

# Kent Academic Repository

## Full text document (pdf)

### Citation for published version

Moore, N. Collin and Thackeray, J. Francis and Hublin, Jean-Jacques and Skinner, Matthew M. (2016) Premolar root and canal variation in South African Plio-Pleistocene specimens attributed to *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus robustus*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 93 . pp. 46-62. ISSN 0047-2484.

### DOI

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2015.12.002>

### Link to record in KAR

<http://kar.kent.ac.uk/54533/>

### Document Version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

#### Copyright & reuse

Content in the Kent Academic Repository is made available for research purposes. Unless otherwise stated all content is protected by copyright and in the absence of an open licence (eg Creative Commons), permissions for further reuse of content should be sought from the publisher, author or other copyright holder.

#### Versions of research

The version in the Kent Academic Repository may differ from the final published version.

Users are advised to check <http://kar.kent.ac.uk> for the status of the paper. **Users should always cite the published version of record.**

#### Enquiries

For any further enquiries regarding the licence status of this document, please contact:

[researchsupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:researchsupport@kent.ac.uk)

If you believe this document infringes copyright then please contact the KAR admin team with the take-down information provided at <http://kar.kent.ac.uk/contact.html>

Elsevier Editorial System(tm) for Journal of Human Evolution  
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number:

Title: Premolar root and canal variation in South African Plio-Pleistocene specimens attributed to *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus robustus*

Article Type: Full Length Article

Keywords: premolar; root; canal; *Australopithecus africanus*; *Paranthropus robustus*; taxonomy

Corresponding Author: Mr. N Collin Moore, M.A.

Corresponding Author's Institution: Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

First Author: N Collin Moore, M.A.

Order of Authors: N Collin Moore, M.A.; Francis Thackeray, Ph.D.; Jean-Jacques Hublin, Ph.D.; Matthew M Skinner, Ph.D.

Abstract: South African hominin fossils attributed to *Australopithecus africanus* derive from the cave sites of Makapansgat, Sterkfontein and Taung, and from deposits dated between about 2 and 3 million years ago (mya), while *Paranthropus robustus* is known from Drimolen, Kromdraai and Swartkrans, and from deposits dated between about 1 and 2 million years ago. Although, variation in the premolar root complex has informed taxonomic and phylogenetic hypotheses for these fossil hominin species, traditionally there has been a focus on external root form, number and position. In this study we use microtomography to undertake the first comprehensive study of maxillary and mandibular premolar root and canal variation in *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus robustus* (n=166 teeth) within and between the species. We also test for correlations between premolar size and root morphology as predicted under the 'size/number continuum' model (Shields, 2005), which correlates increasing root number with increasing tooth size. Our results demonstrate previously undocumented variation in these two fossil hominin species and highlight taxonomic differences in the presence and frequency of particular root types, non-metric root traits, and tooth size (measured as cervix cross-sectional area). Patterns of tooth size and canal/root number are broadly consistent with the SNC model, however, statistically significant support is limited. The implications for hominin taxonomy of increased variation in root morphology documented in this study are discussed.

Dear Dr. Sarah Elton,

Please accept our manuscript entitled '*Premolar root and canal variation in South African Plio-Pleistocene specimens attributed to Australopithecus africanus and Paranthropus robustus*' as a full-length paper for submission to the *Journal of Human Evolution*.

This paper investigates premolar root and canal morphology in an up-to-date sample of *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus robustus*. Using microCT we characterize the root complex and also test the existing hypotheses that larger premolars influence root form using measurement at the dental cervix as a proxy for tooth size. That is, larger teeth would likely contain more numbers of roots/canals and possess a larger cervical size when compared to smaller teeth. This study reveals a different pattern of root and canal forms compared to previous reports in the two study taxa and that specific root forms and/or non-metric features occur in each species allowing for distinguishment. Prior research has not had these same results which may be attributed to methodological differences in observation, root form definition and smaller sample size. Within each species, we found general but unanimous evidence that cervical size co-varies with premolar root/canal form. Statistical significance of these variables was only observed in some cases. We conclude that characterizing complex premolar root form is most effectively accomplished through the use of microCT and by 3D observation and that other factors are at play which influence root form. These findings have implications for fossil ape and hominin systematics that are discussed.

Though previous studies have looked at premolar root form in these two fossil taxa, none have done so by 3D methods with a large sample size or examined and categorized both premolar root and canal form/number/configuration with a rigorous definition. The root canals compared to the external appearance of the root, show different and taxonomically important information. We feel this research would be of interest to your readers and we hope that you find it worthy of publication in the *Journal of Human Evolution*.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Collin  
N. Collin Moore, MA  
Department Human Evolution  
Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology

1  
2  
3  
4 **Title: Premolar root and canal variation in South African Plio-Pleistocene specimens**  
5  
6 **attributed to Australopithecus africanus and Paranthropus robustus**  
7  
8

9  
10 N. Collin Moore<sup>1</sup>, J. Francis Thackeray<sup>2</sup>, Jean-Jacques Hublin<sup>1</sup>, Matthew M. Skinner<sup>3, 1, 2</sup>  
11

12  
13 <sup>1</sup>Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology,  
14  
15 Germany  
16  
17

18  
19 <sup>2</sup>Evolutionary Studies Institute and Center for Excellence in PalaeoSciences, University of the  
20  
21 Witwatersrand, South Africa  
22  
23

24  
25 <sup>3</sup>School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, United Kingdom  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30

31 Address of corresponding author:  
32  
33

34  
35 N. Collin Moore  
36 Department of Human Evolution  
37 MPI-EVA  
38 Deutscher Platz 6  
39 Leipzig, Germany, 04103  
40 Phone: 0049 (0) 341 – 35 50 756  
41 Fax: 0049 (0) 341 – 35 50 399  
42 Email: [collin\\_moore@eva.mpg.de](mailto:collin_moore@eva.mpg.de)  
43  
44  
45  
46

47 Key words: premolar, root, canal, Australopithecus africanus, Paranthropus robustus, cervical  
48 size, dental anatomy, South Africa, Plio-Pleistocene, taxonomy.  
49  
50

51  
52  
53 Running title: Premolar root variation in Australopithecus africanus and Paranthropus robustus  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Abstract**  
5  
6  
7

8 South African hominin fossils attributed to *Australopithecus africanus* derive from the  
9 cave sites of Makapansgat, Sterkfontein and Taung, and from deposits dated between about 2  
10 and 3 million years ago (mya), while *Paranthropus robustus* is known from Drimolen,  
11 and 3 million years ago (mya), while *Paranthropus robustus* is known from Drimolen,  
12 Kromdraai and Swartkrans, and from deposits dated between about 1 and 2 million years ago.  
13 Although, variation in the premolar root complex has informed taxonomic and phylogenetic  
14 hypotheses for these fossil hominin species, traditionally there has been a focus on external root  
15 form, number and position. In this study we use microtomography to undertake the first  
16 comprehensive study of maxillary and mandibular premolar root and canal variation in  
17 *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus robustus* (n=166 teeth) within and between the  
18 species. We also test for correlations between premolar size and root morphology as predicted  
19 under the ‘size/number continuum’ model (Shields, 2005), which correlates increasing root  
20 number with increasing tooth size. Our results demonstrate previously undocumented variation  
21 in these two fossil hominin species and highlight taxonomic differences in the presence and  
22 frequency of particular root types, non-metric root traits, and tooth size (measured as cervix  
23 cross-sectional area). Patterns of tooth size and canal/root number are broadly consistent with the  
24 SNC model, however, statistically significant support is limited. The implications for hominin  
25 taxonomy of increased variation in root morphology documented in this study are discussed.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Maxillary and mandibular premolar tooth roots vary in size and structure, including both  
5  
6 root number (and external form) and the number and form of pulp canals within each root. This  
7  
8 variability has been examined in modern humans, non-human hominoids, as well as certain fossil  
9  
10 hominins, and has been attributed both functional and systematic significance (Wood, 1981;  
11  
12 Abbott, 1984; Wood et al., 1988; Wood and Engleman, 1988; Wood, 1988; Tobias, 1995; Brunet  
13  
14 et al., 1996; Kupczik et al., 2005; Kupczik and Hublin, 2010; Emonet et al., 2012; Hamon et al.,  
15  
16 2012; Moore et al., 2013; Emonet et al., 2014; Moore et al., 2015). Nevertheless, due to  
17  
18 limitations in acquiring detailed observations of the roots and canals in situ (Abbott, 1984;  
19  
20 Shields, 2000, 2005), which has forced researchers to apply only basic categorizations of  
21  
22 morphological variation, the potential of the premolar root complex for systematic inquiry in  
23  
24 fossil material remains unfulfilled. Difficulties of imaging detailed aspects of root structure have  
25  
26 also limited our understanding of potential developmental influences on root morphology in  
27  
28 modern humans and their fossil relatives.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37 Examination of the premolar root and/or pulp canals has been accomplished by direct  
38  
39 observation (Frisch, 1963; Turner, 1981; Moggi-Cecchi et al., 2010), 2D radiography (Sperber,  
40  
41 1974; Abbott, 1984; Wood et al., 1988; Wood and Engleman, 1988; Shields, 2000, 2005) and 3D  
42  
43 computed tomography (Ward et al., 1982; Kupczik et al., 2005; Higham et al., 2011; Kupczik  
44  
45 and Dean, 2008; Moore et al., 2013; Emonet et al., 2014; Moore et al., 2015). Compared to the  
46  
47 external root(s), the canal system has received less attention either due to experimental design or  
48  
49 imaging limitations, but has been examined in extant hominoids (Abbott, 1984; Emonet et al.,  
50  
51 2014) and fossil hominins (Kallay, 1963; Sperber, 1974; Abbott, 1984; Wood et al., 1988). More  
52  
53 recently, microtomographic approaches have identified novel, taxonomically relevant  
54  
55 morphotypes in extant ape root/canal morphology and have highlighted the important  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 contribution of the canal(s) for more fine-grained characterization (Kupczik and Hublin, 2010;  
5  
6 Prado-Simón et al., 2010; Higham et al., 2011; Prado-Simón et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2013,  
7  
8 2015). This is particularly relevant as the variable inclusion of both external and internal  
9  
10 morphology influences interpretation of taxonomic differences and theorized evolutionary  
11  
12 trajectories within clades. For example, studies of premolar root morphology in extant and fossil  
13  
14 hominoids have focused on root number or form (Sperber, 1974; Turner, 1981; Tobias, 1995;  
15  
16 Emonet and Kullmer, 2011; Emonet et al., 2014), canal number or form (Bermúdez de Castro et  
17  
18 al., 1999; Sert and Bayirli, 2004), aspects of the root surface (Turner, 1981; Trope et al., 1986),  
19  
20 or a combination thereof (Kallay, 1963; Abbott, 1984; Wood, 1988; Zilberman and Smith, 1992;  
21  
22 Higham et al., 2011; Prado-Simón et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2013, 2015). Collectively, these  
23  
24 studies highlight the necessity to apply accurate and repeatable scoring criteria of the root system  
25  
26 for proper interpretations of variation.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Based on a number of seminal studies (Abbott, 1984; Wood et al., 1988; Wood and  
35  
36 Engleman, 1988; Kupczik et al., 2005) and with reference to Miocene fossil apes (see Hartwig,  
37  
38 2002; Emonet, 2009; Emonet et al., 2014) the inferred ‘ancestral’ great ape pattern of the  
39  
40 maxillary third ( $P^3$ ) and fourth ( $P^4$ ) premolars consists of two buccal and one lingual root, each  
41  
42 roughly elliptical in cross-section containing a single pulp canal. The mandibular third premolar  
43  
44 ( $P_3$ ) bears one mesio-buccal root (elliptical, with a single canal) and one distal root (plate-like,  
45  
46 with two canals), and the mandibular fourth premolar ( $P_4$ ) has one mesial and one distal root  
47  
48 (both plate-like, each with two canals). Within the hominin clade, derived conditions of a trend  
49  
50 for reduction in root/canal number has been suggested to characterize the genus *Homo* (and the  
51  
52 lineage leading to modern humans in particular), while an elaboration (in both form and number)  
53  
54 of the mandibular premolar roots has been suggested to be prominent in the genus *Paranthropus*  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 (i.e., ‘molariform’ roots in the robust species of the genus *Australopithecus*, chiefly  
5  
6 *Paranthropus boisei*) (Abbott, 1984; Wood, 1988; Wood et al., 1988). Moore and colleagues  
7  
8 (2013, 2015) analyzed the premolar roots of a large sample of *Hylobates*, *Pan troglodytes*,  
9  
10 *Gorilla* and *Pongo* and demonstrated that while the ancestral pattern is largely retained, each  
11  
12 taxon expresses greater variation than previously documented (including unique morphotypes)  
13  
14 and there is evidence of both reduction (*Hylobates* and *Pan troglodytes*) and elaboration (*Gorilla*  
15  
16 and *Pongo*) in root morphology. Re-evaluating the root system of australopiths (see also Abbott,  
17  
18 1984; Wood et al., 1988; Wood and Engleman, 1988), within the context of this newly  
19  
20 documented variation in extant apes, is one of the goals of this study.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27         During root development, morphological variability of the root complex is governed by  
28  
29 ontogenetic modification of Hertwig’s epithelial root sheath (HERS) and associated inter-  
30  
31 radicular process(es) (for review see Butler, 1956; Carlsen, 1967; Kovacs, 1967, 1971; Jernvall  
32  
33 and Thesleff, 2000; Shields, 2005; Ten Cate, 2006; Wright, 2007). The sheath begins root  
34  
35 formation at the cervical enamel, growing in the direction of, and culminating as a primary apical  
36  
37 foramen/foramina at the apex of each root body (Kovacs, 1967, 1971; Ten Cate, 2006).  
38  
39 Specifically, size of the spherical tooth primordium and cellular activity (i.e., HERS growth and  
40  
41 inter-radicular process initiation, level of penetration and unity) interact to regulate root and  
42  
43 canal, form and number (Jernvall and Thesleff, 2000; Shields, 2005). The resultant co-variation  
44  
45 between tooth germ size and root form/number was formulated into a developmental model by  
46  
47 Shields (2005) called the ‘size/number continuum’ (SNC). Based on modern humans, this model  
48  
49 predicts that the size of the developing premolar tooth germ directly regulates the number and  
50  
51 expression of inter-radicular processes (IRPs) responsible for root form/number (i.e., smaller  
52  
53 tooth germs will form fewer roots and larger tooth germs will form a greater number of roots).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 The SNC model is testable from the level of the order Primates down to familial twins (Shields,  
5  
6  
7 2005). Recently, Moore and colleagues' (2013, 2015) investigation of the SNC model across  
8  
9 extant non-human hominoids (using cross-sectional cervix area as a proxy for tooth size)  
10  
11 provided equivocal support for the model, prompting the goal of the present study to investigate  
12  
13 its applicability within the hominin clade.  
14  
15

16  
17 Other factors (e.g., epigenetic effects) have also been proposed to influence root number  
18  
19 or form, some of which unrelated to size (Kovacs, 1967, 1971; Shields, 2005; Brook, 2009). For  
20  
21 example, variables that have been implicated in affecting root morphology include: sexual  
22  
23 dimorphism (Schwartz and Dean, 2005; Shields, 2005; Saunders et al., 2007); population  
24  
25 variation (Frisch, 1963; Trope et a., 1986; Sert and Bayrili, 2004; Shields, 2005); blood supply  
26  
27 and nerve structure (Schwartz and Langdon, 1991; Hildebrand et al., 1995; Moe et al., 2008);  
28  
29 cuspal, crown and cervical features or shape (Kovacs, 1971; Wood et al., 1988; White et al.,  
30  
31 2000; Haile-Selassie, 2001; Kupczik et al., 2005; Moore et al., 2013); masticatory  
32  
33 demands/dietary specialization (Shea, 1983; Spencer, 2003; Kupczik et al., 2005; Taylor, 2006;  
34  
35 Kupczik and Dean, 2008; Hamon et al., 2012; Vogel et al., 2014); and canine size and/or jaw  
36  
37 size (Wolpoff, 1975; Tobias, 1995; Shields, 2005). Accurately characterizing root variation in  
38  
39 the large hypodigms of *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus robustus* will set the  
40  
41 groundwork for assessing the potential influence of some of these factors.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Curiosity in South African australopith premolar root morphology dates back to the mid-  
51  
52 20<sup>th</sup> century with characterization based mainly from direct examination (e.g., Gregory and  
53  
54 Hellman, 1939; Broom and Schepers, 1946; Broom and Robinson, 1952; Robinson, 1956;  
55  
56 Sperber, 1974). Previous surveys report differences in root number and form between *A.*  
57  
58 *africanus* and *P. robustus* (Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974; Abbott, 1984; Wood, 1988; Wood et  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 al., 1988; Wood and Engleman, 1988; Tobias, 1995). For the maxillary premolars, *A. africanus*  
5  
6 (Sterkfontein) has a higher frequency of two than three roots (and one case of a single-rooted P<sup>3</sup>)  
7  
8 compared to *P. robustus* (Swartkrans), which shows the opposite pattern (Robinson, 1956;  
9  
10 Tobias, 1995). The *A. africanus* P<sub>3</sub> exhibits only the Tomes' (hereafter referred to as the C-  
11  
12 shaped root) form, while *P. robustus* exhibits both the C-shaped and a double rooted form (and  
13  
14 one case of three roots) (Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974). The C-shaped form for both taxa is  
15  
16 described as sometimes having 'partially fused' roots potentially meaning a bifid apex, and both  
17  
18 taxa commonly express two rooted P<sub>4</sub>s (Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974). Inter-specific  
19  
20 differences in mandibular root orientation is reported, as well as evidence for root 'molarization'  
21  
22 in cases from Swartkrans and Sterkfontein (Abbott, 1984; Gregory and Hellman, 1939; Broom  
23  
24 and Schepers, 1946; Robinson, 1952, 1956; Sperber, 1974; Wood, 1988; Moggi-Cecchi et al.,  
25  
26 2006). Comprehensive analyses of the associations of the Sterkfontein Member 4 sample  
27  
28 (Moggi-Cecchi et al., 2006), new *P. robustus* material from the site of Drimolen (Keyser, 2000;  
29  
30 Moggi-Cecchi et al., 2010), the availability of high resolution 3D imaging of material from  
31  
32 Drimolen, Kromdraai, Makapansgat, Sterkfontein and Swartkrans, an expanded comparative  
33  
34 context of hominoid root morphology (Emonet et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2013, 2015), and new  
35  
36 models predicting root variation (Shields, 2005) support a re-examination of root and canal  
37  
38 variability in *A. africanus* and *P. robustus*.  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 The present study uses microtomographic scans of over 95% of the hypodigms of *A.*  
50  
51 *africanus* and *P. robustus* to (1) characterize, quantify and document variability in premolar root  
52  
53 morphology within and between each species, (2) test whether the SNC model adequately  
54  
55 explains the observed root variation within each species, and (3) compare our findings with  
56  
57 documented variation in extant non-human apes and other Plio-Pleistocene hominins.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 **Materials and methods**  
9

