

Evolutionary Origin of Teeth

Martin Rücklin, *Naturalis Biodiversity Center, Leiden, The Netherlands*

Philip CJ Donoghue, *School of Earth Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK*

Advanced article

Article Contents

- Introduction
- 'Outside-in' Hypothesis
- 'Inside-out' Hypothesis
- Odontode Regulation Hypothesis
- Whole Genome Duplications
- Molecular Evolution and Gene Regulation: Inside and Out
- Testing Phylogenetic Congruence of Hypotheses on the Evolution of Teeth
- Conclusions and Future Perspectives
- Related Article

Online posting date: 29th July 2019

Teeth and jaws have been widely perceived as key innovations underpinning the adaptive radiation and the evolutionary success of jawed vertebrates. However, the origin, evolution and developmental evolution of teeth are all the subject of controversy. There are three competing hypotheses that are more or less well supported by the available data: (1) the 'outside-in' hypothesis which contends that odontogenic competence spread from the external dermis to the oropharynx – the traditional hypothesis based on the observation that teeth and scales exhibit common patterns of development that extend to the molecular genetic level, combined with evidence that scales appear before teeth within phylogeny; (2) the 'inside-out' hypothesis that teeth and scales evolved independently, based on the observation that some jawless scale-covered vertebrates also possess oro-pharyngeal scales, and (3) the 'inside and out' hypothesis which is effectively agnostic on the question. The available evidence supports an origin of teeth through extension of odontogenic competence from the external dermis to the oropharynx.

Introduction

The evolutionary transition from jawless to jawed and tooth-bearing vertebrates constitutes one of the most formative

events in vertebrate evolution, precipitating ecological change. Jaws and teeth are widely perceived as the key-innovations that underpinned the adaptive radiation and evolutionary success of jawed vertebrates. Surprisingly, the origin and early evolution of teeth remains hotly debated and far from resolved. Thankfully, there is a rich fossil record of teeth and their development because teeth are mineralised and wear-resistant. These fossil remains are readily studied at a cellular level and beyond, using modern X-ray tomographic methods and, because dental tissues are deposited on a daily cycle, the growth lines preserved within the tissues can be analysed to reveal their pattern of development. Thus, fossilised dental tissues can be studied in much the same way as in living species, allowing for an integrative approach to elucidating the developmental evolution of teeth. When this information is organised within a genealogy of early and primitive vertebrates, it becomes possible to test competing scenarios for the evolution of teeth.

'Outside-in' Hypothesis

The first comparative anatomists recognised similarities between external dermal scales and teeth (Agassiz, 1833–1843; Owen, 1843). Are these similarities of shape and composition products of homology or analogy? In order to solve this long-standing question, a phylogenetic framework is needed (**Figure 1**). In living animals with a backbone, the vertebrates, the jawless cyclostomes form a clade comprising lampreys and hagfishes. Cyclostomes from Greek 'round mouth' lack true teeth and a dermal skeleton (**Figure 1**). The tooth function is instead fulfilled by keratinous tooth-like structures (Krejsa *et al.*, 1990). These structures are not homologous to teeth which in living jawed vertebrates are composed of dentine, are capped by an enamel or enamel-like tissue and have a bone of attachment. Living jawed vertebrates include the chondrichthyans (sharks, rays and chimaeras) and osteichthyans (bony fishes and tetrapods, **Figure 1**), have both teeth and jaws. Chondrichthyans, and especially sharks, have been considered the most primitive living jawed vertebrates when looking for the ancestral condition of characters like teeth. However, this perspective ignores the fact that chondrichthyans

eLS subject area: Evolution & Diversity of Life

How to cite:

Rücklin, Martin and Donoghue, Philip CJ (July 2019)
Evolutionary Origin of Teeth. In: eLS. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd:
Chichester.

