>
- 755 Grabowski, M. W. (2013). Hominin Obstetrics and the Evolution of Constraints. *Evolutionary*
756 *Biology*, 40(1), 57-75. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-012-9174-7>
- 757 Gunz, P., Mitteroecker, P., & Bookstein, F. L. (2005). Semilandmarks in Three Dimensions. In
758 D. E. Slice (Éd.), *Modern Morphometrics in Physical Anthropology* (p. 73-98). New
759 York: Kluwer Academic Publishers-Plenum Publishers. [https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-](https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-27614-9_3)
760 [27614-9_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/0-387-27614-9_3)
- 761 Hallgrímsson, B., Jamniczky, H., Young, N. M., Rolian, C., Parsons, T. E., Boughner, J. C., &
762 Marcucio, R. S. (2009). Deciphering the Palimpsest: Studying the Relationship

763 Between Morphological Integration and Phenotypic Covariation. *Evolutionary Biology*,
764 36(4), 355-376. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-009-9076-5>

765 Hallgrímsson, B., Willmore, K., & Hall, B. K. (2002). Canalization, developmental stability,
766 and morphological integration in primate limbs. *American Journal of Physical*
767 *Anthropology*, 119(S35), 131-158. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10182>

768 Hanot, P., Herrel, A., Guintard, C., & Cornette, R. (2018). The impact of artificial selection on
769 morphological integration in the appendicular skeleton of domestic horses. *Journal of*
770 *Anatomy*, 232(4), 657-673. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12772>

771 Hansen, H. L., Bredbenner, T. L., Nicoletta, D. P., Mahaney, M. C., & Havill, L. M. (2009).
772 Cross-sectional geometry of the femoral midshaft in baboons is heritable. *Bone*, 45,
773 892-897. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bone.2009.05.028>

774 Hansen, T. F., & Houle, D. (2008). Measuring and comparing evolvability and constraint in
775 multivariate characters. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 21(5), 1201-1219.
776 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2008.01573.x>

777 Hunt, K. D. (1992). Positional behavior of Pan troglodytes in the Mahale Mountains and Gombe
778 Stream National Parks, Tanzania. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 87(1),
779 83-105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330870108>

780 Hunt, K. D. (2016). Why are there apes? Evidence for the co-evolution of ape and monkey
781 ecomorphology. *Journal of Anatomy*, 228(4), 630-685.
782 <https://doi.org/10.1111/joa.12454>

783 Huseynov, A., Zollikofer, C. P. E., Coudyzer, W., Gascho, D., Kellenberger, C., Hinzpeter, R.,
784 & Ponce de León, M. S. (2016). Developmental evidence for obstetric adaptation of the
785 human female pelvis. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(19),
786 5227-5232. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1517085113>

- 787 Janin, K. G. R. (2021). *The role of modularity and integration in shaping primate pelvic girdle*
788 *evolution*. University of Cambridge, Wolfson College.
- 789 Jung, H., Simons, E. A., & von Cramon-Taubadel, N. (2021). Examination of magnitudes of
790 integration in the catarrhine vertebral column. *Journal of Human Evolution*, *156*,
791 102998. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2021.102998>
- 792 Klingenberg, C. P. (2008). Morphological Integration and Developmental Modularity. *Annual*
793 *Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics*, *39*(1), 115-132.
794 <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.37.091305.110054>
- 795 Klingenberg, C. P. (2009). Morphometric integration and modularity in configurations of
796 landmarks : Tools for evaluating a priori hypotheses. *Evolution & Development*, *11*(4),
797 405-421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1525-142X.2009.00347.x>
- 798 Klingenberg, C. P. (2011). MorphoJ: An integrated software package for geometric
799 morphometrics. *Molecular Ecology Resources*, *11*(2), 353-357.
800 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1755-0998.2010.02924.x>
- 801 Klingenberg, C. P., & Marugán-Lobón, J. (2013). Evolutionary Covariation in Geometric
802 Morphometric Data : Analyzing Integration, Modularity, and Allometry in a
803 Phylogenetic Context. *Systematic Biology*, *62*(4), 591-610.
804 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syt025>
- 805 Komza, K., Viola, B., Netten, T., & Schroeder, L. (2022). Morphological integration in the
806 hominid midfoot. *Journal of Human Evolution*, *170*, 103231.
807 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2022.103231>
- 808 Kraft, T. S., Venkataraman, V. V., & Dominy, N. J. (2014). A natural history of human tree
809 climbing. *Journal of Human Evolution*, *71*, 105-118.
810 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2014.02.002>

