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Abstract: The extant diversity of the avian clade Palaeognathae is composed of the iconic flightless ratites (ostriches, rheas, kiwi, emus, and cassowaries), and the volant tinamous of Central and South America. Palaeognaths were once considered a classic illustration of diversification driven by Gondwanan vicariance, but this paradigm has been rejected in light of molecular phylogenetic and divergence time results from the last two decades that indicate that palaeognaths underwent multiple relatively recent transitions to flightlessness and large body size, reinvigorating research into their evolutionary origins and historical biogeography. This revised perspective on palaeognath macro-evolution has highlighted lingering gaps in our understanding of how, when, and where extant palaeognath diversity arose. Towards resolving those questions, we aim to comprehensively review the known fossil record of palaeognath skeletal remains, and to summarize the current state of knowledge of their evolutionary history. Total clade palaeognaths appear to be one of a small handful of crown bird lineages that crossed the Cretaceous-Paleogene (K-Pg) boundary, but gaps in their Paleogene fossil record and a lack of Cretaceous fossils preclude a detailed understanding of their multiple transitions to flightlessness and large body size, and recognizable members of extant sub-clades generally do not appear until the Neogene. Despite these knowledge gaps, we combine what is known from the fossil record of palaeognaths with plausible divergence time estimates, suggesting a relatively rapid pace of diversification and phenotypic evolution in the early Cenozoic. In line with some recent authors, we surmise that the most recent common ancestor of palaeognaths was likely a relatively small-bodied, ground-feeding bird, features that may have facilitated total-clade palaeognath survivorship through the K-Pg mass extinction, and which may bear on the ecological habits of the ancestral crown bird.
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1. Introduction

Crown birds (Neornithes) comprise roughly 11,000 extant species [1]. They are divided into the reciprocally monophyletic Palaeognathae and Neognathae, with the latter including the hyperdiverse clade Neoaves [1]. At no point in time do total group palaeognaths appear to have been particularly diverse, especially in comparison with contemporaneous neognath diversity. Despite their relatively sparse taxonomic diversity, however, the position of palaeognaths as the sister group to all other neornithines makes them critical to efforts to understand the early evolutionary history of crown birds. Palaeognathae is diagnosed by several traits including a unique palatal structure characterized by enlarged basipterygoid processes and fused pterygoids and palatines (Figure 1), a grooved rhamphotheca, a single articular facet for the otic capitulum of the quadrate, and open ilioischiadic foramina (Figure 2) [2–6]. The palatal structure of palaeognaths was traditionally considered plesiomorphic for Neornithes [7], though recent evidence regarding
the palatal structure of the near-crown Ichthyornithes may indicate that the palaeognathous palate is in fact a synapomorphy of Palaeognathae [8,9].

Figure 1. Comparison of the palate of a palaeognathous and a neognathous bird. (a) Palate of the palaeognathous Emu Dromaius novaehollandiae. The basipterygoid process is elongate, and the pterygoid and palatine are fused (demarcation between them is approximate). (b) Palate of the neognathous Mute Swan Cygnus olor. The pterygoid and palatine are connected by an intrapterygoid joint, and the short basipterygoid processes are mostly obscured by the pterygoids.

Extant palaeognaths are represented by 46 species of tinamou (Tinamidae) and two species of rhea (Rheidae) in Central and South America, two species of ostrich (Struthionidae) in Africa, the monotypic emu and three species of cassowaries (Casuariidae) in Australia and New Guinea, and approximately five species of kiwi in New Zealand (Apterygidae) [10]. Nine species of moa (Dinornithiformes) [11] and four species of elephant bird (Aepyornithidae) [12] survived into the Holocene in New Zealand and Madagascar respectively, before their extinction which may have been related to human activity that had a disproportionate impact on insular flightless birds [13].
Despite being relatively species-poor, extant and recently extinct palaeognaths encompass an impressive range of body sizes and ecologies. The group contains both cursorial open habitat specialists (e.g., emu) and graviportal forest dwellers (e.g., cassowaries), and feeding strategies ranging from cryptic nocturnal invertivores (e.g., kiwi) to megaherbivorous browsers (e.g., moa). Out of all extant palaeognaths, only tinamous (Tinamidae) are capable of flight [14]. This clade comprises small to medium-sized birds, ranging from 43 g in the smallest species (the Dwarf Tinamou Taoniscus nanus) [15], to 2080 g in the...
largest females of the Gray Tinamou (*Tinamus tao*) [16]. By contrast, flightless palaeognaths, from here on referred to collectively as “ratites” (acknowledging the paraphyletic nature of the group), are renowned for their gigantism. The Common Ostrich *Struthio camelus* is the world’s largest extant bird in both height and weight, with large males reaching sizes up to 2.8 m and 156 kg [17]. Recently extinct ratites were even larger: A body mass of 860 kg was estimated from femur measurements of an exceptionally large individual of the elephant bird *Vorombe titan*, making this species the heaviest-known bird ever discovered [12]. Females of the moa *Dinornis robustus* were less massive but appear to have constituted the tallest birds yet discovered, attaining heights of 3.6 m [18,19].

Several early authors argued that ‘ratites’ represented a non-monophyletic assemblage of large-bodied, flightless birds, and debate regarding the potential non-monophyly of ratites persisted through much of the 20th Century [4,20–24]. Opinion shifted with the widespread acceptance of continental drift theory in the latter half of the 20th century, as a monophyletic “Ratitae” became enshrined as a classic example of Gondwanan vicariance biogeography, a hypothesis stipulating that stem group ratites became flightless prior to the breakup of Gondwana, and that Gondwanan fragmentation drove the divergence of the extant ratite lineages as populations became geographically isolated from one-another [25–27]. This hypothesis of a monophyletic “Ratitae”, sister to Tinamidae, was supported by a number of phenotypic features such as the absence of a triosseal canal and sternal keel, and the presence of a fused scapulocoracoid (Figure 3) [5]. Indeed, the term “ratite” refers to the flat, raft-like sterna of taxa lacking a sternal keel (Figure 4) [28]. This consensus opinion was upheld for several decades by most phylogenetic analyses of morphological characters [29–31], though analyses of cranial characters recovered alternative relationships [32–34]. However, over the past twenty years, molecular phylogenetic analyses have forced a wholesale revision of the Gondwanan vicariance paradigm of palaeognath evolution and historical biogeography. Evidence from analyses of both nuclear [35–43] and mitochondrial DNA [41,42,44–46], as well as large-scale phylogenomic analyses [47–50], demonstrate that tinamids are in fact phylogenetically nested within ratites, rendering “Ratitae” paraphyletic, once again reviving the early hypothesis of ratite non-monophyly [4,20–24] (Figure 5).

**Figure 3.** Comparison of the shoulder girdle of a flightless palaeognath displaying the fused ‘ratite’ condition, and that of a volant palaeognath in left lateral view. (a) Fused scapulocoracoid of the flightless Greater Rhea *Rhea americana*. (b) Unfused scapula and coracoid of the volant Andean Tinamou *Nothoprocta pentlandii*. 
Figure 4. Comparison of the sterna of a flightless palaeognath, the Common Ostrich *Struthio camelus* and a volant palaeognath, the Andean Tinamou *Nothoprocta pentlandii*. (a) Sternum of *S. camelus* in dorsal view. (b) Sternum of *S. camelus* in left lateral view. A sternal keel is absent. (c) Sternum of *N. pentlandii* in dorsal view. (d) Sternum of *N. pentlandii* in left lateral view. A deep sternal keel provides an attachment area for the pectoralis and supracoracoideus muscles.

Figure 5. Old and new hypotheses of palaeognath interrelationships. Extinct clades are indicated by †. (a) Ratite monophyly based on the morphological study of Livezey and Zusi [30]. (b) Molecular phylogeny suggesting ratite paraphyly recovered by Mitchell, et al. [45], Grealy, et al. [41], Yonezawa, et al. [49], Urantówka , et al. [46], and Almeida, et al. [42].

The most parsimonious interpretation of this revised tree topology would be that the most recent common ancestor of crown Palaeognathae was flightless, with a reacquisition
of flight arising along the tinamou stem lineage. This interpretation is indeed favoured by maximum likelihood analyses [44] and cannot be definitively rejected; however, this hypothesis would seem to be unlikely from first principles (after all, strong evidence exists for only four independent acquisitions of powered flight throughout the entire evolutionary history of animals [51]). By contrast, multiple independent transitions to flightlessness within the same crown bird subclade are not uncommon. For example, flightlessness has arisen dozens of times in Rallidae among island-dwelling taxa [52,53]. According to some recent molecular topologies, transitions to flightlessness arose a minimum of six times in palaeognaths, and transitions to gigantism a minimum of five [41,45].

The recent revival of a phylogenetic hypothesis stipulating that ratites repeatedly and independently lost the capacity to fly has largely been driven by molecular phylogenetic analyses [36–46,48–50,54–58], but has accrued supporting evidence from independent datasets. For instance, embryological studies have demonstrated important differences in patterns of wing growth among ostriches and emu, suggesting that alternative heterochronic mechanisms may underlie the acquisition of flightlessness in disparate ratite taxa and potentially supporting independent evolutionary transitions to flightlessness among ratites [59]. Furthermore, misexpression of the cardiac transcription factor **Nkx2.5** is associated with reduced wing growth in chicken embryos, and this transcription factor is expressed in the wings of emu embryos but not ostriches—again indicating the potential non-homology of flightlessness in emu and ostriches [60]. Sackton, et al. [50] found that many similarities in ratite forelimb morphology may be the result of convergence in gene regulatory networks, rather than the product of homologous changes to protein coding genes. Overall, the existing body of evidence is congruent with the hypothesis that ‘ratites’ are indeed paraphyletic, and have repeatedly converged on a suite of remarkably similar morphologies that were long interpreted as synapomorphies for the group. Much remains to be understood about the underlying drivers of these independent transitions to large size and flightlessness, as well as the developmental underpinnings of convergent ratite morphologies.

The recognition of ratite paraphyly, coupled with phylogenomic time trees that indicate an origin of crown palaeognaths long after the breakup of Gondwana commenced (e.g., [41,42,45,48,49,55]), makes the classic vicariance hypothesis untenable. Instead, present-day palaeognath biogeography must be the product of dispersal of volant ancestral palaeognaths to multiple landmasses preceding independent origins of flightlessness (Figure 6). However, this interpretation raises many questions regarding the nature of the volant last common ancestor of crown palaeognaths. Tinamous are the only extant volant palaeognaths available for reference, but they are primarily ground-dwelling and are only capable of flight over relatively short distances to flee predators or roost in trees [14,61]. It is difficult to imagine a burst-flying tinamou-like bird undertaking the transoceanic journeys needed to explain the distribution of extant palaeognaths (Figure 6), thus they would appear to be a poor analogue for hypothetical dispersive ancestral palaeognaths. Fossil evidence further suggests that the specialized burst flying of extant tinamous was not pleiomorphic for palaeognaths. The extinct lithornithids (Lithornithidae), known from the Paleocene and Eocene of Europe and North America, were apparently volant and appear to represent the oldest and most stemward known total-clade palaeognaths [49,62–65]. Importantly, they also appear to have been more capable long-distance fliers than extant tinamids are [62,65], and, as the earliest known palaeognaths in the fossil record, they may provide the best models for informing reconstructions of the dispersive ancestral palaeognaths that gave rise to extant palaeognath diversity.
Figure 6. Present-day geographic ranges of extant palaeognath subclades. Range of Rheidae in dark blue, Tinamidae in orange, Struthionidae in green, Casuariidae in aqua, and Apterygidae in pink. [10,14,66–68].

In order to probe deeper into the origin and early evolution of total group Palaeognathae, an in-depth understanding of the palaeognath fossil record is necessary. Early fossil palaeognaths are rare, and the phylogenetic interrelationships among them are poorly understood. For example, the monophyly and phylogenetic position of lithornithids are debated, and thus their relevance for clarifying the pattern and timing of the extant palaeognath radiation remains unclear. Due to the phylogenetic position of palaeognaths as the extant sister taxon of all other Neornithes, stem palaeognaths, which may include lithornithids, should provide key insight into the nature of the ancestral crown bird. Recent time-scaled phylogenies suggest that total-group palaeognaths were one of just a small number of extant neornithine lineages that passed through the Cretaceous-Paleogene (K-Pg) mass extinction event (e.g. [48,69–72]). A better understanding of the ecology and biology of early stem palaeognaths could therefore help clarify the biological attributes of avian survivors of the end-Cretaceous mass extinction, which appears to have eliminated all non-neornithine avialans [73]. Early palaeognath fossils from around the world will also be critical for illustrating how the remarkable convergent evolution of flightlessness and gigantism arose among crown palaeognaths, as well as providing insight into the biogeographic origins of extant palaeognath subclades and their responses to Cenozoic shifts in climate and environment [74,75].

Here, we summarize the current state of knowledge regarding the palaeognath fossil record. Useful reviews on palaeognath fossils and the evolutionary history of this group have previously been published, e.g. [76–78], and we refer interested readers to these excellent summaries, but the present review is the first attempt to systematically address the fossil record of palaeognaths in its entirety. We present the most specific locality data reported in the literature for each fossil occurrence, necessarily limited by the differential specificity available for certain records. We outline key lingering gaps in the known palaeognath fossil record, and suggest potential ways forward in hopes of narrowing those gaps. In addition, we provide an overview of strong inferences about palaeognath macroevolution that can be made on the basis of current molecular phylogenies and estimated divergence times, and summarise what can be reasonably inferred about the most recent common ancestor of crown group palaeognaths. We hope that this review provides both a solid base of information for those interested in the evolution and fossil record of palaeognaths, and helps inspire further work clarifying the evolutionary history of these remarkable birds.
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2. Overview of the Palaeognath Fossil Record

2.1. Lithornithidae

Lithornithids were small bodied, presumably volant birds that were first recognized as palaeognaths by Houde and Olson [79], and described in detail as a clade by Houde [62]. Thus far, they are only known from Europe and North America, contrasting with the Gondwanan distribution of extant palaeognaths. At first glance, they appear remarkably similar to tinamous, particularly in the shape of the skull. Fossil eggshells attributed to lithornithids are also very reminiscent of those of tinamous, and it has been hypothesized.
that lithornithids shared the same polygynandrous breeding behaviour of many extant palaeognaths [62]. However, numerous characters distinguish tinamous and lithornithids, which are detailed by Houde [62]. On the basis of a more distally positioned deltopectoral crest, longer and more curved humeral shaft, and a less distally elongated sternum in lithornithids compared with tinamous, Houde [62] also speculated that lithornithids were much more capable long-distance fliers than extant tinamous are. This idea received further support from a reconstruction of the wing of a specimen of the Eocene lithornithid *Calciavis grandei* with preserved carbonized feather traces, which indicated that this species may have been capable of long-distance flapping flight [65].

Since their fossils are most often recovered from nearshore lacustrine or marine environments, it was suggested that lithornithids may have exhibited a shorebird-like ecology [62], though this may be coincidental as these depositional settings are most likely to produce fossils in general. The lithornithid jaw apparatus appears well suited to distal rhynchokinesis, which allows a bird to capture food items in the ground without having to fully open the jaws [62]. This suggests they could have used their bills for probing the substrate for food items, in a manner more similar to kiwi than tinamous [62]. Additional evidence for this type of foraging behaviour comes from the recognition of mechanoreceptors known as Herbst corpuscles in the rostrum of lithornithids [80], which form a tactile bill-tip organ that picks up mechanical vibrations to detect buried prey.

A major unresolved question is whether Lithornithidae predate the K–Pg mass extinction. The cranial end of a right scapula with a distinctive pointed acromion was recovered from the latest Maastrichtian or earliest Danian Hornerstown Formation in New Jersey, USA [63]. If this material indeed belongs to a lithornithid, it would provide compelling evidence that the clade survived across the boundary. However, it should be noted that several Mesozoic stem ornithurines also have a hooked acromion that approaches the condition seen in Lithornithidae [64,81,82]. Thus, the identity of this fossil remains uncertain, and more material needs to be recovered from both this formation and other contemporaneous localities to clarify which groups of total-clade palaeognaths persisted across the K–Pg boundary.

2.1.1. North American Lithornithids

Definitive lithornithid fossils are known from North America from the middle Paleocene to the early Eocene (Figure 7, Table 1) [62,83–88]. The earliest uncontroversial record on this continent is *Lithornis celetius*, from the middle Paleocene (early to middle Selanian) Fort Union Formation of Montana and the Polecat Bench Formation of Wyoming [62]. The entire skeleton of this species is known from a composite series of individuals [62]. Slightly younger than *L. celetius* is a proximal end of a humerus from the middle Paleocene (Tiffanian) Goler Formation in southern California. Despite being fragmentary, its large, dorsally positioned humeral head and subcircular opening to the pneumotricipital fossa diagnose it as a probable lithornithid, and it was assigned to the genus *Lithornis* [88]. As nearly all North American lithornithids derive from the Rocky Mountain region, this fossil extends their known range significantly further west.
Figure 7. Geographic distribution of palaeognath fossils illustrated on palaeogeographic globes. (top) Middle Paleocene, late Paleocene, early Eocene, middle Eocene, late Eocene, and late Oligocene. (bottom) Early Miocene, middle Miocene, late Miocene, early Pliocene, and late Pliocene. Palaeomaps modified from GPlates (www.gplates.org) [83,84].
Table 1. Lithornithid fossil record.

| Continent | Geological Unit | Location | Epoch | Stage | Age Reference | Taxa | Institutions | Reference |
|-----------|----------------|----------|-------|-------|---------------|------|--------------|-----------|
| North America | Hornerstown Formation | New Jersey, USA | Late Cretaceous-early Paleocene | Maastrichtian-Danian | Olson and Parris [85]; Staron, et al. [86] | ?Palaeognathae | NJSM | Parris and Hope [63] |
| | Fort Union Formation | Park County, Montana, USA | middle Paleocene | Selandian | Lofgren, et al. [87]; Stidham, et al. [88] | Lithornis celatus | USNM, PU | Houde [62] |
| | Polecat Bench Formation | Wyoming, USA | middle Paleocene | Selandian | Lofgren, et al. [87]; Stidham, et al. [88] | Lithornis celatus | PU, UM | Houde [62] |
| | Goler Formation | Kern County, California, USA | middle Paleocene | Selandian | Lofgren, et al. [89]; Albright, et al. [90]; Lofgren, et al. [91] | Lithornis sp. | RAM | Stidham, et al. [88] |
| | Willwood Formation, Sand Coulee beds | Park County, Wyoming, USA | late Paleocene | Thanetian | Lofgren, et al. [87] | Lithornis promiscus, Lithornis plebius | USNM, UM, AMNH | Houde [62] |
| | Willwood Formation | Basin, Wyoming, USA | early Eocene | Ypresian | Lofgren, et al. [87] | Lithornis nasi (provisional), Paracathartes howardae | UM, ROM, USNM | Houde [62] |
| | Green River Formation, Fossil Butte member | Lincoln County, Wyoming, USA | early Eocene | Ypresian | Smith, et al. [92] | Calciavis grandi, Pseudocrypturus cercanaxis | AMNH, USNM | Houde [62]; Nesbitt and Clarke [64] |
| | Bridger Formation | Bridger Basin, Wyoming, USA | middle Eocene | Ypresian-Lutetian | Murphey and Evanoff [93] | incertae sedis | YPM | Houde [62] |
| Europe | Heers Formation, Orp Sand member | Maret, Belgium | middle Paleocene | Selandian | Smith and Smith [94], De Bast, et al. [95] | cf. Lithornithidae | IRSNB | Mayr and Smith [96] |
| | Fissure filling of Walsebeck | Helmstedt, Germany | middle Paleocene | Selandian | Aguilar, et al. [97] | Fissuravis weigelti | GMH | Mayr [98] |
| | Tuffeau de Saint-Omer | Templeuve, France | late Paleocene | Thanetian | Steurbaut [99]; Moreau and Mathis [100]; Smith and Smith [94] | Lithornithidae gen. et sp. indet. | IRSNB | Mayr and Smith [96] |
| | Ølst Formation | Limfjord region, Denmark | early Eocene | Ypresian | Heilmann-Clausen and Schmitz [101] | Lithornis nasi, Lithornis vulturinus | MGUH | Bourdon and Lindow [102] |
| | Fur Formation | Denmark | early Eocene | Ypresian | Chambers, et al. [103] | Lithornis vulturinus | DK, MGUH | Leonard, et al. [104]; Bourdon and Lindow [102] |
| Formation                | Region/Location          | Age            | Subdivision | Species                      | References | Location     | Author        |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|----------------|-------------|------------------------------|------------|--------------|---------------|
| London Clay Formation    | Kent, Essex, Sussex, England | early Eocene | Ypresian    | Lithornis vulturinus, Lithornis nasi, ?Lithornis hookeri, Pseudocrypturus cerca-naxius (provisional) | King [105]; Ellison, et al. [106]; Friedman, et al. [107] | NHMUK, WN, PU | Houde [62]    |
| Messel Formation         | Messel, Germany          | middle Eocene | Ypresian-Lutetian | Lithornis sp. | Franzen and Hau-bold [108]; Schaal and Ziegler [109]; Lenz, et al. [110] | SGPIMH, IRSNB | Mayr [111]; Mayr [112] |
Two sympatric species are known from the late Paleocene (late Thanetian) Sand Coulee Beds of the Willwood Formation in Wyoming. *Lithornis promiscuus* was the larger of the two, and is the largest species in its genus [62]. Like *L. celetius*, virtually all bones of the skeleton are known from a composite series [62]. The holotype, USNM 336535, preserves the entire forelimb skeleton. The smaller *Lithornis plebius* is known from all major appendicular elements [62]. Houde [62] acknowledged the possibility that *L. promiscuus* and *L. plebius* may belong to a single sexually dimorphic species, but erred on the side of a more conservative species diagnosis and retained them as separate taxa. Houde [62] tentatively referred specimen NHMUK A 5303 from the London Clay on the Isle of Sheppey, UK to the latter species. Owing to both the homogeneity of the global hothouse climate and the shorter distance across the North Atlantic at the time, North American and European avifaunas were remarkably similar during the late Paleocene and early Eocene (e.g., [76,113,114]). Finding the same species on both sides of the Atlantic should therefore not come as a surprise, and if NHMUK A 5303 is indeed an example of *L. plebius* it would hint towards the dispersal capabilities of these birds.

The remaining North American lithornithids are Eocene in age. *Paracathartes howardae* [115] was found in early Eocene strata of the Willwood Formation [62]. With the exception of the sternum and pelvis, all bones of this species are again known from a composite series [62]. The lacustrine Green River Formation deposited by the Gosiute, Uinta, and Fossil palaeolakes in what is now Utah, Wyoming, and Colorado has yielded an enormous wealth of fossils, most often preserved as slabs [116]. The Fossil Butte member of the formation, deposited by the short-lived early Eocene Fossil Lake [116], has produced the greatest number of lithornithid specimens thus far [64], as well as a great wealth of other bird fossils (e.g. [117–128]). A minimum of two lithornithid species have been found in this Lagerstätte [64]. The holotype of *Pseudocrypturus cercanaxius* [62] is a complete skull and mandible, with nine cervical vertebrae in articulation [62]. A spectacular crushed articulated specimen missing only the pelvis and caudal vertebrae is owned privately by Siber and Siber, and a cast of this specimen is in the collections of the USNM. Two skeletons collected from the London Clay in England were provisionally referred to this species [62], making it another lithornithid with a possible transatlantic distribution. The recently named *Calciavis grandei* [64] was described from a complete, mediolaterally compressed skeleton with preserved soft tissue including feathers, pedal scales, and claw sheaths. A referred specimen includes most of the postcranial skeleton minus the femora and pelvic region, and a disarticulated skull [64].

2.1.2. European Lithornithids

The fossil record of lithornithids in Europe also begins in the middle Paleocene, and stretches to the middle Eocene (Figure 7, Table 1) [96,111,112]. The Orp Sand member (early to middle Selandian) of the Heers Formation in Maret, Belgium yielded a distal humerus fragment and a partial carpometacarpus that were assigned to Lithornithidae, but the fossils are too incomplete to be assigned at a generic level [96]. The next oldest European lithornithid, *Fissuravis weigelti*, is also known from fragmentary remains, in this case the omal end of an isolated coracoid from the late middle Paleocene (Selandian) of the fissure filling of Walbeck, Germany [98]. A lack of clear diagnostic features has cast some level of doubt to this assignment. The coracoid lacks any lithornithid character other than similarity in size, and seems to be missing the small foramina on the posteroventral surface of the hooked acrocoracoid process that is an apomorphy of this clade [64]. Regardless of the true affinities of *Fissuravis weigelti*, the Maret fossils demonstrate that Lithornithidae stretch at least as far back in time as they do in North America.

As noted by Houde, one of the first fossil birds known to science was *Lithornis vulturnius* [62,129], the holotype specimen of which was purchased by the Royal College of Surgeons in 1798. The holotype was sadly destroyed in the Second World War, though detailed woodcut drawings of the holotype [130] allowed for the identification of a neotype by Houde [62]. The neotype, from the early Eocene (Ypresian) London Clay, was
originally identified as an early relative of turacos and named *Promusophaga magnifica* by Harrison and Walker [131]. It consists of a right humerus, radius, ulna, and carpometacarpus, all missing the distal ends, a right scapula, partial sternum, distal left radius and ulna, proximal left femur, proximal right tibiotarsus, a vertebral series, and ribs within a clay nodule [62]. A large amount of fragmentary material from the London Clay, mainly hindlimb elements, has been referred to this species [102]. A slightly younger specimen from the early Eocene Fur Formation of Denmark preserves a three-dimensional skull in articulation with a nearly complete postcranial skeleton and has been described in great detail [102,104]. Another Danish fossil, a distal left humerus from the latest Paleocene-earliest Eocene Olst Formation, was also referred to this taxon [102].

