A NEW TRICONODONT (MAMMALIA) FROM THE EARLY CRETACEOUS YIXIAN FORMATION OF LIAONING, CHINA

MENG Jin1,2,3, HU Yao-Ming1,2,3, WANG Yuan-Qing1, LI Chuan-Kui1
(1 Institute of Vertebrate Paleontology and Paleoanthropology, Chinese Academy of Sciences Beijing 100044)
(2 Division of Paleontology, American Museum of Natural History New York NY 10024)
(3 Biology Program, Graduate School and City College of New York, City University of New York New York NY 10016)

Abstract A new genus and species of gobiconodontid, Meemannodon lutjatunensis, from the basal member of the Early Cretaceous Yixian Formation at Lujian, Liaoning, northeast China, is described. The new genus, Meemannodon, is similar to Gobiconodon, having reduced lower incisors, conical and pointed posterior incisors, canines and anterior premolars with a tall central cusp, and low compared to middle premolars. It differs from Gobiconodon and its close relatives in having proportionally larger i1 and smaller i2, lack of diastema between p2 and p1, and m1 significantly smaller than m2. It is similar to Repenomamus but further differs from Gobiconodon in lacking the cingulid on lower molars.
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1 Introduction

The Early Cretaceous is a critical period of time in mammalian evolution, during which diverse groups of non-tribosphenic and basal tribosphenic mammals were found in Asia, Europe, North America, and Australia (Fox, 1975; Butler, 1978, 1992; Rougier et al., 2001). These include several groups, such as triconodonts, symmetrodonts, multituberculates, and basal tribosphenic mammals. Triconodonts, which may well be a paraphyletic group (Rougier et al., 1996a; Cifelli et al., 1998; Kelian Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998; Ji et al., 1999), were carnivorous and/or insectivorous, judging from their tooth pattern, body size and stomach content, that lived from the Jurassic to Late Cretaceous (Owen, 1871; Simpson, 1928, 1929; Kerckhove, 1963; Patterson, 1956; Slaughter, 1969; Fox, 1969; Bonaparte, 1986, 1992; Rasmussen and Callison, 1981; Krušat, 1989; Zhou et al., 1991; Sigogneau-Russell, 1995; Cifelli et al., 1998; Cifelli and Madsen, 1998; Engelmann and Callison, 1998; Heinrich, 1998; Godfrey and Guo, 1999; Ji et al., 1999; Li et al., 2000; Rougier et al., 2001; Hu et al., in press). Similar to other Mesozoic mammals, most triconodonts were small-sized creatures. The largest triconodont species are among gobiconodontids (Trofimov, 1978; Jenkins and Schaff, 1988; Maschenko and Lopatin, 1998; Kelian Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998), particularly those in the genus Gobiconodon (Jenkins and Schaff, 1988; Rougier et al., 2001) and among repenomamids (Li et al., 2000; Wang et al., 2001; Hu et al., in press). Triconodont mammals are represented primarily by dental and fragmentary jaw materials but more complete specimens of cranial and postcranial skeletons have been known of Gobiconodon ostromi from North America (Jenkins and Schaff, 1988) and G. zofiae (Li et al., 2003), Jeholodens jenkinsi (Ji et al., 1999) and Repenomamus (Li et al., 2000; Wang et al., 2001; Hu et al., in press) from China.

Here we report yet another new genus and species of triconodonts, Meemannodon lujiatunensis, from the Early Cretaceous Yixian Formation at Lujiatun locality, Liaoning. Known from the same site are three species of mammals, Gobiconodon zofiae (Li et al., 2003), Repenomamus robustus (Li et al., 2000) and a new species of Repenomamus (Hu et al., in press). The discovery of the new species increases the diversity of the mammal fauna of the Yixian Formation. Given that several recent studies have provided thorough reviews on the research history, taxonomy, distribution and phylogeny of triconodonts, particularly gobiconodontids (Kielan-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998; Rougier et al., 2001; Cuenca-Bescós and Canudo, 2003; Li et al., 2003), our report focuses on description of the new taxon and does not attempt a phylogenetic analysis.

