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**SUMMARY:** The objective of this study was to obtain data on craniometric parameters in the crab-eating fox (*Cerdocyon thous*) and to define the general skull type of this species, analysing whether the craniometric classification of domestic dogs can be applied. Eleven skulls of *C. thous* were included in the analysis, irrespective of age and sex. The location of nine craniometric points established for craniometry in domestic dogs was determined and based on the distances between these points, 17 craniometric parameters were measured. Those parameters were used to calculate the following six craniometric indices: 53.17 ± 2.54 mm skull index, 2.33 ± 0.08 mm craniofacial index, 59.17 ± 3.57 mm neurocranial index, 125.58 ± 6.63 mm facial index, 37.52 ± 2.65 mm basal index and the index of the foramen magnum 54.47 ± 3.48 mm. According to the analysed indices, the skull shape in *C. thous* can be classified as mesaticephalic.
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**INTRODUCTION**

*Cerdocyon thous* (Linnaeus, 1766), the crab-eating fox, is a member of the family Canidae and occurs in a wide range of the Brazilian territory, from dense forests to open grasslands, with exception of the federal states Acre and Amazonas (Berta, 1982; Machado & Hingst-Zaher, 2009; Lucherini, 2015). Adult animals weigh from five to eight kg and measure approximately 65 cm from head to tail (Berta; Emmons & Feer, 1997). *C. thous* is a nocturnal and crepuscular species, omnivorous, a generalist and opportunist (Berta; Langguth, 1975).

Nevertheless, the species is affected by habitat fragmentation and road mortality and threatened by hunting from farmers and the proximity to domestic dogs and their potentially contagious diseases (Cheida *et al.*, 2011; Lucherini).

Moura *et al.* (2007) point out that the interaction of wild animals with their natural habitat or their environment in captive conditions can be better understood, based on morphological studies. Basic knowledge of morphological characteristics in wild species might be crucial for conservation strategies. Therefore, the anatomy of wild animals, including the skull, needs to be studied.

The skull is a part of the axial skeleton, forming the head skeleton and enclosing the brain, sensory organs and digestive and respiratory structures. It consists of two parts: the neurocranium and the viscerocranium. The neurocranium surrounds and protects the brain and is composed of flat and irregular bones. The viscerocranium comprises the facial bones, consisting of irregular bones and the mandibula (Nickel *et al.*, 1986).

Machado (2006) states that the shape of the skull is one of the most important criterions for establishing racial patterns and evolution models for species. Some works on comparative osteometry in mammalian species with focus on phylogeny and evolution have been published by Christiansen (1999), Lyras & Van Der Geer (2003), Ferguson & Larivière (2004) and Goswami (2006).

Domestic cats previously have been the object of analyses in order to establish craniometric patterns (Sarma *et al.*, 2002) and domestic dogs have been studied even more profoundly (Machado; Evans & De Lahunta, 2013; Shimmering & Pinto e Silva, 2013). The skull type in domestic dogs is classified employing the skull index, which allows to distinguish three morphological categories:
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Literature on skull morphology in wild animals is rare. Christiansen & Adolfssen (2006) studied the skulls of 56 wild carnivores, including felids, canids and ursids. Nevertheless, the authors focussed on aspects related to the mastigatory force and did not concentrate on craniometric patterns. Furthermore, Santos et al. (2017) realized a study with seven maned wolves (Chrysocyon brachyurus), verifying whether the craniometric data collected allows a classification of the skull type after Getty (1986). According to Hofmann-Appollo (2009), various wild canid species present an intermediate skull type, being classified as mesaticephalic and therefore resembling the domestic dogs.

The objective of this study was to realize craniometric measurements in C. thous, patronize the craniometric values for this species and compare these characteristics to the craniometric patterns in domestic dogs in order to conclude whether the classification of skull types (dolicho-, mesat- and brachycephalic) is appropriate for C. thous as well.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

A total of 11 skulls of C. thous were used in this study, irrespective of age and sex. The samples were collected from road-kill specimens with the approval of the Biodiversity Information and Authorization System (SISBIO, permit n° 49266-1) and belong to the anatomical collection of the Wild Animal Research Laboratory of the Federal University of Uberlândia. Cranio metric points, parameters and indices that were applied in this study, were based on works on craniometry in domestic dogs (Simoens et al., 1994; Onar & Günes, 2003; Janeczek et al., 2008; Shimming & Pinto e Silva, 2013) and are described in Tables I to III and illustrated in Figures 1 to 5.

