

Beneath the surface: physiology, behaviour, and performance of fossorial amphibians and reptiles

Danilo Giacometti^{1,*}; Melissa Bars-Closel²; José Eduardo de Carvalho³ & Glenn J. Tattersall⁴

¹ Departamento de Fisiologia, Instituto de Biociências, Universidade de São Paulo, São Paulo, SP, 05508-900, Brasil, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3882-000X>

² Departamento de Morfologia e Fisiologia Animal, Faculdade de Ciências Agrárias e Veterinárias, Universidade Estadual Paulista, Jaboticabal, SP, 14884-900, Brasil, <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3250-9728>

³ Departamento de Ecologia e Biologia Evolutiva, Universidade Federal de São Paulo, Diadema, SP, 09913-030, Brasil, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7733-3562>

⁴ Department of Biological Sciences, Brock University, St. Catharines, ON L2S 3A1, Canada, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6591-6760>

* dgiacometti@usp.br | + 55 (11) 91208-1154

Abstract

Fossoriality has evolved recurrently in amphibians and reptiles, exposing organisms to a distinctive physical environment that has favoured diverse morphological, physiological, behavioural, and biomechanical adaptations to enable life beneath the surface. Despite substantial progress over recent decades, research has largely examined these traits independently, limiting our understanding of how fossorial ectotherms function as integrated organisms. Here, we synthesise current knowledge on the mechanisms underlying fossoriality in amphibians and reptiles, focusing on the interactions among morphology, functional performance, thermoregulation, water balance, respiration, energetics, and seasonal dormancy. We show that physiological and behavioural responses reflect continuous trade-offs among temperature, water availability, respiratory gases, and substrate properties, highlighting the multidimensional nature of the subterranean environment. Likewise, many features commonly

associated with fossoriality, including body elongation, limb reduction, cranial reinforcement, and sensory reorganisation, have evolved repeatedly but through lineage-specific combinations of traits rather than a single adaptive syndrome. We argue that understanding fossoriality requires moving beyond descriptive accounts of individual traits towards an integrative framework that connects organismal function with environmental conditions. We identify key knowledge gaps and propose future research priorities centred on comparative studies, experimental approaches that manipulate multiple environmental variables simultaneously, and the integration of empirical data with mechanistic biophysical models. Together, these approaches offer a predictive framework for understanding how fossorial amphibians and reptiles interact with heterogeneous subterranean environments and provide a foundation for a more mechanistic understanding of one of the most remarkable lifestyles among terrestrial vertebrates.

Keywords: burrow, gas exchange, humidity, hydroregulation, locomotor performance, morphology, temperature, thermoregulation

42	Table of Contents	
43	ABSTRACT	1
44	I. INTRODUCTION	4
45	II. OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS OF SUBTERRANEAN ENVIRONMENTS	5
46	(1) THE UNDERGROUND AS A REFUGE	5
47	(2) THE THERMAL AND HYDRIC LANDSCAPES	6
48	(3) GAS COMPOSITION AND METABOLIC CONSTRAINTS	8
49	(4) MECHANICAL AND STRUCTURAL CONSTRAINTS	11
50	(5) SENSORY CONSTRAINTS.....	13
51	III. PHYSIOLOGICAL AND BEHAVIOURAL STRATEGIES OF FOSSORIAL TAXA.....	15
52	(1) HYDROREGULATION AND OSMOREGULATION	15
53	(2) THERMAL PHYSIOLOGY	18
54	(3) SEASONAL DORMANCY	20
55	(4) EMERGENCE AND ACTIVITY PATTERNS.....	23
56	IV. MORPHOLOGY AND LOCOMOTION.....	25
57	(1) MORPHOLOGICAL SYNDROMES ASSOCIATED WITH FOSSORIALITY	25
58	(2) CRANIAL, INTEGUMENTARY, AND SENSORY ADAPTATIONS FOR SUBTERRANEAN LOCOMOTION.....	27
59	(3) ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINANTS OF LOCOMOTOR PERFORMANCE	30
60	(4) FUNCTIONAL CONSEQUENCES OF MORPHOLOGICAL VARIATION	32
61	V. FUTURE DIRECTIONS	33
62	VI. CONCLUSIONS.....	34
63	VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	35
64	VIII. FUNDING.....	35
65	IX. AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION.....	35
66	X. DATA AVAILABILITY	35
67	XI. CONFLICT OF INTEREST	36
68	XII. REFERENCES	36
69	XIII. TABLES.....	52
70	XIV. FIGURES.....	54

I. Introduction

Fossoriality has evolved repeatedly and independently across amphibians and reptiles, placing distinct lineages under a common set of environmental and mechanical constraints. Approximately 11% of amphibians and 18% of reptiles spend the majority of their lives beneath the surface (Measey, 2006; Oliveira *et al.*, 2017), making subterranean life a recurrent ecological strategy in these groups. Life underground may confer advantages such as protection from predation and shelter from climatic extremes (Scheffers *et al.*, 2014). At the same time, subterranean environments impose constraints on locomotion, sensory perception, gas exchange, and resource acquisition (Abe & Johansen, 1987; de Barros *et al.*, 2021; Giacometti, Moldowan & Tattersall, 2024). As a result, fossorial amphibians and reptiles have evolved suites of morphological, physiological, and behavioural adaptations that mitigate these constraints. For example, fossorial caecilians (Amphibia: Gymnophiona) have respiratory and circulatory properties that favour life in conditions with limited access to the free atmosphere, like an increased reliance on cutaneous respiration and blood with high oxygen affinity (Wood *et al.*, 1975; Smits & Flanagan, 1994). Moreover, amphisbaenians (Squamata: Amphisbaenia) possess highly specialised morphological and muscular traits that aid in burrowing and moving in the subsoil (Navas *et al.*, 2004). These examples underscore the capacity of amphibians and reptiles to persist underground, yet the mechanistic foundations of their success remain only partly understood.

Despite the longstanding interest in studying the physiology and behaviour of amphibians and reptiles, research focus has typically concerned species that live aboveground as study systems (Feder & Burggren, 1992; Angilletta, 2009). Consequently, most of the current knowledge available may not be representative of fossorial species. There are at least two non-mutually exclusive reasons for this dearth of knowledge. The first stems from the largely untested assumption that fossorial animals are buffered from climatic fluctuations because the underground conditions they experience are more stable than those aboveground (Kinlaw, 1999). Although such buffering may hold over short timescales (e.g., hours), underground climates vary substantially over longer periods (e.g., months) (Cui *et al.*, 2011; Moldowan, Tattersall & Rollinson, 2022), suggesting that fossorial ectotherms may not be as buffered as assumed and that these species may be subject to selection acting on physiological and behavioural processes. The second reason relates to the innately cryptic nature of fossorial species. Indeed, fossorial

amphibians and reptiles spend most of their time underground, with short periods of aboveground activity that are associated with breeding or foraging (Faccio, 2003; Encarnación-Luévano, Rojas-Soto & Sigala-Rodríguez, 2013). Because of this, research into fossorial species has been hampered both by the difficulty of finding individuals in the wild and by the challenges of maintaining them under controlled laboratory conditions. Thus, fossorial ectotherms remain understudied relative to their epigeal counterparts (Henderson *et al.*, 2016).

Nonetheless, studies with fossorial amphibians and reptiles exist, although the ecophysiological and behavioural literature remains fragmented (Bars-Closel & Kohlsdorf, 2012). Studies typically focus on individual taxa or specific traits, like morphology (Rieppel, 1984), locomotor performance (Martín *et al.*, 2021b), hydoregulation (Cartledge *et al.*, 2006), or thermal tolerance (Claussen, 1977), rather than combining multiple axes of response (but see Navas *et al.*, 2004; Camacho *et al.*, 2015; Giacometti & Tattersall, 2023). A framework that integrates and compares these perspectives is thus necessary to understand the mechanisms that connect environmental conditions with organismal responses, predict physiological and behavioural outcomes, and infer vulnerability under changing climates (Camacho *et al.*, 2015; Bars-Closel, Camacho & Kohlsdorf, 2018). The main goal of this review is to provide a comprehensive synthesis of the current knowledge of physiological and behavioural responses to a fossorial lifestyle in amphibians and reptiles. We begin our review by outlining the unique ecological opportunities and constraints that fossorial ectotherms face in subterranean habitats. Next, we address the physiological and behavioural strategies that allow survival in underground environments, as well as the morphological syndromes often observed in fossorial species. Then, we discuss theoretical frameworks that can help predict species' responses to environmental change. Finally, we highlight current knowledge gaps and suggest directions for future research aimed at fostering a more integrative and mechanistic understanding of fossorial life.

II. Opportunities and constraints of subterranean environments

(1) *The underground as a refuge*

The underground environment has repeatedly offered vertebrates a refuge from ecological and climatic disturbances, ultimately promoting the evolution of fossorial lineages

that still persist among amphibians, reptiles, and other taxa (Olson & Bolles, 1975). In early tetrapods, fossoriality likely evolved as a means to avoid predation, desiccation, and thermal stress, offering selective advantages during periods of climatic instability aboveground (Kinlaw, 1999). In extant ectotherms, fossoriality still functions as a defensive and regulatory strategy that reduces exposure to predators and modulates the physiological costs of environmental variation (Wu, Parker & Thompson, 2009; Raya-Garcia, Alvarado-Diaz & Martín Rueda, 2019). This buffering function may also provide protection from acute environmental disturbances such as wildfire (Pilliod *et al.*, 2003). However, the climatic buffering observed in underground environments is neither absolute nor cost-free. Soil temperature, moisture, and gas composition still follow daily and seasonal cycles, all of which also vary with soil depth, soil type, and broader environmental context (Boynton & Compton, 1944; Illston, Basara & Crawford, 2004; Alves & Schmid, 2015). Thus, fossorial species must either continually adjust their physiology and behaviour, or be able to sustain performance across a wide range of changing conditions.

(2) The thermal and hydric landscapes

Temperature and water availability are among the most pervasive environmental variables influencing ectotherms (Feder & Burggren, 1992; Angilletta, 2009), defining both the challenges and opportunities of underground life. The thermal landscape experienced by fossorial species is markedly different from the one experienced by species that live aboveground. The soil acts as a physical buffer, reducing the amplitude of daily thermal fluctuations and mitigating warm and cold extremes (Cui *et al.*, 2011; Scheffers *et al.*, 2014). The extent of thermal buffering, however, depends on both soil depth and composition. Deeper burrows experience small diel temperature fluctuations, but may lag behind surface temperatures over longer timescales, such as seasonal transitions (Moldowan *et al.*, 2022). Soil composition also modulates thermal conductivity, with sandy or dry soils allowing faster heating and cooling than clay-rich or humid soil (Smits *et al.*, 2013; Mu *et al.*, 2019). Moreover, the strength of thermal buffering varies across microhabitats, with surface shading and vegetation cover influencing how heat flows into the subsoil (Alves & Schmid, 2015). As a result, shifts in air temperature may be transmitted underground with a considerable delay, meaning that underground temperatures may peak or trough days or even weeks after those aboveground

(Moldowan *et al.*, 2022) (**Figure 1**). From an ecological standpoint, such thermal inertia can decouple surface environmental cues from the physiological or behavioural timing of fossorial organisms, potentially influencing emergence or reproductive phenology (Moldowan *et al.*, 2022; Giacometti *et al.*, 2024).

These facets demonstrate that underground thermal environments are both temporally and spatially heterogeneous, challenging the longstanding assumption that burrows provide a uniform thermal refuge (Camacho *et al.*, 2015; Forget-Klein & Green, 2021; Moldowan *et al.*, 2022). For amphibians and reptiles, whose biology is highly sensitive to temperature (Tattersall *et al.*, 2012), underground thermal variation can impact a variety of biological processes. For example, work in the Fowler's toad (*Anaxyrus fowleri*) demonstrated that individuals responded to daily thermal fluctuations in the soil by adjusting the depth to which they were buried. In doing so, toads maintained body temperatures (T_{bs}) around 30°C (**Figure 2**), which possibly facilitated the digestion of food items obtained while foraging aboveground in the previous night (Forget-Klein & Green, 2021). Long-term observations likewise indicate that underground positions are not fixed. Hibernating common toads (*Bufo bufo*) moved vertically in the soil as temperature gradients changed, with individuals occupying different depths over the course of winter (van Gelder *et al.*, 1986). Thus, while the subsoil can buffer short-term thermal extremes, fossorial ectotherms may track temporal changes in underground thermal conditions by adjusting their position within the soil profile.

Besides temperature, water availability also has a fundamental influence on fossorial amphibians and reptiles. Relative to the surface, the subsoil generally maintains higher and more stable moisture levels due to reduced evaporation and limited exposure to wind and solar radiation (Hanks, Gardner & Fairbourn, 1967). Because of this, underground environments are also interpreted to provide shelter from desiccation (Rothermel & Luhring, 2005; Martín *et al.*, 2025). Similar to temperature, however, this apparent hydric stability masks spatiotemporal variability in soil water content. Indeed, soil water dynamics are driven by complex interactions among precipitation, drainage, evaporation, and capillary action, which in turn vary with soil texture, compaction, organic matter content, and temperature (Hanks *et al.*, 1967; Bittelli, 2011; Li *et al.*, 2024). Within the scope of this review, the relationship between temperature and humidity is of particular importance. Soil water content influences thermal conductivity, such

that wetter soils buffer temperature fluctuations more effectively than dry soils (Mu *et al.*, 2019). Conversely, warming increases evaporative demand (Anderson, 1936), and may create sharp, vertical hydric and thermal (hereafter “hydrothermal”) gradients in relatively shallow soil (Hanks *et al.*, 1967). These interacting gradients define the hydrothermal niche available to fossorial organisms, which consists of a dynamic axis along which behavioural and physiological regulation must occur.

This combination of factors results in an underground hydrothermal mosaic (Hanks *et al.*, 1967), suggesting that the thermal and hydric optima of a given species rarely occur at the same depth. Based on this, one may hypothesise that the presence of hydrothermal gradients should drive decision-making with respect to the maintenance of homeostasis, thereby influencing fossorial species to move through the subsoil to seek favourable conditions. A central tenet of this view is that fossorial ectotherms should face a fundamental trade-off between maintaining thermal balance and conserving body water (Giacometti & Tattersall, 2025). However, the drive to conserve body water should be disproportionately greater in fossorial amphibians than reptiles. Amphibians possess highly permeable and vascularised skin and are particularly sensitive to drying conditions, whereas reptiles have evolved keratinised integuments that confer an enhanced resistance to evaporative water loss (Lillywhite, 2006). Preliminary evidence supports this notion: under mild hydric and thermal stress, European toads (*Bufo viridis*) and Pacific horned frogs (*Ceratophrys stolzmanni*) rapidly sought deeper layers in the soil and decreased emergence to the surface to minimise evaporative water loss (Hoffman & Katz, 1989; Székely *et al.*, 2018). By contrast, simulated drought only caused a transient increase in glucocorticoid levels in the Iberian worm lizard (*Blanus cinereus*) that was mitigated by behavioural selection of soil with favourable water content (Martín *et al.*, 2025). Together, these data suggest that the ability to detect changes in soil temperature and soil water content is integral to burrow-depth selection and to maintain hydrothermal balance.