10  
11 The sample of permanent premolars (n=166) is derived from microtomographic scans of  
12  
13 crania and mandibulae from *A. africanus* (n=49 individuals) and *P. robustus* (n=60 individuals).  
14  
15 The *A. africanus* specimens originate from Makapansgat and Sterkfontein and the *P. robustus*  
16  
17 material originates from Drimolen, Kromdraai and Swartkrans (Table 1). All fossil material is  
18  
19 curated at either the Ditsong National Museum of Natural History (DNMNH; Pretoria, South  
20  
21 Africa; formerly known as the Transvaal Museum), or the Evolutionary Studies Institute,  
22  
23 University of the Witwatersrand (Johannesburg, South Africa). Taxonomic attribution of the  
24  
25 specimens was acquired from literature sources and museum records. A complete list of the  
26  
27 study sample including accession numbers, and taxonomic and premolar class references is listed  
28  
29 in Appendix 1.  
30  
31  
32  
33

34  
35  
36 All specimens were scanned either on a BIR ACTIS 225/300 high-resolution industrial  
37  
38 microtomographic system at a spatial resolution of 30–80  $\mu\text{m}$  or a SKYSCAN 1172 desktop  
39  
40 microtomographic scanner at a spatial resolution of 30–50  $\mu\text{m}$ . Each tomographic dataset was  
41  
42 imported into Avizo (v7.1, [www.vsg3d.com](http://www.vsg3d.com)) and a threshold-based surface model was created to  
43  
44 observe the jaws and dentition of each specimen. In the first instance, left side premolars were  
45  
46 selected; if these were missing or damaged to an extent that precluded their analyses, the right  
47  
48 side was chosen. On each premolar the sub-cervical region consisting of the radicular dentine  
49  
50 and root canal architecture was characterized in 2D from cross-sectional slices oriented  
51  
52 perpendicular to the occlusal plane and at various positions along the length of the root body,  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 and/or in 3D from a segmented surface model of the dental tissues (see Moore et al., 2013,  
5  
6  
7 2015). All data collection was performed by NCM.  
8  
9

## 10 Root and canal classification

11  
12  
13 To characterize the form, number and configuration of the root and canal, for each  
14  
15 premolar, our methodology followed Moore and colleagues (2013, 2015 developed from  
16  
17 methods outlined in Turner, 1981; Abbott, 1984; Chaparro et al., 1999; Vertucci, 2005;  
18  
19 Jafarzadeh and Wu, 2007). The terms root and canal are used in this study to describe an  
20  
21 independent element extending from the root trunk and pulp chamber, respectively, and  
22  
23 terminating at an apex. When a bi- or trifurcation occurs (i.e., multiple roots/canals), a decision  
24  
25 of root or canal number was made by applying the Turner index (1981), which compares the  
26  
27 furcation location distance (from inter-radicular summit to root apex) relative to the total root  
28  
29 length (from cervix to apex). If this ratio is >25% of the total root length, the root under scrutiny  
30  
31 is considered multi-rooted, if <25% it is considered single rooted (possibly with a bifid apex).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

## 38 Root and canal typology

39  
40  
41 From the above criteria a classification typology was established combining both the  
42  
43 external root surface and canal parameters at each premolar position (following Moore et al.,  
44  
45 2013, 2015; and adapted from Abbott, 1984; Brunet et al., 1996; Kupczik et al., 2005; Vertucci,  
46  
47 2005; Jafarzadeh and Wu, 2007; Emonet, 2009; Emonet et al., 2012). Each root type consists of  
48  
49 a number-letter-number combination. The first number refers to the number of canals, the middle  
50  
51 letter indicates canal form/configuration, and the last number provides external root  
52  
53 number/form/configuration information that discerns types with the same canal morphology. A  
54  
55 formula and description of each root type is listed in Table 2 and this classification is also  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 consistent with variation in premolar root morphology documented in extant hominoids (e.g.,  
5  
6  
7 Abbott, 1984; Shields, 2000; Kupczik et al., 2005; Moore et al., 2013, 2015).  
8  
9

## 10 Tooth size

11  
12  
13 The size of the tooth cervix is correlated with occlusal crown area (Hillson et al., 2005),  
14  
15 root number (Abbot, 1984; Kupczik et al., 2005; Shields, 2005) and canal number (Moore et al.,  
16  
17 2013). Therefore, we measured cervical surface area (CSA) as a proxy for tooth size in order to  
18  
19 test the predictions of the SNC model (see Moore et al., 2015). CSA was measured on a cross-  
20  
21 sectional plane (generated in Avizo) that was positioned initially from points at the buccal and  
22  
23 lingual enamel extensions of the cervix. Next, this plane was then adjusted in the mesio-distal  
24  
25 aspect until the cervical axis was established perpendicular to the longitudinal axis of the crown  
26  
27 and root trunk (cervix to furcation) (following Le Cabec et al., 2012). Finally, this plane was then  
28  
29 translated vertically until equidistant between the coronal and apical boundaries of the cervical  
30  
31 line (following Olejniczak, 2006). Once the cross-section was properly positioned, the dentine  
32  
33 was segmented and the 2D dentine area (mm<sup>2</sup>) was calculated in Avizo.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

## 41 Statistical analyses

42  
43  
44 A Chi-square test of independence was employed to test for canal/root number and root  
45  
46 type differences between the taxa. Nonparametric Mann-Whitney U and/or Kruskal-Wallis one-  
47  
48 way analysis of variance tests were used to test for mean CSA differences between the taxa, as  
49  
50 well as to test for the relationship between CSA and canal/root number and/or form within each  
51  
52 fossil taxon. Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS (v20.0.0, www.SPSS.com) with a  
53  
54 significance level of p=0.05.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Results**  
5  
6

7  
8 Root types for each premolar class and taxon  
9

10  
11 Figures 1–4 illustrate and report counts and percentages of canal and external root form/  
12 number/configuration, as well as a representative cross-sectional image of each root type at each  
13 premolar position for *A. africanus* and *P. robustus*. Across the two fossil species, five root types  
14 are observed for the maxillary premolars and eight root types for the mandibular premolars. The  
15 supplementary material includes a Specimen Image Atlas that illustrates a cross-sectional image  
16 of each premolar in the study sample organized by taxon, position and root type. In the following  
17 sections and to facilitate clarity of descriptions, root number is described on an ordinal scale (i.e.,  
18 single, double, triple) and canal number on a numeric scale (i.e., one, two, three, four).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

30 Maxillary premolars The P<sup>3</sup> (Fig. 1) varies in canal number between one (rarely) and more  
31 commonly two or three. *A. africanus* exhibits one case (STS 47) of a single elliptical canal and  
32 root (1-A-1, 5%) with a slight buccal groove. The frequency of two (2-A) vs. three canals (3-A)  
33 is higher in *A. africanus* (45% and 50%, respectively) compared to *P. robustus* (36% and 64%,  
34 respectively). Variation in external root number is present in the three canal type in which a  
35 small number of specimens (one each in *A. africanus* and *P. robustus*) exhibit a single joined  
36 elliptical buccal root with two canals (3-A-1), rather than two independent roots each with one  
37 canal (3-A-5). Frequencies of canal/root number and discrete root types did not differ  
38 significantly between the taxa (Table 3).  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

FIGURE 1 HERE

The P<sup>4</sup> (Fig. 2) varies in canal number between two and three. As listed in Table 3, the  
frequency of two canals (2-A) vs. three canals (3-A) is significantly higher (p=0.001) in *A.*

1  
2  
3  
4 africanus (62% and 38%, respectively) compared to *P. robustus* (14% and 86%, respectively).  
5  
6 Similarly, the frequency of double vs. triple roots differs significantly ( $p=0.001$ ) between the  
7  
8 taxa. Both taxa exhibit single cases of the three canal type with joined buccal roots (3-A-1) and  
9  
10 *P. robustus* presents one case (SK 28) of joined mesial-buccal/lingual roots (3-A-2).  
11  
12  
13  
14

15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

FIGURE 2 HERE

Mandibular premolars The  $P_3$  canal number varies between one but most commonly two, three and four canals (Fig. 3). There is one *P. robustus* specimen (DNH 58) possessing a single canal/root (1-A-1) with buccal and lingual root grooves and one circular canal that bifurcates periapically (n.b., the root grooves of this specimen are deeply invaginated and differentiate this root form from a typical single rooted premolar in, for example, a modern human). The two canal C-shaped type (2-D-1), with characteristic crescent-shaped mesio-buccal canal and elliptical disto-lingual canal with a bifid apex, is expressed at a similarly moderate frequency for *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* (31% and 33%, respectively). *P. robustus* exhibits other two canal types with one case of a C-shaped type (2-A-3, SKX 311) with circular mesio-buccal and disto-buccal canals and a non-bifid apex, and one case of a two canal, double plate-like root type (2-C-1, TM 1600).

There are key differences in the three canal/double rooted  $P_3$  types between *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* with the former uniquely expressing an elliptical mesio-buccal canal/root (3-A-1, 44%), while only the latter expresses a type with a plate-like mesial canal/root (3-B-1, 47%). In type 3-B-1, the mesial plate-like root relative to the distal plate is narrower lingually, and the buccal edges of both roots are aligned. A three canal type is present in a single *P. robustus* specimen that exhibits triple roots, oriented as two buccal plate-like and one circular lingual root

1  
2  
3  
4 with one canal each (3-C-1, SK 1587a). In this type, the plate-like roots are slightly ‘kidney’  
5  
6 shaped with a groove located on the outward aspect of both the mesial and distal root. The four  
7  
8 canal, double plate-like type (4-A-1) is observed only in *A. africanus* at moderate (25%)  
9  
10 frequency; the mesial and distal plate-like roots are of similar relative size and appear ‘teardrop’  
11  
12 in shape with the more developed blunt portion extending outward. With regards to taxonomic  
13  
14 differences in root type variation for the P<sub>3</sub>, there is a significant difference in the frequency  
15  
16 distribution of three and four canal premolars ( $p < 0.001$ ) due to the unique expression of 3-A-1  
17  
18 (*A. africanus*) and 3-B-1 (*P. robustus*), and lack of the four canal type (4-A-1) in *P. robustus*  
19  
20 (Table 3). This difference also drives the significant difference when comparing root type  
21  
22 frequency across the whole P<sub>3</sub> sample ( $p = 0.001$ ). Ignoring canal number and comparing the  
23  
24 frequency of C-shaped roots vs. double roots did not yield significant differences between the  
25  
26 taxa ( $p = 0.508$ ).  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 FIGURE 3 HERE

35  
36  
37 Similar to the P<sub>3</sub>, the P<sub>4</sub> (Fig. 4) varies in canal number between one and more commonly  
38  
39 two, three and four. One *A. africanus* specimen (STW 87) shows a single canal/root type (1-A-1)  
40  
41 that is mesio-distally flattened. The two canal double-plate root type (2-C-1) is expressed in  
42  
43 single cases for *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* (each 6%). The two canal C-shaped type (2-D-1) is  
44  
45 also expressed in single cases for both taxa. The *A. africanus* C-shaped specimen, STW 212,  
46  
47 contains three canals and thus its tentative classification as 2-D-1 emphasizes the external root  
48  
49 form rather than canal number. Additionally, *P. robustus* presents a 2-D-1 specimen (SKX 4446)  
50  
51 with a root groove that opens on the buccal face (i.e., □-shaped vs. C-shaped). The three canal  
52  
53 type (3-B-1) with double plate-like roots is present with moderate frequency in *A. africanus* and  
54  
55 *P. robustus* (27% and 23%, respectively), and a single case of a three canal/triple root type (3-C-  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 1, STS 7) is found only in *A. africanus*. The four canal double plate-like form (4-A-1) is the most  
5  
6 prevalent type in both *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* (44% and 59%, respectively). SK 88 is a  
7  
8 developing tooth with an incomplete root that was reported as being triple rooted by Sperber  
9  
10 (1974). Although not developed enough to be included in this study, we can confirm that it has a  
11  
12 separate circular lingual root and a large buccal root whose morphology suggests that it could  
13  
14 have ultimately developed into type 3-C-1 (meaning that each taxon would have single examples  
15  
16 of this type in the  $P_4$ ). Inter-specific comparison of all separate root types or between the double  
17  
18 root types with three vs. four canals did not differ significantly between the two taxa (Table 3).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

FIGURE 4 HERE

Intra-root type variation and additional morphological traits The buccal root of the maxillary  
premolar type 2-A-2 exhibits two different groove variants when viewed in both cross-section  
and from a surface model. Among hominoids, Moore and colleagues (2015) outlined four types  
of groove variants: type 1) smooth, circular with no groove; type 2) a lingual groove producing a  
'C' shaped root; type 3) a buccal groove producing a slight '□' shaped root; type 4) a compound  
pattern with grooves on the buccal and lingual (and sometimes mesial and distal) aspects,  
producing a 'butterfly' or 'X' shape (Figure 5 provides cross-sectional images as examples of  
types seen in the hominins). The *A. africanus*  $P^3$  exhibits predominately type 2 (7/10, 70%) and a  
few type 4 (3/10, 30%), while *P. robustus* shows the opposite pattern with only a couple of  
examples of type 2 (2/8, 25%) and predominantly type 4 (6/8, 75%). The frequency of  $P^4$  groove  
pattern for *A. africanus* is again predominantly type 2 (12/13, 92%) compared to type 4 (1/13,  
8%), but with *P. robustus* at this premolar position being similar in pattern to *A. africanus* with a  
higher frequency of type 2 (3/4, 75%) than type 4 (1/4, 25%).

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

FIGURE 5 HERE

Mandibular premolars with bifid apices are common in both taxa for most root types (Table 4). The majority of the P<sub>3</sub> C-shaped (2-D-1) type has a bifid apex for both taxa: *A. africanus* (100%) and *P. robustus* (66%); the single case of type 2-A-3 in *P. robustus* did not have a bifid apex. The P<sub>3</sub> double rooted types express a bifid apex in the distal root in most specimens of *A. africanus* type 3-A-1 (83%) and 4-A-1 (66%), and all of *P. robustus* type 3-B-1 (100%). The *A. africanus* P<sub>4</sub> type 2-C-1 shows no distal bifid apex, whereas the *P. robustus* (100%) specimen does. A distal bifid apex for P<sub>4</sub> type 3-B-1 is uncommon in *A. africanus* (20%) yet typical for *P. robustus* (75%). Similarly, the apices of the P<sub>4</sub> type 4-A-1 were bifid in the majority of *A. africanus* (85% total: 57% distal, 28% both) and *P. robustus* (75% total: 50% distal, 25% both) specimens.

Additionally, in both taxa most double rooted mandibular premolars (type 2-C-1/3-B-1), as well as the P<sub>4</sub> type 4-A-1 with plate-like roots, show an unequal size pattern (see ‘moiety relationship’, Wood et al., 1988) where the mesial root is often smaller than the distal counterpart (see Fig. 3 and 4). Across the mandibular root types, the plate-like roots are often ‘figure-8’ or ‘kidney’ shaped in cross-section (see above) indicating subtle root groove evidence creating the concavity. Finally, the P<sub>3</sub> C-shaped type (2-D-1) is generally distinctive between the taxa and the *A. africanus* version is more consistent in appearance across the sample compared to *P. robustus*, which shows a higher incidence and variable number of grooves on the outer face (see Fig. 6).

