

ARCHIVIO ISTITUZIONALE DELLA RICERCA

Alma Mater Studiorum Università di Bologna Archivio istituzionale della ricerca

Permian lobed Zoophycos as the product of the terrestrialization process: Behavioral innovation in the Tahkandit Limestone (Yukon River, Alaska, USA)

This is the final peer-reviewed author's accepted manuscript (postprint) of the following publication:

Published Version:

Permian lobed Zoophycos as the product of the terrestrialization process: Behavioral innovation in the Tahkandit Limestone (Yukon River, Alaska, USA) / Fiorillo, Anthony R.; Fanti, Federico; Baucon, Andrea; Chiarenza, Alfio Alessandro. - In: PALAEOGEOGRAPHY PALAEOCLIMATOLOGY PALAEOECOLOGY. - ISSN 0031-0182. - ELETTRONICO. - 593:(2022), pp. 110931-110943. [10.1016/j.palaeo.2022.110931]

This version is available at: https://hdl.handle.net/11585/878810 since: 2022-03-18

Published:

DOI: http://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2022.110931

Terms of use:

Some rights reserved. The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

(Article begins on next page)

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (https://cris.unibo.it/). When citing, please refer to the published version.

This is the final peer-reviewed accepted manuscript of:

Fiorillo, Anthony R.; Fanti, Federico; Baucon, Andrea; Chiarenza, Alfio Alessandro: *Permian lobed Zoophycos as the product of the terrestrialization process: Behavioral innovation in the Tahkandit Limestone (Yukon River, Alaska, USA)*

PALAEOGEOGRAPHY PALAEOCLIMATOLOGY PALAEOECOLOGY. Vol. 593. ISSN 0031-0182

DOI: 10.1016/j.palaeo.2022.110931

The final published version is available online at:

https://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2022.110931

Rights / License:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

This item was downloaded from IRIS Università di Bologna (<u>https://cris.unibo.it/</u>)

When citing, please refer to the published version.

Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology

Permian lobed Zoophycos as the product of the terrestrialization process: behavioral innovation in the Tahkandit Limestone Formation (Yukon River, Alaska, USA) --Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	PALAEO-D-21-00864
Article Type:	Research Paper
Keywords:	Ichnology, Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve, marine, limestone
Manuscript Region of Origin:	North America
Abstract:	Paleontological survey in the remote Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve in Alaska led to the discovery of lobed Zoophycos from the lower Tahkandit Limestone Formation (informally named Sandstone unit), an interval characterized by grayish- green glauconitic sandstone and conglomerate of coastal origin. The studied Zoophycos consists of a lobate skirt-like spreite bounded by a marginal tube. Smaller tongue-shaped lobes branch off from larger parent lobes that share the same tongue- like shape. Sedimentological features, together with body fossils and associated trace fossils (Planolites, Chondrites), indicate a shoreface habitat for the Zoophycos producer. This shallow-marine environmental setting is in contrast with the deeper bathymetries in which lobed Zoophycos are recovered in post-Paleozoic times. The producer of the lobed Zoophycos of the Yukon River is interpreted as a deposit- feeder that used sensory-driven, directed search for locating heterogeneously distributed trophic resources. The Zoophycos producer filled its burrow with Coprolus- like fecal pellets, possibly complementing deposit feeding with microbial gardening and/or food caching. Data presented here provide useful insight into the morphological evolution and bathymetric distribution of Zoophycos , suggesting two 'Golden Ages' for lobed Zoophycos: (1) Devonian-Permian and (2) Jurassic-Neogene. This stratigraphic distribution supports the important ecological role of major terrestrialization events, that are, the Palaeozoic expansion of land plants and the Mesozoic expansion of angiosperms. The consequent increased input of nutrients to coastal areas has been an important contributor to declining trends in porewater oxygen concentrations. This phenomenon favored adaptive traits to exploit nutrient-rich but oxygen-poor niches, among which the U-shaped marginal tube of lobed Zoophycos was an efficient adaptation to bring oxygenated water into low-oxygen

Highlights

- 1) This report adds new ichnological information to a poorly understood, and prominent, Permian rock unit that crops out along the Yukon River near the US-Canadian border.
- 2) This report illustrates the important role of terrestralization events in driving the *Zoophycos* morphology.
- 3) Traditionally it has been interpreted that more stable or favorable environments such as offshore settings are conducive to the preservation of larger spirals of *Zoophycos*, and this study shows them preserved in more inshore environments.
- 4) This is one of the oldest known trace morphologies of *Zoophycos* with such a complex vertical structure.

1	Permian lobed Zoophycos as the product of the terrestrialization process: behavioral innovation in
2	the Tahkandit Limestone Formation (Yukon River, Alaska, USA)
3	
4	
5	Anthony R. Fiorillo ¹ , Federico Fanti ² , Andrea Baucon ³ , A. Alessandro Chiarenza ⁴
6	
7	¹ Huffington Department of Earth Sciences, Southern Methodist University, Dallas, TX, United
8	States of America ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8998-0820
9	² Dipartimento di Scienze Biologiche, Geologiche e Ambientali, Alma Mater Studiorum, Università
10	di Bologna, via Zamboni 67, 40126 Bologna, Italy
11	³ DISTAV, University of Genova, Corso Europa 26, 16132 Genova, Italy
12	⁴ Grupo de Ecología Animal, Centro de Investigacion Mariña, Universidade de Vigo, Vigo, 36310,
13	Spain ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5525-6730
14	
15	e-mail: fiorillo@mail.smu.edu
16	
17	RRH:
18	LRH: A.R. FIORILLO ET AL.
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	ABSTRACT

27 Paleontological survey in the remote Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve in Alaska led to the 28 discovery of lobed Zoophycos from the lower Tahkandit Limestone Formation (informally named Sandstone unit), an interval characterized by grayish-green glauconitic sandstone and conglomerate 29 of coastal origin. The studied Zoophycos consists of a lobate skirt-like spreite bounded by a 30 marginal tube. Smaller tongue-shaped lobes branch off from larger parent lobes that share the same 31 tongue-like shape. Sedimentological features, together with body fossils and associated trace fossils 32 33 (*Planolites*, *Chondrites*), indicate a shoreface habitat for the *Zoophycos* producer. This shallowmarine environmental setting is in contrast with the deeper bathymetries in which lobed Zoophycos 34 are recovered in post-Paleozoic times. The producer of the lobed Zoophycos of the Yukon River is 35 36 interpreted as a deposit-feeder that used sensory-driven, directed search for locating heterogeneously distributed trophic resources. The Zoophycos producer filled its burrow with 37 *Coprolus*-like fecal pellets, possibly complementing deposit feeding with microbial gardening 38 39 and/or food caching. Data presented here provide useful insight into the morphological evolution and bathymetric distribution of *Zoophycos*, suggesting two 'Golden Ages' for lobed *Zoophycos*: (1) 40 41 Devonian-Permian and (2) Jurassic-Neogene. This stratigraphic distribution supports the important ecological role of major terrestrialization events, that are, the Palaeozoic expansion of land plants 42 and the Mesozoic expansion of angiosperms. The consequent increased input of nutrients to coastal 43 44 areas has been an important contributor to declining trends in porewater oxygen concentrations. This phenomenon favored adaptive traits to exploit nutrient-rich but oxygen-poor niches, among 45 which the U-shaped marginal tube of lobed Zoophycos was an efficient adaptation to bring 46 oxygenated water into low-oxygen substrates. 47 48 49 50 51