*Lithornis nasi* [132], also from the early Eocene London Clay Formation, was considered a junior synonym of *L. vulturinus* by Bourdon and Lindow [102]. As the material comes from the type locality of *L. vulturinus*, these authors interpreted the differences between *L. nasi* and *L. vulturinus* as intraspecific variation. The holotype consists of proximal fragments of a left humerus and right ulna, distal fragments of a right femur and a right tibiotarsus, and two thoracic vertebrae [62]. Houde [62] tentatively assigned two specimens from Early Eocene Willwood Formation to *L. nasi*. Another bird from the London Clay, *?Lithornis hookeri* [132], was tentatively referred to the genus by Houde [62]. The holotype, a distal end of a tibiotarsus, suggests it was smaller than all currently known lithornithids [62]. The Messel lithornithid from the middle Eocene of Germany (47–48 MYA) is the youngest lithornithid material yet discovered [111,112]. Known from a partial postcranial skeleton and a skull that appear to represent the same species, it was assigned to the genus *Lithornis* but not to a species-level taxon [112].

### 2.1.3. Systematics of Lithornithidae

While it is generally accepted that lithornithids are indeed total-clade palaeognaths, important questions regarding their systematics remain: Do lithornithids represent a monophyletic radiation of volant stem or crown palaeognaths? Do they represent a paraphyletic grade of stem palaeognaths? Or, are they polyphyletic, with some taxa more closely related to certain extant palaeognath lineages than others (Figure 8)? All three scenarios would seem to be possible considering that the earliest members of several extant palaeognath subclades would most likely have been relatively small and volant. Houde [62] argued that lithornithids are not monophyletic and placed *Paracathartes* closer to other ratites on the basis of similar histological growth patterns, and the reduced, rounded postorbital process of its frontals. More recent authors have speculated that this histological similarity exists because *Paracathartes* is larger than other lithornithids, reaching approximately the size of a turkey [76].
Figure 8. Possible relationships of Lithornithidae to the remainder of Palaeognathae. (a) Scenario A shows a monophyletic Lithornithidae, (b) Scenario B shows a paraphyletic Lithornithidae, and (c) Scenario C shows a polyphyletic Lithornithidae.

The phylogenetic analyses of both Nesbitt and Clarke [64] and Yonezawa, et al. [49] recovered lithornithids as a monophyletic group. The character matrix used by Nesbitt and Clarke [64] contained 182 characters combined from the morphological datasets of Cracraft [5], Bledsoe [133], Lee, et al. [29], Mayr and Clarke [134], Clarke [81], Clarke, et al. [135], and new observations gathered by the authors for 38 terminal taxa. In their unconstrained analyses, Lithornithidae was recovered as the sister taxon to Tinamidae at the base of Palaeognathae, congruent with previous morphological phylogenetic hypotheses. This is unsurprising, given that lithornithids and tinamids share numerous skeletal similarities that often optimize as synapomorphies of a lithornithid + tinamou clade. When *Paracathartes* was constrained as sister to ratites, the resultant nonmonophyly of Lithornithidae added a significant number of steps to the analysis. The only character that supported this relationship was the reduction of the postorbital process of the frontal, which the authors considered to be convergent. When relationships of living palaeognaths were constrained to match those recovered by molecular phylogenies, lithornithids were recovered as a clade of stem group palaeognaths. Though Nesbitt and Clarke [64] were unable to achieve any resolution within Lithornithidae, lithornithid monophyly received relatively high support. However, the authors acknowledge the need for future analyses assimilating additional lithornithid character sets to further test the monophyly and phylogenetic position of lithornithids.

A strict consensus tree using parsimony constrained to match recent molecular phylogenetic topologies recovered a monophyletic Lithornithidae sister to Tinamidae, but when the molecular constraint was removed and replaced with constraints enforcing sister group relationships between Palaeognathae + Neognathae and Neoaves + Galloanserae, Lithornithidae instead resolved sister to a *Dinornis + Dromaius + Struthio* clade to the exclusion of tinamous [136]. In an analysis of this same dataset with new characters added and increased taxon sampling, Bayesian analysis placed lithornithids as stem palaeognaths, and a maximum parsimony analysis of this dataset with cranial characters weighted more strongly found strong support for a monophyletic Lithornithidae in this same position [137]. When characters were unweighted in the maximum parsimony
analysis but constrained to a molecular backbone, a monophyletic Lithornithidae was once again sister to Tinamidae [137]. Almeida, et al. [42] also recovered lithornithids as sister to crown Palaeognathae in their Bayesian topology, but sister to tinamous in their maximum parsimony and maximum likelihood trees. Maximum likelihood trees inferred using characters exhibiting low homoplasy also supported a position on the palaeognath stem for Lithornithidae [49], though the monophyly of the clade was dependent on the matrix used. Ten non-homoplastic characters from Houde [62] yielded a paraphyletic Lithornithidae, while 92 non-homoplastic characters from Worthy, et al. [136] supported them as a monophyletic group. The authors considered their results as supportive of the hypothesis that all extant palaeognaths evolved independently from Lithornis-like birds [42]. Given lingering uncertainties regarding the monophyly and phylogenetic position of lithornithids, a careful reevaluation of character states and species limits within the group would be timely, though this is beyond the scope of the present review.

2.2. African and Eurasian Palaeognaths: Struthioniformes

Two ostrich species are extant. The Common Ostrich *Struthio camelus* inhabits open areas across much of sub-Saharan Africa, and the Somali Ostrich *Struthio molybdophanes* of Eastern Africa was once considered conspecific with *S. camelus* but is now given species status [17,138]. While the two extant species of ostrich are now confined to Africa, their range extended into Asia during the Holocene. Ostriches may have persisted as far east as Mongolia until 7,500 years ago based on Carbon-14 dating of eggshells [139] (though see Khatsenovich, et al. [140] regarding uncertainties surrounding the dating of ostrich eggs from Mongolia and Siberia), and ostriches of the subspecies *S. c. syriacus*, whose native range stretched from the Arabian Peninsula to Syria and Iraq, did not become extinct until 1966 [17]. Ostriches are arguably the most cursorial of all birds, able to run at speeds in excess of 70 km per hour [67]. Their extreme cursoriality is evinced by their unique foot morphology: ostriches are the only extant didactyl birds, an anatomical configuration that may be the result of similar selective pressures as those that drove digit reduction in horses [77]. The fossil record of ostrich eggshell is rich, and although the present review focuses only on skeletal remains, we note that the occurrence of palaeognath eggshells in the early Miocene of China 17 million years ago [77,141] supports the theory that struthionids either originated outside of Africa or else underwent rapid range expansion after their emergence. For a thorough review of the ostrich eggshell record, see Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78].

2.2.1. Eurasian Stem Struthionids

Our understanding of palaeognath evolution and particularly the transition to flightlessness in ratites has been hampered by a lack of recognizable stem group representatives of extant palaeognath lineages. Fortunately, recent research advances have provided a valuable window into the nature of early stem struthionids, which were previously unknown prior to the Miocene. The flightless palaeognaths *Palaeotis weigelti* and *Remiornis heberti* have long been known from the Paleogene of Europe [76,142–145], but their relation to the remainder of Palaeognathae was unclear [76,142]. *Palaeotis*, the better-known of the two taxa, has been variably recovered as the sister taxon to rheids [146], sister to a clade including Struthionidae, Rheidae, and Casuariidae [147], and sister to a clade comprised of lithornithids and tinamous [33]. The unconstrained analysis of Nesbitt and Clarke [64] recovered *Palaeotis* outside a *Struthio + Dromaius + Rhea* clade. When relationships of living palaeognaths were constrained to match those recovered by molecular phylogenies, the same authors recovered *Palaeotis* as the sister taxon of extant palaeognaths (to the exclusion of lithornithids). Mayr [142] noted the resemblance of the skull of *Palaeotis* to that of lithornithids, and that the scapulocoracoid differs from all extant ratites, but was unable to find a well-supported placement for *Palaeotis* and proposed that it may represent yet another independent acquisition of ratite features among palaeognaths. The phylogenetic position of *Remiornis heberti* was also challenging to estimate with
confidence. Mayr [76] considered that it may belong with Palaeotididae before amending this hypothesis based upon the lack of a supratendinal bridge and extensor sulcus in Remiornis, both of which are present in Palaeotis [148].

Without information on its palatal anatomy, it would be extremely difficult to recognize Palaeotis as a palaeognath on the basis of its postcranial skeleton, as several aspects of its hindlimb morphology, such as a notch in the distal rim of the medial condyle of the tibiotarsus and intratendinous ossifications on the tarsometatarsus, are unusual for palaeognaths and are more reminiscent of Gruiformes [148]. Recently, Mayr [148] transferred Galligeranoides boriensis from the stem gruiform clade Geranoididae [149] to Palaeotididae. G. boriensis had been described on the basis of leg bones from the early Eocene of France [150]. Its initial assignment to Geranoididae was notable, as this clade was only known from the Eocene of North America [76,149,151]. The transfer of G. boriensis from Geranoididae to Palaeotididae raises the possibility that additional records of early palaeognaths could be hiding in plain sight in museum collections, misidentified due to their lack of obvious palaeognath synapomorphies.

This scenario was indeed the case with Eogruidae, a group of crane-sized birds known primarily from hindlimb elements from Central Asia. Since the remainder of the skeleton of eogruids was virtually unknown, these taxa were difficult to place phylogenetically. Eocene eogruids show a trend towards reduction in the size of the inner toe as a possible adaptation for cursoriality [152], and later eogruids of the subclade Ergilornithidae take this trend even further, to the point where the inner toe is vestigial or absent [148,152]. This feature led several earlier authors to hypothesize a placement for Eogruidae as stem struthionoids [153–155]. However, this hypothesis was not widely accepted, and eogruids were generally viewed as representatives of Gruiformes (either as sister to a clade containing Aramidae and Gruidae [156] or sister to Gruidae [149]), implying that the didactyly of some eogruids was convergent with Struthionidae.

A previously undescribed partial skull PIN 3110–170 from the latest Eocene locality of Khoer Dzan, Mongolia has rendered the hypothesis of eogruids as gruiforms untenable [6]. Although the palate is missing, the skull preserves an articular surface for the otic capitulum of the quadrate, but apparently does not exhibit an articular surface for the squamosal capitulum of the quadrate. Both articular surfaces would be expected for a gruiform, and indeed for most neognaths, which have a bipartite otic process of the quadrate. Instead, the skull appears to genuinely exhibit only one articular facet for the quadrate, a condition seen only in palaeognaths [157]. This feature, in combination with the reduction and eventual loss of the inner toe, strongly indicate a stem struthioniform placement for Eogruidae. If taxa with greater toe reduction are more closely related to crown struthionids, eogruids would form a paraphyletic grade along the ostrich stem lineage [6] (Figure 9).

With the reassignment of Eogruidae, there is now a clear record of stem Struthionidae in Eurasia well before the first crown struthionids appear in the Miocene of Africa. It now appears likely that this iconic clade of extant African birds first arose outside the continent. In addition to recognizing eogruids as stem struthionids, Mayr and Zelenkov [6] also hypothesized that Palaeotis represents a total-clade struthionid based upon similarities in the shape of its skull with the newly described specimen. With palaeotidids interpreted as stem struthionids, the case for a Eurasian origin of Struthioniformes is strengthened even further (Figure 9).
Figure 9. Relationships within Struthioniformes as hypothesized by Mayr and Zelenkov [6]. “Eogruidae” is here estimated to be a paraphyletic grade of crownward stem struthioniforms, and Geranoididae is tentatively inferred to be a clade of early stem struthioniforms.

The oldest flightless, non-lithornithid palaeognaths in Eurasia belong to Palaeotidae. Galligeranoides boriensis is now the oldest known probable palaeotidid, found in rocks ranging between the ages of 56 to 51 Ma [158]. It is known from a right tibiotarsus, a distal portion of a left tibiotarsus, and an incomplete right tarsometatarsus [150]. The nominate and best known palaeotidid, Palaeotis weigelti, was initially interpreted as a bustard [145] and subsequently as a crane [159] before it was finally recognized as a palaeognath by Houde and Haubold [143], who hypothesized that it was as a stem ostrich despite its lack of obvious cursorial adaptations, an assessment that, in light of the recent work discussed above, has gained robust support. P. weigelti is known from six specimens from the middle Eocene of the Messel and Geisel Valley sites of Germany (Table 2). One of these specimens is a complete two-dimensionally preserved skeleton. It stood slightly under 1 meter tall, and was more gracile than the older Renniornis [76].
| Continent | Geological Unit | Location | Epoch       | Stage      | Age Reference          | Taxa                  | Institutions | Reference            |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|-------------|------------|------------------------|-----------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Europe    | Châlons-sur-Vesles Formation | Cernay and Berru, Marne, France | late Paleocene | Thanetian | Buffaut and Angst [160] | Remiornis heberti | MNHN         | Lemoine [144]; Martin [161]; Mayr [76] |
|           | Sables de Brachois Formation | Rivecourt, France | late Paleocene | Thanetian | Smith, et al. [162]    | Remiornis heberti | MV           | Buffetaut and de Ploëg [163] |
|           | Argiles rutilantes d’Issel et de Saint-Papoul | Saint-Papoul, France | early Eocene | Ypresian | Laurent, et al. [164]; Danilo, et al. [165] | Galligranoides boriensis | MHNT         | Bourdon, et al. [150]; Mayr [148] |
|           | Messel Formation | Messel, Germany | middle Eocene | Ypresian-Lutetian | Franzen and Haubold [108]; Schaal and Ziegler [109]; Lenz, et al. [110] | Palaeotis weigelti | HLMD         | Peters [146]; Houde and Haubold [143]; Mayr [142] |
|           | Geiseltal brown coal | Geisel Valley lignite pits, Germany | middle Eocene | Lutetian | Franzen and Haubold [108] | Palaeotis weigelti | GMH          | Lambrecht [145]; Houde and Haubold [143]; Mayr [142]; Mayr [148] |
|           | unlisted | Kolobotova Balka, Tiraspol, Moldova | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | Urmiorius ukrainus | PIN          | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
|           | unlisted | Hrebeniki, Odessa Oblast, Ukraine | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | Urmiorius ukrainus | NNPM         | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
|           | unlisted | Morozovka, Odessa Oblast, Ukraine | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | Urmiorius ukrainus | NNPM         | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
|           | unlisted | Armavir, Krasnodar Krai, Russia | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | Urmiorius ukrainus | Armavir Regional Museum Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
|           | unlisted | Samos, Greece | late Miocene | Tortonian | Zelenkov, et al. [167] | Ampipelargus majori | NHMUK        | Lydekker [168]; Zelenkov, et al. [167] |
|           | Trigilia Formation | Kryopigi, Chalkidiki, Greece | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | Tsoukala and Bartsiokas [169]; Lazaridis and Tsoukala [170] | ?Ampipelargus sp. | AUG          | Boev, et al. [171]; Zelenkov, et al. [167] |
| Asia      | Irdin Manha Formation | Shara Murun region, Inner Mongolia, China | middle Eocene | Lutetian | Li [172] | Eogrus acola | AMNH, PIN | Wetmore [173]; Kurochkin [152]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| Formation                  | Location                        | Age              | Stage       | Authors (Year) | Genus and Species                  | Repository | Authors (Year)                  |
|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------|----------------------------------|------------|----------------------------------|
| Khaichin Formation         | Omnogvi Province, Mongolia      | middle Eocene    | Lutetian    | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166]    | *Eogrus a cola*                    | PIN        | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166]    |
| Obayla Formation           | Kalmakpai River, East Kazakhstan| late Eocene      | Priabonian  | Clarke, et al. [156]            | *Eogrus turanicus*                 | PIN        | Bendukidze [174]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| unlisted                   | Tsagan Khutel, Bayanhongor Province, Mongolia | late Eocene | Priabonian  | Russell and Zhai [175]           | *Eogrus crudus*                    | PIN        | Kurochkin [176]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| unlisted                   | Alag Tsav, Dornogovi Province, Mongolia | late Eocene | Priabonian  | Dashzévég [177]; Clarke, et al. [156] | Eogridae incertae sedis            | IGM        | Clarke, et al. [156]            |
| Kustovskaya Formation      | East Kazakhstan                 | late Eocene      | Priabonian  | Musser, et al. [178]            | *Eogrus sp.*                       | PIN        | Kozlova [179]; Kurochkin [176]; Musser, et al. [178] |
| Ergilin Dzo Formation      | Dornogovi Province, Mongolia    | latest Eocene-earliest Oligocene | Priabonian-Rupelian | Dashzévég [177] | *Eogrus sp.*, *Ergilornis rapidus*, *Ergilornis minor*, *Ergilornis sp.*, *Ergilornithidae incertae sedis*, *Sonogrus gregalis* | PIN        | Wetmore [173]; Kozlova [179]; Kurochkin [152]; Kurochkin [176]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166]; Mayr and Zelenkov [6] |
| unlisted                   | Mynsualmas, Kazakhstan         | early Miocene    | Aquitanian-Burdigalian | Karhu [180]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | *Urmiornis brodkorbi*              | PIN        | Karhu [180]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| Upper Aral Formation       | Altyshokysu, Kazakhstan         | early Miocene    | Aquitanian-Burdigalian | Karhu [180]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | *Urmiornis brodkorbi*              | PIN        | Karhu [180]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| Tunggur Formation          | Shara Murun region, Inner Mongolia, China | middle Miocene | Serravallian | Wang, et al. [181]              | *Eogrus wetmorei*                  | AMNH       | [173]; Brodkorb [182]; Cracraft [183] |
| unlisted                   | Sharga, Gobi-Alta Provine, Mongolia | middle Miocene | Serravallian | Musser, et al. [178]            | *Ergilornis sp.*                   |           | Zelenkov, et al. [167]; Musser, et al. [178] |
| Nagri and Chinji Formations | Gilgit-Baltistan, Pakistan      | late middle-early late Miocene | Serravallian-Tortonian | Barry, et al. [184] | ? *Urmiornis cracrafti*            |           | Harrison and Walker [185]; Musser, et al. [178] |
| unlisted                   | Maragheh, Iran                 | late Miocene     | Tortonian-Messinian | Musser, et al. [178]            | *Urmiornis maraghanus*             | MNHN       | Meccquenem [186]                |
| Formation                  | Location                         | Age            | Geologic Stage | Author(s)                   | Species          | Institution | References                  |
|---------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------|----------------------------|
| Lower Pavlodar Formation  | Pavlodar, Kazakhstan             | late Miocene   | Tortonian-Messinian | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | *Urmiornis sp.* | PIN         | Kurochkin [176]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| Karabulak Formation       | Kalmakpai, Zaisan, East Kazakhstan | late Miocene   | Tortonian-Messinian | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | *Urmiornis orientalis* | PIN         | Kurochkin [176]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| Liushu Formation          | Zhuangeji town, Gansu, China     | late Miocene   | Messinian       | Fang, et al. [187]          | *Sinergilornis guanheensis* | IVPP        | Musser, et al. [178]         |
| Khirgis-Nur Formation     | Khirgis-Nur, Sunur Province, Mongolia | late Miocene   | Messinian       | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | *Urmiornis sp.* | PIN         | Kurochkin [176]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| Khirgis-Nur Formation     | Chono-Khariakh, Kobdos Province, Mongolia | early Pliocene | Zanclean       | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | *Urmiornis dzabghanensis* | PIN         | Kurochkin [188]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
| Khirgis-Nur Formation     | Dzagso-Khairkhan-Obo, Ubsunur Province, Mongolia | early Pliocene | Zanclean       | Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] | *Urmiornis dzabghanensis* | PIN         | Kurochkin [188]; Zelenkov and Kurochkin [166] |
Eogruids are younger than Palaeotididae, occurring from the middle Eocene to the early Pliocene, and comprise fifteen named species in six genera (Table 2). The oldest species, *Eogrus aela*, has been collected from the middle Eocene of Inner Mongolia and Mongolia’s Omnogvii Province [152,166,173] (Table 2). Like nearly all eogruids, it is known only from hindlimb elements. Other members of this genus from the late Eocene include *Eogrus crudus* from central Mongolia [176], and *Eogrus turanicus* from Eastern Kazakhstan [174] (Table 2).

Outcrops of the latest Eocene-earliest Oligocene Ergilin Dzo Formation in Dornogovi Province, Mongolia have produced an enormous wealth of eogruid fossils. It is in this formation that Ergilornithidae first appear. Once recognized as a separate family [179], they are now considered a subclade of Eogruidae [156,167]. Ergilornithids recovered from this formation include *Ergilornis rapidus* [179], *Ergilornis minor* [176,179], and *Sonogrus gregalis* [176] (Table 2). The partial skull PIN 3110–170 was collected from the latest Eocene Sevkhul member of this formation [6,155]. As the Sevkhul member has produced huge quantities of hindlimb material belonging to *Sonogrus gregalis* and *Ergilornis minor* and no other large birds, the skull was presumed to belong to one of the two species [6].

We were unable to find any documented occurrences of this clade for the remainder of the Oligocene. The ergilornithid genus *Urmiornis* first appears in the early Miocene, with two occurrences of *Urmiornis brodkorbi* in western Kazakhstan [180]. The latest occurrence of the genus *Eogrus* is in the middle Miocene of Inner Mongolia with *Eogrus wetmorei* [173,182,183]. By the late Miocene, eogruids had expanded their range outside of Central Asia and reached their greatest generic diversity, with *Amphipelargus major* occurring on Samos island [167,168] and another member of the same genus on the Greek mainland [167,171]. *Urmiornis ukrainus* occurring in Ukraine, Moldova, and southwestern Russia [166,176]. *Urmiornis maraganus* in Iran [183,186,189], *U. maraganus* in the Swatikls of northern Pakistan [185], and *Sinogilornis guancheensis* in Gansu, China [178] (Table 2). Although Kurochkin [176] noted differences between *U. ukrainus* and *U. maraganus*, the validity of *U. ukrainus* requires further conformation and *U. maraganus* would take nomenclatural priority if they are shown to be the same species [166]. The group continued to thrive in their Central Asian stronghold, with *Urmiornis orientalis* found near Zaisan, Kazakhstan [166,176] and *Urmiornis* sp. in the Sunur province of Mongolia and Pavlodar, Kazakhstan [166,176]. The youngest species, *Urmiornis dzabghanensis*, was found in the early Pliocene Khirgis-Nur Formation of Mongolia [166,188] (Table 2).

The possibility that the eogruids were flightless has been proposed by several authors [152,173], though others contend that such a conclusion is premature based on existing evidence [156,178]. The trochlea for the second toe is vestigial or entirely absent in *Ergilornis*, *Sinogilornis*, *Urmiornis*, and *Amphipelargus* [6,166,176,178], which is indicative of a highly cursorial lifestyle as seen in extant struthionids. In addition, a proximal humerus PIN 3110–60 from the Ergilin Dzo Formation attributed to *Ergilornis* has a greatly reduced deltopectoral crest (the portion of the humerus serving as the major insertion point for major flight muscles), and from this it was assumed that at least this taxon was flightless [152]. If some eogruids were volant, it could imply that multiple transitions to flightlessness occurred among stem struthionids, following the phylogeny of Mayr and Zelenkov (Figure 9) [6].

That the North American Geranoididae may also be struthioniforms has been suggested on several occasions, but unlike Eogruidae no strong evidence for such a placement has yet been found [6,148,155]. Geranoidids share several derived features with Palaeotididae, including an elongated tarsometatarsus, a pronounced extensor sulcus along the dorsal surface of the tarsometatarsus, a proximodistally elongated hypotarsus that forms a long medial crest, and a notched distal rim of the medial condyle of the tibiotarsus [148]. With the recent reassignment of *G. boriensis* (discussed above), an investigation into possible palaeognath affinities for fossils assigned to the remaining members of this clade is clearly merited. *Eogeranoides campivagus* from the Wilwood Formation of Wyoming has a deep extensor sulcus along the dorsal surface of the tarsometatarsus, a feature it shares
with *Palaeotis* [142,148]. Considering that North American and European avifaunas were generally similar during the Eocene [114,148], and that certain flightless bird taxa such as Gastornithidae occurred on both sides of the Atlantic [76,77], the possibility that palaeotidids existed in North America is plausible. A clade uniting Palaeotididae, Geranoididae, Eogruidae, and Struthionidae is supported by the following characters highlighted by Mayr and Zelenkov [6]: a very long and narrow tarsometatarsus, a short trochlea for digits II and IV, a tubercle adjacent to the supratendinal bridge, and a shortening of all non-ungual phalanges on pedal digit IV.

Also uncertain is the placement of *Remiornis heberti* [144] from the late Paleocene of France [161] (Table 2). It is known from several isolated elements belonging to different individuals that include a tibiotarsus, tarsometatarsus, and fragmentary associated remains [76,161,163]. It appears to have been recognized as a palaeognath based on its overall resemblance to *Palaeotis*, as the two genera share a deep furrow on the dorsal surface of the tarsometatarsus and a similar configuration of the distal trochleae [76]. Mayr [148] excluded it from Palaeotididae based on its lack of an ossified supratendinal bridge and extensor sulcus, and Mayr and Zelenkov did not include *Remiornis* at all in their new hypothesis of struthioniform interrelationships [6]. However, in light of the variability exhibited by the supratendinal bridge, extensor sulcus, and hypotarsus among palaeognaths, rejecting a struthioniform affinity for *Remiornis* may be premature. An ossified supratendinal bridge of the tibiotarsus is present in Tinamidae and Dinornithidae and is variably present in Apterygidae, but is missing from all other crown palaeognaths [137,148]. Worthy et al. [137] note that given its variability in clades including crown Palaeognathae and Cariamiformes, the presence or absence of this feature should not be viewed to negate potential sister relationships. The extensor sulcus of the tibiotarsus is also variably present in palaeognaths. It is narrow in Lithornithidae, Apterygidae, Tinamidae, and Dinornithidae, and absent in Struthionidae, Casuariidae, Rheidae, and Aepyornithidae [148]. Eogruids have a hypotarsal canal, while all other palaeognaths lack this feature [148]. The putative gruid *Palaeogrus princeps* [190] from the middle Eocene of Italy also shares similarities in the distal tibiotarsus with *Palaeotis* and could represent yet another record of this clade [148].