- 811 Kubicka, A. M., & Myszka, A. (2020). Are enthesal changes and cross-sectional properties
812 associated with the shape of the upper limb? *American Journal of Physical*
813 *Anthropology*, 173(2), 293-306. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24096>
- 814 Lacoste Jeanson, A., Santos, F., Villa, C., Banner, J., & Brůžek, J. (2018). Architecture of the
815 femoral and tibial diaphyses in relation to body mass and composition : Research from
816 whole-body CT scans of adult humans. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*,
817 167(4), 813-826. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23713>
- 818 Lanyon, L. E., & Rubin, C. T. (1984). Static vs dynamic loads as an influence on bone
819 remodelling. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 17(12), 897-905. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0021-9290(84)90003-4)
820 9290(84)90003-4
- 821 Lewton, K. L. (2012). Evolvability of the Primate Pelvic Girdle. *Evolutionary Biology*, 39(1),
822 126-139. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-011-9143-6>
- 823 Libanati, C., Baylink, D. J., Lois-Wenzel, E., Srinivasan, N., & Mohan, S. (1999). Studies on
824 the Potential Mediators of Skeletal Changes Occurring during Puberty in Girls ¹. *The*
825 *Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, 84(8), 2807-2814.
826 <https://doi.org/10.1210/jcem.84.8.5905>
- 827 Lieberman, D. E., Polk, J. D., & Demes, B. (2004). Predicting long bone loading from cross-
828 sectional geometry. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 123(2), 156-171.
829 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10316>
- 830 Marchi, D. (2008). Relationships between lower limb cross-sectional geometry and mobility :
831 The case of a Neolithic sample from Italy. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*,
832 137(2), 188-200. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.20855>
- 833 Marchi, D., Ruff, C. B., Capobianco, A., Rafferty, K. L., Habib, M. B., & Patel, B. A. (2016).
834 The locomotion of *Babakotia radofilai* inferred from epiphyseal and diaphyseal

835 morphology of the humerus and femur : *Babakotia Radofilai* Postcranial Suspensory
836 Adaptations. *Journal of Morphology*, 277(9), 1199-1218.
837 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmor.20569>

838 Milne, N., & Granatosky, M. C. (2021). Ulna Curvature in Arboreal and Terrestrial Primates.
839 *Journal of Mammalian Evolution*, 28(3), 897-909. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10914-021-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10914-021-09566-5)
840 09566-5

841 Mitteroecker, P., & Gunz, P. (2009). Advances in Geometric Morphometrics. *Evolutionary*
842 *Biology*, 36(2), 235-247. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-009-9055-x>

843 Mitteroecker, P., & Schaefer, K. (2022). Thirty years of geometric morphometrics :
844 Achievements, challenges, and the ongoing quest for biological meaningfulness.
845 *American Journal of Biological Anthropology*, 178(S74), 181-210.
846 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24531>

847 Moffett, E. A. (2021). Sexual dimorphism in the size and shape of the NON-OBSTETRIC pelvis
848 across anthropoids. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 176(3), 402-421.
849 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24398>

850 Monteiro, L. R. (1999). Multivariate Regression Models and Geometric Morphometrics : The
851 Search for Causal Factors in the Analysis of Shape. *Systematic Biology*, 48(1), 192-199.
852 <https://doi.org/10.1080/106351599260526>

853 Morimoto, N., De León, M. S. P., & Zollikofer, C. (2011). Exploring Femoral Diaphyseal
854 Shape Variation in Wild and Captive Chimpanzees by Means of Morphometric
855 Mapping : A Test of Wolff's Law. *The Anatomical Record: Advances in Integrative*
856 *Anatomy and Evolutionary Biology*, 294(4), 589-609. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.21346>