52 1. Introduction

53	One of the most iconic, enigmatic and widespread ichnofossils is Zoophycos, a spreite
54	structure comprising protrusive burrows of variable length and orientation, arranged in helicoid
55	spirals with an overall circular, elliptical or lobate outline (Frey, 1970; Häntzschel, 1975;
56	Lowemark and Schafer, 2003; Rodríguez-Tovar and Uchman, 2004; Löwemark et al., 2005;
57	Kotake, 2014; Löwemark, 2015). Zoophycos has been a subject of scientific interest since the 19 th
58	century, when Johann Gotthelf Fischer von Waldheim (1811) first described Zoophycos as
59	Umbellularia logimna and interpreted it as a fossil plant (Baucon et al., 2012; Bessudnova, 2013).
60	The botanical hypothesis of Zoophycos was prominent in the 1800s, e.g., the influential researcher
61	Brogniart (1828) introduced it as Fucoides circinnatus (Plička, 1968). The botanist Massalongo
62	(1851) established the genus Zoophycos, supporting the botanical origin of the trace fossil. The
63	botanical interpretation of Zoophycos was still popular in the 1900s (e.g., Barsanti, 1902), whereas
64	Kryschtofowitsch (1911) interpreted Zoophycos from eastern Siberia as a trace fossil. The
65	ichnological interpretation of Zoophycos gained increased support by the 1950s (e.g., Seilacher,
66	1954), although Plička (1968) interpreted it as fossil prostomia of sabellids.
67	Despite over 190 years of studies on Zoophycos, its taxonomy, tracemaker and ethology, as
68	well as its palaeoenvvironmental significance, remain still mostly unresolved (Olivero, 2007;
69	Löwemark, 2015; Zhang et al., 2015b; Monaco et al., 2016). No extant organism has been observed
70	producing incipient Zoophycos (Zhang et al., 2015b). Sipunculids, polychaete annelids, arthropods
71	and echiuran worms have been proposed as possible producers of Zoophycos (Kotake, 1992;
72	Rodriguez-Tovar and Uchman, 2004). Recently proposed explanations for Zoophycos include (1)
73	deposit feeding, (2) detritus feeding, (3) refuse dumping, (4) caching surface material and (5)
74	gardening microorganisms (Kotake 1989; Bromley and Hanken 2003; Löwemark et al., 2004;
75	Olivero and Gaillard 2007; Löwemark, 2015; Monaco et al. 2016; Zhang et al. 2015a; Giannetti et
76	al. 2017). This Phanerozoic ichnotaxon has a widespread and global occurrence in the geological
77	record, appearing first in the Cambrian (Jensen 1997; Sappenfield et al. 2012) and continuing

through the Quaternary (McGugan 1963; Logan and McGugan 1968; Löwemark and Schäfer 2003;
Seilacher 2007).

Two interesting macroecological trends characterize Zoophycos (recently reviewed by Zhang 80 et al. 2015b). Firstly, this ichnotaxon shifts from more proximal, shallow environments in the early 81 Phanerozoic (Paleozoic) to more distal, closer to the continental rise, settings in the Mesozoic and 82 finally to the deeper, bathyal realm in the Palaeogene to recent times (Zhang et al. 2015b). This 83 habitat migration has been interpreted as a response to biotic pressures, particularly related to global 84 biodiversity expansion after the Permo-Triassic, Triassic-Jurassic and Cretaceous-Paleogene mass 85 extinctions (Olivero 2003; Knaust 2009; Löwemark 2012) or redistribution due to 86 87 paleogeographical reorganization of the continents (Martin 1996; Martin 2003; Martin et al. 2008). Parallel to these biotopic changes, an increase in complexity of the pattern in these trace fossils can 88 be observed, from simple, small tubes arranged in circular or elliptical patterns to complex, 89 90 spiralling multi-branched and lobated structures (Zhang et al. 2015b). While the simple morphotypes are prevalently Paleozoic, more elaborated structures appeared from the Mesozoic to 91 92 dominate the Cenozoic deep-marine record (Zhang et al. 2015b), with structural lobes oriented in 93 different directional planes (Seilacher 1974, 2007). As such, lobed Zoophycos are rare in the Palaeozoic but common in post-Palaeozoic times. 94 This study reports an unusually lobate *Zoophycos* from the early Permian Tahkandit 95 Limestone Formation (sensu Beauchamp, 1995) of the Yukon–Charley Rivers National Preserve, 96 east-central Alaska. These traces numerous vertically oriented whorls and marginal lobes, as it is 97 usually found in Cenozoic traces, anticipating the evolution of these structures by at least ~50 98 99 million years (Olivero 2003; Zhang et al. 2015b). Systematic studies on the trace fossils of the Yukon River and their paleoenvironmental significance are lacking, with regard to the environment 100 101 structure. Specifically, three major questions are posed: (1) what are the trace fossils of the Tahkandit Limestone Formation, a prominent but incompletely understood marine unit found 102

through the region? (2) What is the shape of the Yukon River *Zoophycos*? (3) Why lobed

104 *Zoophycos* are found in the Permian Tahkandit Limestone Formation?

105

106 2. Methods

Data presented in this study were collected in 2010 during a National Park Service Alaska 107 Region sponsored geological and paleontological survey of the Yukon-Charley Rivers National 108 Preserve in east-central Alaska (Fig. 1A-B). The section described in this study (Fig. 2) partially 109 overlaps with the type section of the Tahkandit Limestone Formation described by Brabb and Grant 110 (1971, Fig. 6) and the outcrop is located on the west (left) side of the Yukon River just south of the 111 merge of the Nation River (GPS: N65°10'915"; W141°42'205"), approximately 30 km west of the 112 U.S. - Canada border. The lower section of the Tahkandit Limestone Formation, informally named 113 Sandstone unit, is the subject of the bulk of this study. Tahkandit deposits are described in terms of 114 115 overall architecture, sedimentology, and major paleontological characteristic, with particular attention on identified ichnocenoses. General overall geological data used in this study are provided 116 in the geological map of Brabb and Grant (1965). Specimens referred here were collected on the 117 ancestral homeland of the Han Hwëch'in Athabascans and are housed at the Perot Museum of 118 Nature and Science, Dallas, Texas. The morphology of Zoophycos is described according the 119 terminology of Olivero (2003). 120

121

122 3. Geological Setting

The rocks in this study accumulated at the margin of Ishbel Trough and belong to the poorly defined Tahkandit Limestone which comprises outer shelf to basinal carbonates, sandstones, and shales (Bamber and Waterhouse, 1971; Beauchamp, 1995). In the Charley River and Eagle quadrangles (Fig. 1B), a major unconformity that represents the latest Devonian, Carboniferous, and basal Permian, separates the Devonian Nation River Formation (Brabb 1967; Brabb and Churkin 1967; Scott and Doher 1967; Gehrels et al. 1999) from the overlying Permian Tahkandit Limestone

deposits. The Nation River beds exposed at the locality discussed here are represented by 16 meters 129 of deposits characterized by alternated siliciclastic beds and finely laminated, organic-rich shale. 130 Both the Nation River and the Tahkandit Limestone formations have been folded by a relatively 131 small anticline structure and consequently affected by vertical normal faulting; consequently, 132 Tahkandit deposits show a dip of 62 degrees toward the north-west. The Tahkandit Limestone 133 Formation (Fig.1) has been informally divided into two lithostratigraphic unit, the basal Sandstone 134 unit, and the overlying Limestone unit (Brabb and Grant 1971). The lower interval is represented by 135 approximately 15 meters of gravish-green, glauconitic sandstone and conglomerate consisting 136 primarily of chert and quartz grains. Brachiopods are by large the most abundant fossils, whereas 137 138 bivalves, corals, arenaceous foraminifera, and bryozoans are scarce. The occurrence of the brachiopods Yakovlevia mammata and Thamnosia sp. as well as trilete spores, bisaccate pollen 139 grains, hystrichosphaerids, and megaplant remains in the glauconitic sandstones at the top of the 140 141 lower unit (Brabb and Grant 1971, and references therein, this study) support an Early Permian (Cisuralian) age and shallow marine to estuarine/tidal environments. Brabb and Grant (1971) also 142 143 reported structures "similar to Zoophycos sp." and "the so called Spirophyton sp." from this interval and confirm that such structures are widely distributed in rocks of Pennsylvanian and Permian age 144 in the Yukon territory (Nelson 1961). Sandstone and conglomeratic beds (Fig. 2B) of the lower unit 145 146 grade conformably into very pale, relatively sand- and glauconite-free limestone that forms cliffs and pinnacles typical of the morphology of the area. At a microscopic scale, the bioclastic limestone 147 is a packstone with fragments of brachiopod and thin-shelled bivalves, bryozoans, and foraminifera. 148 Finally, the Tahkandit Limestone Formation is overlain by the Glenn Shale which represents the 149 entire Middle Triassic – Early Cretaceous interval and consists primarily in grayish-black 150 carbonaceous shale with minor siltstone and quartzite. 151

152

153 4. Sedimentology and Paleontology

The basal contact between the Nation River and Tahkandit Limestone formations is only partially exposed (Fig. 2A): however, the sharp juxtaposing of dark, plastic clay and well sorted, glauconitic sandstones clearly mark the boundary between the two formations and is here used as 0 datum for the facies description (Fig. 3). Based on the lithological and sedimentological characteristics, paleontological data, and fossil trace assemblages, depositional facies are identified in the type section of the Tahkandit Limestone Formation as follows.