Several other taxa that deserve further revision of their taxonomic placement are listed here, though it is far less likely that they belong within Palaeognathae. *Eleutherornis cotei* [191,192] from the middle Eocene of Switzerland and France is known from a partial pelvis and hindlimb elements and was originally assumed to be a ratite due to its large size, but was reinterpreted as a phorusrhacoid [193]. *Eremopezus eocaenus* [194] is known from hindlimb elements from the late Eocene Fayum Formation of Egypt [76,195]. Rasmussen, et al. [195] suggest that it could represent a non-palaeognathous endemic African group that independently became large and flightless. More material will be needed to firmly rule out palaeognathous affinities for this taxon [76]. Whether or not these species are indeed palaeognaths, we expect that further revaluation of Paleogene fossil collections is bound to reveal more palaeognaths from a critical time period that may capture their transitions to flightlessness.

### 2.2.2. African and Eurasian Crown Struthionids

As shown in Table 3.
Table 3. Crown struthionid fossil record.

| Continent | Geological Unit | Location | Epoch       | Stage   | Age Reference               | Taxa                     | Institutions | Reference                  |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|-------------|---------|-----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| Africa    | Elisabethfeld silts | Northern Spergebiet, Namibia | early Miocene | Aquitanian | Pickford and Senut [196]     | *Struthio coppensi*     |             | Mourer-Chauviré, et al. [197]; Mourer-Chauviré [198] |
|           | unlisted        | Kadianga West, Kenya          | middle Miocene | Langhian | Pickford [199]               | *Struthio sp.*          | KNM          | Leonard, et al. [200]       |
|           | unlisted        | Central Nyanza, Kenya         | middle Miocene | Serravallian | Pickford [199]               | *Struthio sp.*          | KNM          | Leonard, et al. [200]       |
|           | unlisted        | Ngorora, Kenya                | middle Miocene | Serravallian | Pickford [199]               | *Struthio sp.*          | KNM          | Leonard, et al. [200]       |
|           | Beglia Formation | Bled el Douarrah, Tunisia     | late Miocene  | Tortonian | Werdelin [201]               | *Struthio sp.*          |              | Rich [202]                  |
|           | Varswater Formation | Langebaanweg, South Africa  | early Pliocene | Zanclean | Roberts, et al. [203]        | *Struthio cf. asiaticus* |              | Rich [204]; Manegold, et al. [205], but see Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
|           | unlisted        | Ahl al Oughlam, Casablanca, Morocco | late Pliocene | Piacenzian | Geraads [206]               | *Struthio asiaticus*    |              | Mourer-Chauviré and Geraads [207], but see Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
|           | Olduvai series  | Olduvai Gorge Bed I, Tanzania | early Pliocene | Gelasian | Hay [208]                   | *Struthio oldawayi*     |              | Lowe [209]; Leakey [210]    |
|           | unlisted        | Ain Boucherit, Algeria        | early Pliocene | Gelasian | Werdelin [201]               | *Struthio barbarus*     |              | Arambourg [211]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| Asia      | Turgut strata   | Çandır, Turkey                | middle Miocene | Langhian | Becker-Platen, et al. [212]  | *Struthio cf. brachydactylus* | BGR          | Sauer [213]                 |
|           | unlisted        | Maragha, Iran                 | late Miocene  | Tortonian |                             | *Palaeostruthio karatheodoris* |              | Mequenem [189]; Lambrecht [214]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
|           | Baynunah Formation | United Arab Emirates   | late Miocene  | Tortonian |                             | *Palaeostruthio karatheodoris* |              | Louchart, et al. [215]     |
|           | unlisted        | Pavlodar, Kazakhstan         | late Miocene  | Messinian (?) |                             | *Palaeostruthio karatheodoris* |              | Tugarinov [216]; Kurochkin [188]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
|           | Liushu Formation | Gansu province, China        | late Miocene  | Tortonian-Messinian | Deng, et al. [217] | *Struthio (Orientornis) linxiaensis* |              | Hou, et al. [218]          |
| Region | Location | Time Period | Formation | Taxon | Reference |
|--------|----------|-------------|-----------|-------|-----------|
| unlisted | Baode county, China | late Miocene | Messinian | Kaakin, et al. [219] | Struthio wimani | Lowe [220]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| Dhok Pathan Formation, Siwalik series | Siwalik Hills, India | late Miocene-early Pliocene | Messinian-Zanclean | Sahni, et al. [221]; Sahni, et al. [222]; Stern, et al. [223]; Patnaik, et al. [224] | Struthio asiaticus | Davies [225]; Lydekker [226]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| unlisted | Çalta, Ankara, Turkey | early Pliocene | Zanclean | Ginsburg, et al. [227]; Sen [228]; Janoo and Sen [229] | Struthio sp. | Janoo and Sen [229] |
| unlisted | Pavlodar, Kazakhstan | early Pliocene | Zanclean | | Struthio chersonensis | Beliaveva [230] |
| upper Issykulian Formation | Akterek, Kyrgyzstan | late Pliocene | Piacenzian | Sotnikova, et al. [231] | Pachystruthio transcaucusius | Sotnikova, et al. [231] |
| Nihewan Formation | Nihewan Basin, China | early Pleistocene | Gelasian | Cai, et al. [232] | Pachystruthio indet. | MNHN Buffetaut and Angst [233] |
| unlisted | Zhoukoudian, China | middle-late Pleistocene | Calabrian-Chibanian | | “Struthio anderssoni” | Hou [234] |
| Europe | unlisted | Varnitsa, Moldova | late Miocene | Vangengeim and Tesakov [235] | Struthio orlovi | Kurochkin and Lungu [236] |
| unlisted | Pikermi, Greece | late Miocene | Tortonian | Solounias, et al. [237] | Palaeostruthio cf. karatheodoris | Bachmayer and Zapfe [238]; Michailidis, et al. [239] |
| Nikiti Formation | Nikiti, Greece | late Miocene | Tortonian | | Palaeostruthio cf. karatheodoris | Koufos, et al. [240] |
| unlisted | Hadzhidimovo, Bulgaria | late Miocene | Tortonian | Spassov [241] | Palaeostruthio karatheodoris | NMNHS Boev and Spassov [242] |
| unlisted | Novoelizavetovka, Ukraine | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | Vangengeim and Tesakov [235] | Struthio novorossicus | ONU Alekseev [243]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| unlisted | Kuyalnik, Ukraine | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | | Struthio sp. | Burchak-Abramovich [244]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| unlisted | Samos, Greece | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | | Palaeostruthio karatheodoris | MGL Forsyth Major [245]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| Strumyani Genetic Lithocomplex | Kamimantsi, Bulgaria | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | Tzankov, et al. [246]; Spassov, et al. [247] | Palaeostruthio cf. karatheodoris | NMNHS Boev and Spassov [242] |
| unlisted | Kerassia, Greece | late Miocene | Tortonian-Messinian | Theodorou, et al. [248] | Palaeostruthio karatheodoris | Kampouridis, et al. [249] |
| Site | Region | Age | Formation | Species | Authors |
|------|--------|-----|-----------|---------|---------|
| Grebeniki, Ukraine | late Miocene | Vangengeim and Tesakov [235] | Palaeostruthio karathodoris, Struthio brachydactylus | Burchak-Abramovich [250]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| Odessa Catacombs | early Pliocene | Zanclean | Struthio sp. “Odessa Ostrich” | ONU |
| unlisted | late Pliocene | Piacenzian | Pachystruthio transcaucasius | Burchak-Abramovich and Vekua [251]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| Khapry Formation | early Pleistocene | Gelasian | Struthio sp. “Odessa Ostrich” | Kurochkin and Lungu [236] |
| Sésklo basin sedimentary fill | early Pleistocene | Gelasian | Struthio cf. chersonensis | Athanassiou [254] |
| Dmanisi, Georgia | early Pleistocene | Gelasian | Pachystruthio dmanisensis | Burchak-Abramovich and Vekua [256]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
| Taurida Cave | early Pleistocene | Gelasian | Pachystruthio dmanisensis | Lopatin, et al. [257]; Zelenkov, et al. [258] |
| Kisláng, Hungary | early-middle Pleistocene | Gelisian-Calabrian | Pachystruthio pannonicus | GMB Kretzoi [260]; Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] |
The body fossil record of crown ostriches begins 21 million years ago in the early Miocene of Africa with *Struthio coppensi* (Figure 7, Table 3), named on the basis of the shaft and distal part of a left tibiotarsus, proximal left femur, distal left tarsometatarsus, right tarsometatarsus shaft, and a left fibula from the early Miocene of the Northern Sperrgebiet, Namibia [197]. As noted by Mourer-Chauviré [198], it was smaller and more gracile than *S. camelus*, and a vestigial trochlea metatarsi II shows this early ostrich was didactyl [197,198]. A late middle Miocene ostrich from western Kenya assigned to *Struthio* also had a didactyl foot and was smaller than extant ostriches, though still larger than *S. coppensi* [200]. Other Kenyan middle Miocene ostrich fossils have been discovered, but they remain undescribed [78,261]. A distal tarsometatarsus was found from the middle-late Miocene boundary in Tunisia [201,202], indicating their presence in North Africa. The size of this bone is roughly comparable with that of the extant *S. camelus* [78].

No late Miocene ostrich body fossils have yet been found from sub-Saharan Africa, but they are relatively common in Eurasia during this period (Figure 7, Table 3) [78]. A pedal phalanx from the middle Miocene of Turkey is the oldest body fossil of crown struthionids outside Africa [213]. From the late Miocene onwards, this clade occupied an enormous geographical range, from the Balkans to northeastern China and eastern Siberia, and south to India. The oldest ostrich from Eastern Europe, *Struthio orlovi*, was found in the early late Miocene of Moldova [236]. Late Miocene Southern and Eastern European ostrich species limits are somewhat contentious. *S. karatheodoris* [245] was larger than extant ostriches [78], and many specimens from the Balkans have been referred to this taxon [238–240,242,249]. A large pelvis from the late Miocene of the United Arab Emirates was assigned to this species based on its size [215], and sacral vertebrae of a very large ostrich found in the terminal Miocene of northern Kazakhstan [188,216] may also belong to *S. karatheodoris*. *S. novorossicus* [243] is considered a *nomem dubium* by Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78], as it cannot be distinguished from *S. asiaticus*. Koufos, et al. [240] suggested that *S. brachydactylus* [250] may be a junior synonym of *S. karatheodoris*, but Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] consider them separate taxa, as *S. brachydactylus* was roughly the size of *S. camelus* and therefore much smaller than *S. karatheodoris*. Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] refer *Palaeostruthio sternatus* [244] to *S. karatheodoris*, creating the new combination *Palaeostruthio karatheodoris*.

*Struthio* ("Orientornis") *linxiaensis* from the late Miocene of Gansu province, China, is one of the oldest East Asian ostriches [77,218,262]. Slightly larger than *S. camelus*, Mikhailov and Zelenkov [78] argued that it likely belongs in its own genus, but tentatively treat it as *Struthio*. Other late Miocene Asian ostriches include *S. wimani*, known from a fragmentary pelvis from China [220], and *S. asiaticus* [263] from the Siwalik series in North India and Pakistan. The latter species has been treated as somewhat of a wastebasket taxon, with eggshell fragments attributed to it from sediments as young as the late Pleistocene of the Baikal region [264], and body fossils from as far away as South Africa [204,205] (Table 3). Ostrich eggshells ranging in age from 11 to 1.3 Ma are known from the Siwalik series [223]. However, the distribution, temporal range, and taxonomic identifications of these specimens are in need of revision.

Several large ostriches are known from the Pliocene. *S. transcaucasicus* is known from a pelvis from the late Pliocene of Georgia [251] and was recently assigned to the genus *Pachystruthio* [258]. Many others have not been assigned to a species level taxon. It is evident from hindlimb fragments that a large ostrich existed in the lower Pliocene of South Africa, which was referred to *Struthio cf. asiaticus* [204,205]. Pliocene fossils from Ahl al Oughlam, Casablanca, Morocco, were also attributed to *S. asiaticus* [207]. Another large ostrich is known from the early Pliocene of Central Turkey [229]. An ostrich from Odessa, Ukraine, also from the early Pliocene, has only been assigned to *Struthio* [78,244].

Multiple species of large ostriches persisted through the Pleistocene. *Struthio oldwayii* of the early Pleistocene of Tanzania was similar to the extant *S. camelus*, though considerably larger [209,220]. Large Pleistocene ostrich bones from Kenya’s Olduvai Gorge site may also belong to this species [210]. A large ostrich from the early Pleistocene of Algeria
was assigned to *S. barbarus* [201,211], and a middle Pleistocene cervical vertebra from the Nefud desert in northeastern Saudi Arabia bears a close resemblance to the extant *S. molybdophanes* [265]. Two giant Eurasian ostriches of the early Pleistocene, *Pachystruthio panonicus* and *Struthio dmanisensis*, may be one species [258]. These birds were truly massive; a femur from the lower Pleistocene Taurida Cave of Crimea yields a mass estimate of 450 kg [258] using the equation of Field, et al. [266]. A 1.8-million-year-old right femur from Nihewan, North China may also belong to *Pachystruthio*. Assigned to *Pachystruthio indet.*, its estimated mass is a smaller, though still enormous 300 kg [233]. *S. anderssoni* of the late Pleistocene of eastern China [234] was 1.5 times the size of *S. camelus*, at about 270 kg based on estimates from its minimum femur circumference [267]. Why ostriches disappeared across Eurasia remains a mystery. One hypothesis is that their decline was at least partially linked to climatic cooling throughout the Cenozoic [77]. However, fossil eggshells indicating the possible persistence of ostriches in Mongolia well into the Holocene [139] (though again, see Khatsenovich, et al. [140]) would seem to negate such an explanation, and a stronger explanation for their disappearance is needed.

### 2.3. South American Palaeognaths: Rheiformes and Tinamiformes

South America is notable for being the only continent to host two family-level palaeognath clades that have persisted to the present day. Two species belong to Rheidae, the Greater Rhea *Rhea americana* and the Lesser Rhea or Darwin’s Rhea *Rhea pennata* (alternatively *Pterocnemia pennata* in certain taxonomies). Both species are cursorial and inhabit open areas, with the Greater Rhea’s range covering much of eastern and southern South America while the Lesser Rhea is found in Patagonia and the Altiplano region [68,268,269]. The Lesser Rhea was formerly placed in its own genus, *Pterocnemia*, but genetic studies suggest it is closely related to the Greater Rhea, with which it can hybridize [268,270]. There is some debate surrounding species limits among Lesser Rheas populations, as some consider the Altiplano subspecies *R. p. garleppi* and *R. p. tarapacensis* to form a separate species from the nominate Patagonian subspecies, *R. p. pennata* [268].

Tinamous (*Tinamidae*) are by far the most speciose extant palaeognath clade, and occupy a wide range of habitats in Central and South America [14]. The clade is divided into two major subclades, the forest-adapted Tinaminae which contains 29 species in the genera *Tinamus*, *Crypturellus*, and *Nothocercus*, and the open and arid habitat-dwelling Noturinae, with 17 species in the genera *Taoniscus*, *Nothura*, *Nothoprocta*, *Rynchotus*, *Eudromia*, and *Tinamotis* [14,42,271,272]. Like many ground-dwelling birds, tinamous have short wings relative to their body size which results in high wing loading [273]. High wing loading is associated with rapid flight but makes flight energetically costly [273], therefore tinamous tend to escape from threats on foot unless flight is necessary [61]. The pectoral muscles in tinamids are enormous relative to their body size, and allow for rapid takeoff to escape potential predators [273,274].

#### 2.3.1. Rheid Fossil Record

The oldest named ratite, *Diogenornis fragilis*, provides a key minimum-bound age estimate for the evolution of larger body size and flightlessness among palaeognaths. The type specimen was found in the middle-late Paleocene of Itaborai, Brazil and consists of limb bones, vertebrae, and the tip of a premaxilla deriving from several individuals [76,275]. The precise age of the Itaborai fauna has been subject to debate, and an early Eocene age has also been suggested [276]. However, the distal end of a right tibiotarsus missing most of its lateral condyle from the even older middle Paleocene Rio Chico Formation of Argentina was also referred to this genus [277]. It was about two-thirds the size of the Greater Rhea, and its wings were less reduced [77]. For biogeographical reasons, *Diogenornis* is often presumed to be a stem rheiform [77,275]. However, Alvarenga [278] reported casuariid affinities for *Diogenornis*, and [277] also noted dissimilarities between the referred tibiotarsus and those of rheids. The cranial end of the medial condyle in medial view is larger and projects further distally than the caudal portion, which optimizes
as a synapomorphy of casuariids [5,29]. While we consider it unlikely that *Diopenornis*
represents a casuariiform, the phylogenetic affinities of these fossils remain somewhat un-
certain. We conservatively treat *D. fragilis* as a total-clade rheid (Figure 7, Table 4). An-
other possible Paleogene rheid is represented by pedal phalanges from the middle Paleoe-
cene of Patagonia [279].
Table 4. Rheid fossil record.

| Continent          | Geological Unit       | Location                      | Epoch         | Stage      | Age Reference                        | Taxa                                      | Institutions | Reference                  |
|--------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|
| South America      | Itaborai Formation    | São José, Brazil              | late Paleocene| Selandian  | Pascual and Ortiz-Jauréguzar [280]   | Diogenornis fragilis                      | MACN         | Alvarenga [275]            |
|                    |                       |                               |               |            | Raigemborn, et al. [281]             | Diogenornis sp., Rheidae indet.           | Tambussi    | [279]; Agnolín [277]      |
|                    | Rio Chico Formation   | Chubut province, Argentina    | late Paleocene| Thanetian  | Krause and Bellosi [282]             | gen. et sp. indet.                       | MLP          | Agnolín [277]             |
|                    | Koluel Kaike Formation| El Gauchito, Chubut province, Argentina | late Paleocene| Thanetian  | gen. et sp. Indet.                   | MACN                                      |              | Agnolín [277]             |
|                    | Sarmiento Formation   | Chubut province, Argentina    | middle Eocene to early Miocene | unknown    | Paredes, et al. [283]               | gen. et sp. Indet.                       |              |                            |
|                    | Chichinales Formation | Chichinales Formation        | early Miocene  | Burdigalian| Kramarz, et al. [284]               | Opisthodactylus horaciope-rezi            | MPCN         | Agnolín and Chafrat [285] |
|                    |                       |                               |               |            | Marshall and Patterson [286]; Fleagle, et al. [287]; Blisniuk, et al. [288]; Perkins, et al. [289]; Cuitiño, et al. [290] | Opisthodactylus patagonicus | NHMUK, MPM, |                         |
|                    |                       |                               |               |            | gen. et sp. Indet.                   | MACN                                      |              |                            |
|                    | Santa Cruz Formation  | Santa Cruz province, Argentina| early Miocene | Burdigalian-Langhian | Forasiepi, et al. [294] | Pterocnemia cf. mesopotamica | FMNH         | Agnolín and Noriega [295] |
|                    | Aisol Formation       | Mendoza province, Argentina   | early Miocene  | Burdigalian-Langhian | Cione, et al. [297] | Pterocnemia mesopotamica, Pterocnemia sp., Rheidae indet. | MACN, MASP, | CICYTTP                   |
|                    | Level 13 of Ganduglia | Río Negro province, Argentina | middle Miocene| Langhian   | Ganduglia [296]                      | gen et sp. indet.                        | MLP          | Agnolín [277]             |
|                    | (1977)                |                               |               |            | Cione, et al. [297]                  | Pterocnemia mesopotamica, Pterocnemia sp., Rheidae indet. | MACN, MASP, | CICYTTP                   |
|                    | Ituzaingó Formation   | Entre Ríos province, Argentina| late Miocene  | Messianian | Cerdeño and Montalvo [298]; Verzi, et al. [299] | Pterocnemia sp.                           | GHUNLP       | Cenízol, et al. [300]     |
|                    | Cerro Azul Formation  | La Pampa province, Argentina  | late Miocene  | Messianian | Marshall and Patterson [286]; Bossi and Muruaga [301]; Reguero and Candela [302] | Pterocnemia sp.                           | GHUNLP       | Cenízol, et al. [300]     |
|                    | Andalhuila Formation  | Tucumán province, Argentina   | late Miocene-early Pliocene | Messianian-Zanclean | Marshall and Patterson [286]; Bossi and Muruaga [301]; Reguero and Candela [302] | Opisthodactylus kirchneri                | MUFYCA       | Noriega, et al. [303]     |
|                    | Monte Hermoso For-      | Buenos Aires province, Argentina | early Pliocene | Zanclean    | Deschamps, et al. [304]; Tomassini, et al. [305] | Heterorhea dabbenei, Hinansuri nehuensis | MLP          | Rovereto [306]; Tambussi [279] |
Other apparent ratite fossils from South America whose relations to modern palaeognaths are unclear are an incomplete right tibiotarsus from the middle Paleocene Koluel Kaike Formation of Argentina [277], a pedal phalanx from a poorly dated portion of the Sarmiento Formation that could be anywhere between middle Eocene and early Miocene in age [283], and a distal end of a tibiotarsus from the late Miocene of Patagonia [277]. By the late Miocene there was a marked increase in aridity across the continent, in contrast with the paratropical and warm temperate forests that stretched all the way south into Patagonia before this time [307]. Agnolin [277] puts forth the idea that this environmental change could have led to the extinction of hypothetical forest-adapted non-rheid ratites in South America, while favouring the open-habitat adapted rheids. Due to the high degree of anatomical homoplasy among the various ratite lineages, we may never know the true affinities of *Diogenornis* and these other unnamed ratite-like fossils with certainty, and can only hope that further fossil material will be found that can shed light on their proper phylogenetic placement and ecological habits.

Eocene bird records from South America are unfortunately rare in general [308]. The next oldest rheid fossils are significantly younger, dating from the Miocene (Figure 7, Table 4). *Pterocnemia mesopotamica* was found in the late Miocene of the Mesopotamia region of Argentina [295], and an isolated tarsometatarsus referred to *Pterocnemia cf. mesopotamica* could extend the temporal range of this species back to the middle Miocene [295]. *Opisthodactylus kirchneri*, another rheid from the late Miocene, was described on the basis of a right femur, a right and left tibiotarsus, left and right tarsometatarsi, and pedal phalanges [303]. The robust rheid *Hinasuri nehuensis* is known from a single left femur from the early Pliocene of Buenos Aires province, Argentina [309]. Extant rheid species appear in the Pleistocene, with *Rhea anchorenensis* [310] and *Rhea pampeana* [311] of the Pleistocene of Argentina reassigned to the extant Greater Rhea (*Rhea americana*) [312,313].