(3) Gas composition and metabolic constraints

The gaseous properties of underground environments impose additional constraints on fossorial ectotherms, influencing their respiratory and metabolic strategies. In burrows, restricted diffusion and low air turnover lead to the progressive depletion of oxygen and the accumulation

of carbon dioxide, therefore creating potentially hypoxic and hypercarbic conditions for a resident animal (Withers, 1978; Boutilier, 1990). The detrimental effects of prolonged exposure to hypoxia and hypercarbia are myriad, ranging from changes in thermoregulatory set-points (Tattersall & Boutilier, 1997; Tattersall & Milsom, 2009) to augmented breathing and respiratory acidosis (Ar, Arieli & Shkolnik, 1977; Jackson, 2007). Importantly, our understanding of how fossorial animals deal with hypoxia and hypercarbia under natural conditions is still limited and largely biased toward endotherms, whose elevated metabolism leads to situations which can outpace the rate of gas diffusion through soil. For example, measurements from burrows of the Middle East blind mole rat (*Spalax ehrenbergi*) and Botta's pocket gopher (*Thomomys bottae*) found minimum oxygen concentrations of 7.2–15.5% and maximum carbon dioxide concentrations of 3.8–6.1% (Darden, 1972; Shams, Avivi & Nevo, 2005). In comparison, measurements from burrows of the Gopher tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*) and nests of green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) found the lowest oxygen concentrations to be 18% (Prange & Ackerman, 1974; Ultsch & Anderson, 1988), and data from burrows of spotted salamanders (*Ambystoma maculatum*) suggest maximum carbon dioxide to be around 1.3% (**Figure 3**). Thus, it is possible that fossorial endotherms and ectotherms encounter different respiratory pressures, shaped in part by their divergent metabolic demands (i.e., greater in endotherms than in ectotherms).

One interpretation of these gas dynamics is grounded in the hypothesis that the occupation of hypoxic and hypercarbic burrows favours the evolution of reduced metabolic rates, which would enable fossorial species to conserve energy in habitats with limited access to the free atmosphere (hereafter “energetic-savings hypothesis”) (McNab, 1966). Support for the energetic-savings hypothesis comes primarily from work in fossorial mammals, which appear to have a reduced oxygen demand as well as blunted sensitivity to high carbon dioxide levels (Nevo, 1979; Milsom & Jackson, 2011). This hypothesis was later extended from mammals to reptiles, with the intent to explain metabolic differences between fossorial species and those that live aboveground (**Figure 4**). For example, the California legless lizard (*Anniella pulchra*), the eastern glass lizard (*Ophisaurus ventralis*), and the checkerboard worm lizard (*Trogonophis wiegmanni*) were shown to maintain metabolic rates 34–67% lower than lizards of similar sizes that do not have a fossorial habit (i.e., hereafter “epigeal”) (Kamel & Gatten, 1983). Although similar results were reported in additional species (Andrews & Pough, 1985), the hypothesis that

fossoriality selects for chronically reduced metabolic rates in reptiles has received mixed empirical support. For example, metabolic rates in fossorial skinks were broadly consistent with allometric expectations (Withers, 1981), while fossorial tortoises and snakes did not consistently exhibit lower metabolism than epigeal or semi-fossorial counterparts after accounting for body mass (Ultsch & Anderson, 1988; Wang & Abe, 1994). Central to this counterargument is the fact that reptiles function at intrinsically lower metabolic levels than mammals, so further metabolic reductions caused by fossoriality would be evolutionarily implausible because of a relatively small energetic benefit (Wang & Abe, 1994).

A formal phylogenetically controlled test of the energetic-savings hypothesis has yet to be conducted in reptiles. However, comparative data from 185 species support the idea that fossoriality alone is an unlikely selective pressure on amphibian metabolism. Indeed, after controlling for temperature and body mass effects, metabolic rates were similar between fossorial and epigeal amphibians (**Figure 4**) (Giacometti & Tattersall, 2023). Thus, while many amphibians tolerate hypoxic and hypercarbic conditions (Tattersall & Boutilier, 1997; Bicego-Nahas & Branco, 1999; Sheafor, Wood & Tattersall, 2000; Ultsch, 2012), current evidence does not suggest a systematic metabolic depression in response to the colonisation of environments with periodically or chronically low oxygen and high carbon dioxide levels. Besides their low energetic requirements (Pough, 1983), fossorial amphibians may also demonstrate an enhanced reliance on cutaneous respiration, which allows gas exchange to occur across the integument under conditions where pulmonary ventilation may be constrained, including prolonged exposure to water-saturated substrates (Smits & Flanagan, 1994). Cutaneous respiration may therefore provide an additional pathway for O₂ uptake and carbon dioxide excretion in underground environments, potentially reducing the dependence on pulmonary ventilation under hypoxic or waterlogged conditions (Boutilier & Toews, 1981; Sheafor *et al.*, 2000). Alternatively, behavioural adjustments like exploiting well-ventilated soil layers or periodically emerging to the surface could help restore oxygen and carbon dioxide balance and avoid hypoxia and hypercarbia. To our knowledge, direct observations of such behaviours remain undocumented. Taken together, these pieces of evidence suggest that underground gas composition may reinforce existing physiological strategies rather than impose a single convergent solution. Whereas some mammals and reptiles respond to hypoxic and hypercarbic conditions through a

reduction of metabolic demand and expenditure, amphibians may be able to maintain relatively stable metabolic performance through physiological (and possibly behavioural) buffering.

(4) Mechanical and structural constraints

Fossorial animals also face mechanical and structural challenges that influence how they navigate underground environments. Unlike air or water, soil is a dense medium whose physical properties (e.g., compaction, moisture content, particle size) determine resistance to penetration and the costs of locomotion (de Barros *et al.*, 2021). For fossorial ectotherms, these properties also dictate the extent to which individuals can reposition themselves to access favourable hydrothermal or respiratory conditions (Jared, Navas & Toledo, 1999; Navas *et al.*, 2004). Therefore, soil characteristics may not only constrain movement, but also contribute to the hydrothermal and energetic constraints highlighted in earlier sections.

A key aspect of these mechanical constraints is the interplay between soil density and moisture, which collectively shape the energetic costs of burrowing. Compacted and clay-rich soils offer great resistance to forward motion, meaning that substantial muscular effort is necessary to push or displace the substrate (Gans, 1978). Conversely, loose and sandy soil offer little support and may collapse during excavation, requiring animals to invest additional effort to stabilise tunnels and burrows (Camacho *et al.*, 2015). Moisture content further modulates these dynamics: wetter soils can reduce friction and lower resistance to digging; however, excavation may be impeded when the soil becomes saturated due to loss of structural integrity (Bittelli, 2011; Doody *et al.*, 2015). As a result, fossorial amphibians and reptiles often exhibit preferences for specific soil textures and moisture levels (Cartledge *et al.*, 2006; Greenville & Dickman, 2009; Martín *et al.*, 2021a), and may time their above- and below-ground movement to coincide with periods when mechanical resistance is minimised, such as following rainfall. By effectively tracking shifts in soil mechanics, fossorial animals capitalise on windows of opportunity that present lower costs for movement (Traeholt, 1995).

Because digging is energetically demanding (Wu *et al.*, 2015), fossorial species either adopt locomotor strategies that reduce the need for sustained excavation, or display morphophysiological adaptations that maximise digging and burrowing performance. For

example, fossorial amphibians with limited morphological specialisation, like some mole salamanders (*Ambystoma* spp.), exploit pre-existing burrows or soil fissures to minimise the cost of movement (Semlitsch, 1983; Dzenowski & Hembree, 2014). Other species with more specialised morphologies, like amphisbaenians, limb-reduced skinks, and some anurans, display distinct modes of burrowing (hindlimb- or head-first), “sand-swimming”, or concertina locomotion that facilitate travel through narrow spaces with minimal excavation (Gans, 1978; Navas *et al.*, 2004; Nomura, Rossa-Feres & Langeani, 2009). These coordinated behavioural and biomechanical strategies illustrate that fossorial amphibians and reptiles do not depend solely on digging ability to persist underground. Rather, animals combine active excavation with exploitation of natural soil architecture to sustain mobility in mechanically complex substrates. From an evolutionary perspective, such locomotor specialisations reflect traits that were selected in response to the burden of displacing dense or unstable substrates (Navas *et al.*, 2004; de Barros *et al.*, 2021).

Soil properties also impact burrow architecture and stability, which in turn affect microclimate exposure and refuge quality (Laundré & Reynolds, 1993). Appropriate tunnel diameter, curvature, and depth result from a balance between mechanical stability and the need for ventilation, drainage, and movement (Traeholt, 1995; Doody *et al.*, 2015). One may hypothesise, thus, that amphibians that rely heavily on cutaneous respiration may favour wider or more humid chambers that favour gas exchange and the maintenance of water balance (Wu *et al.*, 2025). In contrast, reptiles may be less constrained by dry subterranean microhabitats due to their reduced risk of evaporative water loss (Abe & Johansen, 1987; Martín *et al.*, 2025). These contrasting requirements imply that burrow architecture may differ between fossorial amphibians and reptiles, although evidence in this context comes primarily from work in extinct, rather than extant, species (Hembree, Martin & Hasiotis, 2004; Dzenowski & Hembree, 2014; Doody *et al.*, 2015). Furthermore, burrow stability is influenced by seasonal changes in soil moisture and freeze-thaw cycles, which can collapse tunnels and force animals to relocate or reconstruct refuges (Traeholt, 1995; Shenbrot *et al.*, 2002; Doody *et al.*, 2015). Such structural dynamics likely interact with hydrothermal and respiratory demands and constraints, ultimately influencing which microhabitats remain accessible to fossorial animals throughout the year.

Finally, it is worth emphasising that mechanical constraints are rarely examined in concert with behavioural and physiological responses, despite representing an important aspect of fossorial life (Jared *et al.*, 1999; Navas *et al.*, 2004). By modulating the energetic costs of movement, the possibility of accessing viable microclimates, and the stability of underground refuges, soil mechanics help determine the extent to which fossorial amphibians and reptiles can deal with environmental variability. Thus, mechanical properties of the soil interact with hydrothermal and respiratory demands, shaping not only movement but also when, where, and how animals utilise subterranean habitats.

(5) *Sensory constraints*

Compared with the surface, underground environments present a radically altered sensory landscape. Because light is virtually absent and sound transmission is muffled, fossorial animals are reliant on mechanosensation and chemosensation to sense their surroundings and communicate with one another (Mason & Narins, 2001; Martín *et al.*, 2020). As a result, fossorial taxa often display neuroanatomical configurations that differ markedly from those of their surface-dwelling counterparts, including enlarged somatosensory regions and reduced processing centres, reflecting both adaptive specialisation and relaxation of unused sensory structures (Madison, 1977; Wake, 1985). Visual constraints are the most immediately apparent. Several fossorial lineages possess reduced eyes and visual acuity, or even complete eye regression (Gans, 1978; Wake, 1985). In caecilians (Amphibia: Gymnophiona), the reduction of ocular structures has long been interpreted as a consequence of fossorial life, with vision playing little to no role in underground navigation, individual recognition, or foraging (Wake, 1985; Martín *et al.*, 2020). Similarly, many fossorial reptiles possess eyelid-protected eyes that only allow for a crude detection of light intensity, likely assisting in orientation or diel timing but not in spatial discrimination (Foureaux *et al.*, 2010; Guerra-Fuentes *et al.*, 2014). Thus, the relaxation of visual demands suggests the predominance of other sensory axes in fossorial taxa.

Vibration appears to be an important orientational cue in fossorial species. Soil transmits low-frequency vibrations while attenuating high-frequency signals, creating a sensory environment in which seismic disturbances provide crucial information about predators or prey (Mason & Narins, 2001; Young & Morain, 2002). Worm-lizards (Squamata: Amphisbaenia), for

example, possess a highly specialised inner ear morphology that enhances the detection of substrate vibrations, allowing them to interpret the direction and intensity of mechanical cues as they navigate the soil (Gans & Wever, 1972; Clark *et al.*, 2024). While some amphibians also appear to rely on seismic signals as a means of communication (Narins, 1990), such data come from epigeal instead of fossorial species. Nonetheless, it is plausible to expect that fossorial amphibians that possess broad cutaneous mechanoreceptors may be particularly suited to detect underground vibrations (Catton, 1958). Unlike reptiles (e.g., Young & Morain, 2002), empirical tests of vibration sensitivity in fossorial amphibians are notably lacking.

Chemical sensing and olfaction may also be modified underground. The diffusion and degradation of odorants through the soil depends on pore size, moisture content, and mass flow of air (Som, Willett & Alborn, 2017). Consequently, fossorial animals often experience reduced access to airborne chemical cues. Reptiles that rely on lingual-vomer nasal sampling, like skinks and amphisbaenians, may compensate through an enhanced sensitivity to odorants or an increase in sampling behaviour, thus permitting the detection of conspecifics and favourable microhabitats (Martín *et al.*, 2020, 2021a). Data from aquatic and epigeal amphibians suggest that chemoreception plays an important role in predator avoidance, habitat selection, and reproduction (Reiss & Eisthen, 2008; Woodley, 2015). Plethodontid salamanders provide a particularly well-characterised example of substrate-borne chemoreception, as their nasolabial grooves can transport chemicals from the substrate to the vomeronasal organ during nose-tapping, facilitating the detection of non-volatile chemical cues (Dawley & Bass, 1988). It is therefore likely that fossorial amphibians similarly exploit chemical gradients to detect conspecifics, navigate microhabitats, or locate prey, although explicit assessments have yet to be conducted.

Given the unique sensory landscape presented by underground environments, the sensory hierarchies of fossorial amphibians and reptiles appear to be reorganised: vibration, mechanosensory and chemosensory cues may dominate over vision and airborne cues. How these inputs are processed remains poorly understood, but available evidence suggests substantial neural and behavioural modifications relative to species that live above the surface (Wahnschaffe, Fritzsche & Himstedt, 1985; Fritzsche & Wake, 1988). Despite this, sensory constraints remain of the least studied aspects of fossorial life, especially in amphibians.

Integrating sensory studies with the hydrothermal, respiratory, and mechanical perspectives outlined above will be crucial for understanding how fossorial animals perceive and respond to subterranean environments.

III. Physiological and behavioural strategies of fossorial taxa

(1) Hydoregulation and osmoregulation

In fossorial ectotherms, hydoregulation is fundamentally governed by the physics of water exchange between the animal and its surrounding environment. Net water flux is determined by gradients in water potential, which integrate effects of temperature, substrate water content, and solute concentration (Shoemaker *et al.*, 1992). When the water potential of the surrounding soil falls below that of the animal's body fluids, water is lost passively; conversely, when the gradient is reversed, water uptake from the substrate becomes possible (Spight, 1967). Given that soil water potential can vary sharply over small spatial scales, especially in drying surface layers, fossorial species are presumed to be exposed to steep and dynamic hydric gradients. Consequently, the capacity to either resist water loss or exploit specific zones of higher water availability is central to the maintenance of hydric and osmotic balance underground (Székely *et al.*, 2018). The extent to which these gradients translate into water loss or gain is contingent on organismal traits, such as integument structure and osmoregulatory capacity, which ultimately govern how water flux is regulated in amphibians and reptiles (Lillywhite, 2006). Importantly, much of the empirical foundation for these mechanisms derives from epigeal or semi-aquatic species, and direct tests in strictly fossorial amphibians and reptiles remain scarce.

The structure and permeability of the integument represent a key point of divergence between amphibians and reptiles. Amphibians possess a thin and highly vascularised skin that is permeable to both water and dissolved gases (Tattersall, 2007). These characteristics enable efficient cutaneous water uptake in moist conditions, but simultaneously predispose amphibians to substantial evaporative water loss when exposed to drier conditions (Giacometti & Tattersall, 2025). In contrast, reptiles possess a stratified epidermis with a well-developed stratum corneum that is composed of keratinised scales and lipid layers that collectively reduce cutaneous permeability to water, ultimately allowing reptiles to maintain internal water balance even in

relatively dry conditions (Lillywhite & Maderson, 1988; Lillywhite, 2006). However, this reduced permeability also limits the potential for direct water uptake through the skin, thereby rendering reptiles more reliant on drinking environmental water or producing it metabolically (Shoemaker & Nagy, 1977; Lillywhite, 2017).