160

161 4.1 Foreshore Facies (F)

This facies association is represented by massive, tabular conglomerate grading upward into 162 163 gravelly sands (Fig. 3). Single beds range in thickness between 20 and 45 cm and generally display sharp-erosional base floored by extensively bioturbated, coarse gravel to coarse pebbly sandstone. 164 These deposits are very well sorted, without any coaly fragment nor sandy or muddy matrix, and 165 166 rare shell fragments. With minor exceptions, conglomerates show pervasive secondary glauconization and carbonate cement. Burrowing structures are referred to the firm ground 167 168 ichnogenera *Conostichus, Bergaueria* and *Skolithos*; vertical burrowing structures are generally robust, dwelling as deep as 80 cm into the underlying sandy deposits, and reach 5 cm in diameter. 169 The sedimentological and ichnological characteristics of this facies association suggest a high-170 171 energy coastal environment: the basal erosion surface is interpreted to be the result of wave ravinement that cut across shoreface to offshore deposits. Glauconite generally develops under 172 oxygenated to slightly reducing conditions close to the sediment/water interface and is considered 173 to represent a powerful (but not exclusive) indicator of stratigraphic condensation within marine 174 sediments (Loutit et al. 1988; Kidwell 1991). Well-developed firm ground Thalassinoides, 175 176 Conostichus, Bergaueria, Planolites, and Skolithos are here referred to the Glossifungites ichnofacies, which develops exclusively in firm, unlithified substrates such as dewatered muds or 177 compacted sands. Relevant to this study is the occurrence at 9.6 m and 14.2 m of the measured 178 section of plant remains, coaly fragments, and organic rich laminated bed that were observed and 179

180 sampled for palynological analyses. Such beds document subaerial conditions or the proximity to a181 non-marine source of sediments.

182

183 4.2 Shoreface Facies (S)

This sedimentary facies is arranged in fining-upward cross-laminated sandstone intercalated 184 with conglomeratic beds (Fig. 3). Conglomeratic beds are sharp-based, largely bioclastic and with 185 minor sandy matrix: strata are tabular to low-angle cross-stratified, reaching individual maximum 186 thickness of 30 cm. Finer-grained conglomeratic deposits are occasionally arranged in elongated 187 lenses and display a rhythmic alternation with laminar sands, suggesting a possible wave to tidal 188 influence during deposition. Alike conglomeratic deposits referred to facies F (Fig. 3), none of these 189 bed display evidence of glauconization. Fossil remains are extremely abundant and represented by 190 the brachiopods Yakovlevia mammata, Thamnosia sp., and Megousia sp., which account for the 191 192 80% of the deposits and are also found in undisturbed life position/assemblages. No ichnofossils have been observed in finer-grained conglomeratic deposits, with the exception of Skolithos traces 193 194 in a single lenticular bed (12.1 m in the measured section). Sandstones are fine- to medium-grained, 195 high-angle cross-bedded lamination, and display an overall fining upward trend with minor silty deposits. In addition, coarser sandy and bioclastic beds characterized by sharp and erosive basal 196 197 contact and scattered with gastropod and bivalve shell fragments (1 cm in average) have been observed and interpreted as tempestite deposits. Sandstones are also characterized by a rich and 198 diverse soft-ground related fossil trace assemblage which are referred to the *Skolithos* ichnofacies. 199 Identifiable ichnogenera traces include *Skolithos*, and *Bergaueria*. The central shoreface facies 200 201 (sensu Antia et al. 1994) shows a high proportion of shells, a broad range of sediment size (from fine-grained sandstones to pebble) and marked diversity in sedimentary structures (Fig. 4). The 202 203 Skolithos ichnofacies is indicative of relatively high levels of wave or current energy characterized by changes in deposition rates and physical reworking of sediments. Graded storm beds, fossil 204

205 distribution and the *Skolithos* ichnofacies are here considered as indicative of upper shoreface206 deposits.

207

208 4.3 Upper Shoreface Facies (US)

=

This facies primarily comprises fine-grained sandstone and silt with large scale, low-angle, 209 hummocky cross-stratification (1–2 meters in average), parallel lamination and an overall fining-210 211 upward trend (Fig. 3). Sandstone beds are also characterized by extensive planar and sub-planar fossil traces, whereas no macroscopic shell remains have been observed. No mudstone intercalation 212 has been observed, whereas glauconitic intervals are recurrent. Zoophycos traces (Fig 5) are by far 213 214 the most frequent of this facies: despite the vast majority range between 35 and 45 cm in size, several intervals preserve feeding traces that exceed 140 cm in diameter, with a measured maximum 215 planar extension of 165 cm. Other identified soft-ground ichnogenera include *Thalassinoides*, 216 217 Planolites, and Chondrites and therefore, together with Zoophycos are referred to the Cruziana ichnofacies. Sedimentological data suggest a lower shoreface environment with intense wave 218 219 influence on sediment distribution and events of abrupt decrease in sediment supply (or sediment 220 by-pass). The Cruziana ichnofacies develops on soft-grounds of shallow-marine, permanently subtidal, and unconsolidated substrates. The ichnogenus Zoophycos has an extremely broad 221 222 paleobathymetric range (Zheng et al., 2015b), but are commonly restricted to intervals characterized by fine, muddy sands and less effected by turbidity flows or significant bottom currents. 223 Lithological characteristic and the occurrence of Zoophycos are consistent with deposition in 224 circalittoral sites. 225

226

227 4.4 Offshore Facies (O)

This facies consists of exclusively silt- and mud-dominated deposits, showing thin-bedded laminar stratification (between 3 and 25 mm). There are no wave-formed structures, and intense bioturbation in mudstone intervals (tubular structures are identifiable) obliterated all sedimentary structures. This facies occurs in close association with finer deposits of shoreface deposits (Fig. 4).
When facies O (Fig. 2C) deposits overly very coarse beds of other shallower facies, the transition is
abrupt, suggesting a rapid shift in depositional condition. No fossil remains have been observed in
this facies. Fine-grained siltstone and mudstone beds present in this facies suggest inner shelf
environment, unaffected by the action of waves and major currents.

236

237 5, Morphology of the *Zoophycos* from the Yukon River

Zoophycos start occurring at 20 cm above the base of the section together with a rich 238 239 ichnoassemblage of Conichnus (between other traces, Fig. 4 and Table 1). Two different morphotypes have been observed, i.e., form A (unlobed) and B (lobed). The morphotypes share 240 common architectural and textural features. Specifically, both morphotypes consist of a thin layer of 241 bioturbated sediment (lamina or spreite sensu Olivero and Gaillard, 2007; see also Zhang, 242 2015). The lamina is helically coiled around a central axis and tapers vertically from a flat area to an 243 244 apical point (apex). As such, the 3D structure is roughly conical. The maximum number of whorls is 2. The lamina is characterized by arched structures (primary lamellae) that represent the positions 245 of a single forming tunnel moving though the sediment (see Olivero, 2003). There is no evidence of 246 247 secondary lamellae, i.e., arched structures located in the spaces between the primary lamellae (Olivero, 2003). When preserved, the burrow fill is darker than the host rock and consists of 248 millimetric ellipsoidal pellets. The structures, especially the lobed form B, frequently display a 249 marginal tube. Many traces present the typical central tube which marginally spread creating a fan-250 251 like lobe of coarser (Fig. 5), more spaced spreiten and a more dorsally pronounced axis of coiling, 252 which forms a sort of proximal "stem" (Fig. 5; e.g. Oliviero and Gaillard 2007). The depth of this axis can range to 20 cm and up to two coils can be counted in the three dimensionally preserved 253 traces (Fig. 5). The two morphotypes differ in the shape of the lamellae and of the lamina outline. 254 255

256 5.1 Form A (unlobed; Fig. 5A, E, F).

Form A comprises several J-shaped lamellae that form the spreite. Each lamella departs from a common apical point and follows a sub-parallel arrangement with regard to the other lamellae. The lamellae arrangement results in a roughly circular outline of the lamina. The studied specimens display sinistral coiling, but dextral coiling cannot be excluded because of limited number of specimens observed. No secondary lamellae have been documented. The diameter of the structures is approximately 20 cm, although the fragmentary nature of the material precludes an exact estimate of the lamina size.

264

265 5.2 Form B (lobed; Fig. 5B, C, D)

Form B consists of several U-shaped primary lamellae that form the spreite. The lamellae 266 267 arrangement results in a skirt-like lamina with lobate outline. The lamina (Figs. 5, 6) is bounded by a marginal tube (Fig. 5B, C). Centrally to the marginal tube, the primary lamellae develop 268 according to the same planar orientation the U-shaped structure. While secondary lamellae are 269 absent (Fig. 6A, B), an irregular surface is present on some traces (Fig. 6C). Large unbioturbated 270 areas are found in-between adjacent lobes (Fig. 5B). Some lobes are tongue-like, being long and 271 272 distinct from the rest of the lamina (Fig. 5C). Smaller tongue lobes (child lobes) can branch off from larger tongue lobes (parent lobes) (Fig. 5C). The axis of the child lobe in Fig. 5C forms an 273 angle of 84° with the axis of its parent lobe. The structures measured at this section (Fig. 3) range in 274 275 size from 140–160 cm.