DOI: 10.1002/9780470015902.a0026408




Figure 1 Phylogeny and distribution of teeth, oral denticles and scales redrawn after Donoghue and Rücklin (2016) changes based on Coates *et al.* (2018) and Murdock *et al.* (2013).

are also specialised and the result of hundreds of millions of years of independent evolution, just like osteichthyans. Therefore, the nature of recent sharks might not be informative about ancestral jawed vertebrate characters. Their dermal skeleton is made of tiny tooth-like scales and their endoskeleton is composed of unmineralised cartilage, fulfilling expectations of a simple skeleton from which a more complex osteichthyan condition evolved.

The similarities of dermal scales and teeth in sharks are obvious, extending from commonality of composition (dentine pulp, enameloid cap and bone of attachment) down to the manner in which they develop (Debiais-Thibaud *et al.*, 2011). Hertwig (1874) hypothesised early in the history of comparative anatomy that both systems share a common ancestry and teeth represent a cooption of scales to an oral position. The same observation of similarity led to the lepidomorial theory of Stensiö and the odontode theory of Ørving which contends that both teeth and scales develop from a common developmental module which has been termed an odontode (Ørving, 1977; Reif, 1982; Donoghue, 2002). This long tradition of recognising a common development and evolution of scales and teeth has more recently been coined the ‘outside-in’ hypothesis based on their idea that internal teeth evolved from external scales (Figure 2a). The fossil record seems to support this view with the discovery of jawless and toothless vertebrates shielded with hundreds of external dermal scales or even encased into an extensive dermal armour resembling the plating of a medieval knight. This fossil record of jawed and tooth-bearing vertebrates evolving long after their armoured

jawless and toothless ‘ostracoderm’ antecedents, has long been interpreted to support the outside-in hypothesis.

‘Inside-out’ Hypothesis

One major problem with the ‘outside-in’ hypothesis is that up to now no animal, fossil or living has shown evidence for the extension of external dermal scales into the mouth. The so-called ‘spiny shark’ acanthodians have been proposed to evidence this evolutionary transition, with tooth-like scales surrounding the mouth (Blais *et al.*, 2011). However, these fossil jawed fish (Figure 1) already have an impressively developed dentition of replacement teeth.

The competing ‘inside-out’ hypothesis draws a fundamental distinction between internal teeth and external scales on the basis that they develop from different tissues: teeth from oral endoderm and scales from the external dermis (Figure 2b). Furthermore, a range of fossil groups have been interpreted to evidence an origin of oral teeth evolving before dermal scales and before the origin of jaws – evidence that would appear to contradict the traditional outside-in hypothesis.

Conodonts

Conodonts are an extinct group of jawless vertebrates that strongly resemble the living cyclostomes, but possessed mineralised tooth-like elements. Conodont elements are composed




Figure 2 Schematic illustration of hypotheses on dental evolution, redrawn after Fraser *et al.* (2010). (a) Inside-out hypothesis and (b) outside-in hypothesis. ect – Ectoderm; end – Endoderm; opc – oro-pharyngeal cavity.

of a cap of hypermineralised material that is similar to enamel and a basal tissue that is similar to dentine, and the two tissues appear to have grown in a manner that is directly comparable to teeth and scales (Donoghue, 1998). As such, conodonts have been interpreted to be more closely related to living jawed vertebrates, but more primitive than the fossil armoured ostracoderms (**Figure 1**). Thus, conodont elements have been interpreted as evidence of tooth-like structures occurring deep inside of the mouth of vertebrates, evolving long before the first vertebrates with external dermal skeleton (Smith and Coates, 1998; Smith, 2003; Fraser *et al.*, 2010).

However, researchers have argued that conodonts are not vertebrates (Turner *et al.*, 2010) and others have demonstrated that the tooth-like condition of conodont elements has evolved convergently. Specifically, it has been shown that the structure of conodonts evolved piecemeal, with early ‘paraconodonts’ possessing only the dentine-like basal tissue, and later ‘euconodonts’ evolving the hypermineralised enamel-like cap. Given their independent evolution within the conodont lineage, these tissues and structures cannot be homologous to the teeth or scales of other vertebrates (**Figure 1**; Murdock *et al.*, 2013). As such, evidence from conodonts is not informative on the question of how teeth evolved.