Beyond these structural differences, fossorial amphibians and reptiles also diverge in the mechanisms that regulate water balance. In amphibians, specialised regions of the integument enhance hydoregulatory capacity. The pelvic patch is a highly vascularised area of ventral skin that is particularly important for water absorption, allowing individuals to rehydrate rapidly when in contact with moist substrates (Parsons & Mobin, 1991). Water uptake across the pelvic patch is facilitated by its dense vascularisation and the presence of aquaporins, whose activity is regulated by arginine vasotocin, a hormone that increases skin permeability and promotes water absorption (Lemenager *et al.*, 2022). In addition to regulating water uptake, amphibians may also exert control over water loss. Recent work suggests that the fossorial *A. maculatum* can maintain a relatively constant vapour pressure deficit (i.e., the driving force for evaporative water loss) across contrasting thermal conditions via selection of favourable microhabitats. This indicates an ability to sense and process environmental water content, as well as engage regulatory mechanisms that stabilise rates of dehydration under variable environments (Giacometti & Tattersall, 2025). Together, the capacity to regulate both water uptake and loss likely enables amphibians to exploit fine-scale hydric heterogeneity in the soil, effectively using behavioural and physiological adjustments to maintain hydric balance (Spotila, 1972). In fossorial contexts, where direct access to free-standing water may be limited, such integrative control of water flux may be critical for sustaining hydration without frequent surface emergence.

In reptiles, hydoregulation appears to rely less on a dynamic modulation of cutaneous exchange and more on minimising water loss and conserving internal water stores. Indeed, due to their integumentary characteristics, reptiles possess markedly lower rates of cutaneous permeability compared to amphibians (Lillywhite & Maderson, 1988; Lillywhite, 2006). To maintain water balance, reptiles depend on the integration between behavioural strategies (e.g., microhabitat selection) and physiological mechanisms. Central to this is the regulation of renal function and nitrogen excretion. Most reptiles are uricotelic, excreting nitrogenous wastes that precipitate with minimal water loss, thus enhancing water conservation (Shoemaker & Nagy,

1977). Although some reptiles possess urinary bladders capable of temporary water storage and reabsorption (Jørgensen, 1998), this mechanism is generally less crucial to water balance than in amphibians. Hormonal regulation also modulates renal water reabsorption and urine concentration in reptiles, contributing to the maintenance of osmotic balance under dry conditions (Bradshaw, 1972). As with amphibians, much of this understanding is derived from epigeal species. Nonetheless, hydoregulation in fossorial reptiles is likely centred on minimising water loss and maximising retention, which may render them more tolerant of drier and more variable soils than amphibians, albeit with a reduced capacity for direct water uptake from the substrate (Jared *et al.*, 1999; Martín *et al.*, 2025).

Osmoregulatory strategies also differ between amphibians and reptiles in terms of internal water storage and endocrine control. Many amphibians possess a urinary bladder that serves as a reservoir for water storage, allowing individuals to buffer short-term fluctuations in hydration state (Shoemaker *et al.*, 1992). When necessary, water stored in the bladder can be reabsorbed into circulation, a process that is hormonally regulated and contributes substantially to the maintenance of osmotic balance (Bentley, 1966). In contrast, reptiles are more reliant on renal regulation and nitrogen excretion strategies to conserve water, primarily through the production of uric acid, which minimises water loss during excretion (Dantzler & Bradshaw, 2008). At the endocrine level, both amphibians and reptiles regulate water balance through neurohypophysial hormones, particularly arginine vasotocin. In amphibians, vasotocin influences kidney function, bladder permeability, and cutaneous water uptake, whereas in reptiles its role is largely restricted to modulating renal water reabsorption and urine concentration (Bentley, 1966; Dantzler & Bradshaw, 2008). These physiological pathways provide a mechanism through which the internal state of an organism can be coordinated with external environmental conditions, thereby enabling adjustments in water balance under fluctuating moisture regimes.

Collectively, the differences highlighted in this section reinforce two contrasting hydoregulatory strategies: amphibians operate as highly permeable systems that depend on environmental water availability and behavioural modulations, whereas reptiles function as more conservative systems that minimise water loss through structural and physiological barriers. In the spatially heterogeneous and often rapidly shifting hydric environment of the subsoil, these contrasting strategies are likely to shape how fossorial species access, exploit, and remain within

suitable microhabitats, ultimately influencing patterns of vertical movement, refuge use, and surface emergence (Székely *et al.*, 2018; Martín *et al.*, 2025).

(2) Thermal physiology

Traditionally, the thermal physiology of fossorial ectotherms has been interpreted through the lens of a syndrome that includes: i) relatively low T_b s, ii) reduced thermal preference (T_{pref}) and selected temperatures (T_{sel}), iii) and limited thermoregulatory performance compared to epigeal species (Andrews, 1994; Camacho *et al.*, 2015). The fossorial syndrome of thermal physiology is generally attributed to the thermal properties of the subsoil, where diel fluctuations are dampened and thermal extremes are attenuated. Under these conditions, both the opportunity and necessity for active thermoregulation are presumed to be reduced (Bury & Balgooyen, 1976; López, Civantos & Martín, 2002). As a result, fossorial ectotherms are often interpreted as thermal generalists that have not been naturally selected for overt behavioural thermoregulation and just passively track underground temperatures (Camacho *et al.*, 2015; Giacometti *et al.*, 2021). However, this interpretation remains only partially supported, and may oversimplify the thermal biology of fossorial taxa.

Although reduced thermal variability in the soil may limit the range of temperatures available at a given depth, vertical thermal gradients can still be pronounced in the subsoil (Forget-Klein & Green, 2021). As a result, fossorial ectotherms may retain the capacity for behavioural thermoregulation by adjusting their position within the soil column. Indeed, recent studies suggest that some fossorial amphibians make thermally-oriented decisions in both natural and laboratory settings. For instance, Fowler's toads (*Anaxyrus fowleri*) have been shown to move vertically along underground thermal gradients, which ensures that their T_b stays within their T_{sel} range (Brattstrom, 1963; Forget-Klein & Green, 2021) (**Figure 2**). Similarly, *A. maculatum* has been demonstrated to behaviourally adjust T_{sel} in response to seasonally-changing acclimation conditions (Giacometti & Tattersall, 2024). In fossorial reptiles, the available evidence suggests that thermoregulatory behaviour may be constrained by the thermal properties of the subsoil. Fossorial skinks exhibit T_{pref} that exceed their field-measured T_b s, indicating that while positive thermotaxis may be retained in fossorial taxa, the opportunity to realise these preferences may be limited by restricted access to suitable thermal microhabitats underground

(Withers, 1981). Thus, while fossorial ectotherms may not be predominantly thermoconformers, behavioural thermoregulation may be constrained.

A related and largely unresolved question concerns the efficiency of thermoregulation in fossorial environments. Indeed, despite the widespread use of thermoregulatory indices in surface-active ectotherms (Hertz, Huey & Stevenson, 1993; Blouin-Demers & Nadeau, 2005), their use has yet to be applied to fossorial species. Possibly, this is due to the difficulty of quantifying the operative thermal environment (Bakken, 1992) and behavioural access to thermal microhabitats underground. Consequently, the extent to which fossorial ectotherms achieve a narrow control over T_b remains unclear. In systems where thermal gradients are shallow or temporally lagged, behavioural adjustments may result in less precise thermoregulation relative to epigeal species (Bogert, 1949; Camacho *et al.*, 2015). Alternatively, the predictability and temporal lag of underground thermal regimes may allow fossorial ectotherms to control T_b through depth and activity adjustments rather than continuous tracking of local thermal conditions (van Gelder *et al.*, 1986; Forget-Klein & Green, 2021). Resolving this issue will require integrating fine-scale measurements of soil temperature profiles with continuous records of T_b and movement patterns (Forget-Klein & Green, 2021).

The mechanisms that underly thermal perception in fossorial environments are also poorly understood. In the absence of radiative heat flux, heat exchange underground occurs primarily through conduction (Jameson, 1981). This suggests that fossorial ectotherms rely primarily on thigmothermy; that is, the detection of temperature through direct contact with the substrate (Black *et al.*, 2019). Because conductive heat transfer operates over short spatial scales, thermal gradients in soil may be shallow and highly localised, potentially reducing the spatial resolution of thermal cues available to fossorial animals. Under such conditions, the spatial distribution and sensitivity of cutaneous thermoreceptors may play an important role in thermal orientation. If thermosensitive units are unevenly distributed across the body surface, as has been suggested in some vertebrates, this could bias how animals sample thermal information (Cabanac, Hammel & Hardy, 1967; Romanovsky, 2014), ultimately impacting their ability to detect the directionality of thermal gradients. In this context, anterior body regions like the head may function as primary sampling interfaces, allowing animals to detect thermal discontinuities during forward displacement through the substrate. If thermal perception is indeed constrained

by contact-based sensing, thermoregulatory behaviour in fossorial ectotherms may depend on iterative sampling and short-distance movements, rather than directed navigation along continuous gradients (Giacometti *et al.*, 2021). However, empirical data on the neurophysiology of thermosensation in fossorial amphibians and reptiles are virtually absent, representing a major gap in our understanding of how these animals perceive and respond to thermal heterogeneity underground.

(3) Seasonal dormancy

The remarkable adaptability of ectothermic tetrapods is nowhere more evident than in seasonally fluctuating environments, where a diverse set of amphibians and reptiles not only survive but thrive under temporal changes in biotic and abiotic features. As previously established, fossoriality is closely tied to the ability to survive prolonged dry spells or severe temperature, with many species relying on subsurface refugia to buffer environmental extremes (Little & Seebacher, 2016). This rationale is supported by fossil evidence indicating that fossorial habits emerged early in the evolutionary history of various ectothermic lineages, thereby representing an ancient state that allows animals to persist in changing environments (Hembree *et al.*, 2004; Nomura *et al.*, 2009). Often, species that spend long portions of the year underground present hypometabolic adjustments that reduce their energy demand while buried in the soil. This reduced energetic demand is not merely a short-term survival mechanism; it also promotes an increase in overall lifespan. By simultaneously lowering metabolic rates, minimising activity, and slowing down physiological processes, seasonal dormancy conserves vital energy reserves and reduces oxidative damage, which collectively contribute to extended longevity (Storey & Storey, 2012).

In general, seasonal metabolic depression entails a marked decrease of physiological functions across multiple organismal systems in response to environmental cues and, in some cases, due to the action of endogenous rhythms (Dark, 2005; Storey & Storey, 2010). In amphibians and reptiles that undergo seasonal dormancy like aestivation (inactivity associated with water deficit) or hibernation (inactivity associated with low body temperatures), voluntary locomotion ceases and feeding along with digestive processes comes to a halt (Sanders *et al.*, 2015; Zena *et al.*, 2016). Concomitantly, cardiac and respiratory rates decline, and cerebral

electrical activity becomes notably slower (Storey & Storey, 1990). The controlling events associated with these processes must therefore promote a new state of equilibrium, which involves a reduction in the rates of all cellular processes, along with specific biochemical adjustments such as shifts in the type of energy substrate used and changes in the accumulation of catabolites (Hochachka & Guppy, 1987; Wang & Wolowyk, 1988). For example, in animals that exhibit profound metabolic depression under hypoxic conditions, there is an inhibition of enzymatic steps in the glycolytic pathway and of pathways that regulate carbohydrate entry into the Krebs cycle, thereby limiting ATP production from this substrate (Storey & Kelly, 1995; Hochachka & Somero, 2002). On the other hand, it is known that aestivation in most anuran species is predominantly an aerobic phenomenon, although in some species it occurs under mildly hypoxic conditions (Storey & Storey, 2012). Thus, aestivating animals can utilise oxidative pathways for ATP production albeit at lower rates. In such cases, the mechanisms underlying metabolic depression are potentially more complex, since the control of the hypometabolic state involves multiple cellular pathways and operates differently across various organs and systems (Storey & Storey, 1990; Carvalho, Navas & Pereira, 2010; Storey & Storey, 2012; Staples, 2016). Metabolic homeostasis during the hypometabolic period is then ensured by lipid stores, which are oxidised at rates compatible with the depressed oxygen consumption and overall activity levels of the animals (Florant, 1998; Dark, 2005; Chazarin *et al.*, 2019).

Beyond the mechanistic processes of biochemical and physiological control, seasonal variation in energy metabolism constitutes a fundamental ecophysiological challenge for amphibians and reptiles, as the observed metabolic adjustments arise from the integration of microhabitat selection, behavioural plasticity, and physiological responses. Microhabitat selection carries profound physiological implications for these animals, particularly regarding exposure to environmental extremes (Huey, 1991). Through behavioural strategies, individuals can mitigate such extremes by seeking thermal and hydric refugia from harsh seasonal conditions (Carvalho *et al.*, 2010; Oromí, Sanuy & Sinsch, 2010). For instance, tegu lizards (*Salvator merianae*), one of the largest lizards in South America, usually alternate between moments spent inside and outside burrows to thermoregulate during the active season despite their enhanced ability to produce endogenous body heat (Abe, 1995; Tattersall *et al.*, 2016). With approaching winter, shorter photoperiods and cooler temperatures, tegus increase the proportion of time spent inside burrows and exhibit spontaneous hypophagia (Abe, 1983). These lizards are known to

hibernate throughout austral autumn and winter, exhibiting a profound depression of aerobic metabolism, ventilation and heart rate independent of environmental and body temperatures (Abe, 1995; Andrade & Abe, 1999; Sanders *et al.*, 2015). Therefore, for tegus, burrows serve not merely as refugia from harsh weather, but as a critical resource that provides the protective conditions essential for survival during prolonged inactivity.

The degree of reliance on burrows, however, differs markedly across species based on their ecological traits. For instance, among aestivating anurans, spadefoot toads (*Scaphiopus couchii*) avoid exposed areas by burrowing into shaded, vegetated sites where temperature fluctuations are reduced and moisture persists longer, a microhabitat preference that mirrors its broader selection of grassland over more arid scrub habitats during the active season (Mayhew, 1965; McClanahan Jr, 1972). Likewise, Australian green-striped frogs (*Cyclorana alboguttata*) show clear selectivity for sandy soil when allowed to choose from different substrates in controlled settings (Booth, 2006). Conversely, some frogs adopt strategies that do not necessarily mitigate stress. The African reed frog (*Hyperolius viridiflavus*) undergoes seasonal dormancy while clinging to sunlit vegetation, while being fully exposed to heat and desiccation (Kobelt & Linsenmair, 1995). Despite numerous reports in the literature on seasonal changes in behavioural and physiological aspects of aestivation in anurans, many subtle features concerning site selection are not yet understood. This issue warrants particular attention, as it bears directly on understanding how burrowing strategies and physiological adjustments are integrated to ensure survival.

For example, aestivating *C. alboguttata* create small air chambers when burrowed, likely through limb movements that compact the soil, which may ultimately reduce cutaneous contact with dry substrates and limit water loss (Booth, 2006). In contrast, spadefoot toads (*Scaphiopus hammondi*) lie fully enveloped by sand during aestivation (Ruibal, Tevis Jr & Roig, 1969). Other aspects of aestivation in these anurans must be considered. For example, *C. alboguttata* form cocoons (i.e., accumulated layers of shed epidermal cells) that promote a reduction in water conductance across the skin (Withers, 1998), while *Scaphiopus* spp. do not form cocoons but instead accumulate large amounts of urea that serve as an organic solute to minimise the osmotic gradient with the environment (Jones, 1980). Moreover, there are clear physicochemical differences between the substrates in which organisms burrow (e.g., sandy soils or drying mud),

each presenting distinct challenges for gas exchange and water balance. In the case of *Scaphiopus* spp., individuals buried in sand typically leave no openings to the surface, relying entirely on oxygen diffusion through the substrate, which remains near atmospheric levels even beneath the ground (Seymour, 1973; Carvalho *et al.*, 2010). Sandy environments thus rarely impose gas exchange limitations for seasonally dormant animals. In contrast, muddy substrates, especially when dry, are likely far less permeable to respiratory gases, though this issue remains understudied (Carvalho *et al.*, 2010). Regarding water availability, the granular structure of sand influences how easily burrowing anurans can extract environmental moisture; water uptake depends not merely on soil water content but also on tension (Ruibal *et al.*, 1969). Together, these examples illustrate that seasonal dormancy underground is an integrated response to the physical and ecological conditions of the subterranean environment. The capacity to remain inactive for prolonged periods depends on the interaction between metabolic depression, water conservation, respiratory physiology, and behavioural selection of suitable microhabitats, with the relative importance of each mechanism varying among dormancy contexts. Consequently, understanding seasonal dormancy in fossorial amphibians and reptiles requires considering how physiological adjustments are coordinated with the properties of the burrow itself.