276

277 6. Taxonomy, tracemaker and behavior of the Yukon River *Zoophycos*

The studied spreite structures share the major architectural elements with the ichnogenus *Zoophycos*, which is characterized by (1) a spreite; (2) protrusive burrows of variable length and orientation, arranged in helicoid spirals; (3) circular, elliptical or lobate outline; (4) a marginal tube, which is often, but not always, present (Frey, 1970; Häntzschel, 1975; Kotake, 2014; Löwemark et al., 2005; Lowemark and Schafer, 2003; Rodríguez-Tovar and Uchman, 2004; Löwemark, 2015).

As such, the studied structures are attributed to the ichnogenus Zoophycos. The morphological 283 284 heterogeneity of Zoophycos is so large that, perhaps, it would be better to refer to a 'Zoophycos group' rather than to a single ichnogenus (Uchman, 1999; see also Olivero, 2003). Early description 285 of ichnoassemblages from estuarine Permian beds in the arctic (Miller, 1991) reported the 286 occurrence of *Spirophyton*, an ichnotaxon characterized by spiral-like structures and opportunistic 287 288 strategies (Bromley, 1996). Although superficially similar to Zoophycos, Spirophyton presents 289 unlobed edges lacking marginal tubes (Jensen, 1997; Miller, 2003; Seilacher, 2007). 290 Following Knaust (2004), no determination at the ichnospecies have been done for the studied specimens because of the poor ichnotaxonomic status of Zoophycos. However, the studied 291 292 *Zoophycos* can be readily compared with the morphotypes described in previous studies. Accordingly, the here studied form A resembles morphotypes A and B of Olivero (2003), which 293 present simple or very slightly lobate outline. Similarly, form A resembles the "cock-tail shaped 294 295 spreiten with J-shaped primary lamellae" described by Zhang et al. (2015b). The cock-tail Zoophycos of Zhang et al. (2015) is typical of Palaeozoic nearshore to offshore settings. By 296 297 contrast, the here studied form B resembles morphotype D of Olivero (2003), which is characterized 298 by strongly lobate margins and lack of secondary lamellae. Morphotype D is typical of Late Cretaceous units deposited in deep slope to basin environments (Olivero, 2003). It should also be 299 300 noted that the size range of the studied Zoophycos matches the width size range (140 - 160 cm) of the largest Zoophycos traces recorded in the Phanerozoic (Zhang et al. 2015b). According to Zhang 301 et al. (2015b), the width of the Zoophycos spreite increased from 18 cm in the Lower Palaeozoic to 302 43 cm in the Cenozoic. 303

Both forms of *Zoophycos* from the Yukon River are filled by elliptical pellets. These are interpreted as a bioprint, that is, the "tracemaker's signature", a set of characters that allow recognition of the producer (Kopaska-Merkel and Rindsberg, 2015). Because both forms of *Zoophycos* share the same bioprint, they plausibly shared the same tracemaker. A vermiform, softbodied producer is a viable hypothesis in light of the pellet-filled tunnels of the modern polychaete

Nereis (Kulkarni and Panchang, 2015). This hypothesis is also supported by the modern terebellid 309 310 polychaete Terebellides stroemi, constructing inclined, Rhizocorallium-like spreite burrows with Coprolus-like faecal pellets (Knaust, 2013). The fecal pellets within the Yukon River Zoophycos fit 311 with the characteristics of the ichnofamily Coprulidae, which comprises rounded, smooth or 312 sculptured, structureless or structured coprolites and cololites (Knaust, 2020). Various animals 313 produce Coprulidae, foremost polychaetes and other annelids, as well as enteropneusts, gastropods, 314 315 bivalves, tunicates and insects (Knaust, 2020). Pellets are also associated with Bohemian Ordovician body fossils (Bruthansová and Kraft, 2003) and they are found in Paleozoic burrows as 316 well (Uchman et al., 2005; Baucon et al., 2020). The excellent preservation of fecal pellets in the 317 318 Yukon River Zoophycos suggests low-oxygen conditions in the interstitial waters, which are known to play a role in preserving fecal pellets (Podhalańska, 2007; Neto de Carvalho et al., 2016; Baucon 319 et al., 2020). 320

The presence of pellets has also an important behavioral significance because it shows that 321 the tracemaker actively filled its tunnels. According to the reviews of Löwemark and Schäfer, 2003 322 323 and Löwemark et al., 2004, the behavioral models of *Zoophycos* are the (1) deposit feeder model; (2) detritus feeder model; (3) refuse dump model; (4) gardening model; (5) cache model. The 324 morphology of the Yukon River structures is compatible with several of the proposed ethological 325 models for Zoophycos, with specific emphasis on the deposit feeding, gardening and cache models. 326 327 In the deposit feeder model, the tracemaker is a deposit feeder, feeding on the outer wall, and excreting its feces on the inner wall (e.g., Wetzel and Werner, 1981; see also the reviews of the 328 329 Zoophycos models in Löwemark and Schäfer, 2003 and Löwemark et al., 2004). This model can 330 explain the morphology of the Yukon River Zoophycos, with specific reference to the lobed form B. In fact, the general morphology of form B is compatible with a sensory-driven, directed search for 331 heterogeneously distributed trophic resources within the substrate. Animals seek to maximize their 332 333 net rate of energy intake, that is, the difference between energetic benefit and their energetic 334 expenditure while searching for, handling, consuming, and digesting food (LaScala-Gruenewald et

al., 2019). To do so, they spend more time in food-rich areas than in areas with scarce resources, 335 336 also benefiting from sensory information on local resource density (Mårell et al., 2002; Stenberg and Persson, 2005; Chapperon and Seuront, 2011; Sinervo, 2013). In this regard, the presence of 337 vast unbioturbated areas between the *Zoophycos* lobes is compatible with areas with scarce 338 resources. Tongue lobes and the wide angles between parent and child lobes are indicative of 339 sensory-directed movement towards food-rich areas. Overall, these features suggest that the 340 341 producer of the Yukon River Zoophycos developed movement patterns adapted to the distribution of food to maximize its net energy intake through time. It should also be noted that the construction 342 of well-developed and defined lobes has been interpreted as either an explorative function of the 343 344 tracemaker (as previously suggested) or the effect of avoiding an obstacle (Fig. 6D), like a coarser grain, in the sediment (Oliviero and Gaillard 2007; Gong et al. 2010). 345

346 In the detritus feeding model, the producer deposits fecal pellets in the sediment in order to remove them from the feeding area on the surface (Kotake, 1991). This model does not explain the 347 presence of vast unbioturbated areas between lobes, the characteristic tongue lobes, and the wide 348 349 angles between child and parent lobes. The detritus feeding model also does not explain the requirement of having an open U-shaped marginal tube, as shown by the Yukon River Zoophycos. 350 A similar objection has been proposed by Löwemark et al. (2004). However, the detritus feeding 351 hypothesis should be reconsidered in light of the similarity between Zoophycos form B and the 352 353 incipient *Rhizocorallium* produced by the modern polychaete *Terebellides stroemi*, which feeds on 354 suspended detritus (Moverley et al., 1986). In fact, *Terebellides stroemi* produces inclined, spreite burrows filled with Coprolus-like faecal pellets (Knaust, 2013). 355

According to the refuse dump model, the tracemaker is a deposit feeder sitting head-down in the burrow and introducing pelleted surface material as ballast to compensate for the material ingested and excreted at the surface (Bromley, 1991; see also the reviews of the Zoophycos models in Löwemark and Schäfer, 2003, and Löwemark et al., 2004). This model does not fit with the hypothesized fecal origin of the pellets of the Yukon River *Zoophycos*. Specifically, the pellets of

the Yukon River Zoophycos are very dark in colour, suggesting a high organic content which, in 361 362 turn, may indicate a fecal origin. For instance, the fresh pellets of the modern polychaete Heteromastus filiformis display an organic content 2.4-fold higher than in the feeding zone 363 sediment because of selective uptake of organic-rich matter (Neira and Höpner, 1994; see also 364 Baucon et al., 2020). According to the gardening model, the producer feeds on detritus on the 365 seafloor and deposits its fecal pellets in the sediment. Oxygenated water is pumped through the 366 367 burrow along the marginal tube, allowing micro-organisms to thrive. The producer then feeds on the microbial content (Bromley, 1991; see also the reviews of the Zoophycos models in Löwemark and 368 Schäfer, 2003 and Löwemark et al., 2004). In the cache model, the Zoophycos producer collects 369 370 food during good times and stores it for bad times (Bromley, 1991; Miller III and D'Alberto, 2001; see also Löwemark and Schäfer, 2003 and Löwemark et al., 2004). The gardening and cache model 371 only partially fit with the Yukon River Zoophycos because there is no evidence of feeding on 372 373 previously stored material.