Thelodonts

Proponents of the inside-out hypothesis have also marshalled evidence for teeth evolving before jaws in a group of extinct jawless ostracoderms called the thelodonts. Thelodonts like *Loganellia scotica* possess an external dermal skeleton comprised of tiny shark-like scales, but some also possess an internal skeleton of even smaller scales lining the mouth and pharynx (**Figure 1**; Van der Bruggen and Janvier, 1993). These scales possess a pulp cavity with dentine and an enameloid cap, and base formed from acellular bone (Donoghue and Sansom, 2002; Rücklin *et al.*, 2012).

Internal scales come in three different styles, as minute individual scales at the front of the mouth, combined scales growing together deeper in the mouth and in the gill area scales are found arranged together as though on a string of pearls, that apparently grew successively, aligned in one direction (Smith and Coates, 2000).

This pattern of aligned growth was interpreted to resemble tooth replacement in the tooth whorls of living sharks and the extinct acanthodians (Van der Bruggen and Janvier, 1993). As with conodonts, this was regarded as evidence that teeth evolved

before jaws inside of the mouth probably from an internal, endodermal tissue and that shark-like tooth replacement had evolved in association with the gills. The ensuing evolutionary scenario that tooth replacement had evolved in the pharynx, later to be reused (coopted) in the mouth, is even in agreement with the idea that jaws and branchial arches share a common developmental origin.

However, the mode of development and replacement of tooth-like scales in the mouth and pharynx of the thelodont *Loganellia* was largely guesswork that had to be tested. High-resolution X-ray tomography was used to characterise the three-dimensional structure of specimens extracted from a key specimen. This work confirmed the initial inference of the scales growing successional and directionally in some specimens (Rücklin *et al.*, 2011), but there is a great diversity and some scale aggregates from the mouth and pharynx of the thelodont *Loganellia* show no coherent pattern, with scales added in both a polarised and unpolarised arrangement (Donoghue and Rücklin, 2016).

Mapped onto an evolutionary tree, the thelodont *Loganellia* is resolved as extremely derived, nested deep inside the clade thelodonts, the majority of which appear to lack oral or pharyngeal scales (Rücklin *et al.*, 2011). As such, the evidence indicates that the tooth-like oral or pharyngeal scales of *Loganellia* evolved independently of the teeth of jawed vertebrates and, like conodonts, they cannot be used in evidence to support the inside-out hypothesis.

Placoderm teeth

The extinct placoderms are the first jawed vertebrates and they have traditionally been interpreted to constitute a natural group, sister to the chondrichthyans and bony fishes (Goujet and Young, 2004). This critical position in the tree of life, combined with the interpretation that the boney jaws of placoderms were toothless, lent support to the hypothesis that teeth evolved after jaws. Discoveries of teeth or tooth-like structures in derived placoderms (arthrodires), composed of the same tissues seen in the teeth of living jawed vertebrates, challenged this view (Smith and Johanson, 2003). Early representatives of each of the main clades of jawed vertebrates, that is the placoderms, acanthodians, chondrichthyans and bony fishes, were all interpreted to have lacked teeth, supporting a thesis that teeth had evolved convergently in each derived members of each of these four lineages. All groups, including the jawless thelodonts, were interpreted to share the same developmental process and replacement pattern found in living jawed vertebrates (Johanson and Smith, 2003), supporting evidence of a deep homology.

In the intervening years, the phylogenetic framework for interpreting this evidence has undergone its own revolution. In particular, placoderms have been reinterpreted to constitute an evolutionary grade and not a natural group (Brazeau, 2009 – though this is still uncertain – see King *et al.*, 2016), with some placoderms resolved as more closely related to living jawed vertebrates than others (Figure 1). As such, the evolution of characteristics, such as teeth, have been recast. Thus, evidence of successional teeth in derived placoderms, such as the arthrodire *Compagopiscis croucheri* (Smith and Johanson, 2003; Rücklin *et al.*, 2012; Donoghue and Rücklin, 2016) and the more basal buchanoosteids,