2 Methods

We follow Rowe (1987, 1988) for the crown group concept of Mammalia. Triconodonts, which are taxa traditionally included in the Triconodonta, are used informally because this group of mammals is probably paraphyletic (Rougier et al., 1996a, 1999; Kielan-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998; Ji et al., 1999). Among triconodonts, Triconodontidae probably is a monophyletic group (Crompton and Jenkins, 1968; Hopson and Crompton, 1969; Jenkins and Crompton, 1979; Rougier et al., 1996a, b; Cifelli et al., 1998; Ji et al., 1999). The nature of other triconodont groups, such as amphiestids, remains uncertain. Amphiestidae (Simpson, 1928; Mills, 1971; Jenkins and Crompton, 1979) was treated as a family that contains the subfamily Gobiconodontinae (Kielan-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998), but that family was considered to be paraphyletic (Rougier et al., 2001). We here adopt the family Gobiconodontidae as used by Rougier et al. (2001), in which the new genus is included. For terminology of tooth structure we follow previous work (Crompton and Jenkins, 1968; Jenkins and Schaff, 1988; Kielan-Jaworowska
and Dashzeveg, 1998; Rougier et al., 2001). The tooth denotation used in the study does not necessarily imply homology; it only follows the convention and provides convenience for the purpose of description.

3 Systematic paleontology

**Class Mammalia**

- Order Triconodonta Osborn, 1888
- Family Gobiconodontidae Chow et Rich, 1984
- Genus and species Meemannodon lujiatunensis gen. and sp. nov.

(Figs. 1, 2)

**Holotype** IVPP V 13102, a left lower mandible with complete dentition.

**Etymology** The generic name is in honor of Dr. Meemann Chang, who has been persistently conducting and promoting researches on the Jehol Biota. The trivial name is after that of the locality, Lujiatun.

**Locality and age** Lujiatun Village, Beipiao, Liaoning; the basal member of the Yixian Formation; early Cretaceous.

**Repository** Institute of Vertebrate Paleontology and Paleoanthropology (IVPP), Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing.

**Diagnosis** A large triconodont with similar size of *Gobiconodon rastromi* and *Repenomamus robustus*; differing from other triconodonts but similar to *Gobiconodon* in having enlarged i1, reduction of number of lower incisors to 2, conical and pointed incisors, canines and anterior premolariforms, premolariforms with tall central cusp but no accessory cusp, and procumbent p1; differing from *Gobiconodon* in having more procumbent lower incisors and canines, proportionally larger i1 and smaller i2, lack of diastema between p2 (the last premolariform) and m1, main cusps of molariforms inclined posteriorly, molariform length greater than height, cusp a relatively low compared to distinct cusps b and c, cheek teeth bearing no cingulid, premolariforms reduced, and m1 significantly smaller than m2~m4.

**Description** The specimen represents a young adult in having all teeth fully erupted except for p1 and m5. The dentary was broken anterior to p2; small bone chips were missing at this region so that the two portions of the dentary cannot be fitted together precisely. The dentary is estimated as 92 mm long, 12.4 mm deep and 7.6 mm thick at m3. The anterior portion of the dentary is robust that accommodates an enlarged i1. On the medial side of the mandible the symphysis is large and oblique. Below the molariforms is the large internal groove or meckelian groove. This groove gradually narrows anteriorly and ends below m2; it opens posteriorly to confluent with the pterygoid fossa. The groove is ventrally bounded by a strong ridge that extends posteriorly to the mandibular condyle; thus this ridge also bounds the pterygoid fossa ventrally. The coronoid process is broken. On the lateral side of the mandible, there are at least two mental foramina, one below p2 and the other below m2. The masseteric is broad and deep and is ventrally delimited by a strong ridge that also extends to the condyle. In ventral view, the bottom of the mandible broadens posteriorly and reaches its maximum at the mandibular condyle. The condyle does not have a distinct boundary with the rest part of the mandible. The articular surface of the condyle is restricted and rough. The most part of the condyle is positioned lateral to the plane of the coronoid process and the horizontal ramus. In posterior view, the condyle is oblique, with its medial end being higher than the lateral one. There is no angular process.