In sum, the morphology of the lobed *Zoophycos* of the Yukon River is suggestive of a deposit feeder that filled its tunnels with fecal pellets. Marine invertebrates commonly switch between different feeding modes, therefore, deposit feeding does not exclude gardening and caching behavior(s) using the fecal products of deposit feeding. The interpretation proposed for the Yukon River specimens does not necessarily apply to each and every *Zoophycos*, especially because the morphological heterogeneity of *Zoophycos* is large (Uchman, 1999; Olivero, 2003), which suggests a wide ethological heterogeneity.

381

382 6.1 The two Golden Ages of lobed *Zoophycos*

This report not only provides new stratigraphic data for a Permian rock unit that crops out along the Yukon River but contributes new insights on the macroevolutionary history of one of the most iconic and widespread ichnotaxon in paleoichnology. An Early Permian age for this section is supported by the co-occurrence of the brachiopods *Yakovlevia mammata* and *Thamnosia* sp. as well as trilete spores, bisaccate pollen grains, hystrichosphaerids, and megaplant remains in the
glauconitic sandstones as typically described for the Tahkandit Limestone Formation (Brabb and
Grant 1971). Because of its Permian age, and lobed morphology, the *Zoophycos* form B occupies a
place of prominence in the evolution of the ichnogenus, as defined by previous authors (Seilacher,
1986; Bottjer et al., 1988; Olivero, 2003; Zhang et al., 2015b). According to these authors, three
aspects of *Zoophycos* changed markedly across the Phanerozoic:

- Habitat: *Zoophycos* is typically found in shelf deposits in the Palaeozoic, lower shelf slope in the Mesozoic, and bathyal settings in the Cenozoic (Seilacher, 1986; Bottjer et
 al., 1988; Olivero, 2003; Zhang et al., 2015b; see also Baucon and Avanzini, 2008);
- 396
 2. Tiering: *Zoophycos* shifted gradually from the shallow to deep tiers of marine substrates
 397 in the Phanerozoic (Zhang et al., 2015b).
- 398 3. Morphology: *Zoophycos* evolved from small, simple, helicoidal, rooster-shaped,

401

circular/elliptical spreiten of one to two whorls without marginal lobes in the Palaeozoic,
to large, complex, helicoidal, lobate spreiten of several whorls in the Cenozoic

(Seilacher, 1986; Bottjer et al., 1988; Olivero, 2003; Zhang et al., 2015b)

The form B of the Yukon River Zoophycos fit well with the typical habitat of Palaeozoic 402 Zoophycos, i.e., the sedimentological features associated with Zoophycos, together with the body 403 404 and trace fossil content, indicate a shoreface setting. The studied Zoophycos provide no unquestionable evidence of tiering depth, although their excellent preservation may indicate a deep-405 tier nature. In fact, shallow-tier structures tend to be obliterated by bioturbation, whereas deep-tier 406 structures tend to dominate an ichnofabric (Bromley, 1996). In addition, the preservation of pellets 407 within Zoophycos suggests that the burrow system has been produced in low-oxygen conditions, 408 which are usually (but not exclusively) associated with deeper tiers. 409

The most peculiar feature of the studied *Zoophycos* is the lobed morphology of form B. The *Zoophycos* form B described herein is a three-dimensionally arranged structure with complex,
marginally lobed spreiten, morphologically similar to those described for Cenozoic bathyal

sediments (e.g. Monaco et al. 2016). To analyze the distribution of lobed *Zoophycos* trough time, 413 414 we used the "Phanerozoic Zoophycos database" (Zhang et al., 2015b: Supplementary Table S1), as a source dataset. This comprehensive dataset reveals two Palaeozoic sites with lobed Zoophycos, 415 416 namely the Catskill Mountains (Devonian, USA) and Malý Rabštýn (Carboniferous, Czech Republic). The dataset has been implemented with the Carboniferous and Permian lobed Zoophycos 417 of the Pramollo Basin (Italy-Austria) (Baucon and Carvalho, 2008; Baucon et al., 2015) and the 418 419 here studied Yukon River ones. By contrast, sites with no information on the basic morphology of Zoophycos have been filtered out from the source dataset. 420

To evaluate the evolution of lobed *Zoophycos*, we calculated (1) the lobed ratio (Fig. 7A), 421 422 that is the proportion between the number of sites with lobed Zoophycos and (2) the total number of sites with lobed Zoophycos (Fig. 7B). Although the oldest Zoophycos of the dataset is Cambrian in 423 age, no lobed Zoophycos are documented before the Devonian (Fig. 7). The lobed ratio increased 424 425 from the Devonian to the Permian, dropped in the Triassic, and increased again from the Jurassic onwards (Fig. 7B). Accordingly, two 'Golden Ages' of lobed Zoophycos are distinguished: (1) 426 427 Devonian-Permian and (2) Jurassic-Neogene. Overall, lobed specimens were much commoner in 428 the second interval than during Palaeozoic times (Fig. 7A). It should be noted that these two Golden Ages of lobed Zoophycos partially coincides with the first (Devonian) and the last (Cretaceous-429 430 Cenozoic) radiation of Zoophycos, which have previously been established by Zhang et al. (2015b). 431

432 6.2 Lobed *Zoophycos* as a product of terrestrialization

The two Golden Ages of lobed *Zoophycos* (Devonian-Permian and Jurassic-Neogene) are both linked with changes in nutrient dynamics. The widespread appearance of lobed *Zoophycos* is contemporaneous with the oceanographic changes that have occurred during the Middle Jurassic, when deep-sea bottom nutrient conditions were greatly improved by increased particulate organic carbon and dissolved organic carbon derived from surface plankton bloom (Zhang et al., 2015b). It should be noted that this event was followed by a major radiation of land plants in the Cretaceous,

which also increased the supply of nutrients to the oceans (Allmon and Martin, 2014). The 439 440 increased shelf areas and plankton blooms have been hypothesized to have driven the high occurrence frequencies of Zoophycos in the Cretaceous-Cenozoic (Zhang et al., 2015b). 441 442 Another profound change in nutrient cycling begun with the Paleozoic origin of wood in plants, permanently shifting the distribution of active carbon species within the global carbon cycle by the 443 end of the Mississippian (Strother et al., 2010). This phase of the terrestrialization process has its 444 roots in the Devonian (Givetian-Frasinian), with the rise of lignophytes (Strother et al., 2010; 445 Kenrick et al., 2012). Large trees with well-developed rooting systems are unlikely to predate the 446 447 Middle Devonian (Kenrick et al., 2012). Intriguingly, the earliest documented lobed Zoophycos dates back to the Givetian (Miller, 1979). The Devonian radiation of lobed Zoophycos coincides 448 449 with the first Zoophycos radiation, which has been linked to the rise of deep-rooted plants (Zhang et 450 al., 2015b). Before of the major intervals of diversification of land plants (Devonian expansion of 451 land plants and the Cretaceous expansion of angiosperms), the supply of nutrients to the oceans by terrestrial runoff was lower than it was afterward (Allmon and Martin, 2014). 452 Contemporaneous events do not necessarily mean causality; therefore, a question might 453 arise: How can nutrient enrichment favor the evolution of lobed Zoophycos? The answer is provided 454 455 by the U-shaped marginal tube of Zoophycos, which represents an efficient adaptation to dwell into nutrient-rich but oxygen-poor substrates. Specifically, the increased input of nutrients to coastal 456 areas has been suggested as an important contributor to declining trends in bottom water oxygen 457

458 concentrations (Diaz and Rosenberg, 1995). Indeed, there is a known interaction between supply of

459 nutrients, primary production, sedimentation and oxygen consumption (Rydberg et al., 1990).