- 857 Morimoto, N., Nakatsukasa, M., Ponce de León, M. S., & Zollikofer, C. P. E. (2018). Femoral
858 ontogeny in humans and great apes and its implications for their last common ancestor.
859 *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-20410-4>
- 860 Morimoto, N., Zollikofer, C. P. E., & Ponce de León, M. S. (2012). Shared Human-Chimpanzee
861 Pattern of Perinatal Femoral Shaft Morphology and Its Implications for the Evolution
862 of Hominin Locomotor Adaptations. *PLoS ONE*, 7(7), e41980.
863 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0041980>
- 864 Murray, A. A. (2022). Variability and the form–function framework in evolutionary
865 biomechanics and human locomotion. *Evolutionary Human Sciences*, 4, e29.
866 <https://doi.org/10.1017/ehs.2022.28>
- 867 Nadell, Jason A., Elton, S., & Kovarovic, K. (2021). Ontogenetic and morphological variation
868 in primate long bones reflects signals of size and behavior. *American Journal of*
869 *Physical Anthropology*, 174(2), 327-351. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24198>
- 870 Nadell, Jason Alexander. (2017). *Ontogeny and Adaptation: A Cross-Sectional Study of*
871 *Primate Limb Elements*. Durham University, Durham, UK.
- 872 Neaux, D., Bienvenu, T., Guy, F., Daver, G., Sansalone, G., Ledogar, J. A., ... Brunet, M.
873 (2017). Relationship between foramen magnum position and locomotion in extant and
874 extinct hominoids. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 113, 1-9.
875 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2017.07.009>
- 876 O’Keefe, F. R., Meachen, J. A., & Polly, P. D. (2022). On Information Rank Deficiency in
877 Phenotypic Covariance Matrices. *Systematic Biology*, 71(4), 810-822.
878 <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syab088>
- 879 Olson, E. C., & Miller, R. L. (1958). *Morphological Integration*. University of Chicago Press.

- 880 Parfitt, A. M. (2002). Parathyroid Hormone and Periosteal Bone Expansion. *Journal of Bone*
881 *and Mineral Research*, 17(10), 1741-1743.
882 <https://doi.org/10.1359/jbmr.2002.17.10.1741>
- 883 Pearson, O. M., & Lieberman, D. E. (2004). The aging of Wolff's law ? Ontogeny and responses
884 to mechanical loading in cortical bone. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*,
885 125(S39), 63-99. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.20155>
- 886 Perrot, A., Narat, V., & Druelle, F. (2022, octobre). *Répertoire posturo-locomoteur du bonobo*
887 *(Pan paniscus): Fonction et habitat*. Présenté à 34ème colloque de la Société
888 francophone de primatologie (SFDP), Aix-en-Provence. Aix-en-Provence.
889 <https://doi.org/10.4000/primatologie.15135>
- 890 Profico, A., Bondioli, L., Raia, P., O'Higgins, P., & Marchi, D. (2020). morphomap : An R
891 package for long bone landmarking, cortical thickness, and cross-sectional geometry
892 mapping. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 174(1), 129-139.
893 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24140>
- 894 Puymeraill, L. (2011). *Caractérisation de l'endostructure et des propriétés biomécaniques de*
895 *la diaphyse fémorale : La signature de la bipédie et la reconstruction des paleo-*
896 *repertoires et locomoteurs des Hominines*. Aix-Marseille Université.
- 897 Puymeraill, L., Ruff, C. B., Bondioli, L., Widiyanto, H., Trinkaus, E., & Macchiarelli, R. (2012).
898 Structural analysis of the Kresna 11 Homo erectus femoral shaft (Sangiran, Java).
899 *Journal of Human Evolution*, 63(5), 741-749.
900 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2012.08.003>
- 901 Richmond, B. G., Begun, D. R., & Strait, D. S. (2001). Origin of human bipedalism : The
902 knuckle-walking hypothesis revisited. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*,
903 116(S33), 70-105. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10019>