The dental formula is i2 c1 p2 m5. All teeth show no wear except for slightly polished facets on the lateral surfaces of cusps b and f on m3. The incisors, canine and premolariforms are single rooted. The enlarged i1 is a strong tooth with sharp pointed tip (see Table 1 for measurements of
Fig. 1 Lateral (A) and medial (B) views of the mandible of *Meemannodon lujiatunensis* gen. et sp. nov. (holotype, IVPP V 13102)

Broken area of the dentary is photographically filled in gray
teeth. It is procumbent and curved. On the medial and lateral surfaces there are weak ridges extending along the tooth from the base to the tip. The small, procumbent tooth on the posterolateral side of i1, separated from the latter by a small gap, is identified as i2 (see below). The tooth crown is ridge-shaped on its anteromedial and posterolateral sides.

The canine is similar to i2 in morphology and orientation but is larger. In contrast to the robust symphysis, the i2 and canine are small and marginally positioned on the jawbone. The diastema between the canine and p1 is the largest on the lower dentition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Measurements of tooth crown (mm)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Length</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i1</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i2</td>
<td>2.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p1</td>
<td>erupting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>p2</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m1</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m2</td>
<td>6.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m3</td>
<td>7.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m4</td>
<td>7.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are two premolariforms. The p1 is partially erupted. This tooth may also be a successive tooth younger than the erupted p2. The p1 is simple, similar to the canine in shape and size but less procumbent. The p2 is also simple and is the smallest tooth in the lower dentition. It is more vertically positioned and is transversely narrow. In lateral view, p2 is asymmetric in having a short
Fig. 2: Medial (A), lateral (B) and occlusal (C) views of the dentition of *Meemannodon lujiatunensis* gen. et sp. nov. (holotype, IVPP V 13102)

Tooth cusps are denoted as a-f.

The anterior crown edge and long posterior edge; the tip of the tooth is more anteriorly positioned. The lateral surface of p2 is convex and the posterior medial surface shows some gentle concavity. There is no accessory cusp.

All molariforms are double-rooted with the posterior root stronger than the anterior one, bear no cingulid, and have the tooth length being greater than the height. Because of the relatively greater length, all cusps appear broad in lateral or medial view. Cusps show a tendency of posterior inclination. Cusp a is the largest of tooth cusps and its tip is slightly anterior to the mid-axis of the tooth in lateral view. On all molariforms, cusps b, c and d are well-developed with cusps c and d being larger than cusp b. In dorsal view, the tooth cusps are aligned in line anteroposteriorly. The edges of the cusps are sharp. For each tooth, the lateral surface is more convex than the medial surface so that the tooth is not bilaterally symmetric in occlusal view. The groove separating any pair of adjacent cusps on a tooth is slightly deeper and longer on the medial side than on the lateral side.

The m1 is significantly smaller than other molariforms. It differs from other molariforms in having only a rudimentary cusp b and no cusps e and f. Cusp d is also proportionally less developed than in other molariforms. The m2 differs from m3 in having poorly developed cusps e and f, although the anterior margin of the tooth is indented for reception of cusp d of m1. In addition, cusp
b is lower than cusp c on m2, whereas the opposite is true for m3. The m3 and m4 are similar in general morphology except that cusps e and f are better developed and preserved on m4. On the anterior end of the tooth these accessory cusps define a vertical trough that accommodates cusp d of m3. The m4 is located at the anterior base of the coronoid process and its posterior root is not fully exposed. The m5 is within the jaw bone at the anterior base of the coronoid process, cusp a of which is visible in occlusal view. As observed in other triconodonts, the relationship of the last molariform with the coronoid process reflects to some degree the age of the individuals (Rougier et al., 2001). In adult individual, there is usually a space between the anterior base of the coronoid and the last molariform. In young individual, there is no such space and, as in the case of V 13102, the last molariform can be within the base of process.