Consequently, from a macroevolutionary perspective, any global increase in seawater nutrients is expected to favor biological adaptations to cope with low-oxygen substrates. Among such adaptations, U-shaped burrows allow to efficiently induce the flow of oxygenated seawater within the substrate (Bromley, 1996). For this reason, *Zoophycos* with U-shaped tunnels are linked with poorly oxygenated conditions, whereas *Zoophycos* with J-shaped tunnels, connected with only one

opening to the seafloor, have been taken to suggest a well-oxygenated setting (Wetzel and Werner, 465 466 1981; Gong et al., 2008). The two Golden Ages of lobed Zoophycos are separated by the Triassic, when a decline in the relative (Fig. 7A) and absolute (Fig. 7B) number of lobed Zoophycos is 467 observed. This decline in lobed Zoophycos is plausibly explained by the effects of the end-Permian 468 extinction on biodiversity and nutrient dynamics. In fact, the aridity of the Late Permian climate, the 469 collapse of the peat mire ecosystem at the Permian-Triassic boundary and the protracted arid 470 471 conditions during the Early Triassic reduced the terrigenous influx of nutrients into the ocean (Zharkov and Chumakov, 2001; Michaelsen, 2002; Benton and Newell, 2014). 472

473 The two Golden Ages of lobed Zoophycos take place in different environmental settings. The Yukon River Zoophycos well exemplifies this phenomenon, since its shoreface setting differs 474 475 from the typical deep-sea environment of the Mesozoic and Cenozoic lobed specimens. Lobed 476 forms of Zoophycos have a bathymetric range spanning from the lower shelf-slope in the Mesozoic to the bathyal realm in the Cenozoic. In particular, the here studied form B resembles the lobed 477 Zoophycos without secondary lamellae described by Olivero (2003), who suggests that lobed 478 479 Zoophycos are typical of Late Cretaceous units deposited in deep slope to basin environments. This different scenario can be explained with the Mesozoic increase in competition in shallow-marine 480 settings. In fact, according to Zhang et al. (2015b), the accelerated competition in the Mesozoic 481 neritic seas might have forced the producers of Zoophycos to migrate to bathyal environments. In 482 addition, the Devonian rise of lignophytes may have had a more profound impact on shallow-483 484 marine environments than on the deep-sea, since the nutrient increase was linked to the land-sea supply of nutrients. By contrast, the Cretaceous expansion of angiosperms was predated by 485 plankton radiations, which plausibly had a more direct impact on deep-sea settings. In fact, the 486 Middle Jurassic was characterized by a major ecological transition within the coccolithophores, and 487 the radiation of one of the principal families of cyst-forming dinoflagellates (Wiggan et al., 2018). 488

489

490 7. Conclusions

A paleontological reconnaissance survey of an Early Permian unit along the Yukon River in 491 492 east-central Alaska has provided new ichnological data for the unit as well as new information on macroevolution of complex Zoophycos-group trace fossils. The producer of the here studied 493 Zoophycos is regarded as a deposit-feeder using sensory-driven, directed search for locating 494 heterogeneously distributed trophic resources. It filled its burrow with Coprolus-like fecal pellets, 495 possibly integrating deposit feeding with microbial gardening and/or food caching. However, the 496 497 proposed hypothesis cannot be tested against a neoichnological analogue of Zoophycos, which has not been described yet. Further neoichnological research is therefore encouraged in this direction. 498 Two 'Golden Ages' of lobed Zoophycos are distinguished in this study: (1) Devonian-Permian and 499 500 (2) Jurassic-Neogene. This distribution supports the important role of terrestralization events in driving the Zoophycos morphology, i.e., radiations of land plants increased nutrient input to the 501 502 oceans and decreased porewater oxygenation, thus favoring biological adaptations to exploit 503 nutrient-rich but oxygen-poor substrates. The characteristic U-shaped marginal tube of lobed Zoophycos is among these adaptations. Further research in other Paleozoic units is needed to 504 confirm the observed trend and derive a more detailed model of the relationship between Zoophycos 505 506 and terrestralization events. Finally, this study shows a fruitful integration between detailed lithostratigraphy with ichnological analysis, allowing to enlighten the macroevolution of this 507 508 enigmatic ichnotaxon for the whole Phanerozoic.

509

510 Acknowledgments

The authors thank the National Park Service Alaska Region (NPS) and the staff of Yukon– Charley Rivers National Preserve for their financial and logistical support. The authors particularly thank Stephen Hasiotis (University of Kansas), Linda Stromquist, Tom Liebscher, Pat Sanders, and Jobe Chakuchin of the NPS for their help in executing the field aspect of this work. David Norton made valuable contributions during the field-collecting phase of this project. FF was also supported with funding by the Museo Geologico Giovanni Capellini (Bologna, Italy) and financially

517	supported by Fondazione Alma Mater, Professor G. Gabbianelli (Dipartimento di Scienze
518	Biologiche, Geologiche e Ambientali, Università di Bologna, Italy). AAC was supported by a
519	Postdoctoral Research Fellowship in Vertebrate Paleontology at the Perot Museum of Nature and
520	Science in Dallas (Texas, United States) and through the European Research Council (ERC) starting
521	grant under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, grant
522	agreement No. 947921, MAPAS at the Universidade de Vigo (Spain). The work of AB has been
523	supported by the CAMBIACLIMA project (University of Genova). The authors thank L. Zhang for
524	discussion on Zoophycos and for providing supplementary material.
525	
526	References
527	
528	Allmon, W.D., Martin, R.E., 2014. Seafood through time revisited: the Phanerozoic increase in
529	marine trophic resources and its macroevolutionary consequences. Paleobiol. 40, 256-287.
530	Bamber, E.W., Waterhouse, J.B., 1971. Carboniferous and Permian stratigraphy and
531	paleontology, northern Yukon Territory, Canada. Bull. Can. Petrol. Geo.119, 29-250
532	Barsanti, L., 1902. Considerationi sopra il genere Zoophycos. Atti della Soc. Toscana Sci. nat.
533	Mem. 18, 68–95.
534	Baucon, A., Avanzini, M., 2008, Zoophycos-like structures associated with dinosaur tracks in a
535	tidal-flat environment: Lower Jurassic (Southern Alps, Italy). In: Avanzini, M., Petti, F.M.
536	(Eds.), Italian Ichnology. Studi Trent. Sci. Nat. Acta Geol.: Museo Tridentino di Storia
537	Naturale, Trento, pp. 123–131.
538	Baucon, A., Bordy, E., Brustur, T., Buatois, L.A., De, C., Duffin, C., Felletti, F., Lockley, M.,
539	Lowe, P., Mayor, A., Mayoral, E., Muttoni, G., Carvalho, C.N. De, Santos, A., et al., 2012. A
540	History of Ideas in Ichnology, In: Knaust, D., Bromley, R.G. (Eds.), Trace Fossils as Indicators
541	of Sedimentary Environments. Developments in Sedimentology 64: Elsevier, Amsterdam, pp.
542	3–43.

543	Baucon, A., Carvalho, C., 2008. From the river to the sea: Pramollo, a new ichnolagerstätte from
544	the Carnic Alps: Studi Trent. Sci. Nat. Acta Geol. 83, 87–114.
545	Baucon, A., Corradini, C., Floris, M., Briguglio, A., Cabella, R., Campomenosi, N., Piazza, M.,
546	Corriga, M.G., 2020. Life in near-anoxic conditions: A case study of the ichnology and
547	infaunal ecology of Silurian graptolitic black shales from Sardinia, Italy. Palaeogeog.
548	Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 556, 109889, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2020.109889.
549	Baucon, A., Venturini, C., Neto de Carvalho, C., Felletti, F., de Carvalho, C.N., Felletti, F.,
550	Muttoni, G., 2015. Behaviours mapped by new geographies: ichnonetwork analysis of the Val
551	Dolce Formation (lower Permian; Italy-Austria). Geosphere, 11, 744–776, doi:
552	10.1130/GES00994.1.
553	Beauchamp, B., 1995. Permian History of North America. In: Scholle, P.A., Peryt, T.M., Ulmer-
554	Scholle, O.S. (Eds.), The Permian of Northern Pangea, v. 2. Sedimentary Basins and
555	Economic Resources. Springer Verlag, Heidelberg, New York, p. 3-22.
556	Benton, M.J., Newell, A.J., 2014. Impacts of global warming on Permo-Triassic terrestrial
557	ecosystems. Gondwana Res., 25, 1308–1337, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gr.2012.12.010.
558	Brabb, E.E, Churkin, M.Jr., 1969. Geological Map of the Charley River Quadrangle, East-Central
559	Alaska. United States Geological Survey, Miscellaneous Geologic Investigations Map I-573
560	scale 1:250,000.
561	Brabb, E.E., Grant, R.E., 1971. Stratigraphy and paleontology of the revised type section for the
562	Tahkandit Limestone (Permian) in east-central Alaska. United States Geological Survey
563	Professional Paper 703, pp. 1-35.
564	Bessudnova, Z., 2013. Grigory (Gotthelf) Fischer Von Waldheim (1771-1853): Author of the First
565	Scientific Works on Russian Geology and Palæontology: (D. Oldroyd, Ed.). Earth Sci. Hist.
566	32, 102–120, doi: 10.17704/eshi.32.1.n68416x30q114916.
567	Bottjer, D.J., Droser, M.L., Jablonski, D., 1988. Palaeoenvironmental trends in the history of trace
568	fossils. Nature, 333, 252–255.