suggests that teeth evolved in close association with jaws than has been perceived hitherto (Rücklin *et al.*, 2012). Acanthothoracids are among the earliest of placoderm grades, and their jaw plates also display concentric rows of tooth-like denticles (Goujet and Young, 2004; Smith and Johanson, 2003). Nevertheless, the jaws of the early-branching antiarchs, as exemplified by the ubiquitous *Bothriolepis* (Young, 1984), show no evidence of teeth associated with their lower jaw (Rücklin *et al.*, 2012). This might reflect evolutionary loss, mirrored by absence of dentine-bearing scales from their dermal skeleton (Downs and Donoghue, 2009; Giles *et al.*, 2013) or a primary absence deep in the evolutionary grade of placoderms. More placoderms from Silurian strata are needed to inform about the basal conditions.

Odontode Regulation Hypothesis

For a long time, the similarities of teeth and dermal scales in their development have been recognised. These similar developmental modules have been described in the odontode regulation theory as reflecting a common evolutionary origin (Ørving, 1977; Reif, 1982; Donoghue and Sansom, 2002). This view is not shared by the inside-out hypothesis which instead posits that internal and external odontodes have evolved independently from a common but unmineralised ancestral organ, such as a taste bud. This 'deep homology' (Johanson and Smith, 2005) is reflected in the shared aspects of development that extends all of the way down to the gene regulatory network that controls the development of teeth, scales and taste buds (Fraser *et al.*, 2010). As such, this hypothesis of homology must extend deep into evolutionary history, before teeth and scales first evolved, into the early stages of vertebrate evolution associated with revolutionary genomic events that distinguish vertebrates from their invertebrate relatives.

Whole Genome Duplications

Many of the genes that comprise the gene regulatory networks that underpin tooth and scale development have an evolutionary origin that is associated with whole genome duplication events. In vertebrates, three duplications of the whole gene set are postulated (1) in the ancestral vertebrate lineage, (2) in the gnathostome stem-lineage and (3) in ray-finned fishes in the teleost stem lineage. From the perspective of living vertebrate diversity, three events seem to correlate with bursts of character evolution and increasing complexity. However, integrating fossil evidence into this perspective provides a more complete picture in which there is no evidence for a series of evolutionary leaps. For instance, the extinct ostracoderms show that gnathostome anatomical characteristics were assembled piecemeal over a protracted episode of evolutionary history, including a dermal skeleton, a differentiated gut, paired fins, slit-shaped gills, and in placoderms even jaws and teeth. This episode extends from the first stem-gnathostomes in the Cambrian, to the first definitive crown-gnathostomes in the Silurian (Donoghue and Purnell, 2005; Brazeau and Friedman, 2015). Therefore, there is no evidence for a direct link between whole genome duplications and evolution of complexity.

Molecular Evolution and Gene Regulation: Inside and Out

Structures like scales, teeth, hair and feathers all exhibit similar patterns of development and, as such, some developmental biologists have grouped them as a family of structures known as epithelial appendages. Some researchers have argued that all manifestations of epithelial appendages share a common evolutionary origin (Krejsa, 1979) even though there is no phylogenetic evidence to support their homology. Hence, the hypothesis that scales and teeth may share an evolutionary origin in an unmineralised sensory organ like a taste bud since they certainly share a common suite of genes directing their development (Fraser *et al.*, 2010). Experiments based in the axolotl have shown that teeth can develop from ectoderm, endoderm and even mixed epithelia (Soukup *et al.*, 2008) demonstrating that apparently fundamental developmental distinctions between teeth and scales are surmountable. As such, the ‘inside and out’ hypothesis contends that the question of the topological origin of odontodes is fundamentally irrelevant (Fraser *et al.*, 2010).

Support for the inside and outside hypothesis has been found in a comparative analysis of tooth and scale development in the catshark (Debiais-Thibaud *et al.*, 2011, 2015). These authors found that shark teeth lack the signalling centres associated with cusp development in mammalian teeth, though shark scales exhibit patterns of nested gene expression that is reminiscent of these signalling centres. In this sense, shark scale and mammalian tooth development are more similar than either is to shark tooth development. Comparative analyses including taste buds have further shown similarities in the regenerative capacity of shark teeth and taste buds, not seen in shark dermal scales (Martin *et al.*, 2016).