(4) *Emergence and activity patterns*

For fossorial species that periodically access the surface, emergence represents a critical behavioural transition between two markedly different environments. While the subsoil provides protection from predators and environmental extremes, the surface offers access to food resources, mates, dispersal opportunities, and suitable sites for reproduction (Semlitsch, 1983; Kinlaw, 1999). Consequently, emergence reflects a trade-off between the benefits of remaining underground and the ecological opportunities available aboveground. Rather than occurring randomly, periods of surface activity are typically concentrated within relatively narrow temporal windows during which environmental conditions minimise physiological costs while maximising fitness benefits (Traeholt, 1995; Madison, 1997; Encarnación-Luévano *et al.*, 2013). Temperature and water availability are the main environmental cues that induce emergence. In amphibians, rainfall frequently triggers synchronised emergence by simultaneously minimising rates of evaporative water loss and facilitating locomotion through moist soil (Faccio, 2003;

Rothermel & Luhring, 2005). Likewise, soil temperature contributes to emergence timing, either by directly influencing physiological performance or indirectly through its effects on reproductive phenology and prey availability (Forget-Klein & Green, 2021; Moldowan, 2023). Reptiles also exhibit weather-dependent emergence patterns, although most species studied to date appear to respond more strongly to temperature than moisture alone (Greenville & Dickman, 2009; Raya-Garcia *et al.*, 2019; Martín *et al.*, 2021b). Importantly, because underground temperatures often lag behind those at the surface, environmental cues perceived within burrows may be substantially different than those experienced immediately after emergence (Giacometti *et al.*, 2024).

Emergence decisions are also state-dependent. Hydration status, energetic reserves, reproductive condition, and thermal state may all influence whether the potential benefits of surface activity outweigh its physiological costs (Madison, 1997; Székely *et al.*, 2018; Martín *et al.*, 2025). For example, dehydrated individuals must remain underground until favourable hydric conditions are restored, whereas reproductive migration may necessitate emergence despite increased desiccation, thermal, or predation risks (Semlitsch, 1983; Rothermel & Luhring, 2005; Giacometti, Moldowan & Tattersall, 2025). Similarly, individuals recovering from seasonal dormancy often emerge only after environmental conditions allow for sustained locomotion and positive energy balance (Carvalho *et al.*, 2010; Holden *et al.*, 2021).

Recent advances have further emphasised that fossorial life is characterised by continual movement between subterranean and surface environments rather than permanent residence belowground (Giacometti *et al.*, 2024). Within this framework, emergence is best viewed as an integrative decision-making process in which animals simultaneously evaluate multiple external cues (e.g., temperature, soil moisture, gravitational orientation, and seasonal information) alongside their internal physiological state to optimise the timing of surface activity. Such a perspective shifts the emphasis from single environmental drivers toward a mechanistic understanding of how multiple sensory and physiological pathways interact to regulate transitions between subterranean and surface habitats. Thus, this perspective recognises that underground and aboveground habitats provide complementary ecological functions: the subsoil primarily serves as a refuge, whereas the surface provides opportunities for resource acquisition, reproduction, and dispersal.

IV. Morphology and locomotion

(1) Morphological syndromes associated with fossoriality

Fossoriality imposes a distinctive set of mechanical demands on amphibians and reptiles, including the need to access subterranean environments, displace resistant substrates, generate propulsion within confined spaces, and withstand frictional and compressive forces acting across the body (Gans, 1974; Ebel *et al.*, 2020). Movement underground therefore requires sufficient force production and the efficient transmission of that force while negotiating frictional resistance and maintaining stability within narrow spaces (Gans, 1974; Navas *et al.*, 2004; Lowie *et al.*, 2022). Consequently, the functional demands of fossoriality are distributed across multiple anatomical systems, including the body axis, cranium, limbs, musculature, and integument, which operate together rather than as independent traits. Although fossoriality has repeatedly favoured changes in body shape, cranial architecture, limb morphology, and muscular organisation, no single anatomical configuration characterises all fossorial taxa. Instead, comparable functions have evolved through distinct and phylogenetically contingent combinations of traits (Gans, 1975; Wiens, Brandley & Reeder, 2006; Keeffe & Blackburn, 2020; Morinaga & Bergmann, 2020).

This diversity is further compounded by variation in the extent to which species depend on subterranean environments. Whereas obligately fossorial taxa conduct most activities below ground and often exhibit extensive morphological specialisation, semi-fossorial or seasonally burrowing species may retain traits associated with surface locomotion, feeding, and dispersal (Kinlaw, 1999; Wu *et al.*, 2015). These contrasting ecological demands are likely to constrain the extent to which morphology can become specialised for subterranean locomotion without compromising performance in other functional contexts. Consequently, the degree and nature of morphological modification are expected to reflect the mechanical demands of burrowing, as well as the frequency, duration, and ecological context of subterranean activity (Buttimer, Stepanova & Womack, 2020; Keeffe & Blackburn, 2020; Giacometti *et al.*, 2024). Among the morphological responses to these combined demands, body elongation and associated axial

specialisation represent recurrent, although not universal, patterns across fossorial amphibians and reptiles (Gans, 1975; Wiens *et al.*, 2006).

Body elongation and axial specialisation have evolved independently in multiple amphibian and reptile lineages, but similar external forms may arise through distinct anatomical and evolutionary pathways (Brandley, Huelsenbeck & Wiens, 2008; Bergmann *et al.*, 2020). In elongate tetrapods, axial specialisation can involve changes in vertebral numbers and proportions, and regional differentiation along the spine (Bergmann & Irschick, 2012; Lowie *et al.*, 2022). These components do not necessarily evolve in parallel with limb reduction in squamates, whereas caecilians combine extreme elongation and limblessness with marked regional variation in vertebral form (Sanger & Gibson-Brown, 2004; Brandley *et al.*, 2008; Bergmann & Irschick, 2012; Lowie *et al.*, 2022). These axial configurations provide the structural basis for propulsion and force transmission within confined spaces. Conversely, many fossorial anurans retain a compact body plan and rely primarily on specialised forelimbs or hindlimbs for excavation, illustrating that elongation is only one of several evolutionary solutions to subterranean locomotion (Emerson, 1976; Vidal-García & Keogh, 2015; Vidal-García & Scott Keogh, 2017; Keeffe & Blackburn, 2020). Thus, the locomotor significance of elongation depends partly on whether the limbs remain important for propulsion, become specialised for excavation, or are reduced or lost.

Limb reduction and limb specialisation represent alternative evolutionary responses to fossoriality rather than successive stages along a single adaptive trajectory. In elongate lineages that rely predominantly on axial or head-first propulsion, the limbs may become reduced or lost, although body elongation and appendicular reduction can evolve at different rates and through partially independent pathways (Brandley *et al.*, 2008; Camaiti *et al.*, 2021). By contrast, appendicular diggers retain the limbs as the primary structures for substrate displacement and commonly exhibit increased robustness of the associated bones and girdles, enlarged areas for muscle attachment, and modifications of the distal limb that enhance force transmission during excavation (Vidal-García & Keogh, 2015). Among anurans, these configurations vary with digging mode: forward burrowers show recurrent specialisation of the forelimbs and pectoral apparatus, whereas the more widespread backward-burrowing condition relies primarily on the hindlimbs, pelvis, and metatarsal structures (Emerson, 1976; Vidal-García & Scott Keogh, 2017;

Keeffe & Blackburn, 2020). Comparative analyses further indicate that appendicular morphology can be evolutionarily labile in relation to locomotion and burrowing, even when other anatomical regions remain more strongly constrained by phylogenetic history (Vidal-García & Scott Keogh, 2017). Reptiles likewise span a continuum from taxa retaining functional limbs for excavation to lineages increasingly dependent on axial and cranial propulsion, emphasising that limb loss is neither an inevitable nor a universally advantageous outcome of fossorial evolution (Camaiti *et al.*, 2021). Rather, the retention, specialisation, reduction, or loss of appendages reflect lineage-specific interactions among ancestral body plan, digging behaviour, and ecological context.

(2) Cranial, integumentary, and sensory adaptations for subterranean locomotion

During head-first burrowing, the cranium forms the leading mechanical interface with the substrate, transmitting forces generated by the axial musculature while resisting loads imposed during substrate displacement (Gans, 1974; Bergmann & Berry, 2021; Lowie *et al.*, 2021). Across caecilians and fossorial squamates, recurrent modifications include compact, strongly ossified skulls, consolidation of cranial elements, interlocking sutures, and changes in snout geometry that influence force transmission (Kearney, Maisano & Rowe, 2005; Kazi & Hipsley, 2018; Lowie *et al.*, 2021). These modifications, however, do not converge on a single cranial configuration. Amphisbaenians include rounded, shovel, keel, and spade-headed forms associated with distinct digging movements, whereas comparative analyses of fossorial lizards indicate that convergence remains constrained by phylogenetic history and substrate properties (Kearney *et al.*, 2005; Kazi & Hipsley, 2018; Stepanova & Bauer, 2021). Indeed, lizards occupying moist and dry soils have evolved towards distinct adaptive optima in head shape, suggesting that fossoriality can favour alternative morphological solutions to the same functional challenge under different substrate conditions (Anelli *et al.*, 2024). Caecilians likewise possess generally compact skulls but vary in temporal closure, mandibular architecture, and regions associated with jaw-muscle attachment (Sherratt *et al.*, 2014; Lowie *et al.*, 2021). Such variation cannot be arranged along a simple continuum of specialisation. Cranial architecture must also accommodate feeding, muscle attachment, and sensory functions, potentially imposing competing functional demands. Cranial morphologies therefore represent lineage-specific solutions shaped jointly by ancestry, substrate, and digging behaviour, rather than successive

degrees of fossorial specialisation. Once a burrow has been initiated, continued progression also depends on how the body surface manages friction and abrasion against the surrounding substrate.

The integument constitutes not merely a physiological barrier but also the continuous mechanical interface between the animal and the substrate, a role particularly pronounced in elongate, limb-reduced forms, in which much of the body surface contacts the burrow walls during locomotion (Gans, 1978; Allam, Daza & Abo-Eleneen, 2016). Across fossorial squamates, smooth or reinforced integumentary surfaces and variation in scale arrangement can reduce abrasion and regulate friction against the substrate (Gans, 1978; Baumgartner *et al.*, 2007). Importantly, these surfaces do not simply minimise friction: scale overlap and orientation can generate direction-dependent resistance, facilitating forward sliding while providing purchase against backward displacement (Gans, 1978). Such properties are especially pronounced in sand-swimming skinks, whose scales combine low friction with high resistance to abrasion by granular substrates (Baumgartner *et al.*, 2007). However, integumentary structure also varies among limbless squamates occupying different environmental conditions, suggesting that the mechanical demands of subterranean locomotion interact with lineage-specific anatomy and broader habitat constraints (Allam *et al.*, 2016). Relatedly, the skin of fossorial amphibians must retain its roles in water and gas exchange while remaining exposed to friction and abrasion (Lillywhite, 2006). In caecilians, abundant mucous glands provide a potential solution by maintaining a lubricated body surface, while the concentration of enlarged mucous glands near the head may facilitate its movement through the substrate (Jared *et al.*, 2018). Thus, the integument contributes to performance through different structural and secretory mechanisms, reflecting a balance among mechanical protection, frictional control and cutaneous exchange rather than a single convergent modification.

Subterranean conditions are also associated with a reorganisation of craniofacial sensory structures, although this does not entail their uniform reduction or loss. In amphisbaenians, the eyes are generally small and covered by skin or scales, and external ear openings are absent, contributing to a continuous head surface while limiting the external exposure of sensory organs (Gans, 1978). Caecilians exhibit even greater variation, with eyes ranging from externally visible to concealed beneath skin or cranial bones; nevertheless, the retention of a differentiated retina

and optic nerve in most examined species indicates that external reduction does not necessarily imply the complete loss of photoreceptive capacity (Wake, 1985). Visual reduction should therefore be interpreted as part of a broader reorganisation of the craniofacial surface rather than as a uniform progression towards blindness. Other sensory structures may be retained or elaborated within this modified architecture. The caecilian tentacle, for example, incorporates muscles, glands, and nerves associated developmentally with the orbital region and connects to the vomeronasal system, providing a distinctive chemosensory interface near the anterior surface of the head (Billo & Wake, 1987; Himstedt & Simon, 1995). The position of the tentacular aperture also varies among caecilian lineages and remains taxonomically informative, although its distribution reflects both phylogenetic inheritance and homoplasy (Nussbaum & Wilkinson, 1989; Wilkinson & Nussbaum, 2006). In snakes, scale organs, or sensilla, constitute mechanosensory structures whose size and distribution vary among lineages, with enlarged organs or greater densities reported in some fossorial taxa, although their function has been examined directly in only a limited range of ecological contexts (Crowe-Riddell *et al.*, 2019). The repeated occurrence of ocular reduction or coverage alongside alternative sensory structures suggests broad functional convergence across independent fossorial lineages, but its anatomical expression remains contingent on ancestry, cranial architecture and the sensory demands associated with different substrates and digging modes.

One can thus infer that fossoriality is associated with recurrent modifications in body proportions, limb development, cranial architecture, integumentary surfaces and sensory structures. These traits, however, neither evolve as an invariant suite nor converge towards a single morphological optimum. Repeated transitions towards elongate, limb-reduced forms in squamates illustrate convergence at the level of the overall body plan, yet fossorial locomotion may also involve the retention or specialisation of limbs and distinct combinations of axial and cranial traits (Wiens *et al.*, 2006). Likewise, variation in head shape and body proportions across substrates and lineages indicates that similar subterranean demands can produce different morphological configurations depending on phylogenetic history and the physical properties of the environment (Stepanova & Bauer, 2021; Anelli *et al.*, 2024). These alternative configurations may also entail context-dependent trade-offs with feeding, surface locomotion and microhabitat use, preventing fossorial specialisation from being arranged along a single linear continuum. Morphological similarity among fossorial taxa should therefore be treated as a hypothesis of

functional equivalence rather than evidence of it, requiring direct tests of how alternative trait combinations affect burrowing and surface locomotor performance across substrates. This context dependence can be conceptualised as a functional landscape in which alternative morphological configurations may achieve similar performance, while substrate properties alter the distribution and accessibility of performance optima (**Figure 5**).

(3) *Environmental determinants of locomotor performance*

Locomotor performance represents the functional expression of how a whole-organism phenotype interacts with its mechanical environment, thereby linking morphology to the execution of biologically relevant tasks (Arnold, 1983; Irschick & Garland, 2001). In fossorial amphibians and reptiles, performance is inherently multidimensional, encompassing force production, the rate and endurance of progression, and the capacity to initiate or extend a burrow (Irschick & Garland, 2001). These components may vary independently, such that similar morphologies can produce different functional outcomes, whereas distinct anatomical configurations can achieve comparable levels of performance (Irschick & Garland, 2001; Bergmann & Berry, 2021). Moreover, the expression and ecological significance of each component depend on the physical properties of the substrate against which performance is generated (Bergmann & Berry, 2021).

The mechanical challenge imposed by the substrate varies not only in magnitude but also in kind, as particle size and shape, compaction, moisture, and cohesion influence the resistance encountered during underground movement (Sharpe, Kuckuk & Goldman, 2015). In caecilians, increasing soil compaction reduced the proportion of individuals able to burrow and increased the time required to do so (**Figure 6**), while animals consistently preferred less compact soils and existing tunnels over the construction of new ones (Ducey *et al.*, 1993). These conditions differ fundamentally from locomotion through loose granular media, in which specialised sand-swimming lizards advance by propagating axial undulations through the surrounding substrate (Maladen *et al.*, 2009). Even within granular substrates, performance can vary with particle properties. For example, two *Calyptommatus* (Squamata: Gymnophthalmidae) species burrowed faster in fine, homogeneous sand, and associations between morphology and performance emerged only under this lower-resistance condition (de Barros *et al.*, 2021). Variation in

moisture and compaction can further constrain burial depth and alter the effectiveness of a given locomotor strategy (Sharpe *et al.*, 2015). Performance measured during sand-swimming therefore cannot be generalised to active excavation through compact or cohesive soils, or to movement within pre-existing tunnels. Consistent with this distinction, fossorial lizards associated with dry and moist substrates exhibit different evolutionary regimes of morphological diversification (Anelli *et al.*, 2024), suggesting that substrate-specific mechanical demands may contribute to lineage-specific relationships between form and performance.