FIGURE 6 HERE

Tooth size (CSA) and root type variation within and between taxa

1  
2  
3  
4 Mean tooth size for each taxon For descriptive statistics of mean tooth size (pooled root types)  
5  
6 for each premolar class, see Table 5. Mean tooth size was significantly larger in *P. robustus*  
7  
8 compared to the *A. africanus* P<sup>3</sup> (76.20 mm<sup>2</sup> and 63.70 mm<sup>2</sup>, respectively; p=0.001) and P<sup>4</sup>  
9  
10 (92.50 mm<sup>2</sup> and 72.20 mm<sup>2</sup>, respectively; p=0.001). The P<sub>3</sub> in *A. africanus* and *P. robustus*  
11  
12 (64.30 mm<sup>2</sup> and 61.60 mm<sup>2</sup>, respectively) and the P<sub>4</sub> (74.70 mm<sup>2</sup> and 78.50 mm<sup>2</sup>, respectively)  
13  
14 did not differ significantly. Tooth size for the P<sub>3</sub> C-shaped type (2-A/2-D) did not differ  
15  
16 significantly between the taxa but was slightly larger in *A. africanus* compared to *P. robustus*  
17  
18 (63.90 mm<sup>2</sup> and 60.00 mm<sup>2</sup>, respectively). For a specimen list separated by each premolar  
19  
20 position showing associated root type with tooth size, see Appendix 2 and for summary statistics  
21  
22 by tooth see Appendices 3 and 4.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 Root morphology and tooth size relationship The variation outlined above allows for the  
30  
31 opportunity to test the predictive power of the SNC model within each fossil hominin taxon.  
32  
33 Specifically, an increase in cervix size is predicted to be associated with an increase in canal  
34  
35 and/or root number. In order to assess canal number, different root types are combined (e.g.,  
36  
37 double roots with two vs. three vs. four canals). Table 6 presents the results of intra-specific  
38  
39 comparisons (e.g., two canals vs. three canals) for each premolar position, indicating whether the  
40  
41 difference in tooth size matches the prediction of the SNC model, and whether this trend is  
42  
43 statistically significant. Comparisons are limited by sample size and when the sample  
44  
45 composition is the same with regards to a comparison of canal or root number, only canal  
46  
47 number is reported. Root types of n=1 are reported but excluded from statistical analysis (i.e.,  
48  
49 only types with n≥2 are compared).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 In the P<sup>3</sup> of *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* there is a non-significant trend for an increase in  
58  
59 cervix size between two vs. three canals; however, this trend was more marked in *P. robustus*. In  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 the P<sup>4</sup> of both *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* there is a significant increase in cervical size between  
5 two vs. three canals ( $p=0.047$  and  $p=0.014$ , respectively). In the P<sub>3</sub> of *A. africanus* cervical size  
6 increases slightly between the C-shaped and double root types, but does not differ significantly;  
7 in *P. robustus* these two root types show no size difference. There is also a non-significant trend  
8 for a decrease in cervix size in *A. africanus* P<sub>3</sub> double rooted specimens with three vs. four  
9 canals. In the P<sub>4</sub>, there is a non-significant trend for an increase in cervix size between *P.*  
10 *robustus* specimens with C/□-shaped type vs. those with double roots. In both hominins, P<sub>4</sub>  
11 cervical size increases, although non-significantly, between double root types with three vs. four  
12 canals.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Comparison with extant non-human hominoids

28  
29  
30 Inter-specific tooth size, canal number, root type and non-metric trait differences Moore and  
31 colleagues (2015) present a detailed overview of premolar root system variability (including both  
32 CSA and root type) in living hominoids, and the following section compares these data with the  
33 results for *A. africanus* and *P. robustus*. Mean tooth size between the two fossil taxa and extant  
34 apes is presented in Table 5. Mean tooth size is significantly different ( $p\leq 0.05$ ) between *A.*  
35 *africanus*/*P. robustus* and each ape genus at most premolar positions (significance was not  
36 reached for comparisons of *P. robustus*/*Pongo* P<sup>3</sup>, *A. africanus*/*Pongo* P<sup>4</sup> and the P<sub>4</sub> between both  
37 fossil taxa and *Pongo*). Figures 7–8 present histograms of canal number and root type  
38 frequencies in each taxon separated by premolar position (only types with  $n\geq 5\%$  in frequency are  
39 listed). The following summarizes the post-hoc pairwise test results between canal number and  
40 root type in each of the two hominins compared separately to each extant ape.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 For the P<sup>3</sup> (Fig. 7), the hominins differ from the hominoids in exhibiting a greater  
5  
6 proportion of specimens with two canals/roots. The most common root type pattern across the  
7  
8 sample is type 3-A-5 (triple roots) with type 2-A-2 (double roots) relatively common in the  
9  
10 hominins and Hylobates. Pairwise tests were significant ( $p \leq 0.032$ ) for all comparisons except  
11  
12 between root types in *P. robustus* vs. Hylobates. For the P<sup>4</sup> (Fig. 7), *A. africanus*, Pan and  
13  
14 Hylobates are similar and unique from the other taxa in having a greater proportion of specimens  
15  
16 with two canals (2-A), while, Gorilla and Pongo almost exclusively present three canals (3-A).  
17  
18 *P. robustus*, with 14% type 2-A stands intermediate to these groups. This differentiation also  
19  
20 holds when comparing root types; although in this case *A. africanus* and Pan are differentiated  
21  
22 from Hylobates in exhibiting type 3-A-1. Pairwise tests were significant ( $p \leq 0.040$ ) in all  
23  
24 comparisons except between each hominin vs. Pan/Hylobates, and *P. robustus* vs. Pongo; canal  
25  
26 number did not significantly differ between *A. africanus* vs. Hylobates.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 The P<sub>3</sub> (see Fig. 8) pattern in neither *P. robustus* nor *A. africanus* is matched in any  
35  
36 extant taxon in having a larger proportion C-shaped and plate-like double rooted types (i.e., 3-B-  
37  
38 1 and 4-A-1, respectively). A variant of the hominin C-shaped form (2-D-1) is observed in Pan  
39  
40 (2-A-3), but differs morphologically and is less common (see below and Fig. 6). The *A.*  
41  
42 *africanus* four canal form (4-A-1) occurs rarely only in Pongo, and the three canal variant in *P.*  
43  
44 *robustus* (3-B-1) is not observed in any extant ape. *A. africanus* and members of Hominidae  
45  
46 share the MB + D form, however, canal number frequency is greater compared to Pan (two  
47  
48 canals, 2-B-1) and lies intermediate to Pongo/Gorilla (three canals, 3-A-1). Pairwise  
49  
50 comparisons were significant ( $p \leq 0.001$ ) for the two fossil taxa except for canal number between  
51  
52 both hominins vs. Pongo, and *P. robustus* vs. Gorilla.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 For the P<sub>4</sub> (Fig. 8), all members of Hominidae are dominated by plate-like double rooted  
5 types (i.e., 2-C/3-B/4-A). However, *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* are differentiated from the great  
6 apes by a much higher relative frequency of four canals (4-A-1) compared to two canals (2-C-1,  
7 invariant in *Pan*, common in Gorilla/Pongo) or three canals (3-B-1, common in Gorilla/Pongo).  
8  
9 The triple rooted (3-C-1) type is rare in both hominins' P<sub>3</sub>/P<sub>4</sub> but most common in the Gorilla P<sub>3</sub>.  
10  
11 The single root/canal (1-A-1) type rare in each fossil taxon's P<sub>3</sub>/P<sub>4</sub> is most numerous in the  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

22 Across Hominidae, bifid apices in the mandibular premolars of many double rooted types  
23 with plate-like roots appears to differ in frequency and sometimes pattern between *A. africanus*,  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## 46 Discussion

### 49 Premolar root and canal variation

52 The current study documents a greater level of premolar root system variation and a  
53 different intra- and inter-specific pattern for *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* than previous  
54 investigations (Abbott, 1984; Gregory and Hellman, 1939; Broom and Schepers, 1946; Broom  
55 and Robinson, 1952; Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974; Wood et al., 1988; Wood and Engleman,  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 1988; Tobias, 1995). Major trends within and between the two taxa are summarized in Table 7  
5  
6 and specific findings for each are discussed below.  
7  
8

9  
10 Intra-specific pattern *A. africanus* P<sup>3</sup> root number has been previously reported (Robinson, 1956;  
11  
12 Sperber, 1974) as predominantly double (84%) and rarely triple (8%) or single rooted (8%). In  
13  
14 contrast, the present P<sup>3</sup> sample exhibits a more similar frequency of double and triple roots (each  
15  
16 45%) and a lower occurrence of single roots (5%). The *A. africanus* P<sup>4</sup> has been reported as  
17  
18 exclusively double rooted (Robinson, 1956), however, the present study determined that while  
19  
20 double roots are most common (62%), triple roots do occur (33%). Robinson (1956) may have  
21  
22 considered the joined three canal type (3-A-1) in the P<sup>3</sup> and P<sup>4</sup> (each 5%) as having double roots  
23  
24 (i.e., type 2-A-2). The *A. africanus* P<sub>3</sub> and P<sub>4</sub> are reported as usually expressing the C-shaped  
25  
26 form described as having a distinct disto-buccal cleft, as well as cases of double rooted P<sub>4</sub>s  
27  
28 (Gregory and Hellman, 1939; Robinson, 1952, 1956; Sperber, 1974). The present study confirms  
29  
30 this C-shaped form occurs in the P<sub>3</sub> (31%) and P<sub>4</sub> (11%), but also demonstrates the presence of  
31  
32 multiple canal, double rooted forms in the P<sub>3</sub> (69%, pooled 3-A-1/4-A-1) and P<sub>4</sub> (77%, pooled 2-  
33  
34 C-1/3-B-1/4-A-1) at high frequency, as well as, rare single root/canal (1-A-1), triple canal C-  
35  
36 shaped, and triple root (3-C-1) types (each n=1).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 The *P. robustus* P<sup>3</sup> and P<sup>4</sup> were reported by Robinson (1956) as predominantly having  
46  
47 triple roots (75% and 80%, respectively) and less commonly double roots (25% and 20%,  
48  
49 respectively). In contrast to Robinson, our P<sup>3</sup> sample shows a relatively higher frequency of  
50  
51 double compared to triple roots (36% and 59%, respectively), while comparatively the P<sup>4</sup> sample  
52  
53 is somewhat similar in the ratio of double vs. triple roots (14% and 78%, respectively). Robinson  
54  
55 (1956) reports that a few P<sup>3</sup>s have ‘partially fused’ buccal roots, which is consistent with the  
56  
57 infrequent (~5%) presence of the 3-A-1 type in the maxillary premolars from our sample.  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Robinson (1956:62) also notes the connecting plate of dentine joining the mesio-buccal and  
5  
6 lingual roots in SK 28 (3-A-2). The *P. robustus* P<sub>3</sub> has been described as predominantly  
7  
8 expressing the C-shaped type with a mesio-lingual cleft (67%) compared to the double root  
9  
10 forms (27%, M + D), and rarely (6%) a single root form (Broom and Robinson, 1952; Robinson,  
11  
12 1956; Sperber, 1974). The results of the present study generally agree, but we show a relatively  
13  
14 higher frequency of double root types (52%, pooled 2-C-1/3-B-1) that vary in canal number  
15  
16 compared to the C-shaped form (38%, pooled 2-A-3/2-D-1). We note the presence of a rare triple  
17  
18 root (5%, 3-C-1) type and we concur on the rarity of the single root/canal (5%, 1-A-1) form. The  
19  
20 P<sub>4</sub> has been previously reported as typically double rooted (90%, M + D) and rarely (10%) triple  
21  
22 rooted (Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974). Our results confirm that double root types dominate  
23  
24 (88%, pooled 2-C-1/3-B-1/4-A-1); however we report for the first time that these vary in canal  
25  
26 number. Furthermore, our analysis identifies previously unreported cases of C/□-shaped (2-D-1)  
27  
28 forms (12% total). Recognizing TM 1517 as the *P. robustus* holotype, most other specimens  
29  
30 match in terms of root types and tooth size. Additionally, SK 6 originally named *P. crassidens*  
31  
32 (Broom, 1949; Broom and Robinson, 1952) is now generally accepted within the *P. robustus*  
33  
34 hypodigm (see Wood et al., 1988 and references therein) and does not display unusual premolar  
35  
36 root morphology or size compared with other specimens of the taxon.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 Inter-specific pattern Our results concur with previous studies (Broom and Schepers, 1946;  
47  
48 Broom and Robinson, 1952; Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974; Wood et al., 1988; Wood and  
49  
50 Engleman, 1988; Tobias, 1995) that maxillary premolar canal/root number tends to be greater in  
51  
52 *P. robustus* than *A. africanus*, however, we demonstrate that this is more apparent for the P<sup>4</sup> than  
53  
54 P<sup>3</sup>. In the mandibular premolars, the P<sub>3</sub> rather than the P<sub>4</sub> is more informative for distinguishing  
55  
56 between *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* (see Fig. 3 and Table 7). Similar to prior reports of the P<sub>3</sub>  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 C-shaped form (i.e., 2-A-3/2-D-1), our sample shows a slightly higher frequency in *P. robustus*  
5 (38%) than *A. africanus* (31%) and also highlights the distinctive inter-specific morphology in  
6  
7 this root type (see Fig. 6 and Table 7). However, we demonstrate that both hominins more  
8  
9 commonly exhibit double rooted P<sub>3</sub>s, which additionally are taxonomically distinctive (i.e., type  
10  
11 3-A-1/4-A-1 in *A. africanus* vs. type 3-B-1 in *P. robustus*). The distinguishing feature between  
12  
13 these root types involves the orientation and form of the mesial root relative to the distal root (3-  
14  
15 A-1, MB elliptical + D plate-like vs. 3-B-1/4-A-1, M + D plate-like) or canal number (3-A-1/3-  
16  
17 B-1, three canals vs. 4-A-1, four canals). Gregory and Hellman (1939) state that the  
18  
19 Paranthropus (*P. robustus*) P<sub>3</sub> appears similar to the Plesianthropus (*A. africanus*) P<sub>4</sub> and are  
20  
21 likely referring to the plate-like morphology (i.e., P<sub>3</sub> type 4-A-1 and P<sub>4</sub> types 2-C-1/3-B-1/4-A-  
22  
23 1). Our study confirms that mandibular root ‘molarization’ occurs within the Swartkrans and  
24  
25 Sterkfontein assemblages (Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974; Moggi-Cecchi et al., 2006).  
26  
27 Maxillary premolar double root buccal groove patterning (see Results and Fig. 5) is previously  
28  
29 unreported and appears to differ (albeit non-significantly) between the two taxa. Future study  
30  
31 should examine this phenomenon across primates (see also Moore et al., 2015) to further  
32  
33 elucidate taxonomic patterns of this trait.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

44         Based on analyses of craniodental morphology, *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* are often  
45 referred to as gracile and robust australopiths, respectively (Wood and Stack, 1980; McCollum,  
46 1999; Wood and Constantino, 2007; Gunz, 2012). In establishing this dichotomy,  
47  
48 craniomandibular characters, endocast volume, relative anterior, canine, and post-canine tooth  
49  
50 size, relative premolar crown size, enamel thickness, and premolar root number/form  
51  
52 (specifically with reference to East African *P. boisei*, discussed below) has led the robust taxa  
53  
54 (including *P. aethiopicus*) to be allocated by cladistic analysis to a monophyletic clade within the  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 hominin lineage (Rak, 1983; Chamberlain and Wood, 1987; Grine and Martin, 1988; Wood,  
5  
6 1988; Strait and Grine, 2004; Gunz, 2012). Specifically, premolar root morphology in the robust  
7  
8 taxa (i.e. *P. boisei*) is characterized as ‘molariform’ with the P<sub>3</sub> and P<sub>4</sub> roots appearing plate-like  
9  
10 (usually with two canals in each plate) and resembling those of the molars (Abbott, 1984; Wood,  
11  
12 1988; Wood et al., 1988). In our study, some P<sub>3</sub>s of both species exhibit a ‘molariform’  
13  
14 appearance with plate-like forms (i.e., 2-C-1/3-B-1/3-C-1/4-A-1), but to differing degrees. *P.*  
15  
16 *robustus* exhibits a greater frequency of plate-like P<sub>3</sub>s compared to *A. africanus* and may be  
17  
18 considered more derived. Both taxa also express low numbers of the mandibular premolar triple  
19  
20 rooted type (3-C-1, see also *A. bahrelghazali* below). It appears that premolar root ‘molarization’  
21  
22 does not typify the robust australopiths (Moore et al., 2015; this study; see also *Gorilla/Pongo*  
23  
24 above and *A. afarensis* below) and future investigation should determine the extent of this  
25  
26 character state within the hominin clade as it has phylogenetic connotations.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Our results are relevant for the debated hypothesis that a larger-toothed *Australopithecus*  
35  
36 species (distinct from *A. africanus* and referred to as *A. prometheus*) could be present in Member  
37  
38 4 of Sterkfontein (e.g., Fornai et al., 2010; Clarke, 2013; Grine, 2013; Grine et al., 2013).  
39  
40 Specimens from our sample that have been proposed, based on aspects of crown morphology and  
41  
42 size, to differ from *A. africanus* include: STS 1, 36, and 71 and STW 183, 252, 384 and 498  
43  
44 (Clarke, 1985, 1989, 1994a, 2008; Fornai et al., 2010). In our analysis STS 1, 36 and 71, and  
45  
46 STW 183, 252 and 384 do not display distinctive patterns of root morphology, but are well above  
47  
48 the mean CSA for their respective premolar positions, especially the latter two specimens. STW  
49  
50 498 along with 142, 212 and 401 (see also Moggi-Cecchi et al., 2006) express the P<sub>3</sub> double-  
51  
52 plate/quad-canal type, which is not observed elsewhere in the sample. However, species of  
53  
54 *Pongo* variably express this P<sub>3</sub> root type, a wide range of variation is documented in differing  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 populations among modern humans (Trope et al., 1986; Sert and Bayrili, 2004; Shields, 2005),  
5  
6 and a large cervical size range occurs within non-human apes (see Table 5), thus, a conservative  
7  
8 interpretation of premolar root variation would suggest that Member 4 individuals belong to a  
9  
10 single species (see also Kimbel and White, 1988; Moggi-Cecchi, 2003; Moggi-Cecchi et al.,  
11  
12 2006; Grine, 2013; Grine et al., 2013).  
13  
14  
15