- 904 Ricklan, S. J., Decrausaz, S., Wells, J. C. K., & Stock, J. T. (2021). Obstetric dimensions of the
905 female pelvis are less integrated than locomotor dimensions and show protective scaling
906 patterns : Implications for the obstetrical dilemma. *American Journal of Human*
907 *Biology*, 33(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23451>
- 908 Rodríguez, L., Carretero, J. M., García-González, R., & Arsuaga, J. L. (2018). Cross-sectional
909 properties of the lower limb long bones in the Middle Pleistocene Sima de los Huesos
910 sample (Sierra de Atapuerca, Spain). *Journal of Human Evolution*, 117, 1-12.
911 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2017.11.007>
- 912 Rohlf, F. J., & Corti, M. (2000). Use of Two-Block Partial Least-Squares to Study Covariation
913 in Shape. *Systematic Biology*, 49(4), 740-753.
914 <https://doi.org/10.1080/106351500750049806>
- 915 Rohlf, F. J., & Slice, D. (1990). Extensions of the Procrustes Method for the Optimal
916 Superimposition of Landmarks. *Systematic Zoology*, 39(1), 40.
917 <https://doi.org/10.2307/2992207>
- 918 Rose, M. D. (1977). Positional behaviour of olive baboons (*Papio anubis*) and its relationship
919 to maintenance and social activities. *Primates*, 18(1), 59-116.
920 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02382953>
- 921 Rubin, C. T., & Lanyon, L. E. (1982). Limb mechanics as a function of speed and gait : A study
922 of functional stains in the radius and tibia of horse and dog. *Journal of Experimental*
923 *Biology*, 101, 187-211.
- 924 Ruff, C.B. (2003). Ontogenetic adaptation to bipedalism : Age changes in femoral to humeral
925 length and strength proportions in humans, with a comparison to baboons. *Journal of*
926 *Human Evolution*, 45(4), 317-349. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2003.08.006>

- 927 Ruff, C.B. (2017). Mechanical Constraints on the Hominin Pelvis and the “Obstetrical
928 Dilemma”: *The Anatomical Record*, 300(5), 946-955. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.23539>
- 929 Ruff, C. B. (1995). Biomechanics of the hip and birth in early *Homo*. *American Journal of*
930 *Physical Anthropology*, 98, 527-574.
- 931 Ruff, C. B. (2002a). Long bone articular and diaphyseal structure in old world monkeys and
932 apes. I: Locomotor effects. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 119(4),
933 305-342. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10117>
- 934 Ruff, C. B. (2002b). Long bone articular and diaphyseal structure in Old World monkeys and
935 apes. II : Estimation of body mass. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 120(1),
936 16-37. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10118>
- 937 Ruff, C. B. (Éd.). (2018). *Skeletal Variation and Adaptation in Europeans : Upper Paleolithic*
938 *to the Twentieth Century* (1^{re} éd.). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118628430>
- 939 Ruff, C. B., Burgess, M. L., Ketcham, R. A., & Kappelman, J. (2016). Limb Bone Structural
940 Proportions and Locomotor Behavior in A.L. 288-1 (« Lucy »). *PLOS ONE*, 11(11),
941 e0166095. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0166095>
- 942 Ruff, C. B., & Hayes, W. C. (1983). Cross-sectional geometry of Pecos Pueblo femora and
943 tibiae—A biomechanical investigation : II. Sex, age, side differences. *American Journal*
944 *of Physical Anthropology*, 60(3), 383-400.
- 945 Ruff, C. B., Trinkaus, E., Walker, A., & Larsen, C. S. (1993). Postcranial robusticity in *Homo*.
946 I: Temporal trends and mechanical interpretation. *American Journal of Physical*
947 *Anthropology*, 91(1), 21-53. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.1330910103>
- 948 Ruff, C.B., Holt, B., & Trinkaus, E. (2006). Who’s afraid of the big bad Wolff? : “Wolff’s law”
949 and bone functional adaptation. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 129(4),
950 484-498. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.20371>

951 Saers, J. P. P., DeMars, L. J., Stephens, N. B., Jashashvili, T., Carlson, K. J., Gordon, A. D.,
952 Shaw, C., Ryan, T., Stock, J. (2021). Combinations of trabecular and cortical bone
953 properties distinguish various loading modalities between athletes and controls.
954 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 174(3), 434-450.
955 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24176>

956 Sarringhaus, L.A., MacLatchy, L. M., & Mitani, J.C. (2014). Locomotor and postural
957 development of wild chimpanzees. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 66, 29-38.
958 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2013.09.006>