Testing Phylogenetic Congruence of Hypotheses on the Evolution of Teeth

Evidently, the competing hypotheses for evolutionary origin of teeth are many and varied, and none have evaded criticism. The ultimate test we can apply is their congruence with phylogenetic hypotheses (Patterson, 1982); as we have seen, however, phylogenetic hypotheses change over time and so this is not a perfect test, but it remains the key test of any evolutionary scenario. Traditional views mainly based on recent taxa result in the view that chondrichthyans represent the most basal jawed vertebrates and therefore their apparently simple tooth replacement is informative about the basal stage of vertebrate tooth development. However, this perspective ignores evolutionary changes along the stem lineage of chondrichthyans. Recent phylogenetic analyses of fossil data have provided greater support for the view that placoderms constitute an evolutionary grade of stem to crown gnathostomes (Brazeau, 2009; Davis *et al.*, 2012; Zhu *et al.*, 2013). This implies that an extensive dermal skeleton is primitive and that the condition both living chondrichthyans and living osteichthyans is secondarily simplified (Zhu *et al.*, 2013). Extraordinary newly discovered placoderms from China, including *Entelognathus* and

Qilinyu, possess jaws resembling those of bony fishes (Zhu *et al.*, 2013, 2016), changing our view on the evolution of jawed vertebrates completely. Within this context, it seems clear that teeth evolved long after scales. Commonality of development, extending from the tissue and cell level, down to molecular genetics, must belie any idea that teeth and scales independently evolved their dentine, enamel and bone tissue and cells, even if they inherited a largely performed gene regulatory network. As such, it seems clear that the inside-out hypothesis must be rejected and with it we can dismiss the inside and outside hypothesis, which is essentially nonevolutionary. This leaves us with the traditional outside-in hypothesis which is compatible with the available evidence, especially the origin of teeth long after the dermal scales. The absence of evidence for a gradual evolution of teeth from marginal scales may be unsettling, but fossils like *Entelognathus* and *Qilinyu* reveal known-unknowns: that the earliest jawed vertebrates possessed marginal dermal bones that would have borne dermal scales. After all these years of debate focused in the laboratory, it is time to go back out to the rocks in the field and find these critical fossils.

Conclusions and Future Perspectives

New large-scale phylogenies allow the congruence test of traditional evolutionary scenarios on dental evolution. Tomographic techniques developed in the last decades, advanced computing and 3D reconstruction, enable the reconstruction of growth in fossils. Advances in developmental biology and developmental genetics enable tests of traditional hypotheses. All three important lines of evidence, phylogeny, fossil record and developmental genetic evidence, facilitate formulation and tests of hypotheses on the evolution of teeth. Phylogenetic analyses integrating evidence from living and fossil species indicate that the outside-in hypothesis represents the most plausible scenario for the evolutionary origin of teeth, a scenario that will surely be further tested by new discoveries in molecular laboratories and new fossils in the field.

Related Article

[Placodermi \(Armoured Fishes\)](#)

Glossary

Acanthodian ‘Spiny sharks’ are considered as stem chondrichthyans.

Conodont Describes the animal, or oral element of the first mineralising vertebrates.

Cooption A new use of a trait, comprising the gene regulation and organs.

Odontode The developmental unit of a tooth or dermal denticle.

Placoderms The first jawed vertebrates, probably forming a grade at the stem of living jawed vertebrates.

Thelodonts The jawless vertebrates with a skeleton of minute scales forming an external dermal, oral and pharyngeal skeleton.