#### 16 17 Comparison with Plio-Pleistocene hominins 18 19

20  
21 With some obvious taxonomic differences, the root types documented for *A. africanus*  
22  
23 and *P. robustus* share many similarities with other Plio-Pleistocene non-Homo hominin taxa.  
24  
25 Root type frequencies and counts presented below are based from specimen description/counts in  
26  
27 published literature (note: due to historical methodological limitations, canal information is  
28  
29 rarely available for many hominin taxa) or from specimen images/illustrations.  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 The P<sup>3</sup> single canal/root type is present in a single *A. africanus* specimen (Robinson,  
35  
36 1956; Tobias, 1995; this study) but is not reported for other non-Homo hominins during this time  
37  
38 period. A two canal/double rooted P<sup>3</sup> is present in *A. deyiremeda* (BRT-VP-3/1, Haile-Selassie et  
39  
40 al., 2015) and *A. sediba* (MH 1/2, Irish et al., 2013). The relative frequency of a two canal/double  
41  
42 rooted P<sup>3</sup> is higher in *A. africanus* compared to *A. anamensis* (25% from Coffing et al., 1994;  
43  
44 Leakey et al., 1995; Ward et al., 2001, 2013) and *A. afarensis* (17% from Johanson and White,  
45  
46 1979; White, 1977, 1980; Ward et al., 1982), while triple root P<sup>3</sup>s are most prevalent in *P. boisei*  
47  
48 (90% from Tobias, 1967; Wood, 1991; Alemseged et al., 2002; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al.,  
49  
50 2013). Triple rooted P<sup>3</sup>s are also reported for all three specimens (KNM-WT 38343A, 38350,  
51  
52 40000) of *K. platyops* (Leakey et al., 2001) and *A. bahrelghazali* (KT 12/H2, Brunet et al.,  
53  
54 1996).  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 The *A. africanus* two canal/double root P<sup>4</sup> is higher in frequency compared to *A.*  
5  
6 *anamensis* (50%) and *A. afarensis* (33%) (White, 1977; Ward et al., 1982; White et al., 2006;  
7  
8 Ward et al., 2013), and is present in one *K. platyops* specimen (KNM-WT 38350) that may  
9  
10 bifurcate apically (Leakey et al., 2001), and also *A. deyiremeda* (BRT-VP-3/1, Haile-Selassie et  
11  
12 al., 2015). *K. platyops* (KNM-WT 40000) also presents the triple root P<sup>4</sup> (Leakey et al., 2001)  
13  
14 and this type is ubiquitous in *P. boisei* (100%) and reported as present in *Ar. ramidus* (ARA-VP-  
15  
16 1/3000) (Tobias, 1967; Wood, 1991; Alemseged et al., 2002; Suwa et al., 2009; Domínguez-  
17  
18 Rodrigo et al., 2013). Compared to other early hominins, type 3-A-1 (with joined buccal roots) is  
19  
20 higher in frequency (66%) in *A. afarensis* P<sup>3</sup>s (Ward et al., 1982) and potentially present in both  
21  
22 *S. tchadensis* maxillary premolars (TM 266-01-060-01); the latter is described as having “three  
23  
24 pulp canals and two roots” (Brunet et al., 2002:150).  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 The P<sub>3</sub> C-shaped type observed with moderate frequency in *A. africanus* and *P. robustus*  
33  
34 is also reported for *Ar. ramidus* (ARA-VP-1/3000, White, 2002) and in the P<sub>3</sub>/P<sub>4</sub> of *A.*  
35  
36 *deyiremeda* (WYT-VP-2/10, Haile-Selassie et al., 2015). Ward and colleagues (1982) note that  
37  
38 30% of *A. afarensis* P<sub>3</sub>s exhibited a single ‘dumbbell-shaped’ root body with two canals, and it  
39  
40 remains to be determined if these specimens would classify under the 2-D-1 type defined in this  
41  
42 study. *P. robustus* expresses a single case of the P<sub>4</sub> C-shaped type as does the single P<sub>4</sub> of *Ar.*  
43  
44 *kadabba* (Haile-Selassie et al., 2001). The single case of the *A. africanus* P<sub>4</sub> three canal C-shaped  
45  
46 type appears similar to those reported for the Atapuerca-TD6 remains (Bermúdez de Castro et  
47  
48 al., 1999). The rare *P. robustus* □-shaped type has not been noted in prior fossil hominin  
49  
50 literature. Without considering canal number, the P<sub>3</sub> MB + D type is rare in *A. afarensis* (6%),  
51  
52 moderate in *P. boisei* (33%) and *A. africanus* (44%), and highest in *A. anamensis* (67%)  
53  
54 (Johanson and White, 1979; Wood et al., 1988; Coffing et al., 1994; this study). Three canals  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 within a MB + D type (3-A-1) is reported for *A. anamensis* (29%, Ward et al., 2001, 2013) and is  
5  
6 the only type reported for *S. tchadensis* (Brunet et al., 2005).  
7  
8  
9

10 Some double rooted P<sub>3</sub> types have been described for *A. afarensis*, *A. anamensis*, *A.*  
11 *deyiremeda* and *A. sediba*, which do not seem to correspond with those in *A. africanus* and *P.*  
12 *robustus*. For example, *A. afarensis* shows a high frequency (55%) of a B + L type (Ward et al.,  
13  
14 1982) that is also seen in *A. deyiremeda* (BRT-VP-3/14, Haile-Selassie et al., 2015), while *A.*  
15 *anamensis* is described as possessing a B + DL type (n=1) with what appears to be a plate-like  
16  
17 mesial root and the distal root has a high bifurcation (KNM-KP 47951, Ward et al., 2013). *A.*  
18 *sediba* is noted as having a double rooted Tomes' variant (MH 1, Irish et al., 2013). The P<sub>3</sub> M +  
19  
20 D plate-like, four canal type (4-A-1) present in four *A. africanus* P<sub>3</sub>s matches the description for  
21  
22 67% of *P. boisei* specimens (Abbott, 1984:338; Wood et al., 1988). The *P. robustus* P<sub>3</sub> three  
23  
24 canal/double plate-like root form (3-B-1) has not been specifically reported in other fossil  
25  
26 hominin taxa. Excluding canal information, the P<sub>3</sub> plate-like root types are also observed from  
27  
28 published images in a single *A. afarensis* (White et al., 2000) and possibly *Ar. ramidus*  
29  
30 specimens (Suwa et al., 2009).  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Within the P<sub>4</sub> double plate-like root (M + D) configuration, canal number differs inter-  
43  
44 specifically, with the two studied taxa presenting two, three, and most commonly four canals. *A.*  
45 *afarensis* (Ward et al., 1982) and *P. boisei* (Wood et al., 1988) are described as having a high  
46  
47 frequency of four canals (84% and 100%, respectively), as does one specimen of *A. deyiremeda*  
48  
49 that also appears to have a high distal bifurcation (BRT-VP-3/14, Haile-Selassie et al., 2015). *A.*  
50  
51 single *A. anamensis* specimen presents four canals (Ward et al., 2013), while the two *S.*  
52  
53 *tchadensis* specimens exhibit three canals (Brunet et al., 2002, 2005). The mandibular premolar  
54  
55 single canal/root type (1-A-1) is observed rarely (n≤2) in *A. africanus*, *A. anamensis* and *A.*  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 afarensis (Robinson, 1956; White, 1977; Coffing et al., 1994; this study) but is reported for the  
5  
6 Ar. ramidus P<sub>4</sub> (White et al., 1994). Triple rooted mandibular premolars appear as rare (n=1) in  
7  
8 A. anamensis, A. afarensis and A. africanus (White, 1977, 1980; Ward et al., 1982; this study),  
9  
10 but is reported for both A. bahrelghazali mandibular premolars (Brunet et al., 1996); excluding  
11  
12 A. africanus, it is unclear if all the latter specimens would be classified as type 3-C-1.  
13  
14  
15  
16

17           While both A. africanus and P. robustus show reduced maxillary premolar root/canal  
18  
19 number from the inferred ancestral great ape condition (i.e., reduction in number from three to  
20  
21 two roots), A. africanus exhibits more reduction than P. robustus. In contrast, the A. africanus  
22  
23 mandibular premolars display the highest proportion root types common with extant apes (i.e., P<sub>3</sub>  
24  
25 MB + D, P<sub>4</sub> M + D), whereas P. robustus shows no evidence of this type in the P<sub>3</sub>. Both taxa  
26  
27 exhibit similar frequencies of P<sub>3</sub> reduction (i.e., reduction in number from two to one root) in the  
28  
29 C-shaped form despite also exhibiting the ‘molariform’ condition (see above); extant apes do not  
30  
31 exhibit this mixture. The double rooted P<sub>4</sub> (M + D) remains largely stable across the study fossil  
32  
33 and extant taxa, although the hominins show comparatively greater canal numbers. With some  
34  
35 exceptions, the ancestral condition ubiquitous in extant great apes (Abbott, 1984; Moore et al.,  
36  
37 2015) contrasts with the relatively higher frequency of the two derived conditions present in each  
38  
39 study hominin, indicating that the two lineages broadly differ in developmental processes  
40  
41 regulating root morphology (see also Wood, 1988). The increasing availability of  
42  
43 microtomography offers a new opportunity to revisit premolar root and canal variation in the  
44  
45 hominin clade in order to incorporate the level of detail demonstrated in this study to be wholly  
46  
47 taxonomically informative.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56

57 The developmental basis of root formation and morphological variation  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 Aspects of HERS growth and IRP number, orientation, and relative timing of  
5  
6 development can be inferred from the study of fully formed roots and canals, and compared  
7  
8 between hominin species (Butler, 1956; Carlsen, 1967; Kovacs, 1967, 1971; Turner, 1981;  
9  
10 Abbott, 1984; Wood, 1988; Wood et al., 1988; Jernvall and Thesleff, 2000; Shields, 2005; Ten  
11  
12 Cate, 2006; Wright, 2007). The greater frequency of maxillary premolar double vs. triple  
13  
14 root/canal types in *A. africanus*, as opposed to *P. robustus*, indicates a higher occurrence of  
15  
16 buccal IRP suppression responsible for bifurcating the dentine and canal into two roots. More  
17  
18 subtle IRP activity is seen in the double root/canal maxillary premolar root groove variants (type  
19  
20 2 and 4), and the bifid apices common in the mandibular premolars. On the buccal root (and  
21  
22 sometimes canal) of the maxillary premolar root groove type 2, an IRP induces slight penetration  
23  
24 on the lingual aspect, while in type 4, multiple IRPs are present primarily on the buccal and  
25  
26 lingual, and sometimes mesial and distal aspects. Mandibular premolar apical bifidity suggests  
27  
28 the presence of IRP union occurring only during the last or penetrative phase of root  
29  
30 development (post-crown eruption and occlusion) which may spatially accommodate nerves  
31  
32 traversing the mandibular body (Pell and Gregory, 1933; Kovacs, 1967, 1971). Many of the  
33  
34 plate-like forms with a 'figure-8', 'kidney' or 'teardrop' appearance is evidence of subtle IRP  
35  
36 and root sheath activity that produces such morphology (including the P<sup>3/4</sup> joined types).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46  
47 Across the sample, several root types exhibit multiple canals within one root body in both  
48  
49 maxillary (3-A-1/3-A-2) and mandibular (2-D/3-A/3-B/4-A) premolars indicating a tendency for  
50  
51 IRP suppression on the outer root, but not in expression of individual canals. For example, the C-  
52  
53 shaped types (i.e., 2-A/2-D) exhibits partial inhibition of the disto-buccal IRP but not of the  
54  
55 lingual IRP given the generally rounded outer face with developmental grooves and  
56  
57 characteristic deep inner cleft, respectively (Shields, 2000; Moore et al., 2015; this study);  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 however, in many cases the IRPs eventually unite periapically resulting in a bifid appearance.  
5  
6 This process would be reversed in the □-shaped type and may indicate epigenetic influences of  
7  
8 the developing root causing root sheath and IRP pattern inversion (see Shields, 2005; Brook,  
9  
10 2009). Additionally, type 2-D-1 vs. 2-A-3 show canal shape differences that correspond to  
11  
12 variation in root sheath growth; in the former root type, partial invagination in the mesio-buccal  
13  
14 canal results in the ‘crescent’ shape not seen in the latter type. The inter-specific difference in the  
15  
16 outward appearance of the C-shaped type (2-D-1, see Results and Fig. 6) is indicative of subtle  
17  
18 root sheath and IRP differences unique to *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* resulting in multiple root  
19  
20 grooves in *P. robustus*, compared to the singular, broad concavity in *A. africanus* (see Fig. 6).  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 The P<sub>3</sub> double root, multi-canal types 3-A-1, 3-B-1 and 4-A-1 each stem from unique  
28  
29 developmental modifications of the mesial root and canal (see also Wood, 1988). The *P.*  
30  
31 *robustus* type 3-B-1 compared to 3-A-1 in *A. africanus* exhibits mesio-distal compression,  
32  
33 bucco-lingual expansion and mesial reorientation (i.e., parallel M + D roots instead of oblique  
34  
35 MB + D roots) of the mesial root sheath; this results in a ‘molariform’ appearance of the root and  
36  
37 canal, but no invagination leading to an increase in canal number (i.e., as in type 4-A-1) (see also  
38  
39 Abbott, 1984; Wood et al., 1988). Conversely, the plate-like types with one vs. two mesial canals  
40  
41 in *P. robustus* compared to *A. africanus* (3-B-1 and 4-A-1, respectively) indicates generally  
42  
43 similar outer root sheath regulation (i.e., shared plate-like mesial root); however, type 4-A-1  
44  
45 differs through additional mesial canal partitioning (i.e., dentine deposition) resulting in two  
46  
47 circular canals instead of one flattened canal as in 3-B-1. Within *A. africanus*, type 4-A-1 vs. 3-  
48  
49 A-1 indicates mesial root sheath and canal number modification of the double rooted types not  
50  
51 observed in *P. robustus*. These differences in root configuration and canal number may be  
52  
53 reflections of intra- and inter-specific variability in crown, cuspal, cervical and/or EDJ  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4 morphology influencing HERS (Wood et al., 1988; White et al., 2000; Haile-Selassie, 2001;  
5  
6 Kupczik et al., 2005; Skinner et al., 2008; Moore et al., 2013). Future research should more  
7  
8 thoroughly investigate the developmental relationship between crown and root morphology.  
9

10  
11  
12 The rare single root/canal type (1-A-1) indicates inhibition of invagination on the canal  
13  
14 portion, but limited IRP activity on the outer root surface as some developmental grooves are  
15  
16 observable on specimens of *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* (see Figs. 1, 3 and 4, and  
17  
18 supplementary material). It is unclear whether minor invaginations represent poorly formed IRPs  
19  
20 or reduced cell division in the root sheath. The rare triple root/canal type (3-C-1) uniquely shows  
21  
22 three IRPs corresponding to the number of features forming two plate-like and one circular root.  
23  
24 Across the sample, in mandibular premolar double rooted types, the number of canals equaling  
25  
26 the number of roots is rare (n.b., 2-C-1); this indicates that in both fossil taxa, HERS activity  
27  
28 creating multiple canals (particularly in the distal root) is common. Future study should focus on  
29  
30 the incongruence of canal and root morphology and what role nerve and blood supply have on  
31  
32 the developing root system and resulting morphology (see Moe et al., 2008).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Developmental implications of the SNC in *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* with comparison to  
41  
42 extant hominoids  
43  
44

45  
46 Our results for *P. robustus*' larger maxillary premolar mean tooth size (i.e., cervical  
47  
48 surface area) compared to *A. africanus* concur with previous assessments using maximum crown  
49  
50 area (calculated from MD/BL linear measurements from Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974; Moggi-  
51  
52 Cecchi et al., 2006) or crown base area (Wood and Engleman, 1988). Tooth size variation (CV,  
53  
54 see Table 5) in the *A. africanus* P<sup>3</sup> and P<sup>4</sup> is larger than *P. robustus* and may be attributed to the  
55  
56 more variable root/canal numbers in the expanded sample. Based on maximum crown diameter,  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 prior studies (Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974; Moggi-Cecchi, 2006) report that *P. robustus*  
5  
6 exceeds *A. africanus* at every premolar position. The current study (using cervical surface area)  
7  
8 is in agreement, with the exception that the  $P_3$  is slightly larger (4.38%) in *A. africanus* vs. *P.*  
9  
10 *robustus*. The *P. robustus*  $P_4$ , however, is larger than *A. africanus*, which concurs with prior  
11  
12 investigation (Robinson, 1956; Sperber, 1974; Moggi-Cecchi, 2006).  $P_3$  tooth size variation (CV)  
13  
14 is larger in *P. robustus* compared to *A. africanus*, while the opposite is seen in the  $P_4$ ; like the  
15  
16 maxillary premolar CV pattern (*A. africanus* > *P. robustus*), this result may stem from the  
17  
18 comparatively greater canal number variability in the *A. africanus*  $P_4$  vs. the *P. robustus*  $P_3$ .  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24  
25 The SNC model has been applied to non-human apes (Moore et al., 2013, 2015) with  
26  
27 mixed intra-specific results. Intra-specific analysis for both *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* provide  
28  
29 several instances supporting the SNC model (Table 6). For both taxa,  $P^4$ s with double roots are  
30  
31 significantly smaller than those with triple roots, and the  $P^3$  exhibits a similar, but non-significant  
32  
33 size trend. The mandibular premolar intra-specific relationship is less clear. In several instances,  
34  
35 these results yield a positive size trend in canal/root number (i.e., the  $P_4$ ) but this size difference  
36  
37 can be negligible or nonexistent as between the  $P_3$  C-shaped vs. double root types. *A. africanus*'  
38  
39  $P_3$  double root types with three vs. four canals had a negative size trend that contradicts Shields'  
40  
41 model (2005). It should be noted that these findings may be due to small sample sizes for some  
42  
43 root types. These results (along with those for extant apes) suggest that intra-specifically, tooth  
44  
45 germ size variation can predict root/canal number or form but that in a number of cases germ  
46  
47 size/cell number and IRP number (i.e., union producing two separate roots) can be decoupled.  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54  
55 Finally, it has been inferred that dietary strategies (i.e., omnivory) and food processing  
56  
57 (e.g., stone tool use) differ between extant apes and early hominins as a group (Robinson, 1972;  
58  
59 Fleagle, 1998; McHenry and Coffing, 2000; Skinner et al., 2015). The premolar pattern observed  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 in the study hominins vs. extant apes may be indicative of a high proportion of  
5  
6 hard/brittle/abrasive foods (i.e., hard fruits, seeds, USOs, grasses, sedges), animal protein, fall-  
7  
8 back foods and a seasonally changing diet (Unger and Grine, 1991; Sponheimer and Lee-Thorp,  
9  
10 1999; Sponheimer et al., 2006; Henry et al., 2012, Sponheimer, 2013). The wider dietary niche  
11  
12 of the fossil taxa may explain the suite of conditions (and convergence in morphologies, see  
13  
14 above) despite their cervical size closeness with Pongo. Future research should attempt to link  
15  
16 premolar root morphology with the material properties of food and determine what adaptive  
17  
18 significance this confers (i.e., finite element modeling, see Benazzi et al., 2011).  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