4 Discussion

Identification of anterior teeth Because only lower dentition is available for *Meemannodon lujiatunensis*, the tooth count is uncertain and has to be based on comparison with those of other taxa, such as *Gobiconodon* and *Repenomamus*. The lower dentition of *Gobiconodon ostromi* was denoted as 1·1·3·4·5 (Jenkins and Schaff, 1988), and this dental formula was considered to be common for the genus (Li et al., 2003; note the formula was erroneously printed as 2·1·3·4·5 in the English version on page 1132). In extant mammals designations of teeth are based on morphology, ontogeny, and position (Clemens and Lillegraven, 1986; Butler and Clemens, 2001). The benchmark for positional characters is the upper canine, which is defined as the tooth whose alveolus is at or immediately behind the premaxillary maxillary suture (Butler and Clemens, 2001). The corresponding lower tooth is usually half tooth anterior to its upper counterpart. Because of incomplete preservation of specimens in known species of *Gobiconodon*, the designations of these teeth for published specimens are not conclusive (Trofimov, 1978; Jenkins and Schaff, 1988; Kielan-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998; Rougier et al., 2001; Li et al., 2003). Although skull material is preserved in *G. zofiae*, the premaxillary-maxillary suture is unclear in the holotype. Therefore, the designations of the non-molariform teeth in *G. zofiae* were tentative and the tooth formula 1·1·3·4·5 was adopted. However, the tooth identified as the lower canine appears too anterior in the tooth row of *G. ostromi* and *G. zofiae*.

Better preserved specimens of *Repenomamus* (Li et al., 2000; Wang et al., 2001; Meng et al., 2003; Hu et al., in press), a genus that is similar to *Gobiconodon*, show clearly the premaxillary maxillary suture in several well-preserved skulls, which helps to determine the upper canine and thus other non-molariform teeth. In *Repenomamus*, the tooth formula is 3·1·2·3·4/2·1·2·3·4 (Hu et al., in press; unpublished material). The i2 of *Repenomamus* is similar to the tooth designated as the lower canine in *G. ostromi* and *G. zofiae*, although in the former the i1 is not enlarged. In light of the dental formula of *Repenomamus*, it is probable that the tooth designated as the lower canine in gobiconodontids is actually the second lower incisor. Therefore, the alternative tooth formula for lower dentition could be 2·1·2·3·5 for gobiconodontids. This emended designation is used here in describing *Meemannodon*. This dental formula is shared by *Gobiconodon*, *Repenomamus* and *Meemannodon*.

Comparison The primary content of *Gobiconodontidae* is the genus *Gobiconodon*, which contains at least five species, including *G. hoburensis*, *G. borissiaki*, and *G. hopsoni* from Mongolia (Trofimov, 1978; Kielan-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998; Rougier et al., 2001), *G. zofiae* from Liaoning, China (Li et al., 2003) and *G. ostromi* from North America (Jenkins and Schaff, 1988). Some of the features characterizing *Gobiconodon* in the emended diagnosis for the genus furnished by Rougier et al. (2001: 6) include “large procumbent i1 and correspondingly enlarged 11; reduction of number of incisors to 1 or 2; conic and pointed posterior incisors, canines and anterior premolariforms. Anterior premolariforms (p1·p3) with tall central cusp and crown
height greater than mesiodistal measurement. Accessory cusp on these premolariforms very small to absent. Procumbent i⁄ p1.” All these features are present in V 13102 except for those unknown, such as the H condition. In an earlier study, Kielar-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg (1998) included the interlocking mechanism of lower molariforms as another generic diagnostic feature for Gobiconodon, in which cusp d of a tooth fits into the embayment between cusps e and f of the succeeding tooth. Because this feature is of “Kuehneotherium type”, it is probably plesiomorphic. Meemannodon has the interlocking structure. Rougier et al. (2001; see also Kielar-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998; Godefroit and Gio, 1999) also considered replacement of anterior molariform teeth, as seen in Gobiconodon astroni, as another feature for the genus, although they cautioned that this feature may be plesiomorphic and thus not diagnostic. Radiography we did for V 13102 does not provide convincing evidence of molariform replacement. Nonetheless, replacement is not present in known specimens of at least two species of Gobiconodon, G. borissiaki and G. hoburensis (Kielar-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998).