References

- Agassiz L (1833–1843) *Recherches sur les Poissons Fossiles*. Imprimerie de Petitpierre: Neuchâtel.
- Blais SA, MacKenzie LA and Wilson MVH (2011) Tooth-like scales in Early Devonian eugnathostomes and the “outside-in” hypothesis for the origins of teeth in vertebrates. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **31**: 1189–1199.
- Brazeau MD (2009) The braincase and jaws of a Devonian “acanthodian” and modern gnathostome origins. *Nature* **457**: 305–308.
- Brazeau MD and Friedman M (2015) The origin and early phylogenetic history of jawed vertebrates. *Nature* **520**: 490–497.
- Coates MI, Finarelli JA, Sansom IJ, Andreev PS, Criswell KE, Tietjen K, Rivers ML and La Riviere PJ (2018) An early chondrichthyan and the evolutionary assembly of a shark body plan. *Proceedings of the Royal Society, London: Series B* **285**: 20172418.
- Davis SP, Finarelli JA and Coates MI (2012) *Acanthodes* and shark-like conditions in the last common ancestor of modern gnathostomes. *Nature* **486**: 247–250.
- Debiais-Thibaud M, Oulion S, Bourrat F, et al. (2011) The homology of odontodes in gnathostomes: insights from Dlx gene expression in the dogfish, *Scyliorhinus canicula*. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **11**: 307.
- Debiais-Thibaud M, Chiori R, Enault S, et al. (2015) Tooth and scale morphogenesis in shark: an alternative process to the mammalian enamel knot system. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **15**: 292. DOI: 10.1186/s12862-015-0557-0.
- Donoghue PCJ (1998) Growth and patterning in the conodont skeleton. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B* **353**: 633–666.
- Donoghue PCJ (2002) Evolution of development of vertebrate teeth and scales: unravelling concepts, regulatory theories and homologies. *Paleobiology* **28**: 474–507.
- Donoghue PCJ and Sansom IJ (2002) Origin and early evolution of vertebrate skeletonization. *Microscopy Research and Technique* **59**: 352–372.
- Donoghue PCJ and Purnell M (2005) Genome duplication, extinction and vertebrate evolution. *TRENDS in Ecology and Evolution* **20**: 312–319.
- Donoghue PCJ and Rücklin M (2016) The ins and outs of the evolutionary origin of teeth. *Evolution & Development* **18**: 19–30.
- Downs JP and Donoghue PCJ (2009) Skeletal histology of *Bothriolepis canadensis* (Placodermi, Antiarchi) and evolution of the skeleton at the origin of jawed vertebrates. *Journal of Morphology* **270**: 1364–1380.
- Fraser GJ, Cerny R, Soukup V, et al. (2010) The odontode explosion: the origin of tooth-like structures in vertebrates. *BioEssays* **32**: 808–817.
- Giles S, Rücklin M and Donoghue PCJ (2013) Histology of “placoderm” dermal skeletons: implications for the nature of the ancestral gnathostome. *Journal of Morphology* **274**: 627–644.
- Goujet D and Young GC (2004) Placoderm anatomy and phylogeny: new insights. In: Arratia G, MVH W and Cloutier R (eds) *Recent Advances in the Origin and Early Radiation of Vertebrates*, pp 109–126. Pfeil: München.
- Hertwig O (1874) Ueber Bau und Entwicklung der Placoidschuppen und der Zähne der Selachier. *Jenaische Zeitschrift für Naturwissenschaft* **8**: 331–404.
- Johanson Z and Smith MM (2003) Placoderm fishes, pharyngeal denticles, and the vertebrate dentition. *Journal of Morphology* **257**: 289–307.
- Johanson Z and Smith MM (2005) Origin and evolution of gnathostome dentitions: a question of teeth and pharyngeal denticles in placoderms. *Biological Reviews* **80**: 303–345.
- King B, Qiao T, Lee MSY, Zhu M and Long JA (2016) Bayesian morphological clock methods resurrect placoderm monophyly and reveal rapid early evolution in jawed vertebrates. *Systematic Biology* **66**: 499–516.
- Krejsa RJ (1979) The comparative anatomy of the integumental skeleton. In: Wake MH (ed) *Hyman's comparative vertebrate anatomy*, pp 112–191. University of Chicago Press: Chicago.
- Krejsa RJ, Bringas P and Slavkin HC (1990) A neontological interpretation of conodont elements based on agnathan cyclostome tooth structure, function, and development. *Lethaia* **23**: 359–378.
- Martin KJM, Rasch LJ, Cooper RL, et al. (2016) Sox2+ progenitors in sharks link taste development with the evolution of regenerative teeth from denticles. *PNAS* **113**: 14769–14774.
- Murdock DJE, Dong X-P, Repetski JE, et al. (2013) The origin of conodonts and of vertebrate mineralized skeletons. *Nature* **502**: 546–549.
- Ørving T (1977) A survey of odontodes (‘dermal teeth’) from developmental, structural, functional, and phyletic points of view. In: Andrews SM, Miles RS and Walker AD (eds) *Problems in Vertebrate Evolution*, Linnean Society Symposium Series 4, pp 53–75. Academic Press: London.
- Owen R (1843) *Lectures on the Comparative Anatomy and Physiology of the Vertebrate Animals, Delivered at the Royal College of Surgeons, in 1843*. Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans: London.
- Patterson C (1982) Morphological characters and homology Problems of Phylogenetic Reconstruction. In: Joysey KA and Friday AE (eds) *Systematics Association Special Volume 21*, pp 21–74. Academic Press: London.
- Reif W-E (1982) Evolution of dermal skeleton and dentition in vertebrates: the odontode regulation theory. *Evolutionary Biology* **15**: 287–368.
- Rücklin M, Giles S, Janvier P, et al. (2011) Teeth before jaws? Comparative analysis of the structure and development of the external and internal scales in the extinct jawless vertebrate *Loganellia scotica*. *Evolution & Development* **13**: 523–532.
- Rücklin M, Donoghue PCJ, Johanson Z, et al. (2012) Development of teeth and jaws in the earliest jawed vertebrates. *Nature* **491**: 748–751.
- Smith MM (2003) Vertebrate dentitions at the origin of jaws: when and how pattern evolved. *Evolution & Development* **5**: 394–413.
- Smith MM and Coates MI (1998) Evolutionary origins of the vertebrate dentition: phylogenetic patterns and developmental evolution. *European Journal of Oral Sciences* **106** (1): 482–500.
- Smith MM and Coates MI (2000) *Evolutionary origins of teeth and jaws: developmental models and phylogenetic patterns*. In: Teaford MF, Smith MM and Ferguson MWJ (eds) *Development, Function and Evolution of Teeth*, pp 133–151. Cambridge University Press: Cambridge.
- Smith MM and Johanson Z (2003) Separate evolutionary origin of teeth from evidence in fossil jawed vertebrates. *Science* **299**: 1235–1236.