Underground progression can be achieved through different combinations of appendicular, cranial, and axial force, whose relative contributions vary among lineages and locomotor modes. Among burrowing anurans, most species excavate backwards through alternating movements of the hindlimbs, with force production and transmission involving the hindlimb–pelvic complex and mobility of the iliosacral articulation; a smaller number of species burrow forwards using the forelimbs, sometimes in combination with the head (Emerson, 1976; Jorgensen & Reilly, 2013). These contrasting modes are embedded within broader, repeatedly evolved fossorial morphotypes across distantly related anuran lineages (Vidal-García *et al.*, 2014; Vidal-García & Keogh, 2015). Head-first burrowing predominates in many fossorial squamates, but the cranium generally applies forces generated elsewhere in the body. In *Leposternon microcephalum* (Squamata: Amphisbaenidae), for example, the axial musculature powers upward head strokes that compress soil against the roof of the developing tunnel (Navas *et al.*, 2004). Terrestrial caecilians rely entirely on the axial system and may use internal concertina locomotion, in which portions of the body wall brace against the burrow while the vertebral column and associated musculature advance partly independently within it (O'Reilly, Ritter & Carrier, 1997; Herrel & Measey, 2010). Elongate squamates likewise make extensive use of axial propulsion, but transitional forms may combine body undulation with residual limb movements, and similar external proportions do not necessarily correspond to convergent locomotor kinematics (Bergmann *et al.*, 2020). Nevertheless, comparisons across *Lerista* (Squamata: Scincidae) species indicate that more snake-like species can enter sand faster than more lizard-like forms, demonstrating that shifts in the relative contributions of axial and appendicular systems can have measurable consequences for fossorial performance (Morinaga & Bergmann, 2020). These contrasting mechanisms show that underground progression is not a

single functional task and that its evaluation requires performance measures matched to the particular way in which force is generated and applied.

(4) *Functional consequences of morphological variation*

Fossorial performance cannot be represented by a single measurement, because force, speed, and endurance capture distinct aspects of whole-organism capacity (Irschick & Garland, 2001). This limitation is evident in caecilians: biomechanical models indicate that complete temporal closure does not confer greater cranial performance under simulated burrowing loads, while comparative measurements show that overall cranial shape does not predict maximal in vivo push force, although other attributes such as head angle or burrowing speed may still be functionally relevant (Kleinteich *et al.*, 2012; Lowie *et al.*, 2021). Potential trade-offs also depend on the performance traits and taxonomic scale under study. Within *Acontias percivali* (Squamata: Scincidae), individuals with relatively wider heads produced stronger bites but burrowed more slowly, suggesting a possible trade-off between bite force and burrowing speed (Vanhooydonck *et al.*, 2011). Importantly, this intraspecific relationship does not demonstrate an antagonism between biting and pushing capacity. Indeed, a broader comparison across fossorial and leaf-litter skinks found no trade-off between maximal bite and push forces: species capable of pushing harder also tended to bite harder (Le Guilloux *et al.*, 2020). Similarly, snake-like *Lerista* entered sand faster than lizard-like species, without a detectable reduction in surface or leaf-litter locomotor performance (Morinaga & Bergmann, 2020). Trade-offs among burrowing force, speed, endurance, biting, and surface locomotion should therefore be tested directly rather than inferred from morphology, with comparisons accounting for body size, phylogenetic history, substrate, and experimental methodology.

Collectively, the available evidence indicates that the ecological significance of fossorial morphology cannot be inferred from the presence of particular traits alone but depends on the performance those traits enable under specific environmental conditions (Arnold, 1983; Irschick & Garland, 2001). Relationships between form and performance need not be one-to-one: distinct morphological configurations may produce comparable functional outcomes, whereas similar external forms may differ in performance when multiple traits and tasks are considered (Wainwright, 2007; Bergmann & McElroy, 2014). In fossorial taxa, substrate-dependent

associations between head morphology and movement, together with the differing effects of body form across locomotor contexts, illustrate why morphological similarity alone cannot establish functional equivalence (Morinaga & Bergmann, 2020; Bergmann & Berry, 2021). Phylogenetically informed comparisons using standardised performance measures across ecologically representative substrates are therefore needed to determine whether recurrent morphologies confer similar performance capacities. Placing these capacities within the physiological and physical context of underground movement represents the next step towards a mechanistic understanding of fossoriality.

V. Future directions

Although research on fossorial amphibians and reptiles has progressed substantially over the past decades, most studies continue to examine physiology, behaviour, and performance in isolation. The synthesis presented here argues that the next stage of this field lies not simply in accumulating additional descriptive data, but in integrating complementary perspectives to understand how organisms interact with the dynamism of the subsoil. Such an approach requires shifting from trait-based descriptions toward mechanistic approaches that explicitly link environmental conditions, organismal traits, and whole-organism performance. Several promising avenues emerge from this context (**Table 1**). For instance, comparative studies may extend beyond documenting morphological convergence to testing whether and how similar morphologies produce equivalent functional outcomes across diverse phylogenetic lineages (Bergmann *et al.*, 2020; Morinaga & Bergmann, 2020; Anelli *et al.*, 2024). Standardised measurements of burrowing and locomotor performance, thermal and hydric physiology, respiratory function, and sensory capabilities across representative clades would provide a robust basis for evaluating the repeated evolution of fossoriality (Camacho *et al.*, 2015; Giacometti & Tattersall, 2023). These comparisons should span biologically relevant scenarios, considering differences in substrate composition, soil compaction, moisture, temperature, and gas composition, all of which are expected to influence organismal performance. From an experimental perspective, laboratory systems capable of manipulating hydrothermal gradients, substrate mechanics, and oxygen and carbon dioxide levels make it possible to investigate how fossorial ectotherms respond physiologically and behaviourally to multiple environmental cues

(Ultsch & Anderson, 1988; Booth, 2006; de Barros *et al.*, 2021; Giacometti & Tattersall, 2025). Experiments of these kinds should move beyond single-factor designs and instead evaluate how interacting environmental parameters influence the maintenance of homeostasis. At the same time, technological advances like miniaturised biologgers, automated tracking systems, environmental sensors, and high-resolution imaging techniques offer unprecedented opportunities to study fossorial ectotherms under both natural and laboratory conditions (Martín *et al.*, 2020; Forget-Klein & Green, 2021; Giacometti *et al.*, 2025).

Perhaps the greatest opportunity lies in combining empirical data with mechanistic biophysical models. Mechanistic models that explicitly incorporate heat transfer, water balance, gas exchange, and substrate mechanics can provide quantitative, trait-based predictions of how fossorial ectotherms respond to current and future climatic conditions (Encarnación-Luévano *et al.*, 2013; Huey *et al.*, 2021). Unlike correlative approaches, these models are grounded in first principles and can thus be extrapolated beyond the environmental conditions under which experimental data were initially collected (Kearney & Porter, 2020). The integration of empirical data with biophysical modeling may help researchers simulate, for instance, how fossorial animals navigate complex hydrothermal landscapes, identify critical environmental thresholds, or predict how altered climatic regimes influence fitness. Evidently, these predictive frameworks also have direct implications for conservation. Fossorial species are likely to be affected by climatic changes that alter the physical properties of the subsoil. However, subterranean environments remain largely absent from most assessments of habitat quality and species vulnerability (Encarnación-Luévano *et al.*, 2013). As such, mechanistic models informed by empirical physiological and behavioural data may provide a means for identifying climatic refugia, forecasting shifts in suitable subterranean conditions, and prioritising conservation actions (Lara-Reséndiz *et al.*, 2021; Moreno-Lara, Becerra-López & Ramírez-Bautista, 2023).

VI. Conclusions

- (1) The subsoil is heterogeneous and dynamic, with thermal, hydric, respiratory, and mechanical conditions varying across space and time.

- (2) Fossoriality thus emerges from the continuous interaction between organismal traits and an abiotic landscape in which animals continually balance competing functional demands.
- (3) The functional consequences of fossorial morphology are context dependent, because the relationship between form and performance depends on substrate properties, locomotor mode and phylogenetic history.
- (4) Future progress will depend on integrating physiology, behaviour, morphology, biomechanics, and environmental physics in a common framework.
- (5) Adopting this mechanistic perspective will advance our understanding of life underground, and help establish fossorial animals as powerful model systems for investigating how organisms interact with complex and dynamic environments.

VII. Acknowledgements

We are thankful to Patrick Moldowan for sharing the raw data and code necessary to produce Figure 1.

VIII. Funding

DG was funded by a Fundação de Amparo à Pesquisa do Estado de São Paulo (FAPESP) Postdoctoral Fellowship (25/06560-5). MBC was funded by a FAPESP Postdoctoral Fellowship (23/13965-6 and 26/07609-0). JEC was funded by a FAPESP Regular Research Grant (20/12962-5). GJT was funded by a Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada Discovery Grant (RGPIN- 2026-05428).

IX. Author contribution

DG and GJT conceived the study. DG led the writing of the manuscript, with critical input from MBC, JEC, and GJT.

X. Data availability

The data and code necessary to reproduce our figures can be accessed from:
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22209333>.

1024 **XI. Conflict of interest**

1025 None.

1026 **XII. References**

- 1027 ABE, A.S. (1983) Observations on dormancy in tegu lizards *Tupinambis teguixim* (Reptilia,
1028 Teiidae). *Naturalia* **8**, 235–239.
- 1029 ABE, A.S. (1995) Estivation in South American amphibians and reptiles. *Brazilian Journal of*
1030 *Medical and Biological Research* **28**, 1241–1247.
- 1031 ABE, A.S. & JOHANSEN, K. (1987) Gas exchange and ventilatory responses to hypoxia and
1032 hypercapnia in *Amphisbaena Alba* (Reptilia: Amphisbaenia). *Journal of Experimental*
1033 *Biology* **127**, 159–172.
- 1034 ALLAM, A.A., DAZA, J.D. & ABO-ELENEEN, R.E. (2016) Histology of the skin of three limbless
1035 squamates dwelling in mesic and arid environments. *The Anatomical Record* **299**, 979–
1036 989.
- 1037 ALVES, A.B.M. & SCHMID, A.L. (2015) Cooling and heating potential of underground soil
1038 according to depth and soil surface treatment in the Brazilian climatic regions. *Energy*
1039 *and Buildings* **90**, 41–50.
- 1040 ANDERSON, D.B. (1936) Relative humidity or vapor pressure deficit. *Ecology* **17**, 277–282.
- 1041 ANDRADE, D.V.D. & ABE, A.S. (1999) Gas exchange and ventilation during dormancy in the
1042 tegu lizard *Tupinambis merianae*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **202**, 3677–3685.
- 1043 ANDREWS, R.M. (1994) Activity and thermal biology of the sand-swimming skink *Neoseps*
1044 *reynoldsi*: diel and seasonal patterns. *Copeia* **1994**, 91–99.
- 1045 ANDREWS, R.M. & POUGH, F.H. (1985) Metabolism of squamate reptiles: allometric and
1046 ecological relationships. *Physiological Zoology* **58**, 214–231.
- 1047 ANELLI, V., BARS-CLOSEL, M., HERREL, A. & KOHLSDORF, T. (2024) Different selection regimes
1048 explain morphological evolution in fossorial lizards. *Functional Ecology* **38**, 1250–1264.
- 1049 ANGILLETTA, M.J. (2009) *Thermal adaptation: a theoretical and empirical synthesis*. Oxford
1050 University Press, Oxford ; New York.
- 1051 AR, A., ARIELI, R. & SHKOLNIK, A. (1977) Blood-gas properties and function in the fossorial
1052 mole rat under normal and hypoxic-hypercapnic atmospheric conditions. *Respiration*
1053 *Physiology* **30**, 201–218.
- 1054 ARNOLD, S.J. (1983) Morphology, performance and fitness. *American Zoologist* **23**, 347–361.

- 1055 BAKKEN, G.S. (1992) Measurement and application of operative and standard operative
1056 temperatures in ecology. *American Zoologist* **32**, 194–216.
- 1057 DE BARROS, F.C., GRIZANTE, M.B., ZAMPIERI, F.A.M. & KOHLSDORF, T. (2021) Peculiar
1058 relationships among morphology, burrowing performance and sand type in two fossorial
1059 microteiid lizards. *Zoology* **144**, 125880.
- 1060 BARS-CLOSEL, M., CAMACHO, A. & KOHLSDORF, T. (2018) Shifts in space and time: ecological
1061 transitions affect the evolution of resting metabolic rates in microteiid lizards. *Journal of*
1062 *Experimental Biology*, jeb.175661.
- 1063 BARS-CLOSEL, M. & KOHLSDORF, T. (2012) Mudanças climáticas e fossorialidade: implicações
1064 para a herpetofauna subterrânea. *Revista da Biologia* **8**, 19–24.
- 1065 BAUMGARTNER, W., SAXE, F., WETH, A., HAJAS, D., SIGUMONRONG, D., EMMERLICH, J.,
1066 SINGHEISER, M., BÖHME, W. & SCHNEIDER, J.M. (2007) The sandfish's skin: morphology,
1067 chemistry and reconstruction. *Journal of Bionic Engineering* **4**, 1–9.
- 1068 BENTLEY, P.J. (1966) Adaptations of Amphibia to arid environments: novel physiological
1069 mechanisms not seen in fish aid frogs and toads to conserve water and live in deserts.
1070 *Science* **152**, 619–623.
- 1071 BERGMANN, P.J. & BERRY, D.S. (2021) How head shape and substrate particle size affect
1072 fossorial locomotion in lizards. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **224**, jeb242244.
- 1073 BERGMANN, P.J. & IRSCHICK, D.J. (2012) Vertebral evolution and the diversification of squamate
1074 reptiles. *Evolution* **66**, 1044–1058.
- 1075 BERGMANN, P.J., MANN, S.D., MORINAGA, G., FREITAS, E.S. & SILER, C.D. (2020) Convergent
1076 evolution of elongate forms in craniates and of locomotion in elongate squamate reptiles.
1077 *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **60**, 190–201.
- 1078 BERGMANN, P.J. & MCELROY, E.J. (2014) Many-to-many mapping of phenotype to performance:
1079 an extension of the F-matrix for studying functional complexity. *Evolutionary Biology*
1080 **41**, 546–560.
- 1081 BILLO, R. & WAKE, M.H. (1987) Tentacle development in *Dermophis mexicanus* (Amphibia,
1082 Gymnophiona) with an hypothesis of tentacle origin. *Journal of Morphology* **192**, 101–
1083 111.
- 1084 BITTELLI, M. (2011) Measuring soil water content: a review. *HortTechnology* **21**, 293–300.
- 1085 BÍCEGO-NAHAS, K.C. & BRANCO, L.G.S. (1999) Seasonal changes in the cardiorespiratory
1086 responses to hypercarbia and temperature in the bullfrog, *Rana catesbeiana*. *Comparative*
1087 *Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology* **124**, 221–229.