- Bromley, R.G., 1991. *Zoophycos*: Strip mine, refuse dump, cache or sewage farm? Lethaia, 24,
 460–462.
- Bromley, R.G., 1996. Trace fossils: biology, taphonomy and applications, 2nd ed.: Chapman & Hall,
 London (361 pp.).
- Bromley, R.G., Ekdale, A., 1984. *Chondrites*: a trace fossil indicator of anoxia in sediments.
 Science, 224, 872–874.
- Bromley, R.G., Hanken, N.M., 2003. Structure and function of large, lobed *Zoophycos*,
 Pliocene of Rhodes, Greece. Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 192, 79–100.
- Bruthansová, J., Kraft, P., 2003. Pellets independent of or associated with Bohemian Ordovician
 body fossils. Acta Palaeontol. Pol. 48, 437–445.
- Chapperon, C., Seuront, L., 2011. Variability in the motion behaviour of intertidal gastropods:
 Ecological and evolutionary perspectives. J. Marine Biol. Assoc. UK, 91, 237–244, doi:
 10.1017/S002531541000007X.
- Diaz, R.J., Rosenberg, R., 1995. Marine benthic hypoxia: A review of its ecological effects and the
 behavioural responses of benthic macrofauna. Oceanography and Marine Biol,: Ann. Rev., 33,
 245–303.
- Fischer de Waldheim, J., 1811. Recherches sur les encrinites, les polycères et les ombellulaires
 Moscou. Notice des fossiles du gouvernement de Moscou. vol 3. University Press, Moscow.
- Frey, R.W., 1970. Trace fossils of Fort Hays Limestone Member of Niobrara Chalk (Upper
 Cretaceous), west-central Kansas. Univ. Kansas Paleontol. Contrib., 53, 1–41.
- Giannetti, A., Tent- Manclús, J. E., Baeza- Carratalá, J.F., 2017. New evidence of nearshore Mid Triassic *Zoophycos*: morphological and Palaeoenivronmental characterization. Facies,
 63:16.
- 592 Gong, Y.M., Shi, G.R., Zhang, L.J., Weldon, E.A., 2010. Zoophycos composite
- ichnofabrics and tiers from the Permian neritic facies in South China and southeastern
- 594 Australia, Lethaia, 43, 182–196.

- Häntzschel, W., 1975. Trace fossils and problematica. In: Teichert, C., (Ed.), Treatise on
- Invertebrate Paleontology: Geological Society of America, University of Kansas, Boulder,
 Colorado and Lawrence, Kansas, p. WI-W269.
- Jensen, S. 1997. Trace fossils from the Lower Cambrian Mickwitzia sandstone, south-central
 Sweden. Fossils and Strata, 42, 1-110.
- 600 Kenrick, P., Wellman, C.H., Schneider, H., Edgecombe, G.D., 2012. A timeline for
- terrestrialization: consequences for the carbon cycle in the Palaeozoic. Phil. Trans. Royal Soc.
 B: Biol. Sci., 367, 519–536, doi: 10.1098/rstb.2011.0271.
- Knaust, D., 2004. The oldest Mesozoic nearshore *Zoophycos*: evidence from the German Triassic.
- 604 Lethaia, 37, 297–306, doi: 10.1080/00241160410002045.
- Knaust, D., 2008. Balanoglossites MÄGDEFRAU, 1932 from the Middle Triassic of Germany: part
- of a complex trace fossil probably produced by burrowing and boring polychaetes: Paläontol.
- 607 Zeitschriftontol. Zeitschrift, 82, 347–372.
- Knaust, D., 2009. Complex behavioural pattern as an aid to identify the producer of *Zoophycos*from the Middle Permian of Oman. Lethaia, 42, 146–154.
- 610 Knaust, D., 2013. The ichnogenus *Rhizocorallium*: Classification, trace makers,
- 611 palaeoenvironments and evolution. Earth-Science Rev., 126, 1–47, doi:
- 612 10.1016/j.earscirev.2013.04.007.
- Knaust, D., 2020. Invertebrate coprolites and cololites revised: (L. Marchetti, Ed.), Papers in
- 614 Palaeontology, v. 6, p. 385–423, doi: 10.1002/spp2.1297.
- 615 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/spp2.1297.
- 616 Kopaska-Merkel, D.C., Rindsberg, A.K., 2015. Bioirrigation in *Alph* n. igen., arthropod cubichnia
- from the Mississippian Hartselle Sandstone of Alabama (USA). Geodinamica Acta, 28, 1–19,
 doi: 10.1080/09853111.2015.1108569.
- Kotake, N., 1989. Paleoecology of the *Zoophycos* producers. Lethaia, 22, 327–341.
- 620 Kotake, N., 1991. Non-selective surface deposit feeding by the Zoophycos producers. Lethaia, 24,

- 621 379–385, doi: 10.1111/j.1502-3931.1991.tb01489.x.
- Kotake, N., 1992. Deep- sea echiurans: possible producers of Zoophycos. Lethaia, 25, 311–316,
 doi: 10.1111/j.1502-3931.1992.tb01400.x.
- Kotake, N., 2014. Changes in lifestyle and habitat of *Zoophycos* -producing animals related to
 evolution of phytoplankton during the Late Mesozoic: geological evidence for the 'benthic-
- 626 pelagic coupling model.' Lethaia, 47, 165–175.
- Kryschtofowitsch, A.N., 1911. Ueber problematische Algenreste Taonurus-Spirophyton aus
 Juraablagerungen des Ussuri–Golfes. Izvestia Geologicheskogo Komiteta, 191, 477–486.
- Kulkarni, K.G., Panchang, R., 2015. New insights into polychaete traces and fecal pellets: Another
 complex ichnotaxon? PLoS ONE, 10, 1–10, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0139933.
- 631 LaScala-Gruenewald, D.E., Mehta, R.S., Liu, Y., Denny, M.W., 2019. Sensory perception plays a
- larger role in foraging efficiency than heavy-tailed movement strategies. Ecological Modelling,
 404, 69–82, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2019.02.015.
- Logan, A., McGugan, A., 1968. Biostratigraphy and faunas of the Permian Ishbel Group, Canadian
 Rocky Mountains. J. Paleontol., 42,1123-1139.
- Löwemark, L., 2012. Ethological analysis of the trace fossil *Zoophycos*: hints from the Arctic
 Ocean. Lethaia, 45, 290–298.
- Löwemark, L., 2015. Testing ethological hypotheses of the trace fossil *Zoophycos* based on
- 639 Quaternary material from the Greenland and Norwegian Seas. Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol.

640 Palaeoecol. 425, 1–13, http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2015.02.025.

- Löwemark, L., In-Tian, L., Chung-Ho, W., Chih-An, H., Kuo-Yen, W., Chih-Wei, C., 2004.
- Ethology of the *Zoophycos*-Producer: Arguments against the Gardening Model from δ 13 C
 org Evidences of the Spreiten Material. TAO, 15, 713–725.
- Löwemark, L., Lin, H.-L., Sarnthein, M., 2005. Temporal variations of the trace fossil Zoophycos in
- a 425 ka long sediment record from the South China Sea: implications for the ethology of the
- 646 Zoophycos producer. Geol. Mag., 143, 105-114, doi: 10.1017/S0016756805001408.

Lowemark, L., Schafer, P., 2003, Ethological implications from a detailed X-ray radiograph and
14C study of the modern deep-sea *Zoophycos*. Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 192,

649 101–121, doi: 10.1016/S0031-0182(02)00681-8.

- http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0031018202006818. Checked March 2011.
- 651 Mangano, G., Buatois, L., Aceñolaza, G., 1996. Trace fossils and sedimentary facies from a
- Late Cambrian- Early Ordovician tide- dominated shelf (Santa Rosita Formation, northwest
 Argentina): implications for ichnofacies models of shallow marine successions. Ichnos, 5,
 53-88.
- Mårell, A., Ball, J.P., Hofgaard, A., 2002. Foraging and movement paths of female reindeer:
- insights from fractal analysis, correlated random walks, and Lévy flights. Can. J. Zool, 80,
 854–865, doi: 10.1139/z02-061.
- Martin, R.E., 1996. Secular increase in nutrient levels through the Phanerozoic: implications for
 productivity, biomass and diversity of the marine biosphere. Palaios, 11, 209–219.
- Martin, R.E., 2003. The fossil record of biodiversity: nutrients, productivity, habitat area and
 differential preservation. Lethaia, 36, 179–193.
- Martin, R.E., Quigg, A., Podkovyrov, V., 2008. Marine biodiversification in response to
- evolving phytoplankton stoichiometry. Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol.
- 664 Palaeoecol., 258, 277–291.
- Massalongo, A., 1855. *Zoophycos*, novum genus Plantarum fossilium. 45–52 (Antonellianis,
 Veronae.
- 667 McGugan, A., 1963. Problematical "*Zoophycos*" from the Permian of western Canada. Ann. Mag.
- 668 Nat. Hist., 6,107-112.Michaelsen, P., 2002. Mass extinction of peat-forming plants and the
- effect on fluvial styles across the Permian-Triassic boundary, northern Bowen Basin,
- Australia. Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 179, 173–188.
- Miller, M.F., 1979. Paleoenvironmental distribution of trace fossils in the Catskill deltaic complex,
- New York State. Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 28, 117–141.