In addition to morphology, body size of Meemannodon is also similar to some species of Gobiconodon. The largest known gobiconodontid is Gobiconodon hopsoni (Rougier et al., 2001). Because measurements of G. hopsoni are known only from M3 4 (These teeth were originally identified as M4 5, but we consider them as M3 4. See Li et al. [2003] for discussion on cheek tooth count in gobiconodontids.), direct size comparison with V 13102 is not possible. G. hopsoni is unique in that the estimated length of M4 is greater than that of M3. In other species of the genus, such as G. zofiae, G. borissiaki, and G. hoburensis, the last molariform (M4) is usually shorter than M3. As shown in G. zofiae, in which articulated upper and lower dentitions of the same individual are known, M3 is longer than either m3 or m4 that are in occlusion with M3. The M3 of G. hopsoni is 5.2 mm long. In contrast, the lengths of m3 4 of Meemannodon are measured 7.43 and 7.62, respectively, which indicate that the new species is probably larger than G. hopsoni. This is supported by the fact that the dentary (PSS-MAE139) referred to G. hopsoni (Rougier et al., 2001: fig. 2) is shallower than that of the new species. Estimated lengths of the alveolus for m1 of PSS-MAE139 is 3.25 mm, whereas the length is 4.67 for m1 of the new species. The fragmentary specimens of G. hopsoni and lack of the upper dentition of the new species prevent further comparison of the two species. Gobiconodon astroni comes second in size to compare with Meemannodon. G. astroni is apparently smaller than the new taxon in all teeth, including i1 (Jenkins and Schaff, 1988: table 1). Given the similarities in morphology and size between Gobiconodon and Meemannodon, we consider the two genera are related more closely than either of them to any other known taxon of triconodonts and therefore place the new genus in the family Gobiconodontidae.

Meemannodon differs from Gobiconodon in several aspects. The incisors and canine of Meemannodon are more procumbent than those of Gobiconodon. More notable is the proportionally larger i1 and smaller i2 in the new taxon. Meemannodon has two premolariforms that are proportionally more reduced than those of Gobiconodon. Using our assignment of cheek teeth, many specimens of Gobiconodon have three premolariforms (Jenkins and Schaff, 1988; Kielar-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998; Li et al., 2003); some, however, lost p3 (Jenkins and Schaff, 1988). The p3 in Gobiconodon is an unusual tooth—it is the smallest tooth, usually has two packed roots, and display more complex crown pattern than premolariforms. The known p3 of Gobiconodon is distinctively different from the last premolariform of Meemannodon, which we denoted as p2. In fact, the p2 of Meemannodon is similar to p2 of Gobiconodon. Lost of p3 in Gobiconodon usually creates a considerable gap between p2 and m1. In Meemannodon, however, p2 and m1 are closely placed. If tooth reduction represents a derived condition in gobiconodontids, then the condition in Meemannodon is more derived in that not only p3 is lost, the space between p2 and m1 also disappears. An alternative interpretation is that the last premolariform of Meemannodon occupies the homologous locus of p3 of gobiconodontids and that p1 or p2 was lost in Meemannodon. If this is the
case, one may expect that the last premolariform in *Meemannodon* and p3 in other gobiconodontids belong to different generation because of their distinctive difference in morphology. In such a case, the last premolariform in *Meemannodon* is more likely from a generation younger than the known p3 in gobiconodontids because p3 in gobiconodontids is more molariform and deeply worn than the molariforms, whereas the last premolariform of *Meemannodon* is simple and bear no wear. However, because p3 lost is a common phenomenon in gobiconodontids and *Repenomamus*, the last premolariform of *Meemannodon* is similar to p2 in gobiconodontids, and there is no evidence of p3 replacement in known specimens of gobiconodontids, we favor the designation of the last premolariform of *Meemannodon* as p2.

Molariform teeth of *Meemannodon* also show significant differences from those of *Gobiconodon*. Cusps of molariforms notably incline posteriorly, in contrasting to more vertically pointed molariforms of *Gobiconodon*. The molariforms of *Meemannodon* are long and relatively low; thus the tooth length is greater than the height. This condition may be attributable to inflation of cusps b, c and d, which are more conspicuous than those of other gobiconodontids. In *Gobiconodon*, however, the molariform is relatively higher and short and cusp a is more dominant. The molariforms of *Meemannodon* bear no cingulid. Development of the cingulid on lower molariforms varies in *Gobiconodon*, but it usually exists. Moreover, ml of *Meemannodon* is remarkably smaller than m2 m4. Because of these differences we consider V 13102 should not be placed in *Gobiconodon*.