- 1088 BLACK, I.R., BERMAN, J.M., CADENA, V. & TATTERSALL, G.J. (2019) Behavioral
1089 thermoregulation in lizards: Strategies for achieving preferred temperature. In *Behavior*
1090 *of lizards* pp. 13–46. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, United States of America.
- 1091 BLOUIN-DEMERS, G. & NADEAU, P. (2005) The cost-benefit model of thermoregulation does not
1092 predict lizard thermoregulatory behavior. *Ecology* **86**, 560–566.
- 1093 BOGERT, C.M. (1949) Thermoregulation in Reptiles, a factor in evolution. *Evolution* **3**, 195–211.
- 1094 BOOTH, D.T. (2006) Effect of soil type on burrowing behavior and cocoon formation in the
1095 green-striped burrowing frog, *Cyclorana alboguttata*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **84**,
1096 832–838.
- 1097 BOUTILIER, R.G. (1990) Respiratory gas tensions in the environment. In *Vertebrate Gas*
1098 *Exchange* pp. 1–13. Springer, Berlin, Germany.
- 1099 BOUTILIER, R.G. & TOEWS, D.P. (1981) Respiratory, circulatory and acid-base adjustments to
1100 hypercapnia in a strictly aquatic and predominantly skin-breathing urodele,
1101 *Cryptobranchus alleganiensis*. *Respiration Physiology* **46**, 177–192.
- 1102 BOYNTON, D. & COMPTON, O.C. (1944) Normal seasonal changes of oxygen and carbon dioxide
1103 percentages in gas from the larger pores of three orchard subsoils. *Soil Science* **57**, 107–
1104 118.
- 1105 BRADSHAW, S.D. (1972) The endocrine control of water and electrolyte metabolism in desert
1106 reptiles. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* **3**, 360–373.
- 1107 BRANDLEY, M.C., HUELSENBECK, J.P. & WIENS, J.J. (2008) Rates and patterns in the evolution of
1108 snake-like body form in squamate reptiles: evidence for repeated re-evolution of lost
1109 digits and long-term persistence of intermediate body forms. *Evolution* **62**, 2042–2064.
- 1110 BRATTSTROM, B.H. (1963) A preliminary review of the thermal requirements of amphibians.
1111 *Ecology* **44**, 238–255.
- 1112 BURY, R.B. & BALGOOYEN, T.G. (1976) Temperature selectivity in the legless lizard, *Anniella*
1113 *pulchra*. *Copeia* **1976**, 152–155.
- 1114 BUTTIMER, S.M., STEPANOVA, N. & WOMACK, M.C. (2020) Evolution of the unique anuran
1115 pelvic and hind limb skeleton in relation to microhabitat, locomotor mode, and jump
1116 performance. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **60**, 1330–1345.
- 1117 CABANAC, M., HAMMEL, T. & HARDY, J.D. (1967) *Tiliqua scincoides*: temperature-sensitive
1118 units in lizard brain. *Science* **158**, 1050–1051.
- 1119 CAMACHO, A., PAVÃO, R., MOREIRA, C.N., PINTO, A.C.B.C.F., NAVAS, C.A. & RODRIGUES, M.T.
1120 (2015) Interaction of morphology, thermal physiology and burrowing performance during
1121 the evolution of fossoriality in Gymnophthalmini lizards. *Functional Ecology* **29**, 515–
1122 521.

- 1123 CAMAITI, M., EVANS, A.R., HIPSLEY, C.A. & CHAPPLE, D.G. (2021) A farewell to arms and legs:
1124 a review of limb reduction in squamates. *Biological Reviews* **96**, 1035–1050.
- 1125 CARTLEDGE, V.A., WITHERS, P.C., THOMPSON, G.G. & MCMASTER, K.A. (2006) Water relations
1126 of the burrowing sandhill frog, *Arenophryne rotunda* (Myobatrachidae). *Journal of*
1127 *Comparative Physiology B* **176**, 295–302.
- 1128 CARVALHO, J.E., NAVAS, C.A. & PEREIRA, I.C. (2010) Energy and water in aestivating
1129 amphibians. In *Aestivation* (eds C. ARTURO NAVAS & J.E. CARVALHO), pp. 141–169.
1130 Springer, Berlin, Germany.
- 1131 CATTON, W.T. (1958) Some properties of frog skin mechanoreceptors. *The Journal of Physiology*
1132 **141**, 305–322.
- 1133 CHAZARIN, B., STOREY, K.B., ZIEMIANIN, A., CHANON, S., PLUMEL, M., CHERY, I., DURAND, C.,
1134 EVANS, A.L., ARNEMO, J.M., ZEDROSSER, A., SWENSON, J.E., GAUQUELIN-KOCH, G.,
1135 SIMON, C., BLANC, S., LEFAI, E., ET AL. (2019) Metabolic reprogramming involving
1136 glycolysis in the hibernating brown bear skeletal muscle. *Frontiers in Zoology* **16**, 12.
- 1137 CLARK, G.E., PALCI, A., LAVER, R.J., HERNANDEZ-MORALES, C., PEREZ-MARTINEZ, C.A., LEWIS,
1138 P.J., THIES, M.L., BELL, C.J., HIPSLEY, C.A. & MÜLLER, J. (2024) The specialized inner
1139 ear labyrinth of worm-lizards (Amphisbaenia: Squamata). *PLoS One* **19**, e0312086.
- 1140 CLAUSSEN, D., L. (1977) Thermal acclimation in ambystomatid salamanders. *Comparative*
1141 *Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Physiology* **58**, 333–340.
- 1142 CROWE-RIDDELL, J.M., WILLIAMS, R., CHAPUIS, L. & SANDERS, K.L. (2019) Ultrastructural
1143 evidence of a mechanosensory function of scale organs (sensilla) in sea snakes
1144 (Hydrophiinae). *Royal Society Open Science* **6**, 182022.
- 1145 CUI, W., LIAO, Q., CHANG, G., CHEN, G., PENG, Q. & JEN, T.-C. (2011) Measurement and
1146 prediction of undisturbed underground temperature distribution. In *ASME International*
1147 *Mechanical Engineering Congress and Exposition* pp. 671–676.
- 1148 DANTZLER, W.H. & BRADSHAW, S.D. (2008) Osmotic and ionic regulation in reptiles. In *Osmotic*
1149 *and ionic regulation* pp. 443–503. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.
- 1150 DARDEN, T.R. (1972) Respiratory adaptations of a fossorial mammal, the pocket gopher
1151 (*Thomomys bottae*). *Journal of Comparative Physiology* **78**, 121–137.
- 1152 DARK, J. (2005) Annual lipid cycles in hibernators: integration of physiology and behavior.
1153 *Annual Review of Nutrition* **25**, 469–497.
- 1154 DAWLEY, E.M. & BASS, A.H. (1988) Organization of the vomeronasal organ in a plethodontid
1155 salamander. *Journal of Morphology* **198**, 243–255.

- 1156 DOODY, J.S., JAMES, H., COLYVAS, K., MCHENRY, C.R. & CLULOW, S. (2015) Deep nesting in a
1157 lizard, déjà vu devil's corkscrews: first helical reptile burrow and deepest vertebrate nest.
1158 *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **116**, 13–26.
- 1159 DUCEY, P.K., FORMANOWICZ JR, D.R., BOYET, L., MAILLOUX, J. & NUSSBAUM, R.A. (1993)
1160 Experimental examination of burrowing behavior in caecilians (Amphibia:
1161 Gymnophiona): effects of soil compaction on burrowing ability of four species.
1162 *Herpetologica*, 450–457.
- 1163 DZENOWSKI, N.D. & HEMBREE, D.I. (2014) The neoichnology of two terrestrial Ambystomatid
1164 salamanders: quantifying amphibian burrows using modern analogs. In *Experimental*
1165 *Approaches to Understanding Fossil Organisms: Lessons from the Living* (eds D.I.
1166 HEMBREE, B.F. PLATT & J.J. SMITH), pp. 305–341. Springer, Dordrecht, Netherlands.
- 1167 EBEL, R., MÜLLER, J., RAMM, T., HIPSLEY, C. & AMSON, E. (2020) First evidence of convergent
1168 lifestyle signal in reptile skull roof microanatomy. *BMC Biology* **18**, 185.
- 1169 EMERSON, S.B. (1976) Burrowing in frogs. *Journal of Morphology* **149**, 437–458.
- 1170 ENCARNACIÓN-LUÉVANO, A., ROJAS-SOTO, O.R. & SIGALA-RODRÍGUEZ, J.J. (2013) Activity
1171 response to climate seasonality in species with fossorial habits: a niche modeling
1172 approach using the lowland burrowing treefrog (*Smilisca fodiens*). *PLoS ONE* **8**, e78290.
- 1173 FACCIO, S.D. (2003) Postbreeding emigration and habitat use by Jefferson and spotted
1174 salamanders in Vermont. *Journal of Herpetology* **37**, 479–489. BioOne.
- 1175 FEDER, M.E. & BURGGREN, W.W. (1992) *Environmental physiology of the amphibians*.
1176 University of Chicago Press.
- 1177 FLORANT, G.L. (1998) Lipid metabolism in hibernators: the importance of essential fatty acids.
1178 *American Zoologist* **38**, 331–340. Oxford University Press, UK.
- 1179 FORGET-KLEIN, É. & GREEN, D.M. (2021) Toads use the subsurface thermal gradient for
1180 temperature regulation underground. *Journal of Thermal Biology* **99**, 102956.
- 1181 FOUREAUX, G., EGAMI, M.I., JARED, C., ANTONIAZZI, M.M., GUTIERRE, R.C. & SMITH, R.L.
1182 (2010) Rudimentary eyes of squamate fossorial reptiles (Amphisbaenia and Serpentes).
1183 *The Anatomical Record* **293**, 351–357.
- 1184 FRITZSCH, B. & WAKE, M.H. (1988) The inner ear of gymnophione amphibians and its nerve
1185 supply: A comparative study of regressive events in a complex sensory system
1186 (Amphibia, Gymnophiona). *Zoomorphology* **108**, 201–217.
- 1187 GANS, C. (1974) *Biomechanics; an approach to vertebrate biology*. Lippincott, Philadelphia.
- 1188 GANS, C. (1975) Tetrapod limblessness: evolution and functional corollaries. *American Zoologist*
1189 **15**, 455–467.

- 1190 GANS, C. (1978) The characteristics and affinities of the Amphisbaenia. *The Transactions of the*
1191 *Zoological Society of London* **34**, 347–416.
- 1192 GANS, C. & WEVER, E.G. (1972) The ear and hearing in Amphisbaenia (Reptilia). *Journal of*
1193 *Experimental Zoology* **179**, 17–34.
- 1194 VAN GELDER, J.J., OLDERS, J.H.J., BOSCH, J.W.G. & STARMANS, P.W. (1986) Behaviour and body
1195 temperature of hibernating common toads *Bufo bufo*. *Holarctic Ecology* **9**, 225–228.
- 1196 GIACOMETTI, D., MOLDOVAN, P.D. & TATTERSALL, G.J. (2024) Ups and downs of fossorial life:
1197 migration restlessness and geotaxis may explain overwintering emergence in the spotted
1198 salamander. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **227**, jeb249319.
- 1199 GIACOMETTI, D., MOLDOVAN, P.D. & TATTERSALL, G.J. (2025) Sub-zero body temperatures
1200 during early spring migration in blue-spotted salamanders (*Ambystoma laterale*).
1201 *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **103**, 1–5.
- 1202 GIACOMETTI, D. & TATTERSALL, G.J. (2023) Putting the energetic-savings hypothesis
1203 underground: fossoriality does not affect metabolic rates in amphibians. *Evolutionary*
1204 *Ecology* **37**, 761–777.
- 1205 GIACOMETTI, D. & TATTERSALL, G.J. (2024) Seasonal variation of behavioural thermoregulation
1206 in a fossorial salamander (*Ambystoma maculatum*). *Royal Society Open Science* **11**,
1207 240537.
- 1208 GIACOMETTI, D. & TATTERSALL, G.J. (2025) Behavioural evidence of a humidistat: a
1209 temperature-compensating mechanism of hydoregulation in spotted salamanders.
1210 *Journal of Experimental Biology* **228**, jeb250297.
- 1211 GIACOMETTI, D., YAGI, K.T., ABNEY, C.R., JUNG, M.P. & TATTERSALL, G.J. (2021) Staying
1212 warm is not always the norm: behavioural differences in thermoregulation of two snake
1213 species. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **99**, 974–983.
- 1214 GREENVILLE, A.C. & DICKMAN, C.R. (2009) Factors affecting habitat selection in a specialist
1215 fossorial skink. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **97**, 531–544.
- 1216 GUERRA-FUENTES, R.A., ROSCITO, J.G., NUNES, P.M.S., OLIVEIRA-BASTOS, P.R., ANTONIAZZI,
1217 M.M., CARLOS, J. & RODRIGUES, M.T. (2014) Through the Looking Glass: The Spectacle
1218 in Gymnophthalmid Lizards. *The Anatomical Record* **297**, 496–504.
- 1219 HANKS, R.J., GARDNER, H.R. & FAIRBOURN, M.L. (1967) Evaporation of water from soils as
1220 influenced by drying with wind or radiation. *Soil Science Society of America Journal* **31**,
1221 593–598.
- 1222 HEMBREE, D.I., MARTIN, L.D. & HASIOTIS, S.T. (2004) Amphibian burrows and ephemeral ponds
1223 of the Lower Permian Speiser Shale, Kansas: evidence for seasonality in the
1224 midcontinent. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* **203**, 127–152.

- 1225 HENDERSON, R.W., POWELL, R., MARTÍN, J. & LOPEZ, P. (2016) Arboreal and fossorial reptiles.
1226 In *Reptile Ecology and Conservation* (ed C.K. DODD), pp. 139–153. Oxford University
1227 Press.
- 1228 HERREL, A. & MEASEY, G.J. (2010) The kinematics of locomotion in caecilians: effects of
1229 substrate and body shape. *Journal of Experimental Zoology Part A: Ecological Genetics*
1230 and *Physiology* **313A**, 301–309.
- 1231 HERTZ, P.E., HUEY, R.B. & STEVENSON, R.D. (1993) Evaluating temperature regulation by field-
1232 active ectotherms: the fallacy of the inappropriate question. *The American Naturalist* **142**,
1233 796–818.
- 1234 HIMSTEDT, W. & SIMON, D. (1995) Sensory basis of foraging behaviour in caecilians (Amphibia,
1235 Gymnophiona). *Herpetological Journal* **5**, 266–271.
- 1236 HOCHACHKA, P.W. & GUPPY, M. (1987) *Metabolic arrest and the control of biological time*.
1237 Harvard University Press.
- 1238 HOCHACHKA, P.W. & SOMERO, G.N. (2002) *Biochemical adaptation: mechanism and process in*
1239 *physiological evolution*. Oxford University Press.
- 1240 HOFFMAN, J. & KATZ, U. (1989) The ecological significance of burrowing behaviour in the toad
1241 (*Bufo viridis*). *Oecologia* **81**, 510–513.
- 1242 HOLDEN, K.G., GANGLOFF, E.J., GOMEZ-MANCILLAS, E., HAGERTY, K. & BRONIKOWSKI, A.M.
1243 (2021) Surviving winter: Physiological regulation of energy balance in a temperate
1244 ectotherm entering and exiting brumation. *General and Comparative Endocrinology* **307**,
1245 113758.
- 1246 HUEY, R.B. (1991) Physiological consequences of habitat selection. *The American Naturalist*
1247 **137**, S91–S115.
- 1248 HUEY, R.B., MA, L., LEVY, O. & KEARNEY, M.R. (2021) Three questions about the eco-
1249 physiology of overwintering underground. *Ecology Letters* **24**, 170–185.
- 1250 ILLSTON, B.G., BASARA, J.B. & CRAWFORD, K.C. (2004) Seasonal to interannual variations of
1251 soil moisture measured in Oklahoma. *International Journal of Climatology* **24**, 1883–
1252 1896.
- 1253 IRSCHICK, D.J. & GARLAND, T. (2001) Integrating function and ecology in studies of adaptation:
1254 investigations of locomotor capacity as a model system. *Annual Review of Ecology and*
1255 *Systematics* **32**, 367–396.
- 1256 JACKSON, D.C. (2007) Temperature and hypoxia in ectothermic tetrapods. *Journal of Thermal*
1257 *Biology* **32**, 125–133.
- 1258 JAMESON, E.W. (1981) Thermoregulation and Water Balance. In *Patterns of Vertebrate Biology*
1259 pp. 146–186. Springer New York, NY, United States of America.