959 Sarringhaus, L.A., MacLatchy, L. M., & Mitani, J.C. (2016). Long bone cross-sectional
960 properties reflect changes in locomotor behavior in developing chimpanzees. *American*
961 *Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 160(1), 16-29. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.22930>

962 Schaffler, M. B., Burr, D. B., Jungers, W. L., & Ruff, C.B. (1985). Structural and mechanical
963 indicators of limb specialization in primates. *Folia Primatologica*, (45), 61-75.
964 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000156218>

965 Schlager, S. (2017). Morpho and Rvcg – Shape Analysis in R. In *Statistical Shape and*
966 *Deformation Analysis* (p. 217-256). Elsevier. [https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-810493-4.00011-0)
967 [810493-4.00011-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-810493-4.00011-0)

968 Schmitt, D. (1999). Compliant walking in primates. *Journal of Zoology*, 248(2), 149-160.
969 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1999.tb01191.x>

970 Schoonaert, K., D'Août, K., & Aerts, P. (2007). Morphometrics and inertial properties in the
971 body segments of chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Journal of Anatomy*, 210(5), 518-531.
972 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7580.2007.00720.x>

- 973 Shackelford, L. L., & Trinkaus, E. (2002). Late Pleistocene human femoral diaphyseal
974 curvature. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 118(4), 359-370.
975 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10093>
- 976 Shapiro, L. J., & Raichlen, D. A. (2006). Limb proportions and the ontogeny of quadrupedal
977 walking in infant baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*). *Journal of Zoology*, 269(2), 191-203.
978 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.2006.00082.x>
- 979 Shaw, C. N., & Stock, J. T. (2013). Extreme mobility in the Late Pleistocene? Comparing limb
980 biomechanics among fossil Homo, varsity athletes and Holocene foragers. *Journal of*
981 *Human Evolution*, 64(4), 242-249. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2013.01.004>
- 982 Shefelbine, S. J., Tardieu, C., & Carter, D. R. (2002). Development of the femoral bicondylar
983 angle in hominid bipedalism. *Bone*, 30(5), 765-770. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S8756-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S8756-3282(02)00700-7)
984 [3282\(02\)00700-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S8756-3282(02)00700-7)
- 985 Simpson, S. W., Latimer, B., & Lovejoy, C. O. (2018). Why Do Knuckle-Walking African
986 Apes Knuckle-Walk? *The Anatomical Record*, 301(3), 496-514.
987 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ar.23743>
- 988 Tardieu, C., & Damsin, J. P. (1997). Evolution of the angle of obliquity of the femoral diaphysis
989 during growth—Correlations. *Surgical and Radiologic Anatomy: SRA*, 19(2), 91-97.
- 990 Tardieu, Christine. (1994). Morphogenèse de la diaphyse fémorale chez l'homme :
991 Signification fonctionnelle et évolutive. *Folia Primatologica*, 63, 53-58.
992 <https://doi.org/10.1159/000156790>
- 993 Tardieu, Christine. (1999). Ontogeny and phylogeny of femoro-tibial characters in humans and
994 hominid fossils : Functional influence and genetic determinism. *American Journal of*
995 *Physical Anthropology*, (110), 13.