## 28 **Conclusions**

29  
30  
31 Our analysis of premolar root and canal form/number/configuration in *A. africanus* and  
32  
33 *P. robustus* reveals increased levels of variation but also taxonomically distinctive morphology  
34  
35 at particular premolar positions. Canal morphology, examined using microtomography, is an  
36  
37 important trait and augments the inter-specific differences based on external root appearance  
38  
39 alone. At some premolar positions our results support the ‘size/number continuum’ model within  
40  
41 species, particularly in the maxillary premolars. *A. africanus* and *P. robustus* differ in their  
42  
43 patterns of reduction/elaboration from the inferred ancestral ape condition at particular premolar  
44  
45 positions. Future studies should synthesize the relationship between the root system and dental  
46  
47 tissue proportions, crown and EDJ morphology, jaw architecture and dietary complexity across  
48  
49 Plio-Pleistocene hominins. These findings provide a framework for the evaluation of root and  
50  
51 canal morphology in fossil hominins and characters incorporated into cladistic analysis.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **Acknowledgements**  
5  
6  
7

8           For fossil access we thank Stephany Potze and Lazarus Kgasi of the Ditsong National  
9  
10 Museum of Natural History and Bernard Zipfel of the University of the Witwatersrand. For  
11  
12 access to specimens from Drimolen we thank Colin Menter. Material from Sterkfontein and  
13  
14 Drimolen was scanned through collaboration between the Institute of Human Evolution (now  
15  
16 integrated with the Evolutionary Studies Institute), University of the Witwatersrand and the  
17  
18 Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology. We also  
19  
20 thank Christophe Boesch (Department of Primatology, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary  
21  
22 Anthropology) for access to the Tai chimpanzee skeletal collection, Ottmar Kullmer  
23  
24 (Senckenberg Research Institute) for access to additional Pan samples and Nora Lange (Natural  
25  
26 History Museum, Berlin) for access to the Gorilla, Pongo and Hylobates samples. We thank  
27  
28 Tracy Kivell, Patrick Schönfeld, Adam Sylvester and Heiko Temming for scanning assistance.  
29  
30 We thank the following individuals for technical assistance, methodological suggestions and/or  
31  
32 general discussions that greatly improved this project: Will Archer, Stefano Benazzi, Paul  
33  
34 Constantino, Edouard-Georges Emonet, Sarah Friedline, Philipp Gunz, Tracy Kivell, Richard  
35  
36 Klein, Kornelius Kupczik, Simon Neubauer, Alejandra Ortiz, Nadia Scott, G. Richard Scott,  
37  
38 Fred Spoor, André Strauss, Adam Sylvester, Zewdi Tsegai and Bernard Wood. This research  
39  
40 was funded by the Max Planck Society.  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Literature Cited

- Abbott, S.A., 1984. A comparative study of tooth root morphology in the great apes, modern man and early hominids. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of London.
- Alemseged, Z., Coppens, Y., Geraads, D., 2002. Hominid cranium from Omo: Description and taxonomy of Omo-323-1976-896. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 117, 103-12.
- Benazzi, S., Kullmer, O., Grosse, I.R., Weber, G.W., 2011. Using occlusal wear information and finite element analysis to investigate stress distributions in human molars. *J. Anat.* 219, 259-72.
- Bermúdez de Castro, J.M., Rosas, A., Nicolás, M.E., 1999. Dental remains from Atapuerca-TD6 (Gran Dolina site, Burgos, Spain). *J. Hum. Evol.* 37, 523-66.
- Brain, C.K., 1970. New findings at the Swartkrans Australopithecine site. *Nature.* 225, 1112-19.
- Brain, C.K., 1981. *The Hunter or the Hunted? An Introduction to African Cave Taphonomy.* University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Brook, A.H., 2009. Multilevel complex interactions between genetic, epigenetic and environmental factors in the aetiology of anomalies of dental development. *Arch. Oral Biol.* 54, S3-17.
- Broom, R.A., 1938. The Pleistocene anthropoid apes of South Africa. *Nature.* 142, 377-79.
- Broom, R.A., Schepers, G.W.H., 1946. The South Africa fossil Ape-men: The Australopithecinae. *Trans. Mus. Mem.* 2, 1-272.
- Broom, R.A., 1949. Another new type of fossil ape-man. *Nature.* 163, 57.
- Broom, R.A., Robinson, J.T., 1950. Man contemporaneous with the Swartkrans ape-man. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 8, 151-55.
- Broom, R.A., Robinson, J.T., 1952. Swartkrans Ape-man: *Paranthropus crassidens*. *Trans. Mus. Mem.* 6, 1-123.
- Brunet, M., Beauvilain, Y., Coppens, E., Heintz, E., Moutaye, A.H.E., Pilbeam, D., 1996. *Australopithecus bahrelghazali*, une nouvelle espece d'Hominide ancien de la region de Koro Toro (Tchad). *C.R. Acad. Sci., Paris.* 322, 907-13.
- Brunet, M., Guy, F., Pilbeam, D., Mackaye, H.T., Likius, A., Ahounta, D., Beauvilain, A., Blondel, C., Bocherens, H., Boisserie, J.-R., De Bonis, L., Coppens, Y., Dejax, J., Denys, C., Dourine, P., Eisenmann, V., Fanone, G., Fronty, P., Geraads, D., Lehmann, T., Lihoreau, F., Louchart, A., Mahamat, A., Merceron, G., Mouchelin, G., Otero, O., Campomanes, P.P., Ponce De León, M., Rage, J.C., Sapanet, M., Schuster, M., Sudre, J., Tassy, P., Valentin, X., Vignaud, P., Viriot, L., Zazzo, A., Zollikofer, C., 2002. A new hominid from upper Miocene of Chad, Central Africa. *Nature.* 418, 145-51.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Brunet, M., Guy, F., Pilbeam, D., Lieberman, D.E., Likius, A., Mackaye, H.T., Ponce De León,  
5 M.S., Zollikofer, C.P.E., Vignaud, P., 2005. New material of the earliest hominid from the Upper  
6 Miocene of Chad. *Nature*. 434, 753-55.  
7  
8  
9 Butler, P.M., 1956. The ontogeny of molar pattern. *Biol. Rev.* 31, 30-70.  
10  
11 Carlsen, O., 1967. Odontogenetic morphology. *Odontol. Tidskr.* 75, 499-516.  
12  
13 Chamberlain, A.T., Wood, B.A., 1987. Early hominid phylogeny. *J. Hum. Evol.* 16, 119-33.  
14  
15 Chaparro, A.J., Segura, J.J., Guerro, E., Jimenez-Rubio, A., Murillo, C., Feito, J.J., 1999.  
16 Number of roots and canals in maxillary first premolars: Study of an Andalusian population.  
17 *Endod. Dent. Traumatol.* 15, 65-7.  
18  
19 Clarke, R.J., 1985. Australopithecus and early Homo in southern Africa. In: Delson, E., (Ed.),  
20 *Ancestors: The hard evidence*. Alan R. Liss, New York, pp. 171-77.  
21  
22  
23 Clarke, R.J., 1988. A new Australopithecus cranium from Sterkfontein and its bearing on the  
24 ancestry of Paranthropus. In: Grine, F.E. (ed.), *Evolutionary History of the "Robust"*  
25 *australopithecine*. Aldine de Gruyter, New York, pp. 3-42.  
26  
27 Clarke, R.J., 1989. A new Australopithecus cranium from Sterkfontein and its bearing on the  
28 ancestry of Paranthropus. In: Grine, F.E. (Ed.), *Evolutionary History of the "Robust"*  
29 *Australopithecine*. Aldine de Gruyter, New York, pp. 285-92.  
30  
31  
32 Clarke, R.J., 1994a. Advances in understanding the craniofacial anatomy of South African early  
33 hominins. In: Corruccini, R.S., Ciochon, R.L. (Eds.), *Integrative paths to the past:*  
34 *Paleoanthropological advances in honor of F. Clark Howell*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, pp.  
35 205-22.  
36  
37  
38 Clarke, R.J., 1998. First ever discovery of a well-preserved and associated skeleton of  
39 Australopithecus. *S. Afr. J. Sci.* 94, 460-63.  
40  
41  
42 Clarke, R.J., 2008. Latest information on Sterkfontein's Australopithecus skeleton and a new  
43 look at Australopithecus. *S. Afr. J. Sci.* 104, 11-12.  
44  
45  
46 Clarke, R.J., 2013. Australopithecus from Sterkfontein Caves, South Africa. In: Reed K.E.,  
47 Fleagle, J.G., Leakey, R.E. (Eds.), *The Paleobiology of Australopithecus*. Springer, Dordrecht,  
48 pp. 73-104.  
49  
50  
51 Coffing, K., Feibel, C., Leakey, M., Walker, A., 1994. Four-million-year-old hominids from East  
52 Lake Turkana, Kenya. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 93:55-65.  
53  
54  
55 de Ruiter, D.J., 2001. A methodological analysis of the relative abundance of hominids and other  
56 macromammals from the site of Swartkrans, South Africa. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of the  
57 Witwatersrand.  
58  
59 Domínguez-Rodrigo, M., Pickering, T.R., Baquedano, E., Mabulla, A., Mark, D.F., Musiba, C.,  
60 Bunn, H.T., UribeArrea, D., Smith, V., Diez-Martin, F., Pérez-González, A., Sánchez, P.,  
61 Santonja, M., Barboni, D., Gidna, A., Ashley, G., Yravedra, J., Heaton, J.L., Arriaza, M.C.,  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 2013. First partial skeleton of a 1.34-million-year-old *Paranthropus boisei* from Bed II, Olduvai  
5 Gorge, Tanzania. PLoS ONE 8, 1-10.  
6

7 Emonet, E.-G., 2009. *Khoratpithecus* et la radiation des hominoids en Asie du Sud-Est au  
8 Miocene. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Poitiers.  
9

10 Emonet, E.-G., Kullmer, O., 2011. Variability of the number of roots in a single biological  
11 population of *Pan troglodytes verus* [abstract]. In: Annual Meeting of the European Society for  
12 the study of Human Evolution 1<sup>st</sup> meeting; 2011 September 23-24; Leipzig, DE.  
13  
14

15 Emonet, E.-G., Tafforeau, P., Chaimanee, Y., Guy, F., de Bonis, L., Koufos, G., Jaeger, J.-J.,  
16 2012. Three-dimensional analysis of mandibular dental root morphology in hominoids. *J. Hum*  
17 *Evol.* 62, 146-154.  
18

19 Emonet, E.-G., Andossa, L., Mackaye, H.T., Brunet, M., 2014. Subocclusal dental morphology  
20 of *Sahelanthropus tchadensis* and the evolution of teeth in hominins. *Am J Phys Anthropol.* 153,  
21 116-123.  
22  
23

24 Fleagle, J.G., 1998. *Primate adaptation and evolution* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.) Academic Press, New York.  
25

26 Frayer, D.W., 1973. *Gigantopithecus* and its relationship to *Australopithecus*. *Am. J. Phys.*  
27 *Anthropol.* 39, 423-26.  
28

29 Fornai, C., Clarke, R.J., Moggi-Cecchi, J., Hemingway, J., de Beer, F.C., Radebe, M.J., 2010.  
30 Testing the “second australopithecine species hypothesis” for Sterkfontein Member 4, South  
31 Africa. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* S50, 105-06.  
32  
33

34 Frisch, J.E. 1963. Dental variability in a population of gibbons (*Hylobates lar*). In: Brothwell, D  
35 (Ed.), *Dental Anthropology*. Pergamon Press, Oxford, pp.15-28.  
36

37 Gregory, W.K., Hellman, M., 1939. The dentition of the extinct South-African man-ape  
38 *Australopithecus (Plesianthropus) transvaalensis* Broom. A comparative and phylogenetic study.  
39 *Annl. Transv. Mus.* 19, 339-73.  
40  
41

42 Grine, F.E., 2004. Description and preliminary analysis of new hominid craniodental fossils from  
43 the Swartkrans Formation. In: Brain, C.K. (Ed.), *Swartkrans: A Cave’s Chronicle of Early Man*.  
44 Transvaal Museum, Pretoria, pp. 75-116  
45

46 Grine, F.E., 2013. The alpha taxonomy of *Australopithecus africanus*. In: Reed, K.E., Fleagle,  
47 J.G., Leakey, R.E. (eds.), *The paleobiology of Australopithecus*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 73-  
48 104.  
49  
50

51 Grine, F.E., Delanty, M.M., Wood, B.A., 2013. Variation in mandibular postcanine dental  
52 morphology and hominin species representation in Member 4, Sterkfontein, South Africa. In:  
53 Reed, K.E., Fleagle, J.G., Leakey, R.E. (Eds.), *The paleobiology of Australopithecus*. Springer,  
54 Dordrecht, pp. 125-46.  
55  
56

57 Grine, F.E., Martin, L.B., 1988. Enamel thickness and development in *Australopithecus* and  
58 *Paranthropus*: In: Grine, F.E. (Ed.), *Evolutionary History of the “Robust” Australopithecine*.  
59 Aldine de Gruyter, New York, pp. 3-42.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Gunz, P., 2012. Evolutionary relationships among the robust and gracile australopiths: an “evo-  
5 devo” perspective. *Evol. Biol.* 39, 427-87.  
6  
7 Haile-Selassie, Y., 2001. Late Miocene hominids from the Middle Awash, Ethiopia. *Nature.* 412,  
8 178-181.  
9  
10 Haile-Selassie, Y., Gilbert, L., Melillo, S.M., Ryan, T.M., Mulugeta, A., Deino, A., Levin, N.E.,  
11 Scott, G., Saylor, B.Z., 2015. New species from Ethiopia further expands Middle Pliocene  
12 hominin diversity. *Nature.* 521, 483-88.  
13  
14  
15 Hamon, N., Emonet, E-G., Chaimanee, Y., Guy, F., Tafforeau, P., Jaeger, J-J., 2012. Analysis of  
16 dental root apical morphology: A new method for dietary reconstructions in Primates. *Anat. Rec.*  
17 295, 1017-26.  
18  
19  
20 Hartwig, W.C. (Ed.), 2002. *The Primate Fossil Record.* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.  
21  
22 Henry, A.G., Unger, P.S., Passey, B.J., Sponheimer, M., Rossouw, L., Bamford, M., Sandberg,  
23 P., de Ruiter, D.J., Berger, L., 2012. The diet of *Australopithecus sediba*. *Nature.* 487, 90-93.  
24  
25 Higham, T., Compton, T., Stringer, C., Jacobi, R., Shapiro, B., Trinkaus, E., Chandler, B.,  
26 Gröning, F., Collins, C., Hillson, S., O’Higgins, P., FitzGerald, C., Fagan, M., 2011. The earliest  
27 evidence for anatomically modern humans in northwest Europe. *Nature.* 479, 521-24.  
28  
29  
30 Hildebrand, C., Fried, K., Tuisku, F., Johansson, C.S., 1995. Teeth and tooth nerves. *Prog.*  
31 *Neurobiol.* 45, 165-222.  
32  
33 Hillson, S., FitzGerald, C., Flinn, H., 2005. Alternative dental measurements: proposals and  
34 relationships with other measurements. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 126, 413-26.  
35  
36 Irish, J.D., Guatelli-Steinberg, D., Legge, S.S., de Ruiter, D.J., Berger, L.R., 2013. Dental  
37 morphology and the phylogenetic “place” of *Australopithecus sediba*. *Science.* 340, 1-4.  
38  
39  
40 Jafarzadeh, H., Wu, Y.N., 2007. The C-shaped root canal configuration: a review. *J. Endod.*  
41 33:517-23.  
42  
43 Jernvall, J., Thesleff, I., 2000. Reiterative signaling and patterning in mammalian tooth  
44 morphogenesis. *Mech. Develop.* 92, 19-29.  
45  
46  
47 Johanson, D.C., White, T.D., 1979. A systematic assessment of early African hominids. *Science.*  
48 202, 321-30.  
49  
50 Kimbel, W.H., White, T.D., 1988. Variation, sexual dimorphism and the taxonomy of  
51 *Australopithecus*. In: Grine, F.E., *Evolutionary history of the “robust” australopithecines.* Aldine  
52 de Gruyter, New York, pp. 175-98.  
53  
54  
55 Kallay, J., 1963. A radiographic study of the Neanderthal teeth from Krapina, Croatia. In:  
56 Kallay, J. (Ed.), *Dental Anthropology.* Pergamon Press, New York, pp. 75-86.  
57  
58 Keyser, A.W., 2000. The Drimolen skull: the most complete australopithecine cranium and  
59 mandible to date. *S. Afr. J. Sci.* 96, 189-93.  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