- 1260 JARED, C., MAILHO-FONTANA, P.L., MARQUES-PORTO, R., SCIANI, J.M., PIMENTA, D.C., BRODIE
1261 JR, E.D. & ANTONIAZZI, M.M. (2018) Skin gland concentrations adapted to different
1262 evolutionary pressures in the head and posterior regions of the caecilian *Siphonops*
1263 *annulatus*. *Scientific Reports* **8**, 3576.
- 1264 JARED, C., NAVAS, C.A. & TOLEDO, R.C. (1999) An appreciation of the physiology and
1265 morphology of the Caecilians (Amphibia: Gymnophiona). *Comparative Biochemistry*
1266 *and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology* **123**, 313–328.
- 1267 JONES, R.M. (1980) Metabolic consequences of accelerated urea synthesis during seasonal
1268 dormancy of spadefoot toads, *Scaphiopus couchi* and *Scaphiopus multiplicatus*. *Journal*
1269 *of Experimental Zoology* **212**, 255–267.
- 1270 JØRGENSEN, C.B. (1998) Role of urinary and cloacal bladders in chelonian water economy:
1271 historical and comparative perspectives. *Biological Reviews* **73**, 347–366.
- 1272 JØRGENSEN, M.E. & REILLY, S.M. (2013) Phylogenetic patterns of skeletal morphometrics and
1273 pelvic traits in relation to locomotor mode in frogs. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **26**,
1274 929–943.
- 1275 KAMEL, S. & GATTEN, R.E. (1983) Aerobic and anaerobic activity metabolism of limbless and
1276 fossorial reptiles. *Physiological Zoology* **56**, 419–429.
- 1277 KAZI, S. & HIPSLEY, C.A. (2018) Conserved evolution of skull shape in Caribbean head-first
1278 burrowing worm lizards (Squamata: Amphisbaenia). *Biological Journal of the Linnean*
1279 *Society* **125**, 14–29.
- 1280 KEARNEY, M., MAISANO, J.A. & ROWE, T. (2005) Cranial anatomy of the extinct amphisbaenian
1281 *Rhineura hatcherii* (Squamata, Amphisbaenia) based on high-resolution X-ray computed
1282 tomography. *Journal of Morphology* **264**, 1–33.
- 1283 KEARNEY, M.R. & PORTER, W.P. (2020) NicheMapR – an R package for biophysical modelling:
1284 the ectotherm and Dynamic Energy Budget models. *Ecography* **43**, 85–96.
- 1285 KEEFFE, R. & BLACKBURN, D.C. (2020) Comparative morphology of the humerus in forward-
1286 burrowing frogs. *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **131**, 291–303.
- 1287 KINLAW, A. (1999) A review of burrowing by semi-fossorial vertebrates in arid environments.
1288 *Journal of Arid Environments* **41**, 127–145.
- 1289 KLEINTEICH, T., MADDIN, H.C., HERZEN, J., BECKMANN, F. & SUMMERS, A.P. (2012) Is solid
1290 always best? Cranial performance in solid and fenestrated caecilian skulls. *Journal of*
1291 *Experimental Biology* **215**, 833–844.
- 1292 KOBELT, F. & LINSENMAIR, K.E. (1995) Adaptations of the reed frog *Hyperolius viridiflavus*
1293 (Amphibia, Anura, Hyperoliidae) to its arid environment. VII. The heat budget of
1294 *Hyperolius viridiflavus nitidulus* and the evolution of an optimized body shape. *Journal*
1295 *of Comparative Physiology B* **165**, 110–124.

- 1296 LARA-RESÉNDIZ, R.A., GALINA-TESSARO, P., SINERVO, B., MILES, D.B., VALDEZ-
1297 VILLAVICENCIO, J.H., VALLE-JIMÉNEZ, F.I. & MÉNDEZ-DE LA CRUZ, F.R. (2021) How will
1298 climate change impact fossorial lizard species? Two examples in the Baja California
1299 Peninsula. *Journal of Thermal Biology* **95**, 102811.
- 1300 LAUNDRÉ, J.W. & REYNOLDS, T.D. (1993) Effects of soil structure on burrow characteristics of
1301 five small mammal species. *The Great Basin Naturalist*, 358–366. JSTOR.
- 1302 LE GUILLOUX, M., MIRALLES, A., MEASEY, J., VANHOODYDONCK, B., O'REILLY, J.C., LOWIE, A.
1303 & HERREL, A. (2020) Trade-offs between burrowing and biting force in fossorial scincid
1304 lizards? *Biological Journal of the Linnean Society* **130**, 310–319.
- 1305 LEMENAGER, L.A., TRACY, C.R., CHRISTIAN, K.A. & TRACY, C.R. (2022) Physiological control
1306 of water exchange in anurans. *Ecology and Evolution* **12**.
- 1307 LI, N., SKAGGS, T.H., ELLEGAARD, P., BERNAL, A. & SCUDIERO, E. (2024) Relationships among
1308 soil moisture at various depths under diverse climate, land cover and soil texture. *Science*
1309 *of The Total Environment* **947**, 174583.
- 1310 LILLYWHITE, H.B. (2006) Water relations of tetrapod integument. *Journal of Experimental*
1311 *Biology* **209**, 202–226.
- 1312 LILLYWHITE, H.B. (2017) Behavior and physiology: an ecological and evolutionary viewpoint on
1313 the energy and water relations of ectothermic amphibians and reptiles. In *Amphibian and*
1314 *Reptile adaptations to the Environment* pp. 1–40. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, United
1315 States of America.
- 1316 LILLYWHITE, H.B. & MADERSON, P.F. (1988) The structure and permeability of integument.
1317 *American Zoologist* **28**, 945–962.
- 1318 LITTLE, A.G. & SEEBACHER, F. (2016) Acclimation, acclimatization, and seasonal variation in
1319 amphibians and reptiles. In *Amphibian and Reptile Adaptations to the Environment* pp.
1320 63–80. CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, United States of America.
- 1321 LÓPEZ, P., CIVANTOS, E. & MARTÍN, J. (2002) Body temperature regulation in the amphisbaenian
1322 *Trogonophis wiegmanni*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **80**, 42–47.
- 1323 LOWIE, A., DE KEGEL, B., WILKINSON, M., MEASEY, J., O'REILLY, J.C., KLEY, N.J., GAUCHER, P.,
1324 BRECKO, J., KLEINTEICH, T. & ADRIAENS, D. (2022) Is vertebral shape variability in
1325 caecilians (Amphibia: Gymnophiona) constrained by forces experienced during
1326 burrowing? *Journal of Experimental Biology* **225**, jeb244288.
- 1327 LOWIE, A., DE KEGEL, B., WILKINSON, M., MEASEY, J., O'REILLY, J.C., KLEY, N.J., GAUCHER,
1328 P., BRECKO, J., KLEINTEICH, T. & VAN HOOREBEKE, L. (2021) Under pressure: the
1329 relationship between cranial shape and burrowing force in caecilians (Gymnophiona).
1330 *Journal of Experimental Biology* **224**, jeb242964.

- 1331 MADISON, D.M. (1977) Chemical communication in amphibians and reptiles. In *Chemical*
1332 *Signals in Vertebrates* (eds D. MÜLLER-SCHWARZE & M.M. MOZELL), pp. 135–168.
1333 Springer US, Boston, MA.
- 1334 MADISON, D.M. (1997) The emigration of radio-implanted spotted salamanders, *Ambystoma*
1335 *maculatum*. *Journal of Herpetology* **31**, 542.
- 1336 MALADEN, R.D., DING, Y., LI, C. & GOLDMAN, D.I. (2009) Undulatory swimming in sand:
1337 subsurface locomotion of the sandfish lizard. *Science* **325**, 314–318.
- 1338 MARTÍN, J., IBÁÑEZ, A., GARRIDO, M., RAYA-GARCÍA, E. & LÓPEZ, P. (2021a) Chemical cues
1339 may allow a fossorial amphisbaenian reptile to avoid extremely saline soils when
1340 selecting microhabitats. *Journal of Arid Environments* **188**, 104452.
- 1341 MARTÍN, J., NAVARRO-CASTILLA, Á., DE LA CONCHA, A., CUERVO, J.J., BARJA, I. & LÓPEZ, P.
1342 (2025) Living Low and Dry: Costs of and resilience to soil hydric stress in a fossorial
1343 amphisbaenian reptile. *Integrative Zoology*, 1749-4877.70012.
- 1344 MARTÍN, J., ORTEGA, J., GARCÍA-ROA, R., JIMÉNEZ-ROBLES, O., RODRÍGUEZ-RUIZ, G., RECIO, P.
1345 & CUERVO, J.J. (2021b) Going underground: short- and long-term movements may reveal
1346 the fossorial spatial ecology of an amphisbaenian. *Movement Ecology* **9**, 14.
- 1347 MARTÍN, J., RAYA GARCIA, E., ORTEGA, J. & LÓPEZ, P. (2020) How to maintain underground
1348 social relationships? Chemosensory sex, partner and self-recognition in a fossorial
1349 amphisbaenian. *PLoS One* **15**, e0237188.
- 1350 MASON, M.J. & NARINS, P.M. (2001) Seismic signal use by fossorial mammals. *American*
1351 *Zoologist* **41**, 1171–1184.
- 1352 MAYHEW, W.W. (1965) Adaptations of the amphibian, *Scaphiopus couchi*, to desert conditions.
1353 *American Midland Naturalist*, 95–109.
- 1354 MCCLANAHAN JR, L. (1972) Changes in body fluids of burrowed spadefoot toads as a function of
1355 soil water potential. *Copeia*, 209–216.
- 1356 MCNAB, B.K. (1966) The metabolism of fossorial rodents: a study of convergence. *Ecology* **47**,
1357 712–733.
- 1358 MEASEY, G.J. (2006) Surveying biodiversity of soil herpetofauna: towards a standard
1359 quantitative methodology. *European Journal of Soil Biology* **42**, S103–S110.
- 1360 MILSOM, W.K. & JACKSON, D.C. (2011) Hibernation and Gas Exchange. In *Comprehensive*
1361 *Physiology* (ed R. TERJUNG), pp. 397–420, 1st edition. Wiley.
- 1362 MOLDOWAN, P.D. (2023) Ecology and sensitivity to environmental change of a northern
1363 population of Spotted Salamander. PhD Thesis, University of Toronto.

- 1364 MOLDOWAN, P.D., TATTERSALL, G.J. & ROLLINSON, N. (2022) Climate-associated decline of
1365 body condition in a fossorial salamander. *Global Change Biology* **28**, 1725–1739.
- 1366 MORENO-LARA, I., BECERRA-LÓPEZ, J.L. & RAMÍREZ-BAUTISTA, A. (2023) Effect of climate
1367 change on fossorial species: a case study comparing species of the genus *Scincella*.
1368 *Amphibia-Reptilia* **44**, 467–482.
- 1369 MORINAGA, G. & BERGMANN, P.J. (2020) Evolution of fossorial locomotion in the transition
1370 from tetrapod to snake-like in lizards. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological*
1371 *Sciences* **287**, 20200192.
- 1372 MU, Q., NG, C.W., ZHOU, C. & ZHOU, G.G. (2019) Effects of clay content on the volumetric
1373 behavior of loess under heating-cooling cycles. *Journal of Zhejiang University* **20**, 979–
1374 990.
- 1375 NARINS, P.M. (1990) Seismic Communication in Anuran Amphibians. *BioScience* **40**, 268–274.
- 1376 NAVAS, C.A., ANTONIAZZI, M.M., CARVALHO, J.E., CHAU-BERLINK, J.G., JAMES, R.S., JARED,
1377 C., KOHLSDOFF, T., PAI-SILVA, M.D. & WILSON, R.S. (2004) Morphological and
1378 physiological specialization for digging in amphisbaenians, an ancient lineage of
1379 fossorial vertebrates. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **207**, 2433–2441.
- 1380 NEVO, E. (1979) Adaptive Convergence and Divergence of Subterranean Mammals. *Annual*
1381 *Review of Ecology and Systematics* **10**, 269–308.
- 1382 NOMURA, F., ROSSA-FERES, D.C. & LANGEANI, F. (2009) Burrowing behavior of *Dermatonotus*
1383 *muelleri* (Anura, Microhylidae) with reference to the origin of the burrowing behavior of
1384 Anura. *Journal of Ethology* **27**, 195–201.
- 1385 NUSSBAUM, R.A. & WILKINSON, M. (1989) On the classification and phylogeny of caecilians
1386 (Amphibia: Gymnophiona), a critical review. *Herpetological monographs* **3**, 1–42.
- 1387 OLIVEIRA, B.F., SÃO-PEDRO, V.A., SANTOS-BARRERA, G., PENONE, C. & COSTA, G.C. (2017)
1388 AmphiBIO, a global database for amphibian ecological traits. *Scientific data* **4**, 1–7.
- 1389 OLSON, E. & BOLLES, K. (1975) Permo-Carboniferous fresh water burrows. *Fieldiana Geology*
1390 **33**, 271–290.
- 1391 O'REILLY, J.C., RITTER, D.A. & CARRIER, D.R. (1997) Hydrostatic locomotion in a limbless
1392 tetrapod. *Nature* **386**, 269–272.
- 1393 OROMÍ, N., SANUY, D. & SINSCH, U. (2010) Thermal ecology of natterjack toads (*Bufo calamita*)
1394 in a semiarid landscape. *Journal of Thermal Biology* **35**, 34–40.
- 1395 PARSONS, R.H. & MOBIN, F. (1991) Water flow across the pectoral and ventral pelvic patch in
1396 *Rana catesbeiana*. *Physiological Zoology* **64**, 812–822.

- 1397 PILLIOD, D.S., BURY, R.B., HYDE, E.J., PEARL, C.A. & CORN, P.S. (2003) Fire and amphibians in
1398 North America. *Forest Ecology and Management* **178**, 163–181.
- 1399 POUGH, F.H. (1983) Amphibians and reptiles as low-energy systems. In *Behavioral energetics:
1400 the cost of survival in vertebrates* (Eds ASPEY, J.D. & LUSTICK, S.I.), 141–188, Ohio
1401 State University Press, Columbus, OH, United States of America.
- 1402 PRANGE, H.D. & ACKERMAN, R.A. (1974) Oxygen Consumption and Mechanisms of Gas
1403 Exchange of Green Turtle (*Chelonia mydas*) Eggs and Hatchlings. *Copeia* **1974**, 758–
1404 763.
- 1405 RAYA-GARCIA, E., ALVARADO-DIAZ, J. & MARTÍN RUEDA, J. (2019) Foraging cues and thermal
1406 environments influence retreat site selection in fossorial earthsnakes. *Herpetological
1407 Conservation and Biology* **14**, 560–567.
- 1408 REISS, J.O. & EISTHEN, H.L. (2008) Comparative anatomy and physiology of chemical senses in
1409 amphibians. In *Sensory evolution on the threshold: Adaptations in secondarily aquatic
1410 vertebrates*, 43–63. University of California Press Berkeley, CA, United States of
1411 America.
- 1412 RIEPPEL, O. (1984) The cranial morphology of the fossorial lizard genus *Dibamus* with a
1413 consideration of its phylogenetic relationships. *Journal of Zoology* **204**, 289–327.
- 1414 ROMANOVSKY, A.A. (2014) Skin temperature: its role in thermoregulation. *Acta Physiologica*
1415 **210**, 498–507.
- 1416 ROTHERMEL, B.B. & LUHRING, T.M. (2005) Burrow Availability and Desiccation Risk of Mole
1417 Salamanders (*Ambystoma talpoideum*) in Harvested versus Unharvested Forest Stands.
1418 *Journal of Herpetology* **39**, 619–626.
- 1419 RUIBAL, R., TEVIS JR, L. & ROIG, V. (1969) The terrestrial ecology of the spadefoot toad
1420 *Scaphiopus hammondi*. *Copeia*, 571–584.
- 1421 SANDERS, C.E., TATTERSALL, G.J., REICHERT, M., ANDRADE, D.V., ABE, A.S. & MILSOM, W.K.
1422 (2015) Daily and annual cycles in thermoregulatory behaviour and cardio-respiratory
1423 physiology of black and white tegu lizards. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B* **185**,
1424 905–915.
- 1425 SANGER, T.J. & GIBSON-BROWN, J.J. (2004) The developmental bases of limb reduction and
1426 body elongation in squamates. *Evolution* **58**, 2103–2106.
- 1427 SCHEFFERS, B.R., EDWARDS, D.P., DIEMOS, A., WILLIAMS, S.E. & EVANS, T.A. (2014)
1428 Microhabitats reduce animal's exposure to climate extremes. *Global Change Biology* **20**,
1429 495–503.
- 1430 SEMLITSCH, R.D. (1983) Burrowing ability and behavior of salamanders of the genus
1431 *Ambystoma*. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **61**, 616–620.