All measurements were performed with a manual calliper Starrett® 125 MEB in total three times, on three different occasions by the same researcher in order to minimize the risk of measurement errors. The data were organized in spreadsheets and statistical analysis was performed (mean and standard deviation) using the software BioEstat 5.3®. The classification of the skull type of C. thous followed the definition of Evans & De Lahunta for domestic dogs.
Table I. Description of nine craniometric points.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basion</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Middle of the ventral margin of the foramen magnum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bregma</td>
<td>BR</td>
<td>Junction on the median plane of the right and left frontoparietal sutures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eurion</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Most lateral point of the neurocranium.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inion</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>Central surface point on the external occipital protuberance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nasion</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Junction on the median plane of the right and left nasofrontal sutures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogonion</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>Most rostral part of the mandible, at the intermandibular articulation, located between the roots of the inferior central incisor teeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosthion</td>
<td>PR</td>
<td>Rostral end of the interincisive suture, located between the roots of the superior central incisor teeth.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhinion</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Midline point at the inferior free end of the internasal suture.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zygion</td>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Point of maximum lateral extent of the lateral surface of the zygomatic arch.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table II. Description of 12 craniometric parameters: linear measurements between craniometric points of the skull (from ‘a’ to ‘m’) and of the occipital area (from ‘n’ to ‘r’).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cranial height</td>
<td>a</td>
<td>Middle of external acoustic meatus to Bregma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the skull</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>Inion to Prosthion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the neurocranium</td>
<td>c</td>
<td>Inion to Nasion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the viscerocranium</td>
<td>d</td>
<td>Nasion to Prosthion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of the neurocranium</td>
<td>e</td>
<td>Width of the neurocranium: distance between left and right Eurion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zygomatic width</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>Width between left and right Zygion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the base of the skull</td>
<td>g</td>
<td>Distance from Basion to Prosthion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condyllobasal length</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>Distance from Prosthion to the caudal margins of the occipital condyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the nose</td>
<td>i</td>
<td>Distance from the middle point of the oral margin of the orbit to Prosthion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the nasal bones</td>
<td>j</td>
<td>Distance from Nasion to Rhinion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of the mandible</td>
<td>l</td>
<td>Distance from the caudal extremity of the angular process to the Pogonion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palatal length</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>Distance from caudal nasal spine of the palatine to the Prosthion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width between the jugular processes</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>Width between the lateral margins of the jugular processes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width between the occipital condyles</td>
<td>o</td>
<td>Width between the lateral margins of the occipital condyles.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Width of the foramen magnum</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Width between the margins of the foramen magnum.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height of the occipital triangle</td>
<td>q</td>
<td>Maximum height of the occipital triangle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heigth of the foramen magnum</td>
<td>r</td>
<td>Distance from ventral to dorsal margin of the foramen magnum.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Tables IV and V show the results (mean ± standard deviation) of parameters measured in 11 skulls.

The length of the skull of *C. thous* in this study was 131.66 ± 14.86 mm, while Santos *et al.* present a skull length of 126.76 ± 5.29 mm in their analysis of skulls of seven C. brachyurus, maned wolves, although *C. thous* is a considerably smaller canid (Cheida et al.). In an analysis of 25 skulls of domestic mesaticephalic dogs of unknown breed, Shimming & Pinto e Silva (2013) mention a skull length of 177.72 ± 16.22 mm. Machado found a skull length of 135.19 ± 38.61 mm in eight mesaticephalic dogs of different breeds and 154.56 ± 21.22 mm in eight brachycephalic boxers.

The specimens of this study presented values similar to what Machado found in mesaticephalic domestic dogs. Dogs with the mesaticephalic skull type generally present a scissors bite occlusion, meaning that the maxillary incisors are located slightly rostral to the inferior incisors, allowing the dog a powerful bite to tear its prey apart and for defence (Evans & De Lahunta). According to Dyce *et al.* (1997) brachycephalic breeds present a predisposition for a shorter upper jaw, maxilla, and dolichocephalic breeds have a higher incidence of a longer than normal upper jaw (both cases resulting in problems when catching prey).

In *C. thous* the zygomatic width was 71.10 ± 7.36 mm, whereas Santos *et al.* observed 121.87 ± 6.30 mm in C. brachyurus. In mesaticephalic dogs Shimming & Pinto e Silva (2013) report 95.44 ± 7.85 mm and Machado measured 106.89 ± 28.11 mm zygomatic width. In contrast, in brachycephalic dogs 139.68 ± 9.63 mm were observed (Machado).

According to Evans & De Lahunta the skull index is 39 mm in dolichocephalic dogs, 52 mm in mesaticephalic and 81 mm in brachycephalic dogs. The skull index for *C. thous*, observed in this study, was 53.17 ± 2.54 mm, resembling the skull index of mesaticephalic dogs as described by Evans & De Lahunta. Similar values were also observed in the German Shepherd breed by Onar (1999) and in domestic dogs of unknown breed by Shimming & Pinto e Silva %, describing a skull index of 51.44 mm and 53.83 ± 3.36 mm, respectively.

On the other hand, Santos *et al.* present a skull index of 96.17 ± 3.89 mm for C. brachyurus. This raises some questions, since C. brachyurus and *C. thous* belong to the same subtribe Cerdocyonina. However, probably the discrepancy...
between the indices of the two species is a result of their methodological errors in the work of Santos et al., as their calculations might be based on wrong measurements, as they report a cranial length for the maned wolf inferior to what is described in this study for *C. thous*, even though *C. thous* is the smaller species. The results of this study were not compared with the work of Machado, since the cited work employs only the craniofacial index for defining the type of skull.

**CONCLUSION**

The craniometric points described in the crab-eating fox, were similar to what is established for the domestic dog. This study shows that the craniometric characteristics of *C. thous* follows what is described for the domestic dog and its skull type can be classified as mesaticephalic.
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