2.3.2. Tinamid Fossil Record

The oldest fossils belonging to crown group Tinamidae appear in the early Miocene Pinturas and Santa Cruz Formations of southern Patagonia (Figure 7, Table 5) [314–316]. This apparently abrupt appearance is most likely an artefact of the region’s limited Eocene record. Molecular divergence time estimates suggest that the origin of crown Tinamidae occurred in the late Eocene or early Oligocene, concurrent with large-scale cooling and the emergence of open habitat in South America that led to turnover of the region’s mammalian fauna [42,317]. Most of these early Miocene fossils are fragmentary and cannot be identified at a generic level, though phylogenetic analyses placed them within the open habitat-specialised tinamid subclade Nothurinae [42,315]. A left humerus from the Santa Cruz Formation was described as a new species, *Crypturellus reai* (*Crypturellus* is an extant genus within the tinamid subclade Tinaminae, which is sister to Nothurinae [316]). Fragmentary remains from the late Miocene were assigned to the extant genera *Eudromia* and *Nothoprocta* [300], both of which belong to Nothurinae. Only two species have been assigned to genera that are no longer extant: *Roveretornis intermedius* and *Tinamisornis parvulus*, both from the early Pliocene Monte Hermoso Formation [306,318], and *Tinamisornis* was later referred to the extant genus *Eudromia* [319]. The extinct *Eudromia olsoni* was also described from the same formation [320], and *Nothura parvula* was found alongside the extant *Nothura darwini* and *Eudromia elegans* in the late Pliocene Chapadmalal Formation [308,321,322]. More recently, *Nothura parvula* was placed as sister to a *Nothura + Taoniscus + Rynchotus + Nothoprocta* clade [42]. As-yet undiscovered representatives of the Tinamidae stem group, which will likely be Eocene in age, are sorely needed to better understand the evolutionary history of this group, and whether the ancestors of crown tinamids were adapted for flight styles other than the highly specialized burst flight seen in tinamous today.
Table 5. Tinamid fossil record.

| Continent    | Geological Unit         | Location                  | Epoch        | Stage   | Age Reference         | Taxa                         | Institutions | Reference                      |
|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------------|
| South America| Pinturas Formation      | Santa Cruz province, Argentina | early Miocene | Burdigalian | Fleagle, et al. [287] | Tinamidae gen. et sp. indet | MACN         | Bertelli and Chiappe [315]       |
|              | Cerro Azul Formation    | La Pampa province, Argentina | late Miocene | Messinian | Cerdeño and Montalvo [298]; Verzi, et al. [299] | Eudromia sp., Nothura sp. | MLP, GHUNLP | Cenizo, et al. [300]             |
|              | Monte Hermoso Formation | Buenos Aires province, Argentina | early Pliocene | Zanclean | Deschamps, et al. [304]; Tomassini, et al. [305] | Eudromia olsoni, Eudromia cf. elegans, Roveretornis intermedius, Tinamisornis parvulus | MACN         | Brodkorb [318]; Tambussi and Tonni [320]; Tomassini, et al. [305] |
|              | Chapadmalal Formation   | Buenos Aires province, Argentina | late Pliocene | Zanclean-Piacenzian | Marshall, et al. [323]; Deschamps, et al. [304] | Eudromia elegans, Eudromia sp., Nothura parvula, Nothura darwini | MLP          | Tambussi and Noriega [324]; Tambussi and Degrange [308] |
2.4. Australian Ratites: Casuariiformes

Both the cursorial emu and the graviportal cassowary belong to the family-level clade Casuariidae [325]. The Emu *Dromaius novaehollandiae* is the only member of its genus, with the recently extinct dwarf Kangaroo Island Emu *D. baudinianus* [326], King Island Emu *D. minor* [327], and Tasmanian Emu *D. diemenensis* [328] now considered to be subspecies of *D. novaehollandiae* [329–331]. Emu are found across most of continental Australia, with the exception of areas of sandy desert and dense forest [332]. Cassowaries have an extremely distinctive appearance, with a casque on the head and wattles on the neck. Unlike Emu, cassowaries typically inhabit dense rainforest habitats. Three cassowary species are currently accepted: the Southern Cassowary *Casuarius casuarius*, the Dwarf Cassowary *Casuarius bennetti*, and the Northern Cassowary *Casuarius unappendiculatus* [66]. All three species inhabit the island of New Guinea, and the Southern Cassowary’s range extends into northeastern Queensland, Australia, and some adjacent islands. No casuariiform fossils are known before the Late Oligocene [333], and thus far there is no indication that any other palaeognath lineage has ever been present in Australia (Figure 7, Table 6).
### Table 6. Casuarid fossil record.

| Continent  | Geological Unit          | Location                          | Epoch                | Stage        | Age Reference                      | Taxa                | Institutions | Reference                  |
|------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Australia  | Etadunna Formation        | Lake Palankarinna, South Australia, Australia | late Oligocene       | Chattian     | Woodburne, et al. [334]; Megirian, et al. [335] | *Emuarius guljaruba* | SAM          | Boles [333]                |
|            |                           |                                   |                      |              | Woodburne, et al. [334]; Megirian, et al. [335] | *Emuarius gidju*    | SAM, AM      | Patterson and Rich [336]; Boles [337] |
|            | Wipajiri Formation        | Etadunna Station, South Australia, Australia | latest Oligocene-early Miocene | Chattian-Aquitanian | Woodburne, et al. [334]; Megirian, et al. [335] | *Emuarius gidju*    | AM, QM       | Boles [337]; Boles [340]; Worthy, et al. [341] |
|            | Riversleigh faunal zones A-C | Riversleigh, Queensland, Australia | latest Oligocene-middle Miocene | Chattian-Langhian | Archer, et al. [338]; Travouillon, et al. [339]; Megirian, et al. [335] | *Emuarius gidju*    | AM, QM       | Boles [337]; Boles [340]; Worthy, et al. [341] |
|            | Camfield beds             | Bullock Creek, Northern Territory, Australia | middle Miocene      | unknown      | Woodburne, et al. [342] | *Dromaius sp.*      |              | Rich [343]; Rich and Van Tets [344] |
|            | Waite Formation           | Alcoota, Northern Territory, Australia | late Miocene        | unknown      | Rich [343] | *Dromaius sp.*      | QM, UCMP         |              | Woodburne [345]; Stirton, et al. [346]; Rich [343]; Rich and Van Tets [344] |
|            | Chinchilla Sands          | Chinchilla, Queensland, Australia  | early Pliocene       | Zanclean     | Rich and Van Tets [344] | *Dromaius novaehollandiae* | QM            | Woods [347]; Stirton, et al. [346]; Rich and Van Tets [344] |
|            | Tirari Formation          | Lake Palankarinna, South Australia, Australia | late Pliocene-early Pleistocene | Piacenzian-Gelasian | Stirton, et al. [348]; Rich and Van Tets [344] | *Dromaius ocypus*   | UCMP         | Miller [349]; Rich [343]; Rich and Van Tets [344] |
| New Guinea | Otianda Formation         | Morobe, Papua New Guinea           | late Pliocene        | Piacenzian   | Hoch and Holm [350] | *Casuarius sp.*      | UCMP          | Plane [351]; Rich and Van Tets [344] |
|            | Cave deposits              | unknown                           | Pleistocene?         | Unknown      | Lydekker [168]; Miller [352] | *Casuarius lydekkeri* | AM            | Lydekker [168]; Rothschild [353]; Miller [352]; Worthy, et al. [341] |
|            | Pleistocene swamp deposits | Pureni, Papua New Guinea           | late Pleistocene     | Chibanian    | Williams, et al. [354] | *Casuarius lydekkeri* | CPC           | Rich, et al. [355] |
One of these early fossil Casuariiformes, *Emuarius gidju* [337], had a temporal range spanning from approximately 24 Ma to 15 Ma and is known from a large number of specimens [341]. *E. gidju* was first described on the basis of a distal tibiotarsus, proximal tarsometatarsus and shaft, and a complete pes from the Lake Ngapakaldi Leaf Locality of the Wipajiri Formation in South Australia [336]. Two more specimens were found in late Miocene deposits in Alcoota, Northern Territory [336,356], and even more from formations spanning the late Oligocene to early late Miocene of Riversleigh, Queensland [337,340]. The genus *Emuarius* differs from *Dromaius* in its retention of a cassowary-like femur, while the tibiotarsus and tarsometatarsus have cursorial modifications and are emu-like [337,340]. The pedal phalanges are of an intermediate morphology between the extant emu and cassowary, being more dorsoventrally compressed than those of cassowaries but less than those of emu [337,341]. This taxon is frequently used to calibrate molecular divergence dates between *Casuarius* and *Dromaius*, and a phylogenetic analysis of morphological characters provided robust confirmation for *E. gidju* and *Dromaius* being sister taxa [341]. The derived tibiotarsus and tarsometatarsus of *Emuarius* and *Dromaius* likely evolved after the emu-cassowary split as the emu lineage began to evolve towards a more cursorial mode of life [337,341]. The humerus is less reduced than in *Dromaius*, which may represent the plesiomorphic state of a bird less removed in time from its volant ancestors than extant Emu and cassowaries are [341]. *E. gidju* was smaller than the extant *D. novaehollandiae*, with an estimated weight of 19–21 kg [340] compared with 30–55 kg in emus [332]. Smaller orbits than *Dromaius* indicates *Emuarius* had smaller eyes relative to its skull, and this feature combined with the limited extent of its cursorial specialisations have been interpreted as being representative of the less open habitats present in Australia before the continent underwent extensive aridification beginning in the latter half of the Miocene [341,357].

*Emuarius guljaruba*, from the 24.1 Ma late Oligocene Etadunna Formation [333–336], is known from a single complete left tarsometatarsus [333]. It is larger than *E. gidju* and most likely a separate species, but its allocation to *Emuarius* remains provisional because no femur has yet been discovered. The extant genus *Dromaius* first appears in the middle Miocene Camfield beds of the Northern Territory [336,343]. *Dromaius arleyekweke* from the late Miocene Waite Formation in the Alcoota scientific reserve, Northern Territory [358] is the oldest named species in this genus. Small and gracile, it is notable in that it exhibits extreme cursorial adaptation, with the tarsometatarsus even more elongated than in *D. novaehollandiae* [358]. It was a small emu, with an estimated body mass based on tibiotarsus least shaft circumference using the algorithm of Campbell and Marcus [359] between 16 and 17.2 kg [358]. Derived features including a distally flattened external condyle of the distal tibiotarsus, the elongated tarsometatarsus, a reduced trochlea metatarsi II as compared with trochlea metatarsi IV, and a shallow median sulcus of the distal trochlea metatarsi II indicate a close affinity with *Dromaius* rather than *Emuarius* [358]. The oldest occurrence of the extant *Dromaius novaehollandiae* is in the early to middle Pliocene-aged Chinchilla Sands of Queensland [336,346,347]. Another species, *Dromaius ocypus*, is known from a tarsometatarsus from the Pliocene Tirari Formation of Lake Palankarinya, South Australia [349]. *D. arleyekweke* was found as the sister taxon of *D. ocypus* and *D. novaehollandiae* [358]. With *D. ocypus* interpreted as less cursorial than either *D. arleyekweke* or *D. novaehollandiae*, this relationship implies an independent acquisition of cursoriality in *D. arleyekweke* or a loss in *D. ocypus*, which may complicate the traditional view of emu evolutionary history as having involved a trend towards increasing cursorial specialisation [358].

The cassowary fossil record is very poor, likely owing to the clade’s preference for tropical forest habitats in which fossils are unlikely to form or be found. Phalanges found from the late Pliocene-aged Otibanda Formation of Papua New Guinea most closely match the extant *C. bennetti* in size but do not appear similar enough to justify being considered conspecific [351]. *Casuarius lydekkeri* [353] is known from a distal right tibiotarsus that is likely Pleistocene in age. The provenance of this fossil is debated [355], and may be
from Darling Downs, Queensland based on its preservation [331,341]. Worthy, et al. [341] assessed the *C. lydekkeri* type material and concluded that its placement within *Casuarius* is likely correct, but there are significant differences between it and the extant *C. bennetti* and *C. casuarius*. A partial skeleton from swamp deposits dating to the late Pleistocene of Pureni, Papua New Guinea was assigned to *C. lydekkeri*, and it was noted to be smaller than any extant cassowary, with a more gracile femur [355]. Unfortunately, no elements from this specimen overlap with those from the Otibanda Formation specimen [355], so the relationship between the only known fossil cassowaries remains a mystery. Naish and Perron [360] speculated that crown cassowaries may be a relatively young clade that evolved in post-Pliocene Australia, with movement into New Guinea occurring during the Pleistocene with the appearance of land bridges between the two landmasses. Of course, this scenario will remain purely speculative until more of these elusive fossils come to light.

### 2.5. New Zealand Ratites: Apterygiformes and Dinornithiformes

Until just a few centuries ago, New Zealand hosted two ratite lineages: Apterygiformes (kiwi) and Dinornithiformes (moa). Without mammalian competition, kiwi and moa filled the niches of small terrestrial insectivorous and large browsing mammals respectively. Five extant species of kiwi (Apterygidae) are currently recognized, all in the same genus: the Southern Brown Kiwi *Apteryx australis*, the North Island Brown Kiwi *Apteryx mantelli*, the Great Spotted Kiwi *Apteryx haastii*, the Little Spotted Kiwi *Apteryx owenii*, and the Okarito Brown Kiwi *Apteryx rowi* [10]. Convergence between kiwi and small ground mammals is often noted, and is indeed remarkable [361]: kiwi are relatively small-bodied and nocturnal, with hair-like plumage and a superb sense of smell that compensates for their poor vision. Their long bills are used to probe the soil and leaf litter for invertebrates. Their eggs, which are the largest relative to body size of any bird, are laid in burrows [10]. Additionally, they are unique in that they are the only known crown birds with two functioning ovaries [362]. All five species face serious threats from introduced mammalian predators, and introduction of kiwi to predator-free offshore islands has been key to their continued survival [363]. Because of their sedentary nature, substantial local diversity exists, and a study examining thousands of mtDNA loci found 16 to 17 genetically distinct lineages within the five extant kiwi species [364].

Moa took the trend of forelimb reduction in flightless birds to the furthest possible extreme by losing the forelimbs entirely. There is no indication of a humeral articular facet on the scapulocoracoid, which itself is highly reduced and, along with the sternum, is the only vestige of the pectoral girdle [77]. A vestigial furcula is present in the genus *Dinornis* but is absent in all other moa [77]. Curiously, the forelimb-specific gene *tbx5* that is essential for the induction of forelimb development appears to have been fully functional in moa, suggesting that other developmental pathways were responsible for the loss of their wings [365]. The moa clade exhibited an extreme degree of reverse sexual dimorphism that for some time led to confusion regarding the number of known species-level taxa. The accepted number of recent taxa based on ancient DNA is nine species in three families: Dinornithidae, containing *Dinornis robustus* and *Dinornis novaezealandiae*, Megalapterygidae containing the monotypic *Megalapteryx didinus*, and Emeidae, containing *Anomalopteryxdidiformis*, *Emeuscrassus*, *Euryapteryxcurtus*, *Pachyornisgeranoides*, *Pachyorniselephantopus*, and *Pachyornisaustralis* [11]. In the largest-bodied genus, *Dinornis*, females could be up to three times larger than males, and it required a study of ancient sex-linked DNA sequences to reveal that individuals of the previously recognized *D. struthoides* actually represented the much smaller males of *D. giganteus* and *D. novaezealandiae* [366]. The extinction of moa is believed to have occurred extremely rapidly, within 200 years of human settlement approximately 600 years BP [367]. Evidence of their existence remains in New Zealand’s flora, some of which retains anachronistic defenses against browsing by moa [368,369]. Moa coprolites and preserved gizzard contents indicate that they were
generalist herbivores, though some degree of species-specific dietary niche partitioning existed [370].

How and when moa and kiwi arrived in New Zealand is still unknown [371], as unfortunately neither group has a clear fossil record from before the Pliocene [372]. Molecular phylogenetic evidence generally supports the hypothesis that moa and tinamous are sister taxa [371], suggesting that moa and kiwi colonised New Zealand and became flightless independently. Depending on the timing of their arrival, both clades may have been greatly affected by the Oligocene drowning of New Zealand, which culminated 25 Mya [373,374]. Coincidentally, this time frame appears to have been a key interval for the emergence of recognizable crown group representatives of other palaeognath clades on different landmasses (Tables 3–6).

Debates regarding how much of Zealandia was above water during the Oligocene drowning episode, and how this event impacted the origins of New Zealand’s endemic flora and fauna continue [375,376]. Cooper and Cooper [377] postulate that only 18% of the present land area was above sea level during peak inundation as a low-lying archipelago. Trewick, et al. [376] and Landis, et al. [374] proposed that the islands were inundated completely, meaning that the entirety of New Zealand’s terrestrial flora and fauna must have arrived in the past 22 million years. An increasing amount of biological evidence suggests at least some land must have remained above sea level during this period and has shifted the consensus against a total inundation [372]. Divergence dating of taxa with poor dispersal ability including frogs of the genus Leiopelma [378], Craterostigmus centipedes [379], mite harvestmen [380], and zopherid beetles [381] indicates that taxa within these groups diverged well before the drowning event, suggesting that all of them would have needed to independently disperse to New Zealand post-flooding had it been fully submerged. Wallis and Jorge [382] reviewed 248 published divergence dates between New Zealand lineages and their closest relatives elsewhere and found evidence for 74 lineages that diverged before 23 Mya, and of those, 25 lineages dated back before Zealandia split from Australia, making them of true Gondwanan vicariant origin. Interestingly, they found no evidence for a spike in extinctions or new arrivals around the time of the transgression. No study has yet presented unequivocal geological evidence for complete submergence [376,383], and clastic sediments deposited during the Waitakian stage in the southern Taranaki Basin suggests a nearby terrestrial sediment source [384].

Cooper and Cooper [377] examined mitochondrial genetic diversity in kiwi, moa, and acanthisitid wrens and found it to be unusually low compared to other ratites and other avian taxa, and interpreted this as evidence for a bottleneck effect due to the Oligocene drowning. They estimated that re-radiation of these endemic New Zealand lineages began 19–24 Mya. Could this be evidence that moa and kiwi survived the drowning in situ on small islands, or that small volant founding populations arrived afterwards? The apparent survival through the drowning event by other New Zealand taxa means the first scenario is certainly possible. If absence of volant non-tinamid palaeognaths after the middle Eocene is not an artifact of the fossil record, then the ancestral founding populations that ultimately gave rise to kiwi and moa must have arrived before the drowning of New Zealand. Ultimately, only new fossil discoveries from before the drowning event are likely to be able to resolve this question completely.

2.5.1. Apterygid Fossil Record

The oldest kiwi and moa fossils are from the St. Bathans terrestrial vertebrate faunal assemblage from the early Miocene of St. Bathans, in the central Otago region of the South Island (Figure 7, Table 7). The site is dated to 19–16 Ma [385,386], and has provided a rare glimpse at New Zealand’s Neogene fauna just after the drowning of New Zealand. The earliest known kiwi, Proapteryx micromeros, was described on the basis of a right femur missing its distal condyles [387]. The only referred specimen is also fragmentary, consisting of a left quadrate missing the orbital process anterior to the pterygoid condyle and much of the lateral mandibular condyle [387]. Based on the femur circumference, the
estimated body mass of *P. micromerus* was between 234.1 and 377 g, making it only slightly larger than the smallest extant kiwi, *A. owenii* [387]. If this species is representative of size of the earliest total-clade apterygids, its size would seem to refute the hypothesis that kiwi are phyletic dwarfs. The classic explanation for the extremely large eggs of kiwi was that kiwi evolved from a large-bodied ancestor, and body size decreased over time while egg size remained the same [361,388,389]. Instead, it may be more likely to have arisen as a novel feature related to producing highly precocial young [387,390]. Based on the gracile shape of the femur, the authors went as far as to propose that *P. micromerus* may have been volant, though that hypothesis is impossible to assess on the basis of presently known fossil material. If *P. micromerus* was volant, it would represent the only known example of a volant stem member of an extant ratite lineage, and would indicate that kiwi may have arrived in New Zealand after the drowning event. Recently, a 1-million-year-old kiwi fossil from the North Island [391] was identified as a new species *Apteryx littoralis* [392]. No other fossils of intermediate age are yet known between the St. Bathans fauna and the Holocene, making it difficult to trace the origins of crown kiwi.
Table 7. Apterygid fossil record.

| Continent     | Geological Unit     | Location                        | Epoch          | Stage       | Age Reference | Taxa              | Institutions | Reference                  |
|---------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------|-------------|---------------|-------------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| New Zealand   | Bannockburn Formation | Otago, South Island, New Zealand | late early Miocene | Burdigalian | Mildenhall and Pocknall [385]; Pole and Douglas [386] | Proapteryx microceros | NMNZ          | Worthy, et al. [387]        |
|               | Kaimatira Pumice     | Marton, North Island, New Zealand | middle Pleistocene | Calabrian   | Worthy [393]  | Apteryx littoralis  | NMNZ          | Tennyson and Tomotani [392] |
Thus far, the only molecular studies that sample multiple *Apteryx* species yield alternative estimates of the timescale over which species-level diversification within *Apteryx* took place. Using concatenated sequences of nuclear and mitochondrial DNA, Grealy, et al. [41] estimated that *Apteryx mantelli* diverged from other kiwi approximately 13 MYA, whereas *A. haastii* and *A. owenii* diverged at about 4 MYA. The phylogenomic time tree produced by Yonezawa, et al. [49] included nuclear and mitochondrial sequences from all five extant kiwi species, and is in agreement with those divergence time estimates, inferring an origin of crown group kiwi at approximately 12 MYA. By contrast, Weir, et al. [364] inferred a much younger origin of the kiwi crown group at 3.85 MYA using mitochondrial DNA from a large sample of individuals. This was interpreted as evidence that the kiwi radiation coincided with the last glacial period when populations were isolated in glacial refugia, particularly those on the South Island [364].

2.5.2. Dinornithid Fossil Record

The St. Bathans fauna also provides a window into moa evolution (Figure 7, Table 8), though the moa fossils known from this locality are even more fragmentary than those of kiwi. Eggshell fragments found at the site suggest at least two species of moa were present [372,394,395]. Several large avian bone fragments have been found, including one that was identified as a portion of the proximal shaft of a right tibiotarsus [395]. Other large New Zealand landbirds such as flightless adzebills and giant geese existed at the time, but the fibular and outer cnemial crests are separated further on this tibiotarsus fragment than they would be in those groups, and instead resemble those of palaeognaths most closely [395]. One can only hope that the St. Bathans site yields bones that can be more conclusively identified as belonging to early representatives of the moa lineage. Many late Pleistocene-Holocene moa fossils are known [391,396], but Pleistocene-Pliocene moa fossils are much scarcer, and very few are known from before the Otira glaciation event which began ~75,000 years ago [397]. A tibiotarsus assigned to *Euryapteryx* was found in marine mudstone reported to be Pliocene in age [397], and *Dinornis* was present on the North Island at least two million years ago [397]. A tibiotarsus and tarsometatarsus fragments belonging to *Anomalapteryx didiformis* were found in a clay bed below a basalt [398], and if they are indeed older than the basalt and not fissure-fill, they would be about 2.5 million years old [397].
Table 8. Dinornithid fossil record.

| Continent | Geological Unit | Location | Epoch | Stage | Age Reference | Taxa | Institutions | Reference |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|-------|-------|---------------|------|--------------|-----------|
| New Zealand | Bannockburn Formation | Otago, South Island, New Zealand | late early Miocene | Burdigalian | Mildenhall and Pocknall [385]; Pole and Douglas [386] | Dinornithidae indet. | NMNZ | Tennyson, et al. [395] |
| unlisted | Timaru, South Island, New Zealand | early Pleistocene | Gelasian | Mathews and Curtis [399] | *Anomalopteryx didiformis* | Forsyth, et al. [397] |
| unlisted | Hawke’s Bay, North Island, New Zealand | early Pleistocene? | Gelasian? | Beu and Edwards [400] | *Eurapteryx curtus* | AIM | Worthy, et al. [397] |
| unlisted | Wairapa, North Island, New Zealand | early Pleistocene? | Gelasian? | Oliver [401]; Beu and Edwards [400] | “*Eurapteryx geranoides*” | NMNZ | Worthy, et al. [397] |
| Tewkesbury Formation | Wanganui, North Island, New Zealand | early Pleistocene | Calabrian | Beu and Edwards [400] | *Dinornis novaeezalandiae, Emeidae indet.* | NMNZ | Marshall [402]; Worthy, et al. [397] |
As with kiwi, molecular time trees have yielded divergent hypotheses regarding the timing of the moa radiation. Bunce et al. [11] found evidence for the radiation being relatively recent. The deepest divergence (between Megalapterygidae and the remaining family-level moa taxa) was estimated at 5.8 MYA, within the same time frame as rapid mountain formation on the South Island during the Miocene-Pliocene [11]. Indeed, the uplift of the Southern Alps would have led to greater habitat diversity [403], and may have spurred the diversification of moa. Interestingly, Haddrath and Baker [38] placed this earliest moa divergence much earlier, at 19 MYA, which roughly coincides with the end of the Oligocene drowning event. Regardless of when the earliest phylogenetic divergence within the moa clade occurred, the fossil record suggests moa crossed onto the North Island via a land bridge 1.5–2 million years ago, which may have led to even greater species diversity as the land bridge reappeared and disappeared during Pleistocene glacial cycles [11]. Whether kiwi were similarly restricted to the South Island before the Pleistocene is unknown, and more fossils from sediments of intermediate age between the Miocene and Pleistocene are needed to make any further advances.

2.6. Malagasy Ratites: Aepyornithiformes

Extremely little is known of the evolutionary history of Madagascar’s giant elephant birds. The island’s Cenozoic terrestrial vertebrate record is notoriously poor, and thus far all fossil finds are restricted to the last 80,000 years [404–406]. What little we do know comes from subfossil bones and eggshells, the latter of which are extremely abundant in some areas. Detailed records of late Pleistocene and Holocene aepyornithid subfossils are beyond the scope of this paper, but can be found in Angst and Buffetaut [407]. Isotopic analysis of eggshells from southern Madagascar reveals that the birds that laid them mainly browsed on non-succulent trees and shrubs [408], some of which retain anachronistic defenses against ratite browsing similar to plants in New Zealand [369]. Palaeoneurological evidence shows that elephant birds had extremely reduced optic lobes, presumably associated with a predominantly nocturnal or crepuscular lifestyle [409].

Even the number of elephant bird species that existed into the Holocene is not known with certainty. Morphometric analysis of subfossil limb bones by Hansford and Turvey [12] recovered evidence for four species-level taxa: Mullerornis modestus, Aepyornis hildebrandti, Aepyornis maximus, and the heaviest bird ever discovered, Vorombe titan. M. modestus, A. maximus, and V. titan were found to be sympatrically distributed across much of Madagascar, while A. hildebrandti was restricted to the central highlands [12]. Molecular studies are needed to evaluate this morphology-based taxonomic scheme, as well as additional fossil collecting in other regions of Madagascar, as most known specimens come from the south of the island and the central highlands [12]. Nuclear and mitochondrial DNA recovered from eggshells suggested that Aepyornis and Mullerornis diverged approximately 27.6 MYA [41]. A divergence at 3.3 MYA between A. hildebrandti and A. maximus had previously been estimated [45]. The third genus found by Hansford and Turvey [12] appears not to have been sampled, highlighting the need to extract aDNA from additional eggshells and subfossil specimens.

Unraveling the decline and eventual demise of elephant birds in Madagascar is less straightforward than for moa, which went extinct within a brief window of time following human arrival in New Zealand [367]. Debate as to how long humans have been present on Madagascar, and thus for how long they coexisted with the island’s endemic megafauna, is ongoing. Based on rare findings of stone tools and butcher marks on elephant bird bones, humans may have arrived early, between 10,000 and 4000 years BP [410,411]. Some anthropologists advocate a more recent arrival, between 1600 and 1000 BP [412], while an intermediate arrival time between 2000 and 1600 BP is supported by 14C data associated with human activity [413]. If humans and elephant birds indeed coexisted for a long period of time, their extinction cannot be easily attributed to the rapid overkill of a naïve population as with moa [411,414]. Instead, a more complex scenario for the extinction of the Malagasy megaherbivores, which also included giant lemurs and tortoises, as
well as dwarf hippopotami, has been proposed. Instead of overhunting, the key factor in their decline may have been the introduction of livestock such as Zebu cattle and a shift towards pastoralism. The introduction of large herbivores by humans coincides with the time frame of Malagasy megafaunal extinction, and under this scenario a combination of resource competition with introduced herbivores, alteration of the landscape by humans to suit the needs of livestock, and increased bushmeat hunting due to the expanding human population could have led to the demise of the Malagasy megafauna [414]. Whatever the direct cause or causes, the extinction of Aepyornithidae occurred roughly 1,000 years BP according to radiometric data [415], concurrent with the drastic decline and extinction of the remainder of the endemic megafauna of the island [416], though some colonial records suggest they may have survived in isolated areas into the 17th century [407,417].