*Hangjinia choi* from Nei Mongol (Inner Mongolia) (Godefroit and Guo, 1999) was considered another gobiconodontid characterized by having fewer postcanine teeth but more incisors than *Gobiconodon* (Godefroit and Guo, 1999). As pointed out by Rougier et al. (2001), the tooth counting of *Hangjinia* is questionable and the type specimen may represent a juvenile individual, a view we fully agree with. In addition to the interpretation entertained for *Hangjinia* by Rougier et al. (2001), the dentition of *Hangjinia* could also be interpreted as having two incisors, following the tooth assignment that we use here. The i3 originally identified in *Hangjinia* may well be a canine and the canine is a premolariform, and possibly the only premolariform. The p1 and p2 originally identified in *Hangjinia* could be m1 and m2. There are several reasons to believe so. First, in all known specimens of *Gobiconodon* the premolariforms have either a single root or two closely packed roots. The two strong and well-separated roots of p1” and p2” in the mandible of *Hangjinia* are more similar to those of molariforms. Second, in *Gobiconodon* there is usually a space between premolariforms and, in contrast, the molariforms are usually closely packed and separated from the premolariforms by a gap. In the mandible of *Hangjinia*, the p1”, ”p2” and the last two molariforms form a tightly packed tooth row unit, separated from what we think to be the premolariform by a diastema. Thirdly, the premolariforms in *Gobiconodon*, particularly the last one, are small and certainly smaller than the molariforms. As indicated by the alveoli and partial tooth preserved in the mandible of *Hangjinia*, the p1” and p2” are as large as, if not larger than, the last two molariforms. Finally, although cusps b, c and d are small on the p1”, as originally described, they do exist. Presence of these accessory cusps makes the tooth more molariform than premolariform. In fact, Rougier et al. (2001) considered this tooth to be molariform and is somewhat similar to the ml of *G. borissiaki*. Nonetheless, even counting the teeth the way we suggest, the dentition of *Hangjinia* still remains peculiar. This is again because the type specimen of *Hangjinia* is from a juvenile individual. Although the only known specimen of *Hangjinia* clearly differs from those of *Meemannodon*, a meaningful comparison between these forms has to wait for discovery of more complete material of the former.

*Klamelia zhaopengi* (Chow and Rich, 1984), originally assigned to gobiconodontids, was considered to be Mammaliaformes incertae sedis (Rougier et al., 2001). Because of the fragmentary nature of the holotype of *Klamelia*, the tooth assignment remains controversial (Rougier et al., 2001). Broken teeth of *Klamelia* also hamper precise comparison with those of *Meemannodon*. However, the double-rooted premolariform and the distinct cingulid on cheek teeth clearly set the
two genera apart. The sizes of the two genera are beyond comparison.

Amphilestidae (Simpson, 1928; Mills, 1971; Jenkins and Crompton, 1979) was treated as a family that contains the subfamily Gobiconodontinae (Kielar-Jaworowska and Dashzeveg, 1998), but that family was considered to be paraphyletic (Rougier et al., 2001). Taxa typical of the subfamily Amphilestinae, such as Amphilestes and Phascolotherium (Simpson, 1928), are significantly smaller than Meemannodon and are different from the latter in many aspects, such as having more incisors, larger canine, lower cheek teeth that are somewhat symmetric in lateral view, distinct cingulid on molariforms, and smaller tooth cusps.

Repenomamus robustus (Li et al., 2000) is a triconodont that comes from the same locality as does Meemannodon. Although Repenomamus is undoubtedly a distinctive taxon, its diagnosis in the original description was not precise. This is largely because preparation of the skull was not fully completed when the taxon was proposed. For instance, the lower jaws were not separated from the skull at the time, which prohibited examination of the crown pattern of teeth. Further preparation of the holotype (V 12549) and discovery of additional specimens (e.g., V 12613, Wang et al., 2001) enabled more accurate observations of the dentition of Repenomamus. In lower dentition, Repenomamus differs from Gobiconodon and Meemannodon in having i1 not enlarged and molariforms higher and more piecing; cusp a is more inflated. Similar to Meemannodon but differing from other Gobiconodon, the lower molariforms of Repenomamus lack cingulid. Some other features that differ Meemannodon from Gobiconodon also applicable to distinguish Meemannodon from Repenomamus, such as posterior inclination of cusps, tooth length being greater than the height and m1 being considerably smaller than m2 ~ m4.

In summary, Meemannodon is more similar to Gobiconodon than to any other known triconodonts and is therefore placed in the family Gobiconodontidae. However, Meemannodon differs from Gobiconodon and other related triconodonts in several dental structures, which provides the basis for the proposal of the new genus and species.
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