- Miller, M.F., 1991. Morphology and paleoenvironmental distribution of Paleozoic *Spirophyton*and *Zoophycos*: implications for the *Zoophycos* ichnofacies. Palaios, 6, 410-425.
- Miller, M.F. 2003. Styles of behavioral complexity record by selected trace fossils. Palaeogeog.
 Palaeoclim. Palaeoecol. 192, 33–44
- 677 Miller III, W., D'Alberto, L., 2001. Paleoethologic implications of *Zoophycos* from Late Cretaceous
- and Paleocene limestones of the Venetian Prealps , northeastern Italy. Palaeogeog.
- Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 166, 237–247.
- 680 Monaco, P., Bracchini, L., Rodriguez-Tovar, F., Uchman, A., Coccioni, R., 2016.
- 681 Evolutionary trend of *Zoophycos* morphotypes from the Upper Cretaceous–Lower Miocene
- in the type pelagic sections of Gubbio, Italy. Lethaia, 50, 41-57.
- Olivero, D., 2003. Early Jurassic to Late Cretaceous evolution of *Zoophycos* in the French
 Subalpine Basin (southeastern France). Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol., 192, 59–
 78.
- Olivero, D., Gaillard, C., 2007 A constructional model for *Zoophycos, in* Miller, W. (Ed.),
 Trace Fossils: Concepts, Problems, Prospects: Elsevier, Amsterdam, p. 466–477.
- Plička, M., 1968. *Zoophycos*, and a Proposed Classification of Sabellid Worms. J. Paleontol., 42,
 836–849.
- Podhalańska, T., 2007. Ichnofossils from the Ordovician mudrocks of the Pomeranian part of the
 Teisseyre-Tornquist Zone (NW Poland). Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol., 245, 295–
 305, doi: 10.1016/j.palaeo.2006.06.002.
- Rodriguez-Tovar, F.J., Uchman, A., 2004. Trace fossils after the KT boundary event from the Agost
 section, SE Spain. Geol. Mag., 141, 429–440, doi: 10.1017/S0016756804009410.
- 695 Rodríguez-Tovar, F.J., Uchman, A., 2004. Ichnotaxonomic analysis of the Cretaceous/Palaeogene
- boundary interval in the Agost section, south-east Spain. Cret. Res., 25, 635–647, doi:
- 697 10.1016/j.cretres.2004.06.003.
- http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0195667104000618. Checked December 2010.

699	Rydberg, L., Edler, L., Floderus, S., Grane Ii, W., 1990. Interaction between supply of nutrients,
700	primary production, sedimentation and oxygen consumption in SE Kattegat. Ambio, 19, 134-
701	141.

- Sappenfield, A., Droser, M., Kennedy, M., Mckenzie, R., 2012. The oldest *Zoophycos* and
 implications for Early Cambrian deposit feeding. Geol. Mag., 149, 1118–
- 704 1123.
- Seilacher, A., 1954. Die Geologische Bedeutung Fossiler Lebenspuren. Zeitschrift Geologische
 Gesellschaft, 105, 214–227.
- Seilacher, A., 1974. Flysch trace fossils: evolution of behavioral diversity in the deep–sea. Neues
 Jahrbuch f
 ür Geologie und Pal
 äontologie, 4, 233–245.
- Seilacher, A., 1986. Evolution of behavior as expressed in marine trace fossils, *in* Nitecki, M.H. and
- Nitecki, J.A., eds., Evolution of Animal Behavior.: Oxford University Press, New York, p. 62–
 87.
- 712 Seilacher, A., 2007. Trace Fossil Analysis: Springer–Verlag, Berlin (236 pp.).
- Sinervo, B., 2006, Optimal Foraging Theory: Constraints and Cognitive Processes. Behavioral
 Ecology, 105–130.
- Stenberg, M., Persson, A., 2005. The effects of spatial food distribution and group size on foraging
 behaviour in a benthic fish. Behav. Proc., 70, 41–50,
- 717 https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0376635705001099.
- 718 Strother, P.K., Servais, T., Vecoli, M., 2010. The effects of terrestrialization on marine ecosystems:
- the fall of CO 2. Geological Society, London, Special Publications, 339, 37–48, doi:
- 720 10.1144/SP339.4. http://sp.lyellcollection.org/lookup/doi/10.1144/SP339.4.
- Uchman, A., 1999. Ichnology of the Rhenodanubian Flysch (Lower Cretaceous–Eocene) in Austria
 and Germany. Beringeria, 25, 67–173.
- 723 Uchman, A., Hanken, N.-M., Binns, R., 2005. Ordovician Bathyal Trace Fossils From
- 724 Metasiliciclastics in Central Norway and Their Sedimentological and Paleogeographical

725	Implications. Ichnos, 12, 105–133, doi: 10.1080/10420940590914534.			
726	Wetzel, A., Werner, F., 1981. Morphology and ecological significance of Zoophycos in deep-sea			
727	sediments off NW Africa. Palaeogeog. Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol., 32, 185-212.			
728	Wiggan, N.J., Riding, J.B., Fensome, R.A., Mattioli, E., 2018. The Bajocian (Middle Jurassic): A			
729	key interval in the early Mesozoic phytoplankton radiation. Earth-Sci. Rev., 180, 126–146, doi:			
730	10.1016/j.earscirev.2018.03.009.			
731	Zhang, L., Shi, G.R., Gong, YM., 2015a. An ethological interpretation of Zoophycos based on			
732	Permian records from South China and southeastern Australia. Palaios, 2015, 30(5), 408-			
733	423.			
734	Zhang, L., Fan, R., Gong, Y., 2015b. Zoophycos macroevolution since 541 Ma. Scientific Reports			
735	5, 14954. https://doi.org/10.1038/srep14954			
736	Zharkov, M. a, and Chumakov, N.M., 2001. Paleogeography and Sedimentation Settings during			
737	Permian–Triassic Reorganizations in Biosphere. Strat. Geol. Correlation. Transl.			
738	Stratigrafiya. Geologicheskaya Korrelyatsiya, 9, 340–363.			
739	http://khramovs.nm.ru/biblio/geo/chumakov-2001.pdf.			
740				
741	FIGURE CAPTION			
742				
743	FIG. 1: A, map showing the study area in the Yukon-Charley Rivers National Preserve near the			
744	U.SCanada border; B, simplified geological map showing the location of the Permian beds			
745	discussed in this manuscript Modified from Brabb and Churkin, 1969.			
746	FIG. 2: A, simplified geological section of the Devonian-Permian beds exposed in the study area. B,			
747	photomosaic showing the Zoophycos locality, Tahkandit Limestone Formation.			
748	FIG. 3: Stratigraphic column of the Nation River Fm. (Devonian, A-B), and composite section of the			
749	Tahkandit Limestone Formation (Permian, C-F)			

- FIG. 4: A–D, trace fossils (*Conichnus*) and body fossils (E, F, brachiopods, bryozoans) co-occurring
 in the *Zoophycos*-bearing ichnocoenosis.
- FIG. 5: A–D, *Zoophycos* traces with well-developed spreiten and lobes; E–I, details from the three dimensionally developed *Zoophycos*.
- FIG. 6: Close-up of some of the best preserved *Zoophycos* laminae from this section showing
 textural details from the lamellae and marginal tube.
- FIG. 7: Lobed *Zoophycos* through time. Data are binned by geologic periods. The source dataset is
- the Phanerozoic *Zoophycos* database of Zhang et al. (2015b). Sites with no information on
- the basic morphology of *Zoophycos* have been filtered out from the dataset. The dataset has
- **59** been implemented by information on the Yukon River *Zoophycos* and two additional
- 760 *Zoophycos*-bearing sites (Baucon and Carvalho, 2008; Baucon et al., 2015). (A) Lobed
- 761 *Zoophycos* ratio. The y axis represents the ratio between the number of sites with lobed
- 762 Zoophycos and the total number of sites with Zoophycos. (B) Number of sites with lobed
- 763 Zoophycos.
- 764

765















1 Table 1. Morphology of the trace fossils of the Tahkandit Limestone Formation.

2

Ichnotaxon	Class	Orientation	Branched	Lining	Fill	Facies
Conostichus	Burrow	Vertical	No	No	Passive?	F
Bergaueria	Burrow	Vertical	No	No	Passive	F, S
Skolithos	Burrow	Vertical	No	No	Passive	F, S
Planolites	Burrow	Vertical	No	No	Active	F, US
Zoophycos	Burrow	Vertical and horizontal	No	No	Active (pelleted)	US
Chondrites	Burrow	Vertical	Yes	No	Active?	US

3

4