2.7. Antarctic Ratites

Antarctica was once a very different place from the frozen continent we recognize today. The formation of a continental ice sheet did not occur until the Eocene—Oligocene boundary [418]. Up until this time, the continent boasted thriving flora and fauna that were isolated from large mammalian predators—an ideal environment for flightless birds to evolve. Palynological records from sediment cores dated to 53.6–51.9 MYA from the eastern Antarctic Wilkes Land coast reveal that a diverse paratropical rainforest with frost-free winters existed during the early Eocene climatic optimum [419,420]. Sparse pollen from more cold-tolerant trees such as Nothofagus (southern beech) and Araucaria (“monkey puzzle”) trees suggest temperate rainforests further inland [419,420]. By the middle Eocene, cores from 49.3–46 MYA indicate species diversity had decreased [420] and that cool temperate Nothofagus-dominated forests had taken over [419,420]. As a point of comparison, petrified wood samples from King George island in the South Shetland Islands aged 49–43 MYA (Middle Eocene) indicate a forest similar in composition to the cold temperate Valdivian rainforest of Chile [421], which is not dissimilar to the temperate rain forests of New Zealand that moa once inhabited.

There is fossil evidence of large terrestrial birds in Antarctica during this time, but they are too fragmentary to allow firm diagnoses (Table 9). A distal fragment of a right tarsometatarsus purported to be a ratite was found in the middle Eocene of the La Meseta Formation of Seymour Island, just off the Antarctic peninsula [422]. Unfortunately, there is no evidence for its ratite affinities other than its large size. Its unusually large trochlea for the second toe is different from that of all other known ratites [76], and it bears consideration that misattribution of large bones to ratites is not uncommon [423]. An anterior part of a premaxilla originally attributed to a phorusrhacid, also from the La Meseta Formation [424–428], was recently suggested to belong to a palaeognath [429,430]. The presence of ratites on Seymour Island would not be surprising given the environmental conditions at the time, as evidenced by abundant petrified conifer wood from the La Meseta Formation [431]. Confirmation of their existence will have to await more complete specimens, but remains a tantalizing possibility.
Table 9. Putative Antarctic ratites.

| Continent | Geological Unit     | Location    | Epoch    | Stage            | Age Reference | Taxa         | Institutions | Reference                  |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------|----------|------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------------------|
| Antarctica| La Meseta Formation| Seymour Island| late Eocene | Lutetian-Priabonian | Amenábar, et al. [432] | “ratitae” | MLP, UCR | Tambussi, et al. [422]; Cenizo [429]; Acosta Hospitaleche, et al. [430] |
The majority of Cenozoic Antarctic bird fossils belong to penguins and other marine birds, but Seymour Island was also host to a thriving terrestrial fauna during the Eocene. The stem falconid *Antarctoboenus carlinii* [433,434] was named from a distal end of tarso-metatarsus from the early Eocene portion of the La Meseta Formation [430]. Small mammals were abundant, and included the extinct and highly enigmatic sudamerid gondwanatheres [435,436] as well as didelphimorph, polydolopimorph, and microbiotheriid marsupials [436–440]. Seymour Island also hosted South American meridiungulates [436,441–445], and a large sparotheriodont with an estimated body mass of 395–440 kg [446] indicates the ecosystem was fully capable of sustaining large herbivores. The presence of meridiungulates also indicates that overland dispersal from South America was possible, and there is no reason why South American ratites could not have made the journey as well. The Drake passage between South America and the Antarctic Peninsula did not begin to open until approximately 41 Ma [447], meaning these faunas lived during an era where biotic interchange was possible. Such interchange with Australia was also hypothetically possible for a brief window during the Paleocene and early Eocene, as dinocyst assemblages indicate the flow of ocean water across the Tasman gateway by 50–49 Ma [448]. It is also possible for a unique ratite lineage to have arisen on Antarctica, though—as with all other ideas regarding Antarctic palaeognaths—this will remain highly speculative until more fossils are recovered. Regardless of whether the Antarctic terrestrial fauna included ratites, the complete glaciation of the continent in the Oligocene would have doomed them to extinction.

3. Molecular Phylogenetic Hypotheses of Palaeognath Interrelationships

Interpreting phylogenetic relationships among extant and fossil palaeognaths was historically challenging due to morphological homoplasy, and although molecular phylogenetic approaches have yielded some consensus on palaeognath interrelationships, areas of disagreement remain. Thus far, all recent molecular phylogenetic studies of palaeognaths have recovered ostriches as the sister taxon to the rest of the clade, yielding congruent support for a reciprocally monophyletic clade called Notopalaeognathae comprising rheas, tinamous, kiwi, moa, and elephant birds [36–41,44–46,48–50,54–58,449,450]. Limited morphological evidence has also been found in support of a monophyletic Notopalaeognathae [33,77]. In addition, all molecular phylogenetic studies investigating ancient DNA from palaeognath subfossils have strongly supported elephant birds as sister to kiwi [41,45,46,49,57], and tinamous as sister to moa [38,40,41,44–46,49,50,57].

The internal relationships of Notopalaeognathae remain controversial, particularly in regard to the position of rheids. The internal branches at the base of Notopalaeognathae appear to be very short, indicating that the clade may have undergone relatively rapid diversification early in its history, which may have led to incomplete lineage sorting and limited phylogenetically informative character acquisition along deep internodes [38,39,56]. This may have pushed Notopalaeognathae into an empirical anomaly zone in which the most common gene trees from molecular phylogenetic analyses do not match the species tree [56]. Rheids are most often recovered in one of two phylogenetic positions:

1. As the sister taxon of the remaining notopalaeognaths [36,37,39,41,42,44–46,48,49,54–56], though this position is generally weakly supported (Figure 10) [41,44,49].

2. As sister to a casuariid + apterygid + aepyornithid clade (“Novaeratitae”) [38,43,48,50,56–58,450] (Figure 11). Several alternative topologies in addition to these have been recovered that place rheas sister to the tinamid-dinornithid clade [37,39,449] or sister to casuariids [38].
Figure 10. A summary of recent molecular phylogenetic studies that recover Rheidae as sister to the remaining notopalaeognaths. Extinct clades are indicated by †. (a) Smith, et al. [39] primary concordance and total evidence tree. (b) Prum, et al. [48] concatenated dataset; Kuhl, et al. [54]. (c) Hackett, et al. [36]; Harshman, et al. [37] maximum likelihood and Bayesian tree; Claramunt and Cracraft [55]. (d) Phillips, et al. [44]; Cloutier, et al. [56] concatenated dataset. (e) Mitchell, et al. [45]; Grealy, et al. [41]; Yonezawa, et al. [49], Urantówka, et al. [46], Almeida, et al. [42].
Figure 11. A summary of recent molecular phylogenetic studies that do not recover Rheidae as sister to the remaining notopalaeognaths. Extinct clades are indicated by †. (a) Kimball, et al. [450]. (b) Prum, et al. [48] binned ASTRAL analysis; Reddy, et al. [58]; Sackton, et al. [50]; Feng, et al. [43] maximum likelihood analysis of avian growth hormone gene copies. (c) Haddrath and Baker [38] 10 and 27 gene concatenated dataset, 27 gene consensus tree; Baker, et al. [40]; Cloutier, et al. [56] total evidence consensus tree. (d) Haddrath and Baker [38] 10 gene consensus tree. (e) Smith, et al. [39] maximum likelihood reanalysis of Phillips, et al. [44]; (f) Harshman, et al. [37] maximum parsimony and RY coded maximum likelihood analysis; Wang, et al. [449]; (g) Smith, et al. [39] using 40 loci.

Determining why these discrepancies exist could be key to finally resolving the internal branching order of Notopalaeognathae. In their attempt to address this question using genome-wide datasets of conserved nonexonic elements, introns, and ultraconserved elements, Cloutier, et al. [56] found that the consensus species tree building methods MP-EST and ASTRAL-II placed rheids sister to the casuariid-apterygid-aepyornithid clade with maximal bootstrap support from MP-EST for all three datasets. Their
concatenated supermatrix dataset recovered rheids as sister to all other notopalaeognaths, but with weaker statistical support. In general, concatenated analyses have often yielded different results to consensus tree building methods regarding the interrelationships of Notopalaeognathae, with concatenated data more frequently recovering rheids as sister to all other notopalaeognaths [56]. Sackton et al. [50] found similar results and claim that their genome-wide approach is more robust to incomplete lineage sorting than concatenation, which is what leads to discrepancies between studies. “Novaeratitae”, a proposed clade that places casuariids sister to an elephant bird + kiwi clade, received high bootstrap support when mitochondrial and genomic data were combined but not when each were analysed individually [41]. In order to finally resolve the messy internal relationships of notopalaeognaths, a greater number of faster-evolving retrotransposons and introns may need to be analysed [41], and the models of sequence evolution employed must fit the type of genomic data being investigated [58].

### Molecular Divergence Time Estimates

The vast majority of molecular divergence time analyses have recovered an estimate for the palaeognath-neognath divergence in the Cretaceous Period, preceding the K–Pg extinction event (e.g. [38,41,42,44,45,47–49,54,55,449]), an estimate that is consistent with the known (yet sparse) fossil record of Mesozoic neornithines [72]. However, estimates of the age of the neornithine root vary enormously, ranging from 131 Ma [38] to 63.2 Ma [42]. Importantly, the oldest published divergence time estimates do not invalidate Gondwanan vicariance as a potential driver of crown palaeognath divergences [38]. The enormous temporal breadth of deep neornithine divergence time estimates have stimulated discussion about the role of model misspecification in driving erroneously ancient divergence time estimates [451]. Hypothesized selection for reduced body size across the end-Cretaceous mass extinction event could have transiently increased molecular substitution rates along the deepest branches within neornithine phylogeny, which would be expected to drive overestimates of node ages around the neornithine root [452]. Indeed, simulations suggest that 40 million years’ worth of age disparity for the neornithine root node can plausibly be explained by the effect of body size on nucleotide substitution rates [452]. Importantly, the palaeognath stem lineage is inferred to have exhibited high nucleotide substitution rates, consistent with ancestral palaeognaths having been small-bodied (the last common ancestor of crown palaeognaths was estimated to have weighed approximately 2.9 kg) [452]. With smaller body sizes and shorter generation times than other extant palaeognaths, tinamous exhibit anomalously high nucleotide substitution rates compared with other palaeognaths [37,449], which may additionally drive erroneously ancient divergence time estimates near the neornithine root [45,453].

Lingering uncertainty regarding the phylogenetic divergence times of crown palaeognaths complicates attempts to place lithornithids within the broader context of palaeognath evolution. Since most palaeognath divergence time estimates pre-date the earliest well-corroborated lithornithid fossils [41,45,49,449] (with the possible exception of the ~66 million year old isolated scapula from the Hornerstown Formation [63]), the hypothesis that at least some lithornithids represent early stem group representatives of major palaeognath clades is temporally viable. However, Prum et al. [48] estimated the origin of the palaeognath crown group at 51 Ma, during the Ypresian stage of the early Eocene. In this temporal scenario, most lithornithid fossils predate the crown palaeognath radiation, in which case nearly all lithornithids with the exception of those found in the younger Messel Formation could only represent stem palaeognaths. This relatively young age for the palaeognath crown group would also imply that early Paleogene remains such as Diogenornis, Palaeotididae, and the Middle Paleocene fossils identified as belonging to a stem rheid fall outside the palaeognath crown group.
4. Key Gaps in the Palaeognath Fossil Record

4.1. Cretaceous Stem Palaeognaths

Virtually no examples of Cretaceous stem palaeognaths have yet been identified, despite consensus — on the basis of divergence time estimates as well as the presence of fossil total-clade neognaths — that they must have existed at this time. This is perhaps the most glaring gap in the known palaeognath fossil record, but is perhaps an unsurprising one given the general scarcity of well-supported Cretaceous neornithines at present. A probable example of a Cretaceous total-clade neognath is *Vegavis iaai*, recovered from the late Maastrichtian of Vega Island, Antarctica [69]. This fossil taxon shows apparent specialisations for foot-propelled diving, and has been variably placed within Anatoidea [69], as a stem neognath, or even outside of Neornithes altogether [72,454]. *Asteriornis maastrichtensis*, from the Maastrichtian of Belgium, is another probable Cretaceous total-clade neognath. At 66.7–66.8 million years old, *Asteriornis* is slightly older than *Vegavis*, and therefore the oldest well-corroborated neornithine yet discovered [72]. A relatively small bird (estimated to have weighed roughly 490 grams), *Asteriornis* was identified as a total-clade galloanseran [72], although a recent study raised the (weakly supported) hypothesis that it instead represents a total-clade palaeognath [8]. The presence of probable total-clade neognaths from before the K-Pg mass extinction, such as *Vegavis* and *Asteriornis*, implies that the palaeognath-neognath split must have occurred even earlier in the Cretaceous (though, as described above, molecular divergence dates do not agree on the true antiquity of the basal neornithine phylogenetic divergence).

Longstanding biogeographic hypotheses held that Neornithes originated in Gondwana [26,55], partly on the basis that there are far more extant endemic bird clades on the southern continents of South America, Africa, and Australia than there are on the northern continents of North America and Eurasia [455]. However, the discovery of *Asteriornis* in Europe indicates that deeply diverging crown bird lineages have a long evolutionary history in the Northern Hemisphere [72]. More broadly, many clades that are currently restricted to tropical latitudes have fossil stem group representatives in the Paleocene and Eocene of the Northern Hemisphere (e.g., [70,74,120,124,455–457]), implying far more widespread geographic distributions early in these clades’ evolutionary histories. Given the generally dispersive capacity of birds, as well as the fact that hothouse climatic conditions predominated throughout the early Paleogene and led to the expansion of paratropical forests into high latitudes, the present-day geographic distributions of many extant tropical clades may not reliably indicate their ancestral areas of origin [74]. In light of these considerations, determining the most likely fossil localities for revealing the first evidence of a Cretaceous stem palaeognath is challenging, and it would seem equally probable that an early palaeognath could derive from Late Cretaceous deposits of either the northern or the southern hemisphere.

4.2. Stem Group Representatives of Extant Palaeognath Subclades

If contemporary hypotheses of ratite paraphyly and dispersal are accurate, small volant palaeognaths should have been present on landmasses where extant palaeognaths are found during the Paleocene or Eocene [45]. However, the timing of each independent palaeognath transition to large body size and flightlessness is uncertain. Transitions to complete flightlessness among island-dwelling birds typically necessitate few terrestrial predators and a food source that does not require flight [458,459]. If these conditions are met, flightlessness may be advantageous because it allows for energy conservation through reduction in the size of the pectoral musculature [460]. Indeed, the basal metabolic rates of flightless rails are lower than those of closely related flighted rails [460]. Given the right circumstances, transitions to flightlessness and large body size can apparently arise quite rapidly. The extinct giant flightless Hawaiian goose *Branta rhiaua* is nested within the Canada Goose *Branta canadensis* species complex, and its presence on the main
island of Hawai‘i means it must have become large and flightless in less than 500,000 years [461].

Most geologically recent transitions to avian flightlessness occurred on oceanic islands in the absence of predation and competition from terrestrial mammals [458,459]. Were these conditions met on continents in the wake of the K–Pg mass extinction event, allowing multiple lineages of ratites to evolve flightlessness and large body sizes before mammalian predators and competitors could evolve? These conditions appear to have been met on at least some landmasses, as even 10 million years after the extinction event most mammals remained relatively small and unspecialized [462]. The Corral Bluffs site in Colorado suggests that the mammalian fauna in the immediate aftermath of the K–Pg was dominated by small omnivores and insectivores [463], and generally there was a dearth of specialized mammalian carnivores in the early Paleocene [76,464,465]. The makeup of terrestrial mammalian faunas at the time could well have favoured the evolution of flightlessness in birds that could obtain food on the ground, and other large flightless Paleogene bird clades such as Gastornithidae, Phorusrhacidae, and Dromornithidae may have followed a similar pattern along with ratites [76]. In particular, the lack of placental carnivores in South America through most of the Cenozoic may have contributed to the diversity of flightless birds on that continent, which also included Phorusrhacoidea and the giant anseriform Brontornis [76].

If volant stem group representatives of various palaeognath subclades evolved into large-bodied, flightless forms during a relatively narrow temporal window in the early Paleogene, the chances of finding direct fossil evidence of these small-bodied ancestral forms might be relatively low. Indeed, short internodes near the root of Notopalaeognathae indicate a rapid diversification of palaeognath lineages during the Paleogene [41,56]. However, if some transitions to flightlessness were protracted, the chances of identifying informative fossils documenting such transitions would be more likely. With their recent reassignment to total clade Struthionidae, eogruids are a superb example of previous unrecognised stem group representatives of an extant ratite lineage, though better data on their wing apparatus are needed in order to assess whether all known taxa were flightless. If some taxa were volant, Eogruidae could provide an illuminating window into the relative timing of transitions to cursoriality, large body size, and loss of flight in a ratite lineage.

A further challenging aspect of reconstructing the early evolutionary history of the various ratite lineages is that, if flightlessness and large body size arose numerous independent times, confidently assigning a given volant palaeognath fossil from the Paleogene to the correct palaeognath subclade may prove difficult due to convergence. However, the ongoing exploration of certain localities may yield further insight into transitions to flightlessness among certain ratite lineages—for example, additional finds from the St. Bathans fauna could shed more light on the origins of moa and kiwi, and help elucidate whether the stem kiwi Proapteryx was indeed small and volant as initially hypothesized [387].

5. Reconstructing the Most Recent Common Ancestor of Palaeognaths

Understanding the nature of the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of extant palaeognaths will reveal much about palaeognath macroevolution, and neornithine macroevolution more broadly. For instance, insight into the flight apparatus of the crown palaeognath MRCA will help explain how the geographic distributions of extant palaeognaths arose. Moreover, stem palaeognaths (along with stem galloanserans and stem neognaths) are inferred to have survived the end-Cretaceous mass extinction event [41,48,71,72], while all non-neornithine birds appear to have perished [73]. Strong evidence regarding the morphology and ecology of early palaeognaths may also help clarify ecological factors that may have favoured the survivorship of crown birds with respect to non-neornithine avialans—one of the more contentious questions in contemporary palaeornithology [71,77]. Inevitably, given that the palaeognath-neognath split is the deepest
divergence within crown birds, a better understanding of the nature of the palaeognath MRCA will in turn shed light on the common ancestral condition of all extant birds. Although much remains to be learned, there are several inferences that can be made regarding the nature of the most recent common ancestor (MRCA) of palaeognaths based upon the information currently available.

5.1. The Flight Apparatus of the Crown Palaeognath MRCA

Due to the relaxation of stabilizing selection, significant polymorphism exists in the wing musculature of ratites [466], complicating attempts to infer features of the ancestral crown palaeognath wing. As the only extant flighted palaeognaths, tinamids presumably provide the best source of data on the muscular anatomy of the wings of early flighted palaeognaths. Nearly all flight muscles present in neognaths are found in tinamids, with the exception of the biceps slip [274,467,468]. Extant phylogenetic bracketing [469] therefore indicates that the same suite of muscles would be expected to be present in both the crown palaeognath and crown neornithine MRCA s. Of course, tinamids are specialized for burst flight over relatively short distances, and as such are probably imperfect analogues of the ancestral crown palaeognaths that must have colonized distant landmasses in the early Cenozoic [470]. Subsequent losses of dispersal capacity, and the extinction of dispersive ancestral lineages, can leave the inaccurate impression that poorly dispersive taxa underwent oceanic dispersal via stochastic events. For example, the phasianid galliforms *Margaroperdix* (Madagascar) and *Anurophasis* (New Guinea) are poor dispersers, yet are found on isolated islands [470]. Phylogenetic analyses revealed that these taxa are nested within *Coturnix* quails and likely evolved from a dispersive *Coturnix*-like ancestor. Both taxa apparently independently evolved towards a non-dispersive partridge-like morphotype, reminiscent of how the ratite condition appears to have repeatedly evolved in palaeognaths [470]. As discussed in this review, some lithornithids appear to have been reasonably capable fliers and could provide more accurate insight into the nature of dispersive ancestral crown palaeognaths.

5.2. Inferred Ecology of the Palaeognath MRCA and K–Pg Survivorship

Non-neornithine avialans thrived throughout the Cretaceous and remained diverse through the Maastrichtian, before suddenly disappearing at the K–Pg boundary [73]. Until this point, Enantiornithes were the dominant Mesozoic avian clade with more than 60 known species and a worldwide distribution [471–473]. Why did they become extinct, while neornithines survived? The answer may be associated with their ecology and habitat preferences. The K–Pg impact was devastating to the world’s forests and resulted in significant species turnover [71,77,474–478]. Palynology of K–Pg boundary sections across the globe indicates that ground cover following the impact consisted primarily of ferns. This “fern spike” is interpreted as evidence of a disaster flora following the destruction of forests worldwide [71,464,474–476] by widespread fires ignited by the impact and subsequent cold and darkness [479,480]. This fern spike persisted for approximately 1,000 years, and closed-canopy forests appear to have remained generally rare during this interval [481]. Indeed, it may have taken as long as 1.4 Ma for floral diversity hotspots to reappear [482]. This widespread habitat destruction would have been a powerful agent of selection against the mostly arboreal Enantiornithes, though this hypothesis does not explain the extinction of contemporaneous marine avialans such as Ichthyornithes and Hesperornithes. Instead, the demise of these marine piscivorous taxa may have been part of a broader collapse of marine food chains in the aftermath of the Chicxulub impact [71,81,483–486]. Importantly, ancestral state reconstructions of crown birds predict that the MRCA s of crown birds and the deepest crown bird subclades (Neornithes, Palaeognathae, Neognathae, and Neoaves) were all non-arboreal [71]. As such, the ancestors of palaeognaths may have made it through this mass extinction event partly by virtue of having exhibited terrestrial non-arboreal lifestyles.
As the most stemward palaeognaths known [49,64], lithornithids provide the best opportunity to draw fossil-informed inferences about the nature of the crown palaeognath MRCA. Vibrotactile bill tips in *Lithornis promiscuus* and *Paracathartes howardae* may have been associated with probe-feeding in the ground, an interpretation congruent with the hypothesis of predominant K–Pg survivorship among non-arboreal taxa. A vibrotactile bill tip organ composed of mechanoreceptors known as Herbst corpuscles embedded within the bone was hypothesized to be a plesiomorphy of Neornithes by du Toit, et al. [80], which would support the neornithine MRCA and its immediate descendants as having been ground-foraging birds. Such organs are found in palaeognathous and neognathous probe-foragers, enabling them to locate prey buried in substrate through vibration detection [487,488]. In non-probe-foraging palaeognaths, the vibrotactile bill tip organ is vestigial [80,489]. The hypothesis that lithornithids and the palaeognath MRCA were probe-feeders agrees with ideas put forth by Houde [62], who suggested that lithornithids may have preferred to live near water and probed for food using their long beaks, noting the similarity of their jaw apparatus to those of kiwi. Additionally, the genus *Lithornis* appears to have had relatively large olfactory lobes, similar to olfactory foraging taxa including Procellariiformes and kiwi [490]. Since ground feeding birds are more likely to become flightless than arboreal taxa, a volant, non-arboreal, probe-feeding taxon would seem to be a provide a reasonable expectation for the ecology of the MRCA of crown palaeognaths.

6. Conclusions

Our understanding of palaeognath evolution has progressed markedly over the past two decades thanks to the development and application of sophisticated molecular phylogenetic approaches and the continued interrogation of the fossil record; however, many fundamental questions about the origins of extant palaeognath diversity remain unanswered. The present review affirms that the palaeognath crown group has a reasonably thorough fossil record from the late Oligocene-early Miocene onwards, with the exception of early elephant birds and early representatives of the New Zealand ratites, whose fossil record remains sparse until the Pleistocene [392,397,409]. However, the fossil record still fails to clearly illuminate how and when independent transitions to large body size and flightlessness arose among the multiple lineages of “ratites”. As yet, volant stem members of these extant flightless clades remain unknown (besides the possible exception of *Proapteryx* [387]), leaving the early evolutionary history of crown group palaeognaths shrouded in mystery. Lithornithids currently provide the best insight into the nature of the earliest total-clade palaeognaths, and their relatively small size, probable non-arboreal ecology, and apparent capacity for sustained flight may make them useful models for understanding the nature of avian survivors of the end-Cretaceous mass extinction event. In the coming years, we anticipate increased consensus on both the evolutionary relationships and age of Palaeognathae and its major subclades, and hope that such advances are accompanied by the recognition of new fossil total-group palaeognaths from the Mesozoic and early Cenozoic. Such advances will be necessary to fill the many gaps in the palaeognath fossil record identified in this review, and to shed light on the repeated independent origins of “ratites”—one of the most striking examples of convergent evolution in birds, or indeed any other vertebrate clade.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization, K.W. and D.J.F.; methodology, K.W. and D.J.F. investigation, K.W.; data curation, K.W.; writing—original draft preparation, K.W.; writing—review and editing, K.W. and D.J.F.; visualization, K.W.; supervision, D.J.F.; funding acquisition, K.W. and D.J.F. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research was funded by UKRI Future Leaders Fellowship, grant number MR/S032177/1 to D.J.F.