- 1  
2  
3  
4 Keyser, A.W., Menter, C.G., Moggi-Cecchi, J., Pickering, T.R., Berger, L.R., 2000. Drimolen: a  
5 new hominid-bearing site in Gauteng, South Africa. *S. Afr. J. Sci.* 96, 193-97.  
6  
7 Kovacs, I., 1967. Contribution to the ontogenetic morphology of roots of human teeth. *J. Dent.*  
8 *Res.* 46, 865-74.  
9  
10 Kovacs, I., 1971. A systematic description of dental roots. In: Dahlberg, A.A. (Ed), *Dental*  
11 *Morphology and Evolution*. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, pp. 211-56.  
12  
13 Kupczik, K., Spoor, F., Pommert, A., Dean, C., 2005. Premolar root number variation in  
14 hominoids: genetic polymorphism vs. functional significance. In: Zadzińska, E. (Ed.), *Current*  
15 *Trends in Dental Morphology Research*. University of Lodz Press, Lodz, pp. 257-68.  
16  
17 Kupczik, K., Dean, M.C., 2008. Comparative observations on the tooth root morphology of  
18 *Gigantopithecus blacki*. *J. Hum. Evol.* 54, 196-204.  
19  
20 Kupczik, K., Hublin, J.-J., 2010. Mandibular molar root morphology in Neanderthals and Late  
21 Pleistocene and recent *Homo sapiens*. *J. Hum. Evol.* 59, 527-41.  
22  
23 Le Cabec, A., Kupczik, K., Gunz, P., Braga, J., Hublin, J.-J., 2012. Long anterior mandibular  
24 tooth roots in Neanderthals are not the result of their large jaws. *J. Hum. Evol.* 63, 667-81.  
25  
26 Leakey, M.G., Felbel, C.S., McDougall, I., Walker, A., 1995. New four-million-year-old  
27 hominid species from Kanapoi and Allia Bay, Kenya. *Nature*. 367, 565-71.  
28  
29 Leakey, M.G., Spoor, F., Brown, F.H., Gathogo, P.N., Kiarie, C., Leakey, L.N., McDougall, I.,  
30 2001. New hominin genus from eastern Africa shows diverse middle Pliocene lineages. *Nature*.  
31 410, 433-40.  
32  
33 Lockwood, C.A., Tobias, P.V., 2002. Morphology and affinities of new hominin cranial remains  
34 from Member 4 of the Sterkfontein Formation, Gauteng Province, South Africa. *J. Hum. Evol.*  
35 36, 389-450.  
36  
37 McCollum, M.A., 1999. The robust australopithecine face: A morphogenetic perspective.  
38 *Science*. 284, 301-05.  
39  
40 McHenry, H.M., Coffing, K., 2000. *Australopithecus to Homo: Transformations in body and*  
41 *mind*. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 29, 125-46.  
42  
43 Moe, K., Kettunen, P., Kvinnsland, I.H., Luukko, K., 2008. Development of the pioneer  
44 sympathetic innervation into the dental pulp of the mouse mandibular first molar. *Arch. Oral*  
45 *Biol.* 53, 865-873.  
46  
47 Moggi-Cecchi, J., 2003. The elusive “second species” in Sterkfontein Member 4: The dental  
48 metrical evidence. *S. Afr. J. Sci.* 99, 268-70.  
49  
50 Moggi-Cecchi, J., Grine, F.E., Tobias, P.V., 2006. Early hominid dental remains from Members  
51 4 and 5 of the Sterkfontein Formation (1966 – 1996 excavations): Catalogue, individual  
52 associations, morphological descriptions and initial metrical analysis. *J. Hum. Evol.* 50, 239-328.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Moggi-Cecchi, J., Menter, C., Boccone, S., Keyser, A., 2010. Early hominin dental remains from  
5 the Plio-Pleistocene site of Drimolen, South Africa. *J. Hum. Evol.* 58, 374-405.  
6  
7 Moore, N.C., Skinner, M.M., Hublin, J.-J., 2013. Premolar root morphology and metric variation  
8 in Pan troglodytes verus. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 150, 632-46.  
9  
10 Moore, N.C., Hublin, J.-J., Skinner, M.M., 2015. Premolar root and canal variation in extant  
11 non-human Hominoidea. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* In press.  
12  
13 Olejniczak, A.J., 2006. Micro-computed tomography of primate molars. Ph.D. Dissertation,  
14 Stoney Brook University.  
15  
16 Pell, G.J., Gregory, G.T., 1933. Impacted mandibular third molars: Classification and modified  
17 technique for removal. *Dent. Dig.* 39, 330-38  
18  
19 Prado-Simón, L., Olejniczak, A.J., Bermúdez de Castro, J.M., Gómez-Robles, A., Baca Garcia,  
20 P., Martínón-Torres, M., 2010. Three-dimensional study of pulp chamber and radicular canal  
21 morphology in hominin premolars. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* S50, 236.  
22  
23 Prado-Simón, L., Martínón-Torres, M., Baca, P., Olejniczak, A.J., Gómez-Robles, A., Lapresa,  
24 M., Arsuaga, J.L., Bermúdez de Castro, J.M., 2012. Three-dimensional evaluation of root canal  
25 morphology in lower second premolars of early and middle Pleistocene human populations from  
26 Atapuerca (Burgos, Spain). *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 147, 452-61.  
27  
28 Rak, Y., 1983. The australopithecine face. Academic Press, New York.  
29  
30 Robinson, J.T., 1952. Some hominid features of the ape-man dentition. *J. Dent. Assoc. S. Afr.* 7,  
31 102-13.  
32  
33 Robinson, J.T., 1953. Telanthropus and its phylogenetic significance. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.*  
34 11, 445-502.  
35  
36 Robinson, J.T., 1956. The dentition of the Australopithecinae. *Trans. Mus. Mem.* 9, 1-179.  
37  
38 Robinson, J.T., 1972. Early hominid posture and locomotion. University of Chicago Press,  
39 Chicago.  
40  
41 Saunders, S.R., Chan, A.H.W., Kahlon, B., Kluge, H.F., FitzGerald, C.M., 2007. Sexual  
42 dimorphism of the dental tissues in human permanent mandibular canines and third premolars.  
43 *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 133, 735-40.  
44  
45 Schwartz, G.T., Dean, M.C., 2005 Sexual dimorphism in modern human permanent teeth. *Am. J.*  
46 *Phys. Anthropol.* 128, 312-17.  
47  
48 Schwartz, J.H., Langdon, H.L. 1991. Innervation of the human upper dentition: implications for  
49 understanding tooth initiation and rethinking growth and eruption patterns. *Am. J. Phys.*  
50 *Anthropol.* 86, 273-86.  
51  
52 Sert, S., Bayirli, G.S., 2004. Evaluation of the root canal configurations of the mandibular and  
53 maxillary permanent teeth by gender in the Turkish Population. *J. Endodont.* 30, 391-98.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Shea, B.T., 1983. Size and diet in the evolution of African ape craniodental form. *Folia*  
5 *Primatol.* 40, 32-68.  
6  
7  
8 Shields, E.D., 2000. Chimpanzees as an outgroup for the examination of human dental evolution.  
9 *J. Cran. Genet. Dev. Bio.* 20, 1-9.  
10  
11 Shields, E.D., 2005. Mandibular premolar and second molar root morphological variation in  
12 modern humans: What root number can tell us about tooth morphogenesis. *Am. J. Phys.*  
13 *Anthropol.* 128, 299-311.  
14  
15 Skinner, M.M., Gunz, P., Hublin, J.-J., 2008. Enamel-dentine junction (EDJ) morphology  
16 distinguishes the lower molars of *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus robustus*. *J.*  
17 *Hum. Evol.* 55, 979-88.  
18  
19  
20 Skinner, M.M., Stephens, N.B., Tsegai, Z.L., Foote, A.C., Nguyen, N.H., Gross, T., Pahr, D.H.,  
21 Hublin, J.-J., Kivell, T.L., 2015. Human evolution. Human-like hand use in *Australopithecus*  
22 *africanus*. *Science.* 347, 395-9.  
23  
24  
25 Spencer, M.A., 2003. Tooth-root form and function in Platyrrhine seed-eaters. *Am. J. Phys.*  
26 *Anthropol.* 122, 352-35.  
27  
28 Sperber, G., 1974. The morphology of the cheek teeth of early South African hominids. Ph.D.  
29 Dissertation, University of the Witwatersrand.  
30  
31 Sponheimer, M., Lee-Thorp, J.A., 1999. Isotopic evidence for the diet of an early hominid  
32 *Australopithecus africanus*. *Science.* 283, 368-69.  
33  
34 Sponheimer, M., Passey, B.H., de Ruiter, D.J., Guatelli-Steinberg, D., Cerling, T.E., Thorp, J.A.,  
35 2006. Isotopic evidence for dietary variability in the early hominin *Paranthropus robustus*.  
36 *Science.* 314, 980-82.  
37  
38  
39 Sponheimer, M., 2013. Some ruminations on australopith diets. In: Reed K.E., Fleagle, J.G.,  
40 Leakey, R.E. (Eds.), *The Paleobiology of Australopithecus*. Springer, Dordrecht, pp. 225-33.  
41  
42 Strait, D.S., Grine, F.E., 2004. Inferring hominoid and early hominid phylogeny using  
43 craniodental characters: The role of fossil taxa. *J. Hum. Evol.* 47, 399-452.  
44  
45  
46 Suwa, G., Kono, R.T., Simpson, S.W., Asfaw, B., Lovejoy, C.O., White, T.D., 2009.  
47 Paleobiological implications of the *Ardipithecus ramidus* dentition. *Science.* 326, 69-99.  
48  
49  
50 Taylor, A.B., 2006. Diet and mandibular morphology in African apes. *Int. J. Primatol.* 27, 182-  
51 201.  
52  
53 Ten Cate, A.R., 1996. The role of epithelium in the development, structure and function of the  
54 tissues of tooth support. *Oral. Dis.* 2, 55-62.  
55  
56 Thackeray, J.F., de Ruiter, D.J., Berger, L.R., van der Merve, N.J., 2001. Hominid fossils from  
57 Kromdraai: a revised list of specimens discovered since 1938. *Annls. Transv. Mus.* 38, 43-56.  
58  
59 Tobias, P.V., 1967. *Olduvai Gorge. Vol. 2. The cranium and maxillary dentition of*  
60 *Australopithecus (Zinjanthropus) boisei*. Cambridge University Press, New York, pp. xvi-264.  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 Tobias, P.V., Copley, K., Brain, C.K., 1977. South Africa. In: Oakley, K.P., Campbell, B.G.,  
5 Molleson, T.I. (Eds.), *Catalogue of Fossil Hominids. Part 1: Africa* (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). British Museum  
6 of Natural History, London, pp. 95-151.
- 7  
8  
9 Tobias, P.V., 1995. Root number in the maxillary third premolars: a very ancient polymorphism.  
10 In: Moggi-Cecchi, J. (Ed.), *Aspects of dental biology: palaeontology, anthropology and*  
11 *evolution*. International Institute for the Study of Man, Florence, pp. 283-290.
- 12  
13 Trope, M., Elfenbein, L., Tronstad, L., 1986. Mandibular premolars with more than one root  
14 canal in different race groups. *J. Endodont.* 12, 343-45.
- 15  
16  
17 Turner, C.G. II, 1981. Root number determination in maxillary first premolars for modern human  
18 populations. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 54, 59-62.
- 19  
20 Unger, P.S., Grine, F.E., 1991. Incisor size and wear in *Australopithecus africanus* and  
21 *Paranthropus robustus*. *J. Hum. Evol.* 20, 313-40.
- 22  
23 Vertucci, F.J. 2005 Root canal morphology and its relationship to endodontic procedures. *Endod.*  
24 *Topics.* 10, 3-29.
- 25  
26  
27 Vogel, E.R., Zulfa, A., Hardus, M., Wich, S.A., Dominy, N.J., Taylor, A.B., 2014. Food  
28 mechanical properties, feeding ecology, and the mandibular morphology of wild orangutans. *J.*  
29 *Hum. Evol.* 75, 110-124.
- 30  
31  
32 Ward, S.C., Johanson, D.C., Coppens, Y., 1982. Subocclusal morphology and alveolar process  
33 relationships of hominid gnathic elements from the Hadar Formation: 1974–1977. *Am. J. Phys.*  
34 *Anthropol.* 57, 605-30.
- 35  
36  
37 Ward, C.V., Leakey, M.G., Walker, A., 2001. Morphology of *Australopithecus anamensis* from  
38 Kanapoi and Allia Bay, Kenya. *J. Hum. Evol.* 41, 255-368.
- 39  
40  
41 Ward, C.V., Manthi, F.K., Plavcan, J.M., 2013. New fossils of *Australopithecus anamensis* from  
42 Kanapoi, West Turkana, Kenya (2003–2008). *J. Hum. Evol.* 65, 501-524.
- 43  
44  
45 White, T.D., 1977. New fossil hominids from Laetolil, Tanzania. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 46,  
46 197-230.
- 47  
48  
49 White, T.D., 1980. Additional fossil hominids from Laetoli, Tanzania: 1976–1979 specimens.  
50 *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 53, 487-504.
- 51  
52  
53 White, T.D., Suwa, G., Asfaw, B., 1994. *Australopithecus ramidus*, a new species of early  
54 hominid from Aramis, Ethiopia. *Nature.* 371, 306-12.
- 55  
56  
57 White, T.D., Suwa, G., Simpson, S., Asfaw, B., 2000. Jaws and Teeth of *Australopithecus*  
58 *afarensis* from Maka, Middle Awash, Ethiopia. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 111, 45-68.
- 59  
60  
61 White, T.D., 2002. Earliest hominids. In: Hartwig, W.C. (Ed.), *The Primate Fossil Record*.  
62 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 407-17.
- 63  
64  
65 White, T.D., WoldeGabriel, G., Asfaw, B., Ambrose, S., Beyene, Y., Bernor, R.L., Boisserie, J-  
66 R., Currie, B., Gilbert, H., Haile-Selassie, Y., Hart, W.K., Hlusko, L.J., Howell, F.C., Kono,

- 1  
2  
3  
4 R.T., Lehmann, T., Louchart, A., Lovejoy, C.O., Renne, P.R., Saegusa, H., Vrba, E.S.,  
5 Wesselman, H., Suwa, G., 2006. Asa Issie, Aramis and the origin of Australopithecus. *Nature*.  
6 440, 883-89.  
7  
8  
9 Wolpoff, M.H., 1975. Some aspects of human mandibular evolution. In: McNamara Jr., J.A.  
10 (Ed.), *Determinants of Mandibular Form and Growth*. Ann Arbor Press, Michigan, pp. 1-64.  
11  
12 Wood, B.A., Stack, C.G., 1980. Does allometry explain the differences between ‘gracile’ and  
13 ‘robust’ australopithecines? *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 52, 55-61.  
14  
15 Wood, B.A., 1981. Tooth size and shape and their relevance to studies of hominid evolution.  
16 *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. B.* 292, 65-76.  
17  
18 Wood, B.A., 1988. Are “robust australopithecines a monophyletic group?”. In: Grine, F.E. (ed.),  
19 *Evolutionary History of the “Robust” Australopithecine*. Aldine de Gruyter, New York, pp. 269-  
20 84.  
21  
22  
23 Wood, B.A., Engleman, C.A., 1988. Analysis of the dental morphology of Plio-Pleistocene  
24 hominids. V. Maxillary postcanine tooth morphology. *J. Anat.* 161, 1-35.  
25  
26 Wood, B.A., Abbott, S.A., Uytterschaut, H., 1988. Analysis of the dental morphology of Plio-  
27 Pleistocene hominids. IV. Mandibular postcanine root morphology. *J. Anat.* 156, 107-139.  
28  
29 Wood, B.A., 1991. *Hominid Cranial Remains, Vol. 4, Koobi Fora Research Project*. Oxford,  
30 Clarendon.  
31  
32  
33 Wood, B.A., Constantino, P. 2007. *Paranthropus boisei: Fifty years of evidence and analysis*.  
34 *Yearb. Phys. Anthropol.* 50, 106-32.  
35  
36 Wright, T., 2007. The molecular control of and clinical variations in root formation. *Cells*  
37 *Tissues Organs.* 186, 86-93.  
38  
39  
40 Zilberman, U., Smith, P., 1992. A comparison of tooth structure in Neanderthals and early Homo  
41 sapiens sapiens: a radiographic study. *J. Anat.* 180, 387-93.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 **List of Figures**  
5  
6  
7

8 Figure 1: Canal and root variation frequency (in percent) in the upper third premolar (raw counts  
9 are in brackets). Examples of each root type in cross-section are illustrated at bottom. Cross-  
10 sectional images of specimens arranged to reflect anatomical orientation legend (in upper left  
11 corner).  
12  
13

14 Figure 2: Canal and root variation frequency (in percent) in the upper fourth premolar (raw  
15 counts are in brackets). Examples of each root type in cross-section are illustrated at bottom.  
16 Cross-sectional example images arranged to reflect anatomical orientation legend (in upper left  
17 corner).  
18  
19

20 Figure 3: Canal and root variation frequency (in percent) in the lower third premolar (raw counts  
21 are in brackets). Examples of each root type in cross-section are illustrated at bottom. Cross-  
22 sectional example images arranged to reflect anatomical orientation legend (in upper left corner).  
23 \*canals arranged mesio-buccal and disto-lingual.  
24  
25

26 Figure 4: Canal and root variation frequency (in percent) in the lower fourth premolar (raw  
27 counts are in brackets). Examples of each root type in cross-section are illustrated at  
28 bottom.\*contains three canals (STW 212 (243)) included; \*\*SKX 4446 is □-shaped. Cross-  
29 sectional example images arranged to reflect anatomical orientation legend (in upper left corner).  
30  
31

32 Figure 5: Variation in maxillary premolar buccal root groove morphology (type 2-A-2): type 2  
33 (A) and type 4 (D); less developed example on left and well developed example on right.  
34

35 Figure 6: Variation in the C-shaped root type in Pan (top), A. africanus (middle) and P. robustus  
36 (bottom); all specimens are the P<sub>3</sub> unless indicated. Cross-sectional example images arranged to  
37 reflect anatomical orientation legend (in upper left corner).  
38

39 Figure 7: Upper third and fourth premolar canal number and root type distribution across A.  
40 africanus, P. robustus and non-human extant hominoids.  
41  
42

43 Figure 8: Lower third and fourth premolar canal number and root type distribution across A.  
44 africanus, P. robustus and non-human extant hominoids.  
45