- 1432 SEYMOUR, R.S. (1973) Gas exchange in spadefoot toads beneath the ground. *Copeia*, 452–460.
- 1433 SHAMS, I., AVIVI, A. & NEVO, E. (2005) Oxygen and carbon dioxide fluctuations in burrows of
1434 subterranean blind mole rats indicate tolerance to hypoxic–hypercapnic stresses.
1435 *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology*
1436 **142**, 376–382.
- 1437 SHARPE, S.S., KUCKUK, R. & GOLDMAN, D.I. (2015) Controlled preparation of wet granular
1438 media reveals limits to lizard burial ability. *Physical biology* **12**, 046009.
- 1439 SHEAFOR, E.A., WOOD, S.C. & TATTERSALL, G.J. (2000) Effects of hypoxia on the salamander
1440 *Desmognathus fuscus*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **203**, 3785–3793.
- 1441 SHENBROT, G., KRASNOV, B., KHOKHLOVA, I., DEMIDOVA, T. & FIELDEN, L. (2002) Habitat-
1442 dependent differences in architecture and microclimate of the burrows of Sundevall’s jird
1443 (*Meriones crassus*) (Rodentia: Gerbillinae) in the Negev Desert, Israel. *Journal of Arid*
1444 *Environments* **51**, 265–279.
- 1445 SHERRATT, E., GOWER, D.J., KLINGENBERG, C.P. & WILKINSON, M. (2014) Evolution of cranial
1446 shape in caecilians (Amphibia: Gymnophiona). *Evolutionary Biology* **41**, 528–545.
- 1447 SHOEMAKER, V. & NAGY, K.A. (1977) Osmoregulation in Amphibians and Reptiles. *Annual*
1448 *Review of Physiology* **39**, 449–471.
- 1449 SHOEMAKER, V.H., HILLMAN, S.S., HILLYARD, S.D., JACKSON, D.C., MCCLANAHAN, L.L.,
1450 WITHERS, P. & WYGODA, M. (1992) Exchange of water, ions and respiratory gases in
1451 terrestrial amphibians. In *Environmental Physiology of the Amphibians* pp. 125–150. The
1452 University of Chicago Press.
- 1453 SMITS, A.W. & FLANAGIN, J.I. (1994) Bimodal respiration in aquatic and terrestrial apodan
1454 amphibians. *American Zoologist* **34**, 247–263.
- 1455 SMITS, K.M., SAKAKI, T., HOWINGTON, S.E., PETERS, J.F. & ILLANGASEKARE, T.H. (2013)
1456 Temperature dependence of thermal properties of sands across a wide range of
1457 temperatures (30–70°C). *Vadose Zone Journal* **12**, vzj2012.0033.
- 1458 SOM, S., WILLETT, D.S. & ALBORN, H.T. (2017) Dynamics of belowground volatile diffusion and
1459 degradation. *Rhizosphere* **4**, 70–74.
- 1460 SPIGHT, T.M. (1967) The water economy of salamanders: Water uptake after dehydration.
1461 *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology* **20**, 767–771.
- 1462 SPOTILA, J.R. (1972) Role of temperature and water in the ecology of lungless salamanders.
1463 *Ecological Monographs* **42**, 95–125.
- 1464 STAPLES, J.F. (2016) Metabolic flexibility: hibernation, torpor, and estivation. *Comprehensive*
1465 *Physiology* **6**, 737–771.

- 1466 STEPANOVA, N. & BAUER, A.M. (2021) Phylogenetic history influences convergence for a
1467 specialized ecology: comparative skull morphology of African burrowing skinks
1468 (Squamata; Scincidae). *BMC Ecology and Evolution* **21**, 86.
- 1469 STOREY, K.B. & KELLY, D.A. (1995) Glycolysis and energetics in organs of hibernating mice
1470 (*Zapus hudsonius*). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* **73**, 202–207.
- 1471 STOREY, K.B. & STOREY, J.M. (1990) Metabolic rate depression and biochemical adaptation in
1472 anaerobiosis, hibernation and estivation. *The Quarterly Review of Biology* **65**, 145–174.
- 1473 STOREY, K.B. & STOREY, J.M. (2010) Metabolic regulation and gene expression during
1474 aestivation. In *Aestivation* (eds C. A. NAVAS & J.E. CARVALHO), pp. 25–45. Springer
1475 Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg.
- 1476 STOREY, K.B. & STOREY, J.M. (2012) Aestivation: signaling and hypometabolism. *Journal of*
1477 *Experimental Biology* **215**, 1425–1433.
- 1478 SZÉKELY, D., COGĂLNICEANU, D., SZÉKELY, P. & DENOËL, M. (2018) Dryness affects burrowing
1479 depth in a semi-fossorial amphibian. *Journal of Arid Environments* **155**, 79–81.
- 1480 TATTERSALL, G. (2007) Skin Breathing in Amphibians. In *Endothelial Biomedicine* pp. 85–91.
1481 Cambridge University Press.
- 1482 TATTERSALL, G.J. & BOUTILIER, R.G. (1997) Balancing hypoxia and hypothermia in cold-
1483 submerged frogs. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **200**, 1031–1038.
- 1484 TATTERSALL, G.J., LEITE, C.A.C., SANDERS, C.E., CADENA, V., ANDRADE, D.V., ABE, A.S. &
1485 MILSOM, W.K. (2016) Seasonal reproductive endothermy in tegu lizards. *Science*
1486 *Advances* **2**, e1500951.
- 1487 TATTERSALL, G.J. & MILSOM, W.K. (2009) Hypoxia reduces the hypothalamic thermogenic
1488 threshold and thermosensitivity: CNS regulation of body temperature in hypoxia. *The*
1489 *Journal of Physiology* **587**, 5259–5274.
- 1490 TATTERSALL, G.J., SINCLAIR, B.J., WITHERS, P.C., FIELDS, P.A., SEEBACHER, F., COOPER, C.E. &
1491 MALONEY, S.K. (2012) Coping with Thermal Challenges: Physiological Adaptations to
1492 Environmental Temperatures. In *Comprehensive Physiology* (ed R. TERJUNG), pp. 2151–
1493 2202. Wiley.
- 1494 TRAEHOLT, C. (1995) Notes on the burrows of the water monitor lizard, *Varanus salvator*.
1495 *Malayan Nature Journal* **49**, 103–112.
- 1496 ULTSCH, G.R. (2012) Metabolism, gas exchange, and acid-base balance of giant salamanders.
1497 *Biological Reviews* **87**, 583–601.
- 1498 ULTSCH, G.R. & ANDERSON, J.F. (1988) Gas exchange during hypoxia and hypercarbia of
1499 terrestrial turtles: a comparison of a fossorial species (*Gopherus polyphemus*) with a

- 1500 sympatric nonfossorial species (*Terrapene carolina*). *Physiological Zoology* **61**, 142–152.
1501 University of Chicago Press.
- 1502 VANHOOYDONCK, B., BOISTEL, R., FERNANDEZ, V. & HERREL, A. (2011) Push and bite: trade-
1503 offs between burrowing and biting in a burrowing skink (*Acontias percivali*). *Biological*
1504 *Journal of the Linnean Society* **102**, 91–99.
- 1505 VIDAL-GARCÍA, M., BYRNE, P.G., ROBERTS, J.D. & KEOGH, J.S. (2014) The role of phylogeny
1506 and ecology in shaping morphology in 21 genera and 127 species of Australo-Papuan
1507 myobatrachid frogs. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **27**, 181–192.
- 1508 VIDAL-GARCÍA, M. & KEOGH, J.S. (2015) Convergent evolution across the Australian continent:
1509 ecotype diversification drives morphological convergence in two distantly related clades
1510 of Australian frogs. *Journal of Evolutionary Biology* **28**, 2136–2151.
- 1511 VIDAL-GARCÍA, M. & SCOTT KEOGH, J. (2017) Phylogenetic conservatism in skulls and
1512 evolutionary lability in limbs – morphological evolution across an ancient frog radiation
1513 is shaped by diet, locomotion and burrowing. *BMC Evolutionary Biology* **17**, 165.
- 1514 WAHNSCHAFTE, U., FRITZSCH, B. & HIMSTEDT, W. (1985) The fine structure of the lateral-line
1515 organs of larval *Ichthyophis* (Amphibia: Gymnophiona). *Journal of Morphology* **186**,
1516 369–377.
- 1517 WAINWRIGHT, P.C. (2007) Functional versus morphological diversity in macroevolution. *Annual*
1518 *Review of Ecology, Evolution, and Systematics* **38**, 381–401.
- 1519 WAKE, M.H. (1985) The comparative morphology and evolution of the eyes of caecilians
1520 (Amphibia, Gymnophiona). *Zoomorphology* **105**, 277–295.
- 1521 WANG, L.C.H. & WOLOWYK, M.W. (1988) Torpor in mammals and birds. *Canadian Journal of*
1522 *Zoology* **66**, 133–137.
- 1523 WANG, T. & ABE, A.S. (1994) Oxygen uptake in snakes: is there a reduction in fossorial species?
1524 *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology Part A: Physiology* **107**, 483–485.
- 1525 WIENS, J.J., BRANDLEY, M.C. & REEDER, T.W. (2006) Why does a trait evolve multiple times
1526 within a clade? Repeated evolution of snakelike body form in squamate reptiles.
1527 *Evolution* **60**, 123–141.
- 1528 WILKINSON, M. & NUSSBAUM, R.A. (2006) Caecilian Phylogeny and Classification.
1529 *Reproductive Biology and Phylogeny of Gymnophiona: Caecilians*, 39–78. CRC Press,
1530 Boca Raton, FL, United States of America.
- 1531 WITHERS, P.C. (1978) Models of diffusion-mediated gas exchange in animal burrows. *The*
1532 *American Naturalist* **112**, 1101–1112.
- 1533 WITHERS, P.C. (1981) Physiological correlates of limblessness and fossoriality in scincid lizards.
1534 *Copeia* **1981**, 197.

1535 WITHERS, P.C. (1998) Evaporative water loss and the role of cocoon formation in Australian
1536 frogs. *Australian Journal of Zoology* **46**, 405–418.

1537 WOOD, S.C., WEBER, R.E., MALOY, G.M.O. & JOHANSEN, K. (1975) Oxygen uptake and blood
1538 respiratory properties of the caecilian *Boulengerula taitanus*. *Respiration Physiology* **24**,
1539 355–363.

1540 WOODLEY, S. (2015) Chemosignals, hormones, and amphibian reproduction. *Hormones and*
1541 *Behavior* **68**, 3–13.

1542 WU, N.C., ALTON, L.A., CLEMENTE, C.J., KEARNEY, M.R. & WHITE, C.R. (2015) Morphology
1543 and burrowing energetics of semi-fossorial skinks (*Liopholis*). *Journal of Experimental*
1544 *Biology*, jeb.113803.

1545 WU, N.C., ANDERSON, R.O., BORZÉE, A., BUTTIMER, S., DEZETTER, M., DUBINER, S., LI, Q.-H.,
1546 NAVAS, C.A., SÁNCHEZ-OCHOA, D. & SHERIDAN, J.A. (2025) A user's guide for
1547 understanding reptile and amphibian hydroregulation and climate change impacts.
1548 *Conservation Physiology* **13**, coaf038.

1549 WU, Q., PARKER, S.L. & THOMPSON, M.B. (2009) Selected body temperature, metabolic rate and
1550 activity pattern of the Australian fossorial skink, *Saiphos equalis*. *The Herpetological*
1551 *Journal* **19**, 127–133. British Herpetological Society.

1552 YOUNG, B.A. & MORAIN, M. (2002) The use of ground-borne vibrations for prey localization in
1553 the Saharan sand vipers (*Cerastes*). *Journal of Experimental Biology* **205**, 661–665.

1554 ZENA, L.A., DANTONIO, V., GARGAGLIONI, L.H., ANDRADE, D.V., ABE, A.S. & BICEGO, K.C.
1555 (2016) Winter metabolic depression does not change arterial baroreflex control of heart
1556 rate in the tegu lizard *Salvator merianae*. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **219**, 725–733.

1557


1559 **Table 1.** Open questions about the physiology, behaviour, and performance of fossorial amphibians and reptiles, along with potential
 1560 approaches to answer them, and their broader biological significance.

Open question	Proposed approach	Relevance
How do fossorial amphibians and reptiles integrate thermal and hydric information when selecting underground microhabitats?	Use laboratory hydrothermal gradients in which temperature and soil moisture are manipulated independently or simultaneously while continuously recording body temperature, hydration state, movement, and microhabitat selection	Reveals behavioural decision rules underlying hydrothermal trade-offs and identifies environmental thresholds governing subterranean habitat selection
How do underground respiratory environments influence physiology and behaviour?	Expose animals to ecologically realistic combinations of oxygen and carbon dioxide while measuring metabolic rate, ventilation, and body temperature selection	Determines whether respiratory constraints directly influence energy balance, and thermoregulation
How do multiple environmental variables interact to influence underground decisions?	Conduct factorial experiments manipulating temperature, moisture, respiratory gases, and soil mechanics simultaneously.	Identifies interactions and trade-offs among environmental drivers, providing a mechanistic understanding of subterranean behaviour
How do fossorial animals regulate seasonal dormancy?	Combine environmental manipulations with automated underground tracking or telemetry across simulated seasonal cycles	Clarifies the mechanisms governing overwintering, aestivation, and seasonal energy conservation
How do substrate properties influence burrowing performance?	Measure burrowing speed, force production, energy expenditure, and endurance across soils differing in compaction, moisture, texture, and particle size	Determines how soil mechanics constrain locomotion, habitat use, and underground performance
Do repeated morphological adaptations lead to convergent functional performance?	Compare morphology and standardised performance metrics across species occupying similar and contrasting substrates	Reveals whether repeated morphological evolution results in predictable functional convergence
Which fossorial species are most vulnerable to environmental change?	Combine physiological, behavioural and environmental data within mechanistic biophysical and species distribution models	Predicts range shifts, identifies vulnerable species, and informs conservation planning under future climate scenarios

XIV. Figures



Figure 1. Thermal profile at different depths in Bat Lake, Algonquin Provincial Park, ON, Canada, highlighting how shallow depths may experience greater thermal fluctuations than deeper layers. Depths are representative of the underground environments occupied by mole salamanders (*Ambystoma* spp.) that live in the forest surrounding the lake. Redrawn from Moldowan *et al.*, (2022).



1569

1570 **Figure 2.** Temporal changes in operative temperatures measured at three soil depths and body
 1571 temperatures of free-ranging Fowler's toad (*Anaxyrus fowleri*). Shallow soil exhibited the
 1572 greatest diel thermal fluctuations, whereas deeper layers buffered temperature variation. Toads
 1573 adjusted the depth at which they were buried in response to thermal variation in the soil.
 1574 Redrawn from Forget-Klein & Green (2021). Inset photo by Laura Perlick (U.S. Fish and Wildlife
 1575 Service; public domain).





Figure 3. Minimum oxygen and maximum carbon dioxide concentration (%) measured from burrows of different species of fossorial vertebrates. The extent to which burrows remain normoxic and normocarbic, or become hypoxic and hypercarbic varies across species. Data for all species were obtained from the literature, except for *Ambystoma maculatum* (D.G. & G.J.T., unpublished observations). Silhouettes were obtained from PhyloPic's public domain.



1582

1583 **Figure 4.** Metabolic rate measurements across fossorial and epigeal amphibians and reptiles. **(a)**
 1584 Number of metabolic rate measurements available for each taxonomic order and lifestyle
 1585 category