Institutional Review Board Statement: Not applicable.
Acknowledgments: We thank E. Buffetaut and D. Angst for the opportunity to contribute to this Special Issue, K. Welch for proofreading, and G. Mayr as well as an anonymous reviewer for constructive comments on our manuscript.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest. The funders had no role in the design of the study; in the collection, analyses, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

References

1. Billerman, S.; Keeney, B.; Rodewald, P.; Schulenberg, T. Birds of the World. Available online: https://birdsofthe-world.org/bow/home (accessed on 30 March 2021).
2. Pycraft, W.P. On the Morphology and Phylogeny of the Palaeognathae (Ratitae and Crypturidae and Neognathae (Carinatae). Trans. Zool. Soc. Lond. 1900, 15, 149–290, doi:10.1111/j.1096–3642.1900.tb00023.x.
3. Bock, W. The cranial evidence for ratite affinities. In Proceedings of the XIII International Ornithological Congress, Ithaca, New York, NY, USA, 17–24 June 1962; pp. 39–54.
4. Parkes, K.C.; Clark, G.A., Jr. An Additional Character Linking Ratities and Tinamous, and an Interpretation of their Monophyly. Condor 1966, 68, 459–471, doi:10.2307/1365318.
5. Cracraft, J. Phylogeny and evolution of the ratite birds. Ibis 1974, 116, 494–521, doi:10.1111/j.1474–919X.1974.tb07648.x.
6. Mayr, G.; Zelenkov, N. Extinct crane-like birds (Eogruidae and Ergilornithidae) from the Cenozoic of Central Asia are indeed ostrich precursors. Ornithology 2021, 138, 1–15, doi:10.1093/ornithology/ukab048.
7. Huxley, T.H. On the Classification of Birds and on the Taxonomic Value of the Modifications of Certain of the Cranial Bones Observed in that Class; Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London: London, UK, 1867.
8. Torres, C.R.; Norell, M.A.; Clarke, J.A. Bird neurocranial and body mass evolution across the end-Cretaceous mass extinction: The avian brain shape left other dinosaurs behind. Sci. Adv. 2021, 7, eabd7099, doi:10.1126/sciadv.abd7099.
9. Field, D.J.; Benito, J.; Kuo, P.; Jagt, J. Mesozoic Fossil Insight into the Palaeognath–Neognath Anatomical Dichotomy. In Proceedings of the The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology Annual Meeting, 2021; p. 278.
10. Winkler, D.W.; Billerman, S.M.; Lovette, I.J. Kiwis (Apterygidae), version 1.0. Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow.aptery1.01.
11. Bunce, M.; Worthy, T.H.; Phillips, M.J.; Holdaway, R.N.; Williams, E.; Halse, J.; Shapero, B.; Scofield, R.P.; Drummond, A.; Kemp, P.F.J.; et al. The evolutionary history of the extinct ratite moa and New Zealand Neogene paleogeography. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 2009, 106, 20646–20651, doi:10.1073/pnas.0906660106.
12. Hansford, J.P.; Turvey, S.T. Unexpected diversity within the extinct elephant birds (Aves: Aepyornithidae) and a new identity for the world’s largest bird. R. Soc. Open Sci. 2018, 5, 181295, doi:10.1098/rsos.181295.
13. Fromm, A.; Meiri, S. Big, flightless, insular and dead: Characterising the extinct birds of the Quaternary. J. Biogeogr. 2021, 1–10, doi:10.1111/jbi.14206.
14. Winkler, D.; Billerman, S.; Lovette, I. Tinamous (Tinamidae). Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow.tinami1.01.
15. Cabot, J.; Christie, A.D.; Jutglar, F.; Sharpe, C.J. Dwarf Tinamou (Taoiscus nanus), version 1.0. Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow.dwatin1.01.
16. Cabot, J.; Jutglar, F.; Garcia, E.F.J.; Boesman, P.F.D.; Sharpe, C.J. Gray Tinamou (Tinamus tau), version 1.0. Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow.grytin1.01.
17. Folch, A.; Christie, A.D.; Jutglar, F.; Garcia, E.F.J. Common Ostrich (Struthio camelus), version 1.0. Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow.ostric2.01.
18. Davies, S.J.F. Moas. In Grzimek’s Animal Life Encyclopedia. Birds I: Tinamous and Ratites to Hoatzins, 2nd ed.; Hutchins, M., Ed.; Gale Group: Farmington Hills, MI, USA, 2003; Volume 8, pp. 95–98.
19. Szabo, M.J. South Island Giant Moa. Available online: http://nzbirdsonline.org.nz/species/south-island-giant-moa (accessed on 18 April 2021).
20. McDowell, S. The Bony Palate of Birds. Part I The Palaeognathae. Auk 1948, 65, 520–549, doi:10.2307/4080603.
21. Fürbringer, M. Untersuchungen zur Morphologie and Systematik der Vögel: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Anatomie der Stütz–und Bewegungsgänge; T. van Holkema: Amsterdam, The Netherlands, 1888; Volume 15.
22. Allen, G.M. Birds and Their Attributes; Marshall Jones Company: Boston, MA, USA, 1925.
23. Stresemann, E. Aves in: Küenth-Krumbach, Handbuch der Zoologie. Zool. VII 1927, 7, 2.
24. Verheyen, R. Outline of procedure in basic avian systematics. Gerfaut, 1960, 1960, 50.
25. Cracraft, J. Continental drift, paleoclimatology, and the evolution and biogeography of birds. J. Zool. 1973, 169, 455–543, doi:10.1111/j.1469–7987.1973.tb03122.x.
26. Cracraft, J. Avian evolution, Gondwanan biogeography and the Cretaceous–Tertiary mass extinction event. Proc. R. Soc. B 2001, 268, 459–469, doi:10.1098/rspb.2000.1368.
27. Roff, D. The evolution of flightlessness: Is history important? Evol. Ecol. 1994, 8, 639–657, doi:10.1007/BF01237847.
28. Merrem, B. Tentamen systematis naturalis avium. Abb. Der Königlichen Akad. Der Wiss. Berl. 1813, 237–259.
29. Lee, K.; Feinstein, J.; Cracraft, J. Chapter 7—The Phylogeny of Ratite Birds: Resolving Conflicts between Molecular and Morphological Data Sets. In Avian Molecular Evolution and Systematics; Mindell, D.P., Ed.; Academic Press: San Diego, CA, USA, 1997; pp. 173–209.
30. Livezey, B.C.; Zusi, R.L. Higher-order phylogeny of modern birds (Theropoda, Aves: Neornithes) based on comparative anatomy. II. Analysis and discussion. Zool. J. Linn. Soc. 2007, 149, 1–95, doi:10.1111/j.1096–3642.2006.00293.x.
31. Bourdon, E.; De Riqles, A.; Cubo, J. A new Transantarctic relationship: morphological evidence for a Rheidae–Dromaiaidae–Casuariiidae clade (Aves, Palaeognathae, Ratitae). Zool. J. Linn. Soc. 2009, 156, 641–663, doi:10.1111/j.1096–3642.2008.00509.x.
32. Elzanowski, A. Cretaceous birds and avian phylogeny. Cour. Forsch. Senckenb. 1985, 181, 37–53.
33. Johnston, P. New morphological evidence supports congruent phylogenies and Gondwanan vicariance for palaeognathous birds. Zool. J. Linn. Soc. 2011, 163, 959–982, doi:10.1111/j.1096–3642.2011.01730.x.
34. Owen, R. The Anatomy of Vertebrates, Volume 2: Birds and Mammals. Longmans, Green and Company: London, UK, 1866.
35. Choi, J.-H.; Kimball, R.T.; Braun, E.L. Introns outperform exons in analyses of basal avian phylogeny using clathrin heavy chain genes. Gene 2008, 410, 89–96, doi:10.1016/j.gene.2007.11.016.
36. Hackett, S.J.; Kimball, R.T.; Reddy, S.; Bowie, R.C.K.; Braun, E.L.; Braun, M.J.; Choi, J.-H.; Kimball, J.R.; Cox, W.A.; Han, K.; Harshman, J.; et al. A Phylogenomic Study of Birds Reveals Their Evolutionary History. Science 2008, 320, 1763–1768, doi:10.1126/science.1157704.
37. Harshman, J.; Braun, E.L.; Braun, M.J.; Huddleston, C.J.; Bowie, R.C.K.; Choi, J.-H.; Hackett, S.J.; Han, K.; Kimball, R.T.; Marks, B.D.; et al. Phylogenomic evidence for multiple losses of flight in ratite birds. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 2008, 105, 13462–13467, doi:10.1073/pnas.0803242105.
38. Haddrath, O.; Baker, A. Multiple gene sets and retroposons support vicariance and dispersal of the palaeognaths, and an Early Cretaceous origin of modern birds. Proc. R. Soc. B: Biol. Sci. 2012, 279, 4617–4625, doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.1630.
39. Smith, J.V.; Braun, E.L.; Kimball, R.T. Rattie Nonmonophyly: Independent Evidence from 40 Novel Loci. Syst. Biol. 2012, 61, 35–49, doi:10.1093/sysbio/sys067.
40. Baker, A.J.; Haddrath, O.; McPherson, J.D.; Cloutier, A. Genomic Support for a Moa–Tinamou Clade and Adaptive Morphological Convergence in Flightless Ratties. Mol. Biol. Evol. 2014, 31, 1686–1696, doi:10.1093/molbev/msu153.
41. Grealy, A.; Phillips, M.M.; Gifford; Gilbert, M.T.P.R.; Jean-Marie Lambert, David; Bunce, M.; Haile, J. Eggshell palaeogenomics: Palaeognath evolutionary history revealed through ancient nuclear and mitochondrial DNA from Madagascar elephant bird (Aepyornis sp.) eggshell. Mol. Phylogenetics Evol. 2017, 109, 151–163, doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2017.01.005.
42. Almeida, F.C.; Porzecanski, A.L.; Cracraft, J.; Bertelli, S. The evolution of tinamous (Palaeognathae: Tinamidae) in light of molecular and combined analyses. Zool. J. Linn. Soc. 2021, doi:10.1093/zoolinnean/zlab080.
43. Feng, S.; Stiller, J.; Deng, Y.; Armstrong, J.; Fang, Q.; Reese, A.H.; Xie, D.; Chen, G.; Guo, C.; Faircloth, B.C.; et al. Diverse sampling of bird diversity increases power of comparative genomics. Nature 2020, 587, 252–257, doi:10.1038/s41586–020–2873–9.
44. Phillips, M.J.; Gibb, G.C.; Crimp, E.A.; Penny, D. Tinamous and Moa Flock Together: Mitochondrial Genome Sequence Analysis Reveals Independent Losses of Flight among Ratties. Syst. Biol. 2009, 59, 90–107, doi:10.1093/systbio/syp079.
45. Mitchell, K.J.; Llamas, B.; Soubrier, J.; Rawcliffe, N.J.; Worthy, T.H.; Wood, J.; Lee, M.S.Y.; Cooper, A. Ancient DNA reveals elephant birds and kiwi are sister taxa and clarifies ratite bird evolution. Science 2014, 344, 898–900, doi:10.1126/science.1251981.
46. Urantówka, A.D.; Kroczak, A.; Mackiewicz, P. New view on the organization and evolution of Palaeognathae mitogenomes poses the question on the ancestral gene rearrangement in Aves. BMC Genom. 2020, 21, 874, doi:10.1186/s12864–020–07284–5.
47. Jarvis, E.D.; Mirarab, S.; Aberer, A.J.; Li, B.; Houde, P.; Li, C.; Ho, S.Y.W.; Faircloth, B.C.; Nabholz, B.; Howard, J.T.; et al. Whole-genome analyses resolve early branches in the tree of life of modern birds. Science 2014, 346, 1320–1331, doi:10.1126/science.1253451.
48. Prum, R.O.; Berv, J.S.; Dornburg, A.; Field, D.J.; Townsend, J.P.; Lemmon, E.M.; Lemmon, A.R. A comprehensive phylogeny of birds (Aves) using targeted next-generation DNA sequencing. Nature 2015, 526, 569–573, doi:10.1038/nature15697.
49. Yonezawa, T.; Segawa, T.; Mori, H.; Campos, P.F.; Hongoh, Y.; Endo, H.; Akiyoshi, A.; Kohno, N.; Nishida, S.; Wu, J. Phylogenomics and morphology of extinct palaeognaths reveal the origin and evolution of the ratites. Currr. Biol. 2017, 27, 68–77, doi:10.1016/j.cub.2016.05.029.
50. Sackton, T.B.; Grayson, P.; Cloutier, A.; Hu, Z.; Liu, J.S.; Wheeler, N.E.; Gardner, P.P.; Clarke, J.A.; Baker, A.J.; Clamp, M.; et al. Convergent regulatory evolution and loss of flight in palaeognathous birds. Science 2019, 364, 74–78, doi:10.1126/science.aat7244.
51. Norberg, U.L. Evolution of flight in animals. Flow Phenom. Nat. 2007, 1, 36–48.
52. Livezey, B.C. Evolution of flightlessness in rails (Gruiiformes, Railidae): Phylogenetic, Ecomorphological, and Ontogenetic Perspectives. Ornithol. Monogr. 2003, 53, iii–654.
53. Gaspar, J.; Gibb, G.C.; Trewick, S.A. Convergent morphological responses to loss of flight in rails (Aves: Railidae). Ecol. Evol. 2020, 10, 6186–6207, doi:10.1002/eee3.6298.
54. Kuhl, H.; Frankl-Vilches, C.; Bakker, A.; Mayr, G.; Nikolaus, G.; Boerno, S.T.; Klages, S.; Timmermann, B.; Gahr, M. An Unbiased Molecular Approach Using 3’-UTRs Resolves the Avian Family-Level Tree of Life. Mol. Biol. Evol. 2020, 38, 108–127, doi:10.1093/molbev/msaa191.
55. Claramunt, S.; Cracraft, J. A new time tree reveals Earth history’s imprint on the evolution of modern birds. Sci. Adv. 2015, 1, e1501005, doi:10.1126/sciadv.1501005.
56. Cloutier, A.; Sackton, T.B.; Grayson, P.; Clamp, M.; Baker, A.J.; Edwards, S.V. Whole-Genome Analyses Resolve the Phylogeny of Flightless Birds (Palaeognathae) in the Presence of an Empirical Anomaly Zone. Syst. Biol. 2019, 68, 937–955, doi:10.1093/sysbio/syz019.
57. Kimball, R.; Oliveros, C.; Wang, N.; White, N.D.; Barker, F.K.; Field, D.J.; Ksepka, D.; Chesser, R.; Moyle, R.; Braun, M.; et al. A Phylogenomic Supertree of Birds. Diversity 2019, 11, 109, doi:10.3390/d11070109.
114. Mayr, G. Birds—The most species-rich vertebrate group in Messel. Senckenberg Ges. Für Nat. Frankf. Am Main 2018, 169–214.

115. Harrison, C. A new cathartid vulture from the lower Eocene of Wyoming. Tert. Res. 1979, 5, 7–10.

116. Grande, L. Palaeontology of the Green River Formation, with a Review of the Fish Fauna, 2nd ed.; University of Wyoming: Laramie, WY, USA, 1984.

117. Wetmore, A. Fossil birds from the Green River deposits of eastern Utah. Ann. Carnegie Mus. 1926, 16, 391–497.

118. Brodkorb, P. An eocene puffbird from Wyoming. Rocky Mt. Geol. 1970, 9, 13–15.

119. Olson, S. A Lower Eocene Frigatebird from the Green River Formation of Wyoming (Pelecaniformes: Fregatidae). Smithson. Contrib. Paleobiol. 1977, 35.

120. Olson, S. An early eocene oilbird from the Green River Formation of Wyoming (Caprimulgiformes: Steatornithidae). In Proceedings of the Table Ronde internationale du CNRS, Lyon, France, 18–21 September 1985; pp. 57–69.

121. Olson, S. A new family of primitive landbirds from the early Eocene Green River Formation of Wyoming. Pap. Avian Paleontol. Honor. Pierce Brodkorb 1992, 36, 127–136.

122. Mayr, G.; Daniels, M. A new short-legged landbird from the Early Eocene of Wyoming and contemporaneous European sites. Acta Palaeontol. Pol. 2001, 46, 393–402.

123. Olson, S.; Matsuoka, H. New species of the early Eocene frigatebird Linornispatra (Pelecaniformes: Fregatidae), with the description of a new species. Zootaxa 2005, 1046, 1–15, doi:10.11646/ZOOTAXA.1046.1.1.

124. Ksepka, D.T.; Clarke, J.A. Affinities of Palaeospiza bella and the Phylogeny and Biogeography of Mousebirds (Coliiformes). Auk 2009, 126, 245–259, doi:10.1525/auk.2009.07178.

125. Ksepka, D.T.; Clarke, J.A. Primobucco megcravi (Aves: Coraci) from the Eocene Green River Formation: New anatomical data from the earliest constrained record of stem rollers. J. Vertebr. Paleontol. 2010, 30, 215–225, doi:10.1080/02724630903412414.

126. Weidig, I. New birds from the Lower Eocene Green River Formation, North America. In Proceedings of the VII International Meeting of the Society of Avian Paleontology and Evolution, ed. W.E. Boles and T.H. Worthy. Rec. Aust. Mus. 2010, 62, 29–44.

127. Ksepka, D.T.; Clarke, J.A.; Grande, L. Stem Parrots (Aves, Halcyornithidae) from the Green River Formation and a Combined Phylogeny of Pan-Psittaciformes. J. Paleontol. 2011, 85, 833–852, doi:10.1086/666610–108.1.

128. Smith, N., D.; Grande, L.; Clarke, J.A. A new species of Threskiornithidae-like bird (Aves, Ciconiiformes) from the Green River Formation (Eocene) of Wyoming. J. Vertebr. Paleontol. 2013, 33, 363–381, doi:10.1080/02724634.2012.722989.

129. Owen, R. Description of the remains of a mammal, a bird, and a serpent from the London Clay. Proc. Geol. Soc. Lond. 1840, 3, 162–166.

130. Owen, R. Description of the Fossil Remains of a Mammal (Hyracotherium leporinum) and of a Bird (Lithornis culturinus) from the London Clay. Trans. Geol. Soc. 1841, 2, 203–208.

131. Harrison, C.J.O.; Walker, C.A. Birds of the British Lower Eocene. Tert. Res. Spec. Pap. 1977, 3, 1–52.

132. Harrison, C.J.O. Rail-like cursorial birds of the British Lower Eocene, with descriptions of two new species. Lond. Nat. 1984, 63, 14–23.

133. Bledsoe, A.H. A Phylogenetic Analysis of Postcranial Skeletal Characters of the Ratite Birds. Ann. Carnegie Mus. 1938, 57, 73–90.

134. Mayr, G.; Clarke, J. The deep divergences of neornithine birds: A phylogenetic analysis of morphological characters. Cladistics 2003, 19, 527–553, doi:10.1111/j.1091-0268.2003.tb00387.x.

135. Clarke, J.; Zhou, Z.; Zhang, F. Insight into the evolution of avian flight from a new clade of Early Cretaceous ornithurines from China and the morphology of Xiyiornis grabaui. J. Anat. 2006, 208, 287–308, doi:10.1111/j.1469–7580.2006.00534.x.

136. Worthy, T.H.; Mitri, M.; Handley, W.D.; Lee, M.S.Y.; Anderson, A.; Sand, C. Osteology supports a stem-galliform affinity for the giant extinct flightless bird Sylvornis novaelandiae (Sylvornithidae, Gallanoesers). PLoS ONE 2016, 11, e0150871, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0150871.

137. Worthy, T.H.; Degrange, F.J.; Handley, W.D.; Lee, M.S.Y. The evolution of giant flightless birds and novel phylogenetic relationships for extinct fowl (Aves, Galliformes). R. Soc. Open Sci. 2017, 4, 170975, doi:10.1098/rsos.170975.

138. del Hoyo, J.; Collar, N.; Garcia, E.F.J. Somali Ostrich (Struthio molybdophanes), version 1.0. Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow-os	ic.301.

139. Janz, L.; Feathers, J.K.; Burr, G.S. Dating surface assemblages using pottery and eggshell: assessing radiocarbon and luminescence techniques in Northeast Asia. J. Archaeol. Sci. 2015, 57, 119–129, doi:10.1016/j.jas.2015.02.006.

140. Khatenovich, A.; Rybin, E.; Gunchinsuren, B.; Bolorbat, T.; Odsuren, D.; Angaragdulguun, G.; Margad-Erdene, G. Human and Struthio asiaticus: One page of Paleolithic art in the eastern part of Central Asia. Irkutsk State Univ. Bull. Ser. Geoarcheol. Ethnol. Anthropol. 2017, 21, 80–106.

141. Wang, S.; Hu, Y.; Wang, L. New rattie eggshell material from the Miocene of Inner Mongolia, China. Chin. Birds 2011, 2, 28–26, doi:10.5122/cbirds.2011.0002.

142. Mayr, G. The middle Eocene European “rattie” Palaeotis (Aves, Palaeognathae) restudied once more. Paläontologische Z. 2015, 89, 503–514, doi:10.1007/s12542–014–0248-y.

143. Houde, P.; Haubold, H. Palaeotis weigelti restudied; a small middle Eocene ostrich (Aves: Struthioniformes). Palaeovertebrata 1987, 17, 27–42.

144. Lemoine, V. Recherches sur les Oiseaux Fossiles des Terrains Tertiaires Inférieurs des Environs de Reims, Deuxième Partie; Matot-Braine: Reims, France, 1881.

145. Lambrecht, K. Palaeotis weigelti n. g. n. sp., eine fossile Trappe aus der mitteleozänen Braunkohle des Geiseltales. Jahrb. Des Halleschen Verb. Für Die Erforsch. Mitteldtsch. Bodenschatze 1928, 7, 1–11.
207. Mourer-Chauviré, C.; Geraads, D. The Struthionidae and Pelagornithidae (Aves: Struthioniformes, Odontopterygiformes) from the late Pliocene of Ahl al Oughlam, Morocco [Les Struthionidae et les Pelagornithidae (Aves, Struthioniformes et Odontopterygiformes) du Pliocène final d’Ahl al Oughlam, Maroc]. In Proceedings of the 6ème Symposium international de la Society for Avian Paleontology and Evolution (SAPE), Quillan, France, 28 September–3 October 2004; pp. 169–194.

208. Hay, R.L. *Geology of the Olduvai Gorge: University of California Press: Berkeley, CA, USA, 1976.*

209. Lowe, P.R. XL I.—On Some Struthious Remains:—1. Description of some Pelvic Remains of a large Fossil Ostrich, *Struthio oldawari*, sp. n., from the Lower Pleistocene of Oldaway (Tanganyika Territory); 2. Egg–shell Fragments referable to Psammornis and other Struthiones collected by Mr. St. John Philby in Southern Arabia. *Ibis* 1933, 75, 652–658, doi:10.1111/j.1474–9919.1933.tb03357.x.

210. Leakey, L.B.R. *Olduvai Gorge. 1951–1961. Vol 1. A preliminary report on the Geology and Fauna;* Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 1967.

211. Arambourg, C. *Vertébrés viliafranchiens d’Afrique du Nord.* (Artiodactyles, Carnivores, Primates, Reptiles, Oiseaux); Fondation Singer-Polignac: Paris, France, 1979; p. 141.

212. Becker-Platen, J.D.; Benda, L.; Steffens, P. *Litho-und Biostratigraphische Deutung radiometrischer Altersbestimmungen aus dem Jungtertiär der Türkei;* Schweizerbart’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung; Stuttgart, Germany, 1977.

213. Sauer, E.G. *A Miocene Ostrich from Anatolia.* *Ibis* 1979, 121, 494–501.

214. Lambrecht, K. *Handbuch der Palaeornithologie;* Gebrüder Borntraeger: Berlin, Germany, 1933.

215. Louchart, A.; Bibi, F.; Stewart, J.R. The birds of the late Miocene Baynunah Formation, Abu Dhabi Emirate. In * Sands of Time: Late Miocene Fossils from the Baynunah Formation, U.A.E. ;* Bibi, F., Kraatz, B., Beech, M., Hill, A., Eds.; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2020.

216. Tugarinov, A.Y. Some data on Pliocene ornithofauna of Siberia. *Tr. Paleozoologicheskago Inst.* 1935, 4, 79–85.

217. Deng, T.; Qiu, Z.; Wang, B.; Wang, X.; Hou, S. Late Cenozoic biostatigraphy of the Linxia basin, northwestern China. In *Fossil Mammals of Asia;* Columbia University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2013; pp. 243–273.

218. Hou, L.; Zhou, Z.; Zhang, F.; Wang, Z. A Miocene ostrich fossil from Gansu Province, northwest China. *Chin. Sci. Bull.* 2005, 50, 1808–1810.

219. Kaakinien, A.; Passsey, B.H.; Zhang, Z.; Liu, L.; Pesonen, L.J.; Fortelius, M. Stratigraphy and paleoecology of the classical dragon bone localities of Baode County, Shanxi Province. In *Fossil Mammals of Asia: Neogene Biostratigraphy and Chronology;* Wang, X., Flynn, L.J., Fortelius, M., Eds.; Columbia University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2013; pp. 203–217.

220. Lowe, P.R. *Struthious Remains from Northern China and Mongolia: With Descriptions of Struthio winnani, Struthio anderssoni and Struthio mongolicus, Sup. Nov.;* Geological Survey of China: Beijing, China, 1931.

221. Sahni, A.; Kumar, G.; Bajpai, S.; Srinivasan, S. Ultrastructure and taxonomy of ostrich eggshells from Upper Palaeolithic sites of India. *J. Palaeontol. Soc. India* 1989, 34, 91–98.

222. Sahni, A.; Kumar, G.; Srinivasan, S.; Bajpai, S. Review of Late Pleistocene ostriches (*Struthio sp.*) of India. *Man Environ.* 1990, 15, 41–47.

223. Stern, L.A.; Johnson, G.D.; Chamberlain, C.P. Carbon isotope signature of environmental change found in fossil rattle eggshells from a South Asian Neogene sequence. *Geology* 1994, 22, 419–422, doi:10.1130/91–7613(1994)022<0419:CISOEC–2.0.CO;2.

224. Patnaik, R.; Sahni, A.; Cameron, D.; Pillans, B.; Chatrath, P.; Simons, E.; Williams, M.; Bibi, F. Ostrich-like eggshells from a 10.1 million-year-old Miocene ape locality, Haritalyangar, Himachal Pradesh, India. *Carr. Sci.* 2009, 96, 1485–1495.

225. Davies, W. III.—On some Fossil Bird-Remains from the Siwalik Hills in the British Museum. *Geol. Mag.* 1880, 7, 18–27, doi:10.1017/S0016756800146904.

226. Lydekker, R. *Indian Tertiary and post-Tertiary Vertebrata. Siwalik and Narbada bunodont Suina.* *Mem. Geol. Surv. India Palaeontol. Indica Ser.* 10 1884, 3, 35–104.

227. Ginsburg, I.; Heintz, F.; Sen, S. Le gisement pliocène à Mammiferes de Çalta (Ankara, Turquie). *Comptes Rendus De L‘académie Des Sci. Paris* 1974, 278–279, doi:10.1017/S0016756800146904.

228. Sen, S. La faune de rangeurs pliocènes de Çalta (Ankara, Turquie). *Bull. Du Muséum National D’histoire Nat. Ser. 3 Sci. De La Terre* 1977, 61, 89–171.