- 996 Thompson, N. E., Rubinstein, D., & Larson, S. G. (2018). Great ape thorax and shoulder
997 configuration—An adaptation for arboreality or knuckle-walking? *Journal of Human*
998 *Evolution*, *125*, 15-26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2018.09.005>
- 999 Thorpe, S. K. S., Holder, R. L., & Crompton, R. H. (2007). Origin of Human Bipedalism As an
1000 Adaptation for Locomotion on Flexible Branches. *Science*, *316*(5829), 1328-1331.
1001 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1140799>
- 1002 Torres-Tamayo, N., Martelli, S., Schlager, S., García-Martínez, D., Sanchis-Gimeno, J. A.,
1003 Mata-Escolano, F., Nalla, S., Ogihara, N., Oishi, M., Bastir, M. (2020). Assessing
1004 thoraco-pelvic covariation in *Homo sapiens* and *Pan troglodytes*: A 3D geometric
1005 morphometric approach. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, *173*(3), 514-534.
1006 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24103>
- 1007 Torres-Tamayo, N., Schlager, S., García-Martínez, D., Sanchis-Gimeno, J. A., Nalla, S.,
1008 Ogihara, N., Oishi, M., Martelli, S., Bastir, M. (2020). Three-dimensional geometric
1009 morphometrics of thorax-pelvis covariation and its potential for predicting the thorax
1010 morphology : A case study on Kebara 2 Neandertal. *Journal of Human Evolution*, *147*,
1011 102854. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2020.102854>
- 1012 Trinkaus, E., & Ruff, C. B. (1999). Diaphyseal cross-sectional geometry of near eastern Middle
1013 Palaeolithic humans : The femur. *Journal of Archaeological Science*, *26*, 409-424.
- 1014 Trinkaus, E., & Ruff, C. B. (2012). Femoral and Tibial Diaphyseal Cross-Sectional Geometry
1015 in Pleistocene *Homo*. *PaleoAnthropology*, 13-62.
1016 <https://doi.org/10.4207/PA.2012.ART69>
- 1017 Venkataraman, V. V., Kraft, T. S., & Dominy, N. J. (2013). Tree climbing and human evolution.
1018 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *110*(4), 1237-1242.
1019 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1208717110>

- 1020 Villmoare, B., Fish, J., & Jungers, W. (2011). Selection, Morphological Integration, and
 1021 Strepsirrhine Locomotor Adaptations. *Evolutionary Biology*, 38(1), 88-99.
 1022 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11692-011-9108-9>
- 1023 Villotte, S., Samsel, M., & Sparacello, V. (2017). The paleobiology of two adult skeletons from
 1024 Baouso da Torre (Bausu da Ture) (Liguria, Italy) : Implications for Gravettian lifestyle.
 1025 *Comptes Rendus Palevol*, 16(4), 462-473. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crpv.2016.09.004>
- 1026 Wagner, G. P. (1996). Homologues, Natural Kinds and the Evolution of Modularity. *American*
 1027 *Zoologist*, 36(1), 36-43. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/36.1.36>
- 1028 Wagner, G. P., Pavlicev, M., & Cheverud, J. M. (2007). The road to modularity. *Nature Reviews*
 1029 *Genetics*, 8(12), 921-931. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrg2267>
- 1030 Weaver, T. D. (2003). The shape of the Neandertal femur is primarily the consequence of a
 1031 hyperpolar body form. *PNAS*, 100(12), 6926-6929.
 1032 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1232340100>
- 1033 Williams, S. A., Prang, T. C., Russo, G. A., Young, N. M., & Gebo, D. L. (2023). African apes
 1034 and the evolutionary history of orthograde and bipedalism. *American Journal of*
 1035 *Biological Anthropology*, 181(S76), 58-80. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24684>
- 1036 Young, N. M., Wagner, G. P., & Hallgrímsson, B. (2010). Development and the evolvability
 1037 of human limbs. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 107(8), 3400-3405.
 1038 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0911856107>

1039 Table legends

1040 Table 1: Study sample description. Percentages are averages values of locomotor bouts.
 1041 †Climbing bouts can also be considered at the species level (Kraft et al., 2014; Venkataraman
 1042 et al., 2013); ‡data for *Pan*: (Doran, 1992, 1997; Hunt, 1992; Sarringhaus et al., 2014) ; §data
 1043 for *Papio*: (Druelle, 2017; Hunt, 2016; Rose, 1977).

1044 Table 2: Covariance Ratio based on data on the morphometric shape of the femur and the pelvis
1045 in each dataset. First line: CR based on Procrustes coordinates; second line in parentheses: CR
1046 based on allometric residuals.

1047 Table 3: CR effect size difference obtained for each pair of samples. First line: CR effect size
1048 difference from CR based on Procrustes coordinates; second line in parentheses: CR effect size
1049 difference from CR based on allometric residuals.