46 Supplementary Material - Specimen Image Atlas: Presents a mid-root cross-sectional image of  
47 each fossil specimen divided by taxon, premolar position and root type. Specimen orientation  
48 observed from the occlusal aspect. Dashed lines emphasize morphology due to poor contrast  
49 and/or indicate that root presence was inferred by existing morphology. 1—indicates three canal  
50 type 2-D-1; 2—indicates rotated root entities; 3—indicates roots partially appressed, but not joined;  
51 4—indicates □-shaped type 2-D-1.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## LIST OF TABLES

*TABLE 1.* Study sample separated by taxon and premolar class

Taxon	P <sup>3</sup>	P <sup>4</sup>	P <sub>3</sub>	P <sub>4</sub>	Total
<i>A. africanus</i>	22	21	16	18	77
<i>P. robustus</i>	22	28	22	17	89
Total	44	49	38	35	166

TABLE 2. Classification scheme for premolar canal and root types

Root Type	Canal Number	Root Number	Formula	Description
$P^3/P^4$				
1-A-1	1	1	$1_1$	1 elliptical root / 1 elliptical canal
2-A-1	2	1	$1_{2(1B+1L)}$	1 elliptical root (joined 1B + 1L roots) / 2 circular canals (1B + 1L)
2-A-2	2	2	$1_1B + 1_1L$	2 roots (1B elliptical + 1L circular) / 2 circular canals (1B + 1L)*
3-A-1	3	2	$1_2B + 1_1L$	2 roots (1B elliptical + 1L circular) [joined 2B roots] / 3 circular canals (2B + 1L)
3-A-2	3	2	$1_2ML + 1_1BD$	2 roots (1ML plate-like + 1BD circular) [joined 1MB + 1L roots] / 3 circular canals (2ML + 1BD)
3-A-3	3	2	$1_1MB + 1_2DL$	2 roots (1MB circular + 1DL plate-like) [joined 1DB + 1L roots] / 3 circular canals (1MB + 2DL)
3-A-4	3	1	$1_{3(2B+1L)}$	1 root (joined 2B + 1L roots, tripartite cross-section) / 3 circular canals (2B + 1L)
3-A-5	3	3	$2_2B + 1_1L$	3 roots (2B elliptical + 1L circular) / 3 circular canals (2B + 1L)
4-A-1	4	3	$2_2B + 1_2L$	3 roots (2B circular + 1L plate-like) / 4 circular canals (2B + 2L)
$P_3/P_4$				
1-A-1	1	1	$1_1$	1 elliptical root / 1 elliptical canal
1-B-1	1	1	$1C_1$	Tomes' root; 1 C-shaped root body (deep ML groove, round DB face) / 1 C-shaped canal
2-A-1	2	1	$1_{2(1M+1D)}$	1 elliptical root (slight B + L grooves) [joined 1M + 1D roots] / 2 circular canals (1M + 1D)
2-A-2	2	2	$1_1M + 1_1D$	2 circular roots (1M + 1D) / 2 circular canals (1M + 1D)
2-A-3	2	1	$1C_{2(1MB+1DL)}$	Tomes' root; 1 C-shaped root body (deep ML groove, round DL face) / 2 circular canals (1MB + 1DL)
2-A-4	2	1	$1J_{2(1MB+1DL)}$	Reverse Tomes' root; 1 J-shaped root body (deep MB groove, round DL face) / 2 elliptical canals (1MB + 1DL)
2-B-1	2	2	$1_1MB + 1_1D$	2 roots (1MB elliptical + 1D plate-like) / 2 canals (1MB elliptical + 1D plate-like)
2-C-1	2	2	$1_1M + 1_1D$	2 plate-like roots (1M + 1D) / 2 plate-like canals (1M + 1D)
2-D-1	2	1	$1C_{2(1MB+1DL)}$	Tomes' root, usually bifid apex; 1 C-shaped root body (deep L groove, slight groove(s) on M, B or D aspects of round outer face) / 2 canals (1MB crescent + 1DL elliptical)****
3-A-1	3	2	$1_1MB + 1_2D$	2 roots (1MB elliptical + 1D plate-like) / 3 canals (1MB elliptical + 2D circular)
3-B-1	3	2	$1_1M + 1_2D$	2 plate-like roots (1M + 1D) / 3 canals (1M plate-like + 2D circular)
3-C-1	3	3	$2_2B + 1_1L$	3 roots (2B plate-like + 1L circular) / 3 canals (2B elliptical + 1L circular)
4-A-1	4	2	$1_2M + 1_2D$	2 plate-like roots (1M + 1D) / 4 circular canals (2M + 2D)

Note: Formula column standard numbers denote root number and subscript numbers denote canal number.

\*variable B root groove morphology.

\*\*STW 212 (STW 243) specimen exhibits an additional canal (3 canals) and trifid apex.

\*\*\*SKX 4446 specimen exhibits a J-shaped configuration.



TABLE 3. Variation in canal/root number and selected root types between taxa for each premolar class

Comparison	<i>A. africanus</i>	<i>P. robustus</i>	Chi-square	<i>p</i> -value
$p^3$				
2 vs. 3 canals (2-A vs. 3-A)	10/11	8/14	0.559	0.455
2 vs. 3 roots (2-A/3-A-1 vs. 3-A-5)	11/10	9/13	0.568	0.451
Discrete types (1-A-1 vs. 2-A-1 vs. 3-A-1 vs. 3-A-5)	1/10/1/10	0/8/1/13	1.614	0.656
$p^4$				
2 vs. 3 canals (2-A vs. 3-A)	13/8	4/24	12.010	0.001
2 vs. 3 roots (2-A/3-A-1/3-A-2 vs. 3-A-5)	14/7	6/22	10.166	0.001
Discrete types (2-A-2 vs. 3-A-1 vs. 3-A-2 vs. 3-A-5)	13/1/0/7	4/1/1/22	12.784	0.005
$P_3$				
1 vs. 2 roots (2-A/2-D vs. 2-C/3-A/3-B/4-A)	5/11	8/11	0.438	0.508
3 (MB + D) vs. 3 (M + D) vs. 4 canals (M + D) [3-A vs. 3-B vs. 4-A]	7/0/4	0/10/0	23.521	<0.001
Discrete types (1-A-1 vs. 2-A-3 vs. 2-C-1 vs. 2-D-1 vs. 3-A-1 vs. 3-B-1 vs. 3-C-1 vs. 4-A-1)	0/0/0/5/7/0/0/4	1/1/1/7/0/10/1/0	26.035	0.001
$P_4^*$				
3 vs. 4 canals (M + D) [3-B vs. 4-A]	5/8	4/10	0.805	0.669
Discrete types (1-A-1 vs. 2-C-1 vs. 2-D-1 vs. 3-B-1 vs. 3-C-1 vs. 4-A-1)	1/1/2/5/1/8	0/1/2/4/0/10	2.307	0.805

Note: shaded indicates significant *p*-value; \*inter-specific  $P_4$  root number variation was low and not tested for (i.e., C-shaped vs. two roots).

TABLE 4. Bifid apex frequency for double rooted mandibular premolars

Root Type	2-C-1	3-A-1	3-B-1	4-A-1
P <sub>3</sub>				
<i>A. africanus</i>		83% D		66% D
<i>P. robustus</i>			100% D	
<i>Gorilla</i> <sup>1</sup>		82% D		
<i>Pongo</i> <sup>1</sup>		62% D		100% B
P <sub>4</sub>				
<i>A. africanus</i>	0%		20% D	85% (57% D, 28% B)
<i>P. robustus</i>	100% D		75% D	75% (50% D, 25% B)
<i>Gorilla</i> <sup>1</sup>	26% D		75% (58% D, 17% B)	100% (40% D, 60% B)
<i>Pongo</i> <sup>1</sup>	20% D		89% D	100% B

Note: frequency indicates percentage of measurable specimens; D–distal root, B–both roots; 1–data from Moore et al., 2015

TABLE 5. CSA (mm<sup>2</sup>) for *A. africanus*, *P. robustus* and extant hominoids\*

Taxon	Mean	Min	Max	SD	CV	n
p <sup>3</sup>						
<i>A. africanus</i>	63.70	50.40	75.60	8.20	12.90	13
<i>P. robustus</i>	76.20	60.70	95.30	9.50	12.40	17
<i>Pan</i>	42.90	29.90	56.60	5.50	12.90	35
<i>Gorilla</i>	106.70	77.30	142.10	14.80	13.80	46
<i>Pongo</i> <sup>2</sup>	74.80	57.60	111.50	13.10	17.60	27
<i>Hylobates</i>	13.20	9.90	16.50	1.50	11.00	24
p <sup>4</sup>						
<i>A. africanus</i>	72.20	56.20	95.50	12.80	17.70	10
<i>P. robustus</i>	92.50	71.90	115.90	12.50	13.50	22
<i>Pan</i>	38.60	29.90	52.30	6.10	15.80	44
<i>Gorilla</i>	101.20	72.60	125.10	12.30	12.10	43
<i>Pongo</i> <sup>1</sup>	73.50	57.00	97.50	10.10	13.70	29
<i>Hylobates</i>	12.80	9.90	19.70	2.10	16.20	25
P <sub>3</sub>						
<i>A. africanus</i>	64.30	51.70	77.70	7.00	10.80	11
<i>P. robustus</i>	61.60	52.60	80.40	8.10	13.20	13
<i>Pan</i>	45.20	34.80	54.70	4.70	10.40	32
<i>Gorilla</i>	120.40	66.10	178.50	25.10	20.90	40
<i>Pongo</i>	84.10	59.80	133.50	18.30	21.80	26
<i>Hylobates</i>	13.90	9.90	18.20	2.20	15.50	23
P <sub>4</sub>						
<i>A. africanus</i>	74.70	55.70	107.20	13.30	17.80	17
<i>P. robustus</i>	78.50	68.80	94.50	7.00	9.00	14
<i>Pan</i>	43.20	35.00	51.50	4.10	9.40	30
<i>Gorilla</i>	97.70	55.50	124.80	14.80	15.20	43
<i>Pongo</i> <sup>1,2</sup>	77.30	57.60	109.50	12.70	16.50	27
<i>Hylobates</i>	11.40	8.50	15.10	1.50	13.30	24

Note: 1—denotes a non-significant difference from *A. africanus*, 2—denotes a non-significant difference from *P. robustus*; \*—data from Moore et al., 2015.

TABLE 6. Intra-specific tests of the 'size-number continuum' model on CSA and canal number/root type

Taxon	Group Comparison	Mean Group 1 (n)	SD	Mean Group 2 (n)	SD	U	<i>p</i>	Predicted Trend <sup>1</sup>
<i>P</i> <sup>3</sup>								
<i>A. africanus</i>	2 vs. 3 canals [2-A vs. 3-A]	63.00 (5)	8.60	64.70 (7)	9.10	14.00	0.639	Yes
<i>P. robustus</i>	2 vs. 3 canals [2-A vs. 3-A]	74.40 (7)	9.60	77.50 (10)	9.70	26.00	0.417	Yes
<i>P</i> <sup>4</sup>								
<i>A. africanus</i>	2 vs. 3 canals [2-A vs. 3-A]	63.90 (5)	9.80	80.60 (5)	9.90	3.00	0.047	Yes
<i>P. robustus</i>	2 vs. 3 canals [2-A vs. 3-A]	79.30 (4)	7.30	95.50 (18)	11.50	8.00	0.014	Yes
<i>P</i> <sub>3</sub>								
<i>A. africanus</i>	C-shaped (2 canals) vs. 2 roots (3 & 4 canals) [2-D vs. 3-A/4-A]	63.90 (3)	7.00	64.40 (8)	7.40	9.00	0.630	Yes*
<i>P. robustus</i>	C-shaped (2 canals) vs. 2 roots (3 canals) [2-A/2-D vs. 3-B]	60.00 (7)	6.30	60.00 (4)	7.90	13.00	0.927	No*
<i>A. africanus</i>	2 roots w/ 3 vs. 4 canals [3-A vs. 4-A]	63.90 (4)	7.00	61.80 (4)	7.10	7.00	0.886	No
<i>P</i> <sub>4</sub>								
<i>P. robustus</i>	C/D-shaped (2 canals) vs. 2 roots (3 & 4 canals) [2-D vs. 3-B/4-A]	75.50 (2)	0.70	79.60 (11)	7.60	7.00	0.513	Yes
<i>A. africanus</i>	2 roots w/ 3 vs. 4 canals [3-B vs. 4-A]	76.40 (5)	18.30	79.10 (8)	8.70	14.00	0.435	Yes
<i>P. robustus</i>	2 roots w/ 3 vs. 4 canals [3-B vs. 4-A]	76.10 (4)	4.90	81.50 (7)	8.40	9.00	0.412	Yes

Note: 1—in all cases the predicted trend is that premolars with greater numbers of canals/roots will exhibit larger CSA. For example, double vs. triple canal *P*<sup>3</sup>/*P*<sup>4</sup>s and double rooted *P*<sub>3</sub>/*P*<sub>4</sub>s w/ two circular vs. single plate-like canals are predicted to display a larger CSA. Shading indicates significant *p*-value; \* –indicates <1 mm<sup>2</sup> size difference.

TABLE 7. Summary of inter-specific differences

Character	<i>A. africanus</i>	<i>P. robustus</i>
<i>Maxillary Premolars</i>		
Single root/canal (1-A-1)	p <sup>3</sup>	absent
P <sup>4</sup> : typical canal number	2/3	3
Common buccal root groove (2-A-2)	type 2	type 4
P <sup>3</sup> & P <sup>4</sup> tooth size (CSA)	lesser/lesser	greater/greater
<i>Mandibular Premolars</i>		
Single root/canal (1-A-1)	P <sub>4</sub>	P <sub>3</sub>
P <sub>3</sub> : typical canal number	2/3/4	2/3
P <sub>3</sub> : typical root form <sup>1</sup>	C-shaped/MB (E) + D (P)/M (P) + D (P)	C-shaped/M (P) + D (P)
C-shaped type with rounded outer face with two circular canals (2-A-3)	absent	P <sub>3</sub>
C-shaped type (2-D-1) outer root groove differences	single shallow B concavity	grooves on M + D and sometimes B aspects
J-shaped type (reverse 2-D-1)	absent	P <sub>4</sub>
C-shaped type with 3 canals	P <sub>4</sub>	absent
Triple root/canal type (3-C-1)	P <sub>3</sub>	P <sub>4</sub>
Two canals within two plate-like roots (2-C-1)	absent	P <sub>3</sub>
Three canals within two plate-like roots (3-B-1)	P <sub>4</sub>	P <sub>3</sub> /P <sub>4</sub>
Four canals within two plate-like roots (4-A-1)	P <sub>3</sub> /P <sub>4</sub>	P <sub>4</sub>
P <sub>3</sub> & P <sub>4</sub> tooth size (CSA)	greater/lesser	lesser/greater
E—elliptical; P—plate-like		

APPENDIX 1. Specimen list with references for taxon and tooth position

Specimen	Taxon	Reference	Premolar	Basis	Reference
MLD 6	<i>A. africanus</i>	A	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	A
MLD 6	<i>A. africanus</i>	A	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	A
MLD 9	<i>A. africanus</i>	A*	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	A
MLD 9	<i>A. africanus</i>	A*	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	A
MLD 18	<i>A. africanus</i>	A	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	A
MLD 18	<i>A. africanus</i>	A	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	A
MLD 27	<i>A. africanus</i>	A*	RP <sub>3</sub>	2	A
MLD 40	<i>A. africanus</i>	A	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	A
MLD 40	<i>A. africanus</i>	A	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	A
MLD 45	<i>A. africanus</i>	A	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	A
MLD 45	<i>A. africanus</i>	A	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	A
STS 1	<i>A. africanus</i>	B*	LP <sup>3</sup>	2	B
STS 5	<i>A. africanus</i>	B, J	RP <sup>3</sup>	2	J
STS 5	<i>A. africanus</i>	B, J	LP <sup>4</sup>	2	J
STS 7	<i>A. africanus</i>	B*	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	B
STS 7	<i>A. africanus</i>	B*	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	B
STS 12	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	LP <sup>3</sup>	2	B
STS 12	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	LP <sup>4</sup>	2	B
STS 17	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
STS 17	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
STS 30	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	3	B
STS 36	<i>A. africanus</i>	B*	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	B
STS 36	<i>A. africanus</i>	B*	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	B
STS 47	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	P <sup>3</sup>	3, 5	B
STS 52a	<i>A. africanus</i>	H	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	H
STS 52a	<i>A. africanus</i>	H	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	H
STS 52b	<i>A. africanus</i>	H	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	H
STS 52b	<i>A. africanus</i>	H	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	H
STS 53	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
STS 53	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
STS 61	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	2	B
STS 61	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	2	B
STS 71	<i>A. africanus</i>	B*	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
STS 71	<i>A. africanus</i>	B*	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
STW 7	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	LP <sub>3</sub>	3	B
STW 13	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	C
STW 13	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	C
STW 14	<i>A. africanus</i>	C*	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	C
STW 19a	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sup>3</sup>	3	C

STW 39	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	C
STW 39	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	C
STW 45	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sup>4</sup>	3	C
STW 56a	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>4</sub>	3	C
STW 73	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	C
STW 73	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	C
STW 87	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>4</sub>	3	C
STW 95	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>3</sub>	2, 3	C
STW 131	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>3</sub>	2	C
STW 131	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	C
STW 142	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	C
STW 142	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	C
STW 183 (245)	<i>A. africanus</i>	C, D*	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	C
STW 183 (245)	<i>A. africanus</i>	C, D*	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	C
STW 193 (194)	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>4</sub>	3	C
STW 212 (240)	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>3</sub>	3	C
STW 212 (242)	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>4</sub>	3	C
STW 212 (243)	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>4</sub>	3	C
STW 252a (251)	<i>A. africanus</i>	T*	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	T, C
STW 252i	<i>A. africanus</i>	T*	LP <sup>4</sup>	3	T, C
STW 280 (282)	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sup>3</sup>	3	C
STW 280 (281)	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sup>4</sup>	3	C
STW 289	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	C
STW 327	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	LP <sub>4</sub>	3	C
STW 384	<i>A. africanus</i>	C*	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	C
STW 391	<i>A. africanus</i>	U	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	A
STW 391	<i>A. africanus</i>	U	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	A
STW 401	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>3</sub>	3	C
STW 404	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	C
STW 404	<i>A. africanus</i>	C	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	C
STW 498d	<i>A. africanus</i>	C*	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	C
STW 498d	<i>A. africanus</i>	C*	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	C
STW 579	<i>A. africanus</i>	D	RP <sup>3</sup>	2	A
STW 579	<i>A. africanus</i>	D	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	A
TM 1511	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
TM 1511	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
TM 1512	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
TM 1512	<i>A. africanus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
<hr/>					
DNH 8	<i>P. robustus</i>	E	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	E