229. Janoo, A.; Sen, S. Pliocene vertebrate locality of Çalta, Ankara, Turkey. 2. Aves: Struthionidae. *Geodiversitas* 1998, 20, 339–351.

230. Belaieva, E.I. *Catalogue of Tertiary Fossil Sites of Land Mammals in the USSR;* American Geological Institute: Alexandria, VA, USA, 1962.

231. Sotnikova, M.; Dodonov, A.; Pen’kov, A. Upper Cenozoic bio-magnetic stratigraphy of Central Asian mammalian localities. *Palaeoeeogr. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol.* 1997, 133, 243–258, doi:10.1016/S0031–0182(97)00078–3.

232. Cai, B.; Zheng, S.; Liddicoat, J.C.; Li, Q. Review of the litho-, bio-, and chronostratigraphy in the Nihewan Basin, Hebei, China. In *Fossil Mammals of Asia;* Wang, X., Flynn, L.J., Fortelius, M., Eds.; Columbia University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2013; pp. 218–242.

233. Buffetaut, E.; Angst, D. A Giant Ostrich from the Lower Pleistocene Nihewan Formation of North China, with a Review of the Fossil Ostriches of China. *Diversity* 2021, 13, 47, doi:10.3390/d13020047.

234. Hou, L. Avian fossils of Pleistocene from Zhoukoudian. *Mem. Inst. Vertebr. Palaeontol. Palaeoanthropology Acad. Sin.* 1993, 19, 165–297.

235. Vangengeim, E.; Tesakov, A.S. Late Miocene Mammal Localities of Eastern Europe and Western Asia. In *Fossil Mammals of Asia;* Columbia University Press: New York, NY, USA, 2013; pp. 521–537.
236. Kurochkin, E.N.; Lungu, A.N. A new ostrich from the Middle Sarmatian of Moldavia. Paleontol. Zhurnal 1970, 1, 118–123.
237. Solounias, N.; Rivals, F.; Semprebon, G.M. Dietary interpretation and paleoecology of herbivores from Pikermi and Samos (late Miocene of Greece). Paleobiology 2010, 36, 113–136, doi:10.1666/0094-8373-36.1.113.
238. Bachmayer, F.; Zapfe, H. Reste von Struthio aus Pikermi. Proc. Acad. Athens 1962, 37, 247–253.
239. Michaillidis, D.; Roussiaakis, S.; Theodorou, G. Palaeoavian remains from the late Miocene localities of Pikermi, Chomateri and Kerassia: palaeoecological implications. In Proceedings of the 9th Congress of the Carpathian-Balkan Geological Association, Thessaloniki, Greece, 23–26 September 2002; pp. 23–26.
240. Koufos, G.D.; Kostopoulou, D.S.; Konidaris, G.E. Palaeontology of the upper Miocene vertebrate localities of Nikiti (Chalkidi Peninsula, Macedonia, Greece) Foreword. Geobios 2016, 49, 29–36, doi:10.1016/j.geobios.2016.01.012.
241. Spassov, N. The Turolian Megafauna of West Bulgaria and the character of the Late Miocene “Pikermian biome”. Bol. Soc. Paleontol. Ital. 2002, 41, 69–82.
242. Boev, Z.; Spassov, N. First record of ostriches (Aves, Struthioniformes, Struthionidae) from the late Miocene of Bulgaria with taxonomic and zoogeographic discussion. Geodiversitas 2009, 31, 493–507, doi:10.5252/g2009n3a1.
243. Alekseev, A. Animaux Fossiles du Village Novo-Elisavetovka; Zapiski Novorosiyiskogo Institute: Odessa, Ukraine, 1915; pp. 273–453.
244. Burchak-Abramovich, N. Fossil ostriches of Caucasus and Southern Ukraine. Tr. Estestvenoritoricheskogo Musyza Im. G. Zardabi 1953, 7, 1–206.
245. Forsyth Major, C. Sur un gisement d’ossements fossiles dans l’île de Samos, contemporaire de l’âge de Pikermi. Comptes Rendus De L’Academie Des Sci. Paris 1888, 107, 1178–1181.
246. Tzankov, T.; Spassov, N.; Stoyanov, K. Neogene-Quaternary Paleogeography and Geodynamics of the Region of Middle Struma River Valley (South-Western Bulgaria); Publishing House of the South-Western University “N. Rilski”: Blagoevgrad, Bulgaria, 2005; p. 199.
247. Spassov, N.; Tzankov, T.; Geraads, D. Late Neogene stratigraphy, biochronology, faunal diversity and environments of South-West Bulgaria (Struma River Valley). Geodiversitas 2006, 28, 477–498.
248. Theodorou, G.; Athanassiou, A.; Roussiaakis, S.; Ilipoulos, G. Preliminary remarks on the late Miocene herbivores of Kerassia (Northern Euboea, Greece). Deinoea 2003, 10, 519–530.
249. Kampouridis, P.; Michaillidis, D.; Kargopoulos, N.; Roussiaakis, S.; Theodorou, G. First description of an ostrich from the late Miocene of Kerassia (Euboea, Greece): Remarks on its cervical anatomy. Hist. Biol. 2020, 33, 1–8, doi:10.1080/08912963.2020.1779252.
250. Burchak-Abramovich, N. New data on the Tertiary ostriches of Southern Ukraine. Priroda 1939, 5, 94–97.
251. Burchak-Abramovich, N.I.; Vekua, A.K. The Fossil Ostrich from Akchagil Layers of Georgia. Acta Zool. Crac. 1971, 16, 1–26.
252. Tesakov, A. Biostratigraphy of Middle Pliocene—Eopleistocene of Eastern Europe (based on small mammals). Trans. Geol. Inst. 2004, 1–247.
253. Tesakov, A.S.; Dodonov, A.E.; Titov, V.V.; Trubikhin, V.M. Plio-Pleistocene geological record and small mammal faunas, eastern shore of the Azov Sea, Southern European Russia. Quat. Int. 2007, 160, 57–69, doi:10.1016/j.quaint.2006.09.009.
254. Athanassiou, A. A Villafranchian Hipparion-Bearing Mammal Fauna from Sèklo (E. Thessaly, Greece): Implications for the Question of Hippo-Eurus Sympathy in Europe. Quaternary 2018, 1, doi:10.3390/quat1020012.
255. Ferrigno, R.; Oms, O.; Agustí, J.; Berna, F.; Niordadze, M.; Shelia, T.; Tappen, M.; Vekua, A.; Zhvania, D.; Lordkipanidze, D. Earliest human occupations at Dmanisi (Georgian Caucasus) dated to 1.85–1.78 Ma. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 2011, 108, 10432–10436, doi:10.1073/pnas.110638108.
256. Burchak-Abramovich, N.; Vekua, A. The fossil ostrich Struthio dmanensis sp. n. from the Lower Pleistocene of eastern Georgia. Acta Zool. Crac. 1990, 33, 121–132.
257. Lopatin, A.V.; Vislobokova, I.A.; Lavrov, A.V.; Startsev, D.B.; Gimranov, D.O.; Zelenkov, N.V.; Maschenko, E.N.; Sotnikova, M.V.; Tarasenko, K.K.; Titov, V.V. The Taurida Cave, a New Locality of Early Pleistocene Vertebrates in Crimea. Dokl. Biol. Sci. 2019, 485, 40–43, doi:10.1134/S0012496619020066.
258. Zelenkov, N.V.; Lavrov, A.V.; Startsev, D.B.; Vislobokova, I.A.; Lopatin, A.V. A giant early Pleistocene bird from eastern Europe: unexpected component of terrestrial faunas at the time of early Homo arrival. J. Vertbr. Paleontol. 2019, 39, e1065521, doi:10.1080/02724634.2019.1605521.
259. Mayhew, D.F. Revision of the fossil vole assemblage (Mammalia, Rodentia, Arvicolidae) from Pleistocene deposits at Kisláng, Hungary. Palaeontology 2012, 55, 11–29, doi:10.1111/j.1475-4983.2011.01115.x.
260. Kretzoi, M. Bericht über die Calabrische (Villafranchische) Fauna von Kisláng. Kom. Feyéér. Jahresarh. Der Ung. Geol. Anst. 1954, 1953, 212–264.
261. Rich, P.V. Significance of the Tertiary avifaunas from Africa (with emphasis on a mid to late Miocene avifauna from southern Tunisia). Ann. Geol. Surv. Egypt 1974, 4, 167–210.
262. Wang, S. Rediscussion in the taxonomic assignment of “Struthio linxiaensis” Hou, et al., 2005. Acta Palaeontologica Sin. 2008, 47, 362–368.
263. Milne-Edwards, A. Recherches Anatomiques et Paléontologiques pour Servir à l’histoire des Oiseaux Fossiles de la France, Tome Second; Victor Masson: Paris, France, 1869–1871; Volume 1, p. 632.
264. Milkovsky, J.; Chenzhchenova, F.; Filippov, A. Quaternary birds of the Baikal region, East Siberia. Acta Soc. Zool. Bohem. 1997, 61, 151–156.
Diversity 2022, 14, 105

265. Stimpson, C.M.; Lister, A.; Parton, A.; Clark-Balzan, L.; Breeze, P.S.; Drake, N.A.; Groucutt, H.S.; Jennings, R.; Scerri, E.M.L.; White, T.S.; et al. Middle Pleistocene vertebrate fossils from the Nefud Desert, Saudi Arabia: Implications for biogeography and palaeoecology. Quat. Sci. Rev. 2016, 143, 13–36, doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2015.06.016.

266. Field, D.J.; Lynner, C.; Brown, C.; Darroch, S.A. Skeletal correlates for body mass estimation in modern and fossil flying birds. PLoS ONE 2013, 8, e82800. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0082000.

267. Buffetat, E.; Angst, D. How large was the giant ostrich of China. EVOLUÇÃO Rev. De Geistória E Pré-História 2017, 2, 6–8.

268. Folch, A.; del Hoyo, J.; Christie, D.A.; Collar, N.; Jutglar, F.; Garcia, E.F.J. Lesser Rhea (Rhea pennata), version 1.0. Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow.lesrhea.201.

269. Kirwan, G.M.; Korthals, A.; Hodès, C.E. Greater Rhea (Rhea americana), version 2.0. Birds World 2021, doi:10.2173/bow.greberh.02.

270. Delsuc, F.; Superina, M.; Ferraris, G.; Tilak, M.K.; Douzery, E. Molecular evidence for hybridisation between the two living species of South American ratites: potential conservation implications. Conserv. Genet. 2007, 8, 503–507, doi:10.1007/s10592–006–9179-9.

271. Miranda-Ribeiro, A. Notas ornithológicas, tinamidae. Rev. Do Mus. Paul. 1938, 23, 667–788.

272. Bertelli, S.; Chiappe, L.M.; Mayr, G. Phylogeographic interrelationships of living and extinct Tinamidae, volant palaeognathous birds from the New World. Zool. J. Linn. Soc. 2014, 172, 145–184, doi:10.1111/zoj.12156.

273. Rayner, J.M. Form and function in avian flight. In Current Ornithology; Springer: New York, NY, USA, 1988; pp. 1–66.

274. Widrig, K.E.; Watanabe, J.; Bhullar, B.S.; Field, D.J. Three-dimensional atlas of pectoral musculoskeletal anatomy in the extant tinamou Notopterus pentlandii (Palaeognathae). In Proceedings of the The Society of Vertebrate Paleontology 80th Annual Meeting, Virtual, 12–16 October 2020.

275. Alvarenga, H.M. Uma ave ratia de paleoceno brasileiro: bacia caicaia de itaborai, estado do Rio de Janeiro, Brasil. Bol. Do Mus. Nacional. Nova Ser. 1993, 41, 1–8.

276. Woodburne, M.O.; Goin, F.J.; Raimemborn, M.S.; Heizler, M.; Gelfo, J.N.; Oliveira, E.V. Revised timing of the South American early Paleogene land mammal ages. J. South. Am. Earth Sci. 2014, 50, 149–119, doi:10.1016/j.jsames.2014.05.003.

277. Agnolin, F.L. Unexpected diversity of ratites (Aves, Palaeognathae) in the early Cenozoic of South America: palaeobiogeographical implications. Alcheringa: An Australas. J. Palaeontol. 2017, 1, 101–111, doi:10.1080/03315518.2016.1184898.

278. Alvarenga, H. Diogenornis fragilis Alvarenga, 1985, restudied: a South American ratite closely related to Casuariidae. In Proceedings of the 25th International Ornithological Congress, Campos do Jordão, Brazil, 22–28 August 2010.

279. Tambussi, C. The fossil Rheiformes from Argentina. Cour. Forsch. Senckenberg 1995, 181, 121–129.

280. Pascual, R.; Ortiz-Jaureguizar, E. The Gondwanan and South American episodes: two major and unrelated moments in the history of the South American mammals. J. Mamm. Evol. 2007, 14, 75–137, doi:10.1007/s10914–007–9039–5.

281. Raigemborn, M.S.; Krause, J.M.; Belloso, E.; Matheos, S.D. Redefinition estratigráfica del grupo Río Chico (Paleógeno Inferior), en el norte de la cuenca del golfo San Jorge, Chubut. Rev. De La Asoc. Geológica Argent. 2010, 67, 239–256.

282. Krause, J.; Belloso, E. Paleosols from the Kolue Kaike Formation (Lower-Middle Eocene) in the South-central Chubut, Argentina. A preliminary analysis. In Proceedings of the Actas IV Congreso Latinoamericano de Sedimentología, La Plata, Argentina, 11–24 November 2006; pp. 125–136.

283. Paredes, J.M.; Colombo, F.; Fois, N.; Allard, J.O.; Nilini, A.; Allo, M. Basaltic Explosive Volcanism in a tuff-dominated intraplate setting, Sarmiento formation (Middle Eocene-lower Miocene), Patagonia, Argentina. Lat. Am. J. Sedimentol. Basin Anal. 2008, 15, 77–92.

284. Kramarz, A.; Garrido, A.; Ribeiro, A.; Ortiz, R. Nuevos registros de vertebrados fósiles de la Formación Chichinales, Mioceno Temprano de la provincia de Río Negro, Argentina. Ameghiniana 2004, 41, 539.

285. Agnolin, F.; Chafriat, P. New fossil bird remains from the Chichinales Formation (Early Miocene) of northern Patagonia, Argentina. Am. Geol. 2015, 101, 87–94, doi:10.1016/j.amgeo.2015.02.001.

286. Marshall, L.G.; Patterson, B. Geology and Geochronology of the Mammal-Bearing Tertiary of the Valle de Santa Maria and Rio Corral Quemado, Catamarca Province, Argentina; Field Museum of Natural History: Chicago, IL, USA, 1981.

287. Fleagle, J.G.; Perkins, M.E.; Heizler, M.T.; Nash, B.; Bown, T.M.; Tauber, A.A.; Dozo, M.T.; Tejedor, M.F.; Vizcaíno, S.F.; Kay, R.F. Absolute and relative ages of fossil localities in the Santa Cruz and Pinturas Formations. In Early Miocene Paleobiology in Patagonia: High-Latitude Paleocommunities of the Santa Cruz Formation; Vizcaíno, S.F., Kay, R.F., Bargo, M.S., Eds.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2012; pp. 41–58.

288. Blisniuk, P.M.; Stern, L.A.; Chamberlain, C.P.; Idleman, B.; Zeitler, P.K. Climatic and ecologic changes during Miocene surface uplift in the Southern Patagonian Andes. Earth Planet. Sci. Lett. 2005, 230, 125–142, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2004.11.015.

289. Perkins, M.E.; Fleagle, J.G.; Heizler, M.T.; Nash, B.; Bown, T.; Tauber, A.A.; Dozo, M.T. Tephrochronology of the Miocene Santa Cruz and Pinturas Formations, Argentina. In Early Miocene Paleobiology in Patagonia: High-Latitude Paleocommunities of the Santa Cruz Formation; Vizcaíno, S.F., Kay, R.F., Bargo, M.S., Eds.; Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, UK, 2012; pp. 23–40.

290. Cuitín, J.I.; Fernicola, J.C.; Kohn, M.J.; Trayler, R.; Naipauer, M.; Bargo, M.S.; Kay, R.F.; Vizcaíno, S.F. U-Pb geochronology of the Santa Cruz Formation (early Miocene) at the Río Bote and Río Santa Cruz (southernmost Patagonia, Argentina): Implications for the correlation of fossil vertebrate localities. J. South. Am. Earth Sci. 2016, 70, 198–210, doi:10.1016/j.jsames.2016.05.007.

291. Ameghino, F. Enumeración de las aves fósiles de la República Argentina. Rev. Argent. De Hist. Nat. 1891, 1, 441–453.

292. Buffetat, E. Tertiary ground birds from Patagonia (Argentina) in the Tournouër collection of the Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle, Paris. Bull. De La Soc. Geol. De Fr. 2014, 185, 207–214, doi:10.2113/gssgbull.185.3.207.
Diversity 2022, 14, 105

293. Dieden, J.M.; Noriega, J. New Records Of Birds In The Santa Cruz Formation (Early-Middle Miocene) At The Rio Santa Cruz Valley, Patagonia, Argentina. Publicación Electrónica De La Asoc. Paleontológica Argent. 2020, 19, 55–61, doi:10.5710/PEAPA.16.09.2019.284.

294. Forasiepi, A.M.; Martinelli, A.G.; de la Fuente, M.; Dieguez, S.; Bond, M. Paleontology and stratigraphy of the Aisol Formation (Neogene), San Rafael, Mendoza. Cenozoic Geol. Cent. Andes Argentina. SCS Publ. Salta 2011, 135–154.

295. Agnoli, F.L.; Noriega, J.I. Una Nueva Especie de Nandú (Aves: Rheidae) del Miocene Tardío de la Mesopotamia Argentina. Ameghiniana 2012, 49, 236–246, doi:10.5710/AMGH.V49I2(492).

296. Ganduglia, P. Observaciones geológicas en la región de Ingeniero Jacobacci provincia de Río Negro (con énfasis en el Cretácico y Terciario). Bachelor’s Dissertation, Universidad Nacional de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1977.

297. Cione, A.L.; Azpelicueta, M.d.I.M.; Bond, M.; Carlini, A.A.; Casciotta, J.R.; Cozzuol, M.A.; de la Fuente, M.; Gasparini, Z.; Goin, F.J.; Noriega, J. Miocene vertebrates from Entre Ríos province, eastern Argentina. El Neógeno De Argentina. Ser. Correlación Geológica 2000, 14, 191–237.

298. Cerdeño, E.; Montalvo, C. Los Mesotheriinae (Mesotheriidae, Notoungulata) del Miocene superior de La Pampa, Argentina. Rev. Española De Paleontol. 2001, 16, 63–75.

299. Verzi, D.; Deschamps, C.; Montalvo, C. Bioestratigrafía y biocronología del Miocene tardío de Argentina central. Ameghiniana 2004, 41, 21R.

300. Cenizo, M.M.; Tambussi, C.; Montalvo, P.C.I. Late Miocene continental birds from the Cerro Azul Formation in the Pampean region (central-southern Argentina). Alcheringa: An. Australas. J. Palaeontol. 2012, 36, 47–68, doi:10.1080/07124634.2011.582806.

301. Bossi, G.E.; Muruaga, C.M. Estratigrafía e inversión tectónica del ‘rift’ neógeno en el Campo del Arenal, Catamarca, NO Argentina. Andean Geol. 2009, 36, 311–340.

302. Reguero, M.A.; Candela, A.M. Late Cenozoic mammals from the northwest of Argentina. Cenozoic Geol. Cent. Andes Argent. 2011, 45R, 411–426.

303. Noriega, J.I.; Jordan, E.A.; Vezzosi, R.I.; Areta, J.I. A new species of Opisthodactylus Ameghino, 1891 (Aves, Rheidae), from the late Miocene of northwestern Argentina, with implications for the paleobiogeography and phylogeny of rheas. J. Vertebr. Paleontol. 2017, 37, e1278005, doi:10.1080/07380699.2017.1278005.

304. Deschamps, C.M.; Vucetic, M.G.; Verzi, D.H.; Olivares, A.I. Biostratigraphy and correlation of the Monte Hermoso Formation (early Pliocene, Argentina): the evidence from caviomorph rodents. J. South. Am. Earth Sci. 2012, 35, 1–9, doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2011.10.006.

305. Tomassini, R.L.; Montalvo, C.I.; Deschamps, C.M.; Manera, T. Biostratigraphy and biochronology of the Monte Hermoso Formation (early Pliocene at its type locality, Buenos Aires Province, Argentina. J. South. Am. Earth Sci. 2013, 48, 31–42, doi:10.1016/j.jseaes.2013.08.002.

306. Rovereto, G. Los estratos araucanos y sus fósiles. An. Del Mus. Nac. De Hist. Nat. De Buenos Aires 1914, 25, 1–247.

307. Palazzesi, L.; Barreda, V. Fossil pollen records reveal a late rise of open-habitat ecosystems in Patagonia. Nat. Commun. 2012, 1294, 1–5, doi:10.1038/ncomms12299.

308. Tambussi, C.P.; DeGrange, F.J. South. American and Antarctic Continental Cenozoic Birds: Paleobiogeographic Affinities and Disparities; Springer: Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 2013; p. 113.

309. Picasso, M.B.J.; Mosto, M.C. New insights about Hinasuri neuhuensis (Aves, Rheidae, Palaeognathae) from the early Pliocene of Argentina. Alcheringa: An. Australas. J. Palaeontol. 2016, 40, 244–250, doi:10.1080/03115518.2016.1122961.

310. Ameghino, C.; Rusconi, C. Nueva subspecie de avestruz fósil del Pliocene de Buenos Aires. An. De La Soc. Cientifica Argent. 1932, 114, 38–42.

311. Moreno, F.P.; Mercerat, A. Catálogo de los pájaros fósiles de la República Argentina conservados en el Museo de La Plata. An. Del Mus. De La Plata Paleontol. 1891, 1, 7–71.

312. Picasso, M.B.J.; Mosto, C. The new taxonomic status of Rheas anchorenensis (Ameghino and Rusconi, 1932) (Aves, Palaeognathae) from the Pleistocene of Argentina. Ann. De Paleontol. 2016, 102, 237–241, doi:10.1016/j.annpal.2016.10.001.

313. Picasso, M.B.J. Diversity of extinct Rheidae (Aves, Palaeognathae): historical controversies and the new taxonomic status of Rheas pampeana Moreno and Mercerat 1891 from the Pleistocene of Argentina. Hist. Biol. 2016, 28, 1101–1107, doi:10.1080/08912963.2015.1118838.

314. Chippaux, L. Fossil birds from the Miocene Pinturas Formation of southern Argentina. J. Vertebr. Paleontol. 1991, 11, 21A–22A.

315. Bertelli, S.; Chippaux, L.M. Earliest Tinamous (Aves: Palaeognathae) from the Miocene of Argentina and their Phylogenetic Position; Natural History Museum of Los Angeles County: Los Angeles, CA, USA, 2005.

316. Chandler, R. A New Species of Tinamou (Aves: Tinamiformes, Tinamidae) From the Early-Middle Miocene of Argentina. Palearc’s J. Vertebr. Paleontol. 2012, 9, 1–8.

317. Woodburne, M.O.; Goin, F.J.; Bond, M.; Carlini, A.A.; Gelfo, J.N.; López, G.M.; Iglesias, A.; Zimic, A.N. Paleogene Land Mammal Faunas of South America; A Response to Global Climatic Changes and Indigenous Floral Diversity. J. Mamm. Evol. 2014, 21, 1–73, doi:10.1007/s10914-012-9222-1.

318. Brodkorb, P. Notes on fossil Tinamous. Auk 1961, 78, 257–257.

319. Tonni, E.P. Los Tinamidos Fósiles Argentinos I. El Genero Tinamisornis Rovereto, 1914. Ameghiniana 1977, 14, 224–232.

320. Tambussi, C.; Tonni, E. Un Tinamidae (Aves: Tinamiformes) del Miocene tardio de La Pampa (República Argentina) y comentarios sobre los tinámidos fósiles argentinos. Rev. De La Asoc. Paleontológica Argent. 1985, 14, 4.
Diversity 2022, 14, 105

321. Tambussi, C.P. Catalogo Critico De Los Tinamidae (Aves: Tinamiformes) Fossiles De La Republica Argentina. Ameghiniana 1987, 24, 241–244.

322. Tambussi, C.P. Las Aves del Pliocene Tardio-Pleistoceno Temprano de la Provincia de Buenos Aires; Universidad Nacional de La Plata: Buenos Aires, Argentina, 1989.

323. Marshall, L.G.; Berta, A.; Hofstetter, R.; Pascual, R.; Reig, O.; Bombin, M.; Mones, A. Mammals and Stratigraphy: Geochronology of the Continental Mammal-Bearing Quaternary of South America; Laboratoire de paléontologie des vertébrés de l’Ecole pratique des hautes études: Montpellier, France, 1983.

324. Tambussi, C.; Noriega, J. Summary of the avian fossil record from southern South America. Muenchener Geowiss. Abh. 1996, 30, 245–264.

325. Gill, F.; Donsker, D.; Rasmussen, P. IOC World Bird List; 2021. Available online:https://www.worldbirdnames.org/new/ (accessed on 31 December 2021)

326. Parker, S.A. The extinct Kangaroo Island Emu, a hitherto-unrecognised species. Bull. Br. Ornithol. Club 1984, 104, 19–22.

327. Spencer, B. The King Island Emu. Vic. Nat. 1906, 23, 140.

328. Le Souef, W.H.D. Dromaius diemenensis. Bull. Br. Ornithol. Club 1907, 21, 13.

329. Heupink, T.H.; Huynen, L.; Lambart, D.M. Ancient DNA Suggests Dwarf and ‘Giant’ Emu Are Conspecific. PLoS ONE 2011, 6, e18728, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0018728.

330. Thomson, V.A.; Mitchell, K.J.; Eberhard, R.; Doritch, J.; Austin, J.J.; Cooper, A. Genetic diversity and drivers of dwarfism in extinct island emu populations. Biol. Lett. 2018, 14, 20170617, doi:10.1098/rsbl.2017.0617.