1050 Table 4: Detailed results of the 2b-PLS tests between femoral geometric morphometrics data
1051 and cross-sectional geometry parameters, measured on the whole diaphysis (the 61 sections
1052 between 20% and 80% of the biomechanical length) and on diaphyseal portions (15 sections
1053 each). The Procrustes coordinates (or allometric residuals) provide overall external femoral
1054 morphology, the principal components (PC or rPC) indicate a specific morphology depicted in
1055 supplementary materials figures. First line: 2b-PLS based on Procrustes coordinates; second
1056 line in parentheses: 2b-PLS based on allometric residuals. Highlighted boxes show the
1057 diaphyseal stages with a significant result, bold mentions represent significant 2b-PLS.

1058 Table 5: Detailed results of the 2b-PLS tests between pelvic geometric morphometrics data and
1059 cross-sectional geometry parameters, measured on the whole diaphysis (the 61 sections
1060 between 20% and 80% of the biomechanical length) and on diaphyseal portions (15 sections
1061 each). The Procrustes coordinates (or allometric residuals) provide overall external pelvic
1062 morphology, the principal components (PC or rPC) indicate a specific morphology depicted in
1063 supplementary materials figures. First line: 2b-PLS based on Procrustes coordinates; second
1064 line in parentheses: 2b-PLS based on allometric residuals. Highlighted boxes show the
1065 diaphyseal stages with a significant result, bold mentions represent significant 2b-PLS.

1066 Figure legends

1067 Figure 1: template for landmarks on the pelvis and femur. Landmarks type I and II in red; curve-
1068 landmarks in blue; surface-landmarks in green.

1069 Figure 2: Morpho-structural integration between principal component of the geometric
1070 morphometric analysis of the femur (PC refers to Procrustes coordinates analysis, rPC to
1071 allometric residuals analysis) and cross-sectional geometry (CSG) of the femoral diaphysis. An
1072 arrow indicates a significant 2b-PLS between the PC/rPC and the CSG taken from the entire
1073 diaphysis. Highlighted portions of the diaphysis indicates a significant 2b-PLS between the
1074 PC/rPC and the CSG of the diaphyseal portion. The morphological variations depicted by the
1075 PC/rPC are represented by landmarks projections. The deviation of the landmarks indicates its
1076 variation on the PC/rPC score from -1 to 1. A: anterior, P: posterior, L: lateral, M: medial, S:
1077 superior, I: inferior. When no significant 2b-PLS is found for this morpho-structural integration,
1078 the group is not represented.

1079 Figure 3: Morpho-structural integration between principal component (PC) of the geometric
1080 morphometric analysis of the pelvis and cross-sectional geometry (CSG) of the femoral
1081 diaphysis. An arrow indicates a significant 2b-PLS between the PC and the CSG taken from
1082 the entire diaphysis. Highlighted portions of the diaphysis indicates a significant 2b-PLS
1083 between the PC and the CSG of the diaphyseal portion. The morphological variations depicted
1084 by the PC are represented by landmarks projections. The deviation of the landmarks indicates
1085 its variation on the PC score from -1 to 1. A: anterior, P: posterior, L: lateral, M: medial, S:

1086 superior, I: inferior. When no significant 2b-PLS is found for this morpho-structural integration,
1087 the group is not represented.

1088 Figure 4: Patterns of morphological and morpho-structural integration. The CR value in the
1089 dotted box indicates a test performed without allometry correction. The CR value in the hatched
1090 box indicates a test performed with allometry correction. Double arrows indicate the presence
1091 of a significant 2b-PLS test and therefore the presence of morpho-structural integration (see
1092 Tables 3, 4 and SI Tables). \emptyset symbolizes the absence of significant 2b-PLS. The symbols
1093 outside the parentheses represent the analysis taking into account all 61 diaphyseal sections;
1094 those inside the parentheses describe the analysis taking into account diaphyseal portions
1095 (distal, mid-distal, mid-proximal, proximal). Shaded arrows represent the presence of morpho-
1096 structural integration only for morphological data without allometry correction; hatched arrows
1097 represent the presence of morpho-structural integration only for morphological data with
1098 allometry correction; solid arrows represent the morpho-structural integration present for
1099 morphological data with and without allometry correction. The dotted clouds represent the
1100 average conformations of the femur and pelvis from the morphometric analysis. Created with
1101 [BioRender.com](https://www.biorender.com).