DNH 8	<i>P. robustus</i>	E	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	E
DNH 17	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	LP <sup>3</sup>	3	F
DNH 19	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	F
DNH 22a	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	F
DNH 27	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	LP <sub>4</sub>	3	F
DNH 51	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	F
DNH 51	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	F
DNH 58	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	LP <sub>3</sub>	3	F
DNH 59	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	RP <sup>4</sup>	3	F
DNH 68	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	RP <sub>3</sub>	2	F
DNH 68	<i>P. robustus</i>	F	RP <sub>4</sub>	2	F
SK 6	<i>P. robustus</i>	G	LP <sub>3</sub>	2	G
SK 6	<i>P. robustus</i>	G	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	G
SK 7	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	RP <sub>4</sub>	3	H
SK 11	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	H
SK 11	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	H
SK 12a	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	J
SK 12a	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	J
SK 13.14	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	H
SK 13.14	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	H
SK 18a	<i>P. robustus</i>	I	LP <sub>3</sub>	3	V
SK 21.21a	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
SK 21.21a	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
SK 23	<i>P. robustus</i>	K	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	K
SK 23	<i>P. robustus</i>	K	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	K
SK 28	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	LP <sup>4</sup>	3	H
SK 30	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	LP <sub>3</sub>	3	H
SK 32	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	RP <sup>4</sup>	3	H
SK 46	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	K
SK 46	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	K
SK 47	<i>P. robustus</i>	B, L	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	K
SK 48	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	K
SK 48	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	K
SK 49	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
SK 49	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
SK 52	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
SK 52	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
SK 55b	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	B
SK 57	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	H
SK 57	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	H



SK 65	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	H
SK 65	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	H
SK 72	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sub>3</sub>	3	H
SK 74a	<i>P. robustus</i>	J	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	J
SK 74a	<i>P. robustus</i>	J	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	J
SK 74c	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	3	B
SK 79	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
SK 79	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
SK 81	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	H
SK 81	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	H
SK 83	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	B
SK 83	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	B
SK 821	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	LP <sup>3</sup>	3	H
SK 827	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	LP <sub>4</sub>	3	H
SK 838a	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	2	H
SK 857	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	RP <sub>3</sub>	3	H
SK 858.861.883	<i>P. robustus</i>	H	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	M
SK 876	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	B
SK 876	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	B
SK 1512	<i>P. robustus</i>	N	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	N
SK 1587a	<i>P. robustus</i>	N	LP <sub>3</sub>	1	N
SK 1587a	<i>P. robustus</i>	N	LP <sub>4</sub>	1	N
SK 1588	<i>P. robustus</i>	N	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	N
SK 1588	<i>P. robustus</i>	N	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	N
SK 1590a	<i>P. robustus</i>	N	RP <sup>4</sup>	2	N
SK 1590b	<i>P. robustus</i>	N	RP <sup>3</sup>	2	N
SK 14001	<i>P. robustus</i>	N	LP <sup>3</sup>	3	N
SK 14080	<i>P. robustus</i>	B	RP <sup>4</sup>	2	B
SK 14133	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	LP <sup>4</sup>	2	O
SKW 5	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	P
SKW 5	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	P
SKW 8	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	O
SKW 8	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	O
SKW 11	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	RP <sup>3</sup>	1	O
SKW 11	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	RP <sup>4</sup>	1	O
SKW 12	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	LP <sup>3</sup>	1	O
SKW 12	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	LP <sup>4</sup>	1	O
SKW 6113	<i>P. robustus</i>	I	RP <sup>3</sup>	3	Q
SKX 311	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	LP <sub>3</sub>	3	O
SKX 3354	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	LP <sup>4</sup>	3	O

SKX 4446	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	RP <sub>3</sub>	1	O
SKX 4446	<i>P. robustus</i>	O	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	O
SKX 50078	<i>P. robustus</i>	I	RP <sup>3</sup>	3	I
TM 1517a	<i>P. robustus</i>	R	LP <sup>3</sup>	2	R, S
TM 1517a	<i>P. robustus</i>	R	LP <sup>4</sup>	2	R, S
TM 1517b	<i>P. robustus</i>	R	RP <sub>3</sub>	2	R, S
TM 1517b	<i>P. robustus</i>	R	RP <sub>4</sub>	1	R, S
TM 1600	<i>P. robustus</i>	S	LP <sub>3</sub>	3	S

---

References: A–University of the Witwatersrand records; B–Brain, 1981; C–Moggi-Cecchi et al., 2006; D–Lockwood and Tobias, 2002; E–Keyser et al., 2000; F–Moggi-Cecchi et al., 2010; G–Broom, 1949 (originally designated as *P. crassidens*); H–Robinson, 1956; I–Ditsong National Museum of Natural History records; J–Broom and Robinson, 1950; K–Broom and Robinson, 1952; L–Wood and Engleman, 1988; M–Frayser, 1973; N–Brain, 1970; O–Grine, 2004; P–Tobias et al., 1977; Q–de Ruiter, 2001; R–Broom, 1938; S–Thackeray et al., 2001; T–Clarke, 1988; U–Clarke, 2008; V–Robinson, 1953; \*–attributed as a different species after Clarke, 1985, 1989, 1994a, 2008; Fornai et al., 2010.

Premolar position basis: 1–*in situ* with all adjacent teeth; 2–*in situ* with some adjacent teeth; 3–based on root morphological features; 4–initial designation adjusted based on overall root morphology; 5–left/right side indeterminate.

APPENDIX 2. Specimen list with element, root type and tooth size (mm<sup>2</sup>)

Specimen	p <sup>3</sup>	p <sup>4</sup>	P <sub>3</sub>	P <sub>4</sub>
		<i>A. africanus</i>		
MLD 6	3-A-5	3-A-5 (71.80)		
MLD 9	2-A-2	2-A-2		
MLD 18			3-A-1 (64.80)	4-A-1 (67.40)
MLD 27			2-D-1	
MLD 40			3-A-1 (62.60)	4-A-1 (70.30)
MLD 45	3-A-5 (67.40)	3-A-5 <sup>1</sup>		
STS 1	2-A-2 (70.60)			
STS 5	3-A-5 <sup>3</sup>	2-A-2 <sup>3</sup>		
STS 7			3-A-1 (68.00)	3-C-1 (77.60)
STS 12	3-A-5 (50.40)	2-A-2		
STS 17	3-A-1 (61.40)	2-A-2 (63.20)		
STS 30		2-A-2 (80.80)		
STS 36			2-D-1 (72.00)	4-A-1 (77.90)
STS 47	1-A-1 (60.40)			
STS 53	2-A-2	2-A-2		
STS 61	2-A-2 (57.20)	2-A-2 (56.20)		
STS 71	3-A-5	2-A-2 <sup>1</sup>		
STW 7			2-D-1 (59.20)	
STW 13	3-A-5 (66.50)	3-A-5 (76.90)		
STW 14				4-A-1 (71.80)
STW 19a	2-A-2 <sup>1</sup>			
STW 39			3-A-1 <sup>1</sup>	2-C-1 (56.10)
STW 45		3-A-5 (73.30)		
STS 52a	2-A-2	2-A-2		
STS 52b			3-A-1	2-D-1
STW 56a				4-A-1 (89.60)
STW 73	2-A-2 (55.70)	2-A-2 (60.60)		
STW 87				1-A-1 (55.70)
STW 95			2-D-1 (60.60)	
STW 131			3-A-1	3-B-1 (73.40)
STW 142			4-A-1 (60.60)	3-B-1 (64.90)
STW 183 (STW 245)	2-A-2 (74.10) <sup>1</sup>	2-A-2 <sup>3</sup>		
STW 193 (STW 194)				4-A-1 (85.20)
STW 212 (STW 240)			4-A-1 (62.10)	
STW 212 (STW 242)				3-B-1 (75.70)
STW 212 (STW 243)				2-D-1 (66.30)*
STW 252a	3-A-5 (75.60)			
STW 252i		3-A-5 (95.90)		
STW 280 (STW 281)		3-A-5 (85.30) <sup>1</sup>		
STW 280 (STW 282)	3-A-5 (74.50)			

STW 289			2-D-1	
STW 327				4-A-1 (80.60) <sup>4</sup>
STW 384				3-B-1 (107.20)
STW 391	2-A-2	3-A-1		
STW 401			4-A-1 (77.70)	
STW 404			3-A-1 (51.70)	3-B-1 (60.70)
STW 498d			4-A-1 (67.60)	4-A-1 (89.90)
STW 579	3-A-5 <sup>1</sup>	3-A-5		
TM 1511	3-A-5 (57.30)	2-A-2 (58.70)		
TM 1512	2-A-2 (57.70)	2-A-2 <sup>3</sup>		

---

*P. robustus*

DNH 8			3-B-1 (66.50)	4-A-1 (84.10)
DNH 17	2-A-2			
DNH 19				4-A-1 (94.50)
DNH 22a		3-A-5 (72.80)		
DNH 27				4-A-1 (71.70)
DNH 51			(60.70) <sup>2</sup>	3-B-1 (78.20)
DNH 58			1-A-1	
DNH 59		2-A-2 (74.80)		
DNH 68			2-D-1 (66.60)	4-A-1
SK 6			2-D-1 (65.40)	3-B-1 (79.50)
SK 7				4-A-1 (83.30)
SK 11	2-A-2 (71.30)	2-A-2 (87.90)		
SK 12a	3-A-5 (95.30)	3-A-5 (115.90)		
SK 13.14	2-A-2 (68.50)	3-A-5 (95.60)		
SK 18a			2-D-1 (53.00)	
SK 21.21a	3-A-5	3-A-5		
SK 23			3-B-1 (52.60)	4-A-1 (73.30)
SK 28		3-A-2 (97.26)		
SK 30			2-D-1 (60.70)	
SK 32		3-A-5 (90.00)		
SK 46	3-A-5 (71.40)	3-A-1 (89.60)		
SK 47		2-A-2 (82.50)		
SK 48	3-A-5 (74.60)	3-A-5		
SK 49	3-A-5	3-A-5 (112.90)		
SK 52	3-A-5 (88.80)	3-A-5 (104.30)		
SK 55b			3-B-1 <sup>4</sup>	
SK 57	3-A-5 (81.60)	3-A-5 (106.90)		
SK 65	3-A-5 (79.40)	3-A-5 (101.60)		
SK 72			3-B-1 (67.00)	
SK 74a			2-D-1 (52.80)	2-D-1 (75.00)
SK 74c		3-A-5 (100.10)		
SK 79	3-A-1	3-A-5 (80.40)		

SK 81			2-D-1	4-A-1 (88.30)
SK 83	2-A-2 (77.20)	3-A-5 (102.20)		
SK 821	3-A-5 (75.40)			
SK 827				3-B-1 (68.80) <sup>1</sup>
SK 838a		3-A-5 (80.40)		
SK 857			2-D-1 (65.20)	
SK 858.861.883			3-B-1	
SK 876			3-B-1	4-A-1
SK 1512		3-A-5		
SK 1587a			3-C-1	2-C-1 (72.50)
SK 1588			3-B-1	3-B-1 (77.80)
SK 1590a		2-A-2 (71.90)		
SK 1590b	2-A-2 (60.70)			
SK 14001	2-A-2 (73.50)			
SK 14080		3-A-5		
SK 14133		3-A-5 <sup>1</sup>		
SKW 5			3-B-1 (53.80)	4-A-1 (75.50)
SKW 8	3-A-5	3-A-5 (92.90)		
SKW 11	3-A-5 (77.90)	3-A-5 (100.40)		
SKW 12	3-A-5 (61.30)	3-A-5 (83.80)		
SKW 6113	2-A-2 (91.60)			
SKX 311			2-A-3 (56.00)	
SKX 3354		3-A-5		
SKX 4446			3-B-1	2-D-1 (76.00)**
SKX 50078	2-A-2 (78.10)			
TM 1517a	3-A-5 (69.10)	3-A-5 (91.90)		
TM 1517b			3-B-1	4-A-1
TM 1600			2-C-1 (80.40)	

Note: Blank CSA value indicates unmeasurable cervix; \*C-shaped type with 3 canals;

\*\*J-shaped type; 1—missing root structure, enough anatomy present for scoring ; 2—damaged root structure precludes scoring, but not CSA measurement; 3—missing tooth or matrix filled alveolus, scoring inferred from other specimens; 4—slightly incomplete canal growth, scoring inferred from other specimens.

APPENDIX 3. Maxillary premolar root type and CSA (mm<sup>2</sup>)

Canals	1	2		3	3	3	
Roots	1	2		2	2	3	
Root Type	1-A-1**	2-A-2	SD	3-A-1**	3-A-2**	3-A-5	SD
p <sup>3</sup>							
<i>A. africanus</i>	60.40 (1)	63.00 (5)	8.60	61.40 (1)		65.30 (6)	9.80
<i>P. robustus</i>		74.40 (7)	9.60	*		77.50 (10)	9.70
p <sup>4</sup>							
<i>A. africanus</i>		63.90 (5)	9.80	*		80.60 (5)	9.90
<i>P. robustus</i>		79.30 (4)	7.30	89.60 (1)	97.30 (1)	95.70 (16)	12.20

Note: specimen number in brackets; \*specimen damaged, measurement not possible; \*\*SD could not be calculated, n=1.

APPENDIX 4. Mandibular premolar root type and CSA (mm<sup>2</sup>)

Canals	1	2	2	2		3		3		3	4	
Roots	1	1	2	1		2		2		3	2	
Root Type	1-A-1**	2-A-3**	2-C-1**	2-D-1	SD	3-A-1	SD	3-B-1	SD	3-C-1**	4-A-1	SD
P <sub>3</sub>												
<i>A. africanus</i>				63.90 (3)	7.00	61.80 (4)	7.10				67.00 (4)	7.70
<i>P. robustus</i>	*	56.00 (1)	80.40 (1)	60.60 (6)	6.30			60.00 (4)	7.90	*		
P <sub>4</sub>												
<i>A. africanus</i>	55.70 (1)		58.40 (1)	66.30 (1)	**			76.40 (5)	18.30	77.620 (1)	79.10 (8)	8.70
<i>P. robustus</i>			76.60 (1)	75.50 (2)	0.70			76.10 (4)	4.90		81.50 (7)	8.40

Note: specimen number in brackets; \*specimen damaged, measurement not possible; \*\*SD could not be calculated, n=1.

Figure 1  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

p3



	1 Canal	2 Canals	3 Canals	
<b>Canal form</b>				
	<b>1-A</b>	<b>2-A</b>	<b>3-A</b>	
<i>A. africanus</i>	5% (1)	45% (10)	50% (11)	
<i>P. robustus</i>		36% (8)	64% (14)	
<b>External root form</b>				
	<b>1-A-1</b>	<b>2-A-2</b>	<b>3-A-1</b>	<b>3-A-5</b>
<i>A. africanus</i>	5% (1)	45% (10)	5% (1)	45% (10)
<i>P. robustus</i>		36% (8)	5% (1)	59% (13)

**Cross-sectional image**  
 (at mid-root)







Figure 2  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)

P<sup>4</sup>



	2 Canals		3 Canals		
<b>Canal form</b>					
	<b>2-A</b>		<b>3-A</b>		
<i>A. africanus</i>	62% (13)		38% (8)		
<i>P. robustus</i>	14% (4)		86% (24)		
<b>External root form</b>					
	<b>2-A-2</b>	<b>3-A-1</b>	<b>3-A-2</b>	<b>3-A-5</b>	
<i>A. africanus</i>	62% (13)	5% (1)		33% (7)	
<i>P. robustus</i>	14% (4)	4% (1)	4% (1)	78% (22)	

**Cross-sectional image**  
 (at mid-root)



**Figure 3**  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



P<sub>4</sub>



	1 Canal	2 Canals		3 Canals		4 Canals
<b>Canal form</b>						
	<b>1-A</b>	<b>2-C</b>	<b>2-D</b>	<b>3-B</b>	<b>3-C</b>	<b>4-A</b>
<i>A. africanus</i>	6% (1)	6% (1)	11% (2)	27% (5)	6% (1)	44% (8)
<i>P. robustus</i>		6% (1)	12% (2)	23% (4)		59% (10)
<b>External root form</b>						
	<b>1-A-1</b>	<b>2-C-1</b>	<b>2-D-1</b>	<b>3-B-1</b>	<b>3-C-1</b>	<b>4-A-1</b>
<i>A. africanus</i>	6% (1)	6% (1)	11% (2)*	27% (5)	6% (1)	44% (8)
<i>P. robustus</i>		6% (1)	12% (2)**	23% (4)		59% (10)
<b>Cross-sectional image (at mid-root)</b>						



Type 2



Type 4






Figure 6  
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)



*Pan*



*A. africanus*



MLD 27

STS 36

STS 52b P<sub>4</sub>


STW 7

STW 95

STW 212 (243) P<sub>4</sub>

STW 289

*P. robustus*



DNH 68

SK 6

SK 18a

SK 30

SK 74a P<sub>3/4</sub>

SK 81

SK 857

SKX 311

SKX 4446 P<sub>4</sub>

Figure 7











Figure 8



**Supplementary Material**

[Click here to download Supplementary Material: Supplementary Material - Specimen Image Atlas.pdf](#)