331. Worthy, T.H.; Nguyen, J.M.T. An annotated checklist of the fossil birds of Australia. Trans. R. Soc. South. Aust. 2020, 144, 66–108, doi:10.1080/03723426.2020.1756560.

332. Folch, A.; Christie, D.A.; Garcia, E.F.J. Emu (Dromaius novaehollandiae), version 1.0. Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow.emu1.01.

333. Boles, W. A new emu (Dromaiinae) from the Late Oligocene Etadunna Formation. Emu Austral. Ornithol. 2001, 101, 317–321, doi:10.1071/ML000052.

334. Woodburne, M.O.; Macfadden, B.J.; Case, J.A.; Springer, M.S.; Pledge, N.S.; Power, J.D.; Woodburne, J.M.; Springer, K.B. Land mammal biostratigraphy and magnetostratigraphy of the Etadunna Formation (late Oligocene) of South Australia. J. Vertebr. Paleontol. 1994, 13, 483–515.

335. Megirian, D.; Prideaux, G.J.; Murray, P.F.; Smit, N. An Australian land mammal age biochronological scheme. Palaeobiology 2010, 36, 658–671, doi:10.1666/09047.1.

336. Patterson, C.; Rich, P. The fossil history of the emus, Dromaius (Aves: Dromaiinae). Rec. South. Aust. Mus. 1987, 21, 85–11.

337. Boles, W. Revision of Dromaius gidju Patterson and Rich, 1987 from Riversleigh, northwestern Queensland, Australia, with a reassessment of its generic position. Pap. Asian Paleontol. Honor. Pierce Brodkorb 1992, 36, 195–208.

338. Archer, M.; Hand, S.; Godthelp, H.; Creaser, P. Correlation of the Cainozoic sediments of the Riversleigh World Heritage fossil property, Queensland, Australia. Mémoires Et Trav. De L’institut De Montp. 1997, 131–152.

339. Travouillon, K.J.; Archer, M.; Hand, S.J.; Godthelp, H. Multivariate analyses of Cenozoic mammalian faunas from Riversleigh, northwestern Queensland. Alcheringa: An. Australas. J. Palaeontol. 2006, 30, 323–349, doi:10.1080/03111510609506871.

340. Boles, W. Hindlimb proportions and locomotion of Emuarius gidju (Patterson & Rich, 1987) (Aves: Casuariidae). Mem. Qld. Mus. 1997, 41, 235–240.

341. Worthy, T.H.; Hand, S.J.; Archer, M. Phylogenetic relationships of the Australian Oligo-Miocene ratite Emuarius gidju Casuariidae. Integr. Zool. 2014, 9, 148–166, doi:10.1111/1749-4877.12050.

342. Woodburne, M.; Tedford, R.; Archer, M.; Turnbull, W.; Plane, M. Biochronology of the continental mammal record of Australia and New Guinea. Spec. Publ. South. Aust. Dep. Mines Energy 1985, 5, 347–363.

343. Rich, P.V. The Dromornithidae, an extinct family of large ground birds endemic to Australia. Bur. Mineral. Resour. Geol. Geophys. (Aust.) 1979, 184, 1–196.

344. Rich, P.; Van Tets, J. Fossil birds of Australia and New Guinea: their biogeographic, phylogenetic and biostratigraphic input. In The fossil Vertebrate Record of Australasia; Rich, P.V., Thompson, E.M., Eds.; Monash University Offset Printing Unit: Melbourne, Australia, 1982; pp. 235–385.

345. Woodburne, M.O. The Alcoota Fauna, Central Australia: An Integrated Palaeontological and Geological Study; Australian Government Public Service: Canberra, Australia, 1967; Volume 87.

346. Stirton, R.A.; Tedford, R.H.; Woodburne, M.O. Australian Tertiary deposits containing terrestrial mammals. Univ. Calif. Publ. Geol. Sci. 1968, 77, 1–30.

347. Woods, J.T. Fossiliferous fluvialite and cave deposits. J. Geol. Soc. Aust. 1960, 7, 393–403.

348. Stirton, R.; Tedford, R.; Miller, A. Cenozoic stratigraphy and vertebrate paleontology of the Tirari Desert, South Australia. Rec. South. Aust. Mus. 1961, 14, 19–61.

349. Miller, A.H. Fossil ratite birds of the late Tertiary of South Australia. Rec. South. Aust. Mus. 1963, 14, 413–420.

350. Hoc, E.; Holm, P. New K/Ar age determinations of the Awe fauna gangue, Papua New Guinea: Consequences for Papuaaustralian late Cenozoic biostratigraphy. Mod. Geol. 1986, 10, 181–195.

351. Plane, M. Stratigraphy and vertebrate fauna of the Otibanda formation, New Guinea; Bureau of Mineral Resources, Geology and Geophysics: Canberra, Australia, 1967; p. 64.

352. Miller, A.H. The history and significance of the fossil Casuarius lydekkeri. Rec. Aust. Mus. 1962, 25, 235–238.
353. Rothschild, L.W.R.B. On the Former and Present Distribution of the So Called Ratitae Or Ostrich-like Birds with Certain Deductions and a Description of a New Form by CW Andrew. In Proceedings of the Proceedings of the Fifth International Ornithological Congress, Berlin, Germany, 4 June 1910; pp. 144–169.

354. Williams, P.; McDougall, I.; Powell, J. Aspects of the quaternary geology of the Tari-Koroba area, Papua. J. Geol. Soc. Aust. 1972, 18, 333–347, doi:10.1080/001671610918728772.

355. Rich, P.V.; Plane, M.; Schroeder, N. A pygmy cassowary (Casuarius lydekkeri) from late Pleistocene bog deposits at Purenui, Papua New Guinea. BMR J. Aust. Geol. Geophys. 1998, 10, 377–389.

356. Vickers-Rich, P.; Rich, T. Wildlife of Gondwana; Indiana University Press: Bloomington, IN, USA, 1993.

357. Martin, H.A. Cenozoic climatic change and the development of the arid vegetation in Australia. J. Arid Environ. 2006, 66, 533–563, doi:10.1016/j.jaridenv.2006.01.009.

358. Yates, A.M.; Worthy, T.H. A diminutive species of emu (Casuariidae: Dromaiinae) from the late Miocene of the Northern Territory, Australia. J. Vertbr. Paleontol. 2019, 39, e1165057, doi:10.1080/22274634.2019.1665057.

359. Campbell, K.E.; Marcus, L. The relationship of hindlimb bone dimensions to body weight in birds. Nat. Hist. Mus. Los Angeles Cty. Sci. Ser. 1992, 36, 395–412.

360. Naish, D.; Perron, R. Structure and function of the cassowary’s casque and its implications for cassowary history, biology and evolution. Hist. Biol. 2014, 28, 507–518, doi:10.1080/08912963.2014.985669.

361. Calder, W.A. The Kiwi. Sci. Am. 1978, 239, 132–143.

362. Kinsky, F.C. The consistent presence of paired ovaries in the Kiwi (Apteryx) with some discussion of this condition in other birds. J. Für Ornithol. 1971, 112, 334–357, doi:10.1007/BF01640692.

363. Folch, A.; Jutglar, F.; Garcia, E.F.J. Little Spotted Kiwi (Apteryx owenii), version 1.0. Birds World 2020, doi:10.2173/bow.likiw1.01.

364. Weir, J.T.; Haddrath, O.; Robertson, H.A.; Colbourne, R.M.; Baker, A.J. Explosive ice age diversification of kiwi. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA 2016, 113, E5580–5587, doi:10.1073/pnas.1603795113.

365. Huynen, L.; Suzuki, T.; Ogura, T.; Watanabe, Y.; Millar, C.D.; Hofreiter, M.; Smith, C.; Mirmoeini, S.; Lambert, D.M. Reconstruction and in vivo analysis of the extinct tbx5 gene from ancient wingless moa (Aves: Dinornithiformes). BMC Evol. Biol. 2014, 14, 75, doi:10.1186/1471–2147–14–75.

366. Bunce, M.; Worthy, T.; Ford, T.; Hoppitt, W.; Willerslev, E.; Drummond, A.; Cooper, A. Extreme reversed sexual size dimorphism in the extinct New Zealand moa Dinornis. Nature 2003, 425, 172–175, doi:10.1038/nature01871.

367. Perry, G.L.W.; Wheeler, A.B.; Wood, J.R.; Wilmshurst, J.M. A high-precision chronology for the rapid extinction of New Zealand moa (Aves, Dinornithiformes). Quat. Sci. Rev. 2014, 105, 126–135, doi:10.1016/j.quascirev.2014.09.025.

368. Greenwood, R.; Atkinson, I. Evolution of divaricating plants in New Zealand in relation to moa browsing. Proc. New Zealand J. Sci. 1977, 24, 21–33.

369. Bond, W.; Silander, J. Springs and wire plants: anachronistic defences against Madagascar’s extinct elephant birds. Proc. R. Soc. B 2007, 274, 1985–1992, doi:10.1098/rspb.2007.0414.

370. Wood, J.R.; Richardson, S.J.; McGlone, M.S.; Wilmshurst, J.M. The diets of moa (Aves: Dinornithiformes). New Zealand J. Ecol. 2020, 44, 1–21, doi:dx.doi.org/10.20417/nzjicool.44.3.

371. Allen, M.; Rawlinson, N.J. Moa’s Ark or volant ghosts of Gondwana? Insights from nineteen years of ancient DNA research on the extinct moa (Aves: Dinornithiformes) of New Zealand. Ann. Anat. 2012, 194, 36–51, doi:10.1016/j.aanat.2011.04.002.

372. Tennyson, A.J.D. The origin and history of New Zealand’s terrestrial vertebrates. New Zealand J. Ecol. 2010, 34, 6–27.

373. Suggate, R.P.; Stevens, G.R.; Te Punga, M.T. The Geology of New Zealand; EC Keating, Government Printer: Wellington, New Zealand, 1978, Volume 2, p. 819.

374. Landis, C.; Campbell, H.; Begg, J.; Mildenhall, D.; Paterson, A.; Trewick, S. The Waipounamu Erosion Surface: questioning the antiquity of the New Zealand land surface and terrestrial fauna and flora. Geol. Mag. 2008, 145, 173–197, doi:10.1017/S0016756807042476.

375. Waters, J.M.; Craw, D. Goodbye Gondwana? New Zealand biogeography, geology, and the problem of circularity. Syst. Biol. 2006, 55, 351–356, doi:10.1080/10635150600681659.

376. Trewick, S.A.; Paterson, A.M.; Campbell, H.J. Hello New Zealand. J. Biogeogr. 2007, 34, 1–6, doi:10.1111/j.1365–2699.2007.01643.x.

377. Cooper, A.; Cooper, R. The Oligocene bottleneck and New Zealand biota: Genetic record of a past environmental crisis. Proc. R. Soc. B 1995, 261, 293–302, doi:10.1098/rspb.1995.0150.

378. Carr, L.; McNelachan, P.; Waddell, P.; Gemmell, N.; Penny, D. Analyses of the mitochondrial genome of Leiopelma hochstetteri argues against the full drowning of New Zealand. J. Biogeogr. 2015, 42, 1066–1076, doi:10.1111/jbi.12482.

379. Edgecombe, G.D.; Giribet, G. A New Zealand species of the trans-Tasman centipede order Craterostigmomorphomorpha (Arthropoda: Chilopoda) corroborated by molecular evidence. Invertebr. Syst. 2008, 22, 1–15, doi:10.1071/IS07036.

380. Boyer, S.L.; Giribet, G. Welcome back New Zealand: Regional biogeography and Gondwanan origin of three endemic genera of mite harvestmen (Arachnida, Opiliones, Cyphophthalmi). J. Biogeogr. 2009, 36, 1084–1099, doi:10.1111/j.1365–2699.2009.02092.x.

381. Buckley, T.R.; Lord, N.; Ramón-Laca, A.; Allwood, J.; Leschen, R. Multiple lineages of hyper-diverse Zopheridae beetles survived the New Zealand Oligocene Drowning. J. Biogeogr. 2020, 47, 927–940, doi:10.1111/jbi.13776.

382. Wallis, G.P.; Jorge, F. Going under down under? Lineage ages argue for extensive survival of the Oligocene marine transgression on Zealandia. Mol. Ecol. 2018, 27, 4368–4396, doi:10.1111/mec.14875.
Diversity 2022, 14, 105

442. Bond, M.; Pascual, R.; Reguero, M.; Santillana, S.; Marenssi, S. Los primeros ungulados extinguidos sudamericanos de la Antártida. *Ameghiniana* 1990, 16, 240.

443. Bond, M.; Kramarz, A.; Macphee, R.D.E.; Reguero, M. A New Astraphoterida (Mammalia, Meridiungulata) from La Meseta Formation, Seymour (Marambio) Island, and a Reassessment of Previous Records of Antarctic Astraphoterida. *Am. Mus. Novit.* 2011, 2011, 1–16, 16.

444. Hooker, J.J. An additional record of a placental mammal (Order Astraphoterida) from the Eocene of West Antarctica. *Antarct. Sci.* 1992, 4, 107–108, doi:10.1017/S0954102092000154.

445. Gelfo, J.N.; López, G.M.; Santillana, S.N. Eocene ungulate mammals from West Antarctica: Implications from their fossil record and a new species. *Antarct. Sci.* 2017, 29, 445–455, doi:10.1017/S0954102017000244.

446. Vizcaíno, S.F.; Reguero, M.A.; Goin, F.J.; Tambussi, C.P.; Noriega, J.I. Community structure of Eocene terrestrial vertebrates from Antarctic Peninsula. *Publicación Electrónica De La Asoc. Paleontológica Argent.* 1998, 5.

447. Scher, H.D.; Martin, E.E. Timing and climatic consequences of the opening of Drake Passage. *Science* 2006, 312, 428–430, doi:10.1126/science.1120044.

448. Bijl, P.K.; Bendle, J.A.P.; Bohlany, S.M.; Pross, J.; Schouten, S.; Tauxe, L.; Stickley, C.E.; McKay, R.M.; Röh, U.; Olney, M.; et al. Eocene cooling linked to early flow across the Tasmanian Gateway. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2013, 110, 9645–9650, doi:10.1073/pnas.1220872110.

449. Wang, Z.; Zhang, J.; Xu, X.; Witt, C.; Deng, Y.; Chenc, G.; Meng, G.; Feng, S.; Xu, L.; Szekely, T. Phylogeny and Sex Chromosome Evolution of Palaeognathae. *J. Genet. Genom.* 2021, doi:10.1016/j.jgg.2021.06.013.

450. Kimball, R.T.; Witt, N.; Heimer-McGinn, V.; Ferguson, C.; Braun, E.L. Identifying localized biases in large datasets: A case study using the avian tree of life. *Mol. Phylogenetics Evol.* 2013, 69, 1021–1032, doi:10.1016/j.ympev.2013.05.029.

451. Field, D.J.; Berv, J.; HSiang, A.; Lanfear, R.; Landis, M.; Dornburg, A. Timing the Extant Avian Radiation: The Rise of Modern Birds, and the Importance of Modeling Molecular Rate Variation. *Bull. Am. Mus. Nat. History* 2020, 440, doi:10.7287/peerj.preprints.27521v1.

452. Berv, J.S.; Field, D.J. Genomic Signature of an Avian Lilliput Effect across the K-Pg Extinction. *Syst. Biol.* 2017, 67, 1–13, doi:10.1093/sysbio/syx064.

453. Beaulieu, J.M.; O’Meara, B.C.; Crane, P.; Donoghue, M.J. Heterogeneous Rates of Molecular Evolution and Diversification Could Explain the Triassic Age Estimate for Angiosperms. *Syst. Biol.* 2015, 64, 869–878, doi:10.1093/sysbio/syv027.

454. Mayr, G.; De Pietri, V.L.; Scofield, R.P.; Worby, J.H. On the taxonomic composition and phylogenetic affinities of the recently proposed clade Vegaviidae Agnolin et al., 2017—neornithine birds from the Upper Cretaceous of the Southern Hemisphere. *Cretac. Res.* 2018, 86, 178–185, doi:10.1016/j.cretre.2018.02.013.

455. Field, D.J.; Hsiang, A.Y. A North American stem turaco, and the complex biogeographic history of modern birds. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 2018, 18, doi:10.1186/s12862-018-1212-3.

456. Mayr, G. Old World Fossil Record of Modern-Type Hummingbirds. *Science* 2004, 304, 861–864, doi:10.1126/science.1096856.

457. Mayr, G.; Alvarenga, R.; Mourié-Chauvière, C. Out of Africa: Fossils shed light on the origin of the hoatzin, an iconic Neotropic bird. *Naturwissenschaften* 2011, 98, 961–966, doi:10.1007/s00114–011–0849–1.

458. Olson, S.L. Evolution of the rails on the South Atlantic islands (Aves: Rallidae). *Smithson. Contrib. Zool.* 1973, 152, 1–153.

459. Wright, N.A.; Steadman, D.W.; Witt, C.C. Predictable evolution toward flightlessness in volant island birds. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2016, 113, 4765–4770, doi:10.1073/pnas.1522931113.

460. McNab, B.K. Energy Conservation and the Evolution of Flightlessness in Birds. *Am. Nat.* 1994, 144, 628–642.

461. Paxinos, E.E.; James, H.F.; Olson, S.L.; Sorenson, M.D.; Jackson, J.; Fleischer, R.C. mtDNA from fossils reveals a radiation of Hawaiian geeze recently derived from the Canada goose (*Branta canadensis*). *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2002, 99, 1399–1404, doi:10.1073/pnas.032166399.

462. Black, K.; Archer, M.; Hand, S.; Godthelp, H. The Rise of Australian Marsupials: A Synopsis of Biostratigraphic, Phylogenetic, Palaeoecologic and Palaeobiogeographic Understanding. In *Earth and Life: Global Biodiversity, Extinction Intervals and Biogeographic Perturbations Through Time*; Talent, J., Ed.Mulder, E.F.J.d., Derbyshire, E., Eds.; International Year of Planet Earth; Springer: Berlin/Heidelberg, Germany, 2012; pp. 983–1078.

463. Lyson, T.; Miller, I.; Bercovici, A.; Weissenburger, K.; Fuentes, A.J.; Clyde, W.; Hagadorn, J.W.; Buttrim, M.J.; Johnson, K.R.; Fleming, R.; et al. Exceptional continental record of biotic recovery after the Cretaceous Paleogene mass extinction. *Science* 2019, 366, 977–983, doi:10.1126/science.aay2268.

464. Van Valkenburgh, B. Major patterns in the history of carnivorous mammals. *Annu. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* 1999, 27, 463–493, doi:10.1146/annurev.earth.27.1.463.

465. Figueirido, B.; Palmqvist, P.; Pérez-Claras, J.A.; Janis, C.M. Sixty-six million years along the road of mammalian ecomorphological specialization. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2019, 116, 12698–12703, doi:10.1073/pnas.1821825116.

466. Maxwell, E.E.; Larsson, H.C.E. Osteology and myology of the wing of the Eme (*Dromaius novaehollandiae*), and its bearing on the evolution of vestigial structures. *J. Morphol.* 2007, 268, 423–441, doi:10.1002/jmor.10527.

467. Hudson, G.; Schreweis, D.; Wang, S.C.; Lancaster, D. A numerical study of the wing and leg muscles of tinamous (*Tinamidae*). *Northwest. Sci.* 1972, 46, 207–255.

468. Suzuki, D.; Chiba, K.; VanBuren, C.S.; Ohashi, T. The Appendicular Anatomy of the Elegant Crested Tinamou (*Eudromia elegans*); Kitakyushu Museum of Natural History and Human History: Kitakyushu, Japan, 2014.
469. Witmer, L.M. The extant phylogenetic bracket and the importance of reconstructing soft tissues in fossils. *Func. Morphol. Vertebrae. Paleontol.* 1995, 1, 19–33.

470. Hosner, P.A.; Tobias, J.A.; Braun, E.L.; Kimball, R.T. How do seemingly non-vague clades accomplish trans-marine dispersal? Trait and dispersal evolution in the land flora (Aves: Galliformes). *Proc. R. Soc. B* 2017, 284, doi:10.1098/rspb.2017.0210.

471. Chiappe, L.M.; Walker, C.A. Skeletal morphology and systematics of the Cretaceous Euenantiornithes (Ornithothoraces: Eunantiornithes). In *Mesozoic Birds: Above the Heads of Dinosaurs*; Chiappe, L.M., Witmer, L.M., Eds.; University of California Press: Berkeley, CA, USA, 2002; pp. 240–267.

472. O’Connor, J.K.; Chiappe, L.M.; Bell, A. Pre-modern birds: Avian divergences in the Mesozoic. In *Living Dinosaurs: The Evolutionary History of Modern Birds*; Dyke, G., Kaiser, G., Eds.; Wiley-Blackwell: Hoboken, NJ, USA, 2011; pp. 39–114.

473. Chiappe, L.M.; Qingjin, M. *Birds of Stone: Chinese Avian Fossils from the Age of Dinosaurs*; JHU Press: Baltimore, MD, USA, 2016.

474. Tschudy, R.H.; Pillmore, C.L.; Orth, C.J.; Gilmore, J.S.; Knight, J.D. Disruption of the Terrestrial Plant Ecosystem at the Cretaceous-Tertiary Boundary, Western Interior. *Science* 1984, 225, 1030–1032, doi:10.1126/science.225.4666.1030.

475. Vajda, V.; Raine, J.I.; Hollis, C.J. Indication of Global Deforestation at the Cretaceous-Tertiary Boundary by New Zealand Fern Spike. *Science* 2001, 294, 1700–1702, doi:10.1126/science.1064706.

476. Vajda, V.; Bercovici, A. The global vegetation pattern across the Cretaceous–Paleogene mass extinction interval: A template for other extinction events. *glob. Planet. Chang.* 2014, 122, 29–49, doi:10.1016/j.gloplacha.2014.07.014.

477. Klein, C.G.; Pisani, D.; Field, D.J.; Lakin, R.; Wills, M.A.; Longrich, N.R. Evolution and dispersal of snakes across the Cretaceous-Paleogene mass extinction. *Nat. Commun.* 2012, 3, 5335, doi:10.1038/ncomms1467–021–25136-y.

478. Hughes, J.J.; Berv, J.S.; Chester, S.G.B.; Sargis, E.J.; Field, D.J. Ecological selectivity and the evolution of mammalian substrate preference across the K–Pg boundary. *Ecol. Evol.* 2021, 11, 14540–14554, doi:10.1002/eco3.8114.

479. Anders, E.; Wolbach, W.S.; Gilmour, I. Major wildfires at the Cretaceous-Tertiary boundary. In *Global Biomass Burning*; Levine, J.S., Ed.; The MIT Press: Cambridge, MA, USA, 1991; pp. 485–492.

480. Robertson, D.S.; Lewis, W.M.; Sheehan, P.M.; Toon, O.B. K-Pg extinction: Reevaluation of the heat-fire hypothesis. *J. Geophys. Res. Biogeosci.* 2013, 118, 329–336, doi:10.1002/jgrg.20018.

481. Clyde, W.C.; Ramezani, J.; Johnson, K.R.; Bowring, S.A.; Jones, M.M. Direct high-precision U-Pb geochronology of the end-Cretaceous extinction and calibration of Paleocene astronomical timescales. *Earth Planet. Sci. Lett.* 2016, 452, 272–280, doi:10.1016/j.epsl.2016.07.041.

482. Johnson, K.R.; Ellis, B. A Tropical Rainforest in Colorado 1.4 Million Years After the Cretaceous-Tertiary Boundary. *Science* 2002, 296, 2379–2383, doi:10.1126/science.1072102.

483. Bell, A.; Chiappe, L.M. A species-level phylogeny of the Cretaceous Hesperornithiformes (Aves: Ornithuromorpha): implications for body size evolution amongst the earliest diving birds. *J. Syst. Palaeontol.* 2014, 14, 239–251, doi:10.1080/14772019.2015.1036141.

484. Dumont, M.; Tafforeau, P.; Bertin, T.; Bhullar, B.; Field, D.; Schulp, A.; Strilisky, B.; Thivichon-Prince, B.; Viriot, L.; Louchart, A. Synchrotron imaging of dentition provides insights into the biology of *Hesperornis* and *Ichthyornis*, the last toothed birds. *BMC Evol. Biol.* 2016, 16, 178, doi:10.1186/s12862–016-0753–6.

485. Field, D.J.; Hanson, M.; Burnham, D.; Wilson, L.E.; Super, K.; Ehret, D.; Ebersole, J.A.; Bhullar, B.A.S. Complete Ichthyornis skull illuminates mosaic assembly of the avian head. *Nature* 2018, 557, 96–100, doi:10.1038/s41586–018–0053-y.

486. Alegret, L.; Thomas, E.; Lohmann, K.C. End-Cretaceous marine mass extinction not caused by productivity collapse. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 2012, 109, 728–732, doi:10.1073/pnas.1110601109.

487. Gottschaldt, K. Structure and function of avian somatosensory receptors. In *Form and Function in Birds*, King, A.S., McElland, J., Eds.; Academic Press: London, UK, 1985; Volume 3, pp. 375–461.

488. Cunningham, S.; Castro, I.; Alley, M. A new prey detection mechanism for kiwi (*Apteryx* spp.) suggests convergent evolution between paleognathous and neognathous birds. *J. Anat.* 2007, 211, 493–502, doi:10.1111/j.1469–7580.2007.00786.x.

489. Crole, M.; Soley, J. Bony Pits in the Ostrich (*Struthio camelus*) and Emu (*Dromaius novaehollandiae*) Bill Tip. *Anat. Rec.* 2017, 300, 1705–1715, doi:10.1002/ar.23594.

490. Zelenitsky, D.K.; Therrien, F.; Ridgely, R.C.; McGee, A.R.; Witmer, L.M. Evolution of olfaction in non-avian theropod dinosaurs and birds. *Proc. R. Soc. B* 2011, 278, 3625–3634, doi:10.1098/rspb.2011.0238.