- Soukup V, Epperlein HH, Horacek I, *et al.* (2008) Dual epithelial origin of vertebrate oral teeth. *Nature* **455**: 795–798.
- Turner S, Burrow C, Schultze H-P, *et al.* (2010) False teeth: conodont-vertebrate phylogenetic relationships revisited. *Geodiversitas* **32** (2): 545–594.
- Van der Bruggen W and Janvier P (1993) Denticles in thelodonts. *Nature* **364**: 107.
- Young GC (1984) Reconstruction of the jaws and braincase in the Devonian placoderm fish *Bothriolepis*. *Palaeontology* **27**: 635–661.
- Zhu M, Yu X, Ahlberg PE, *et al.* (2013) A Silurian placoderm with osteichthyan-like marginal jaw bones. *Nature* **502**: 188–193.
- Zhu M, Ahlberg PE, Pan Z, *et al.* (2016) A Silurian maxillate placoderm illuminates jaw evolution. *Science* **354**: 334–336.

Further Reading

- Friedman M and Brazeau MD (2013) A jaw-dropping fossil fish. *Nature* **502**: 175–177.
- Janvier P (1996) *Early Vertebrates*, Oxford Monographs on Geology and Geophysics 33. Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Witten PE, Sire J-Y and Huysseune A (2014) Old, new and new-old concepts about the evolution of teeth. *Journal of Applied Ichthyology* **30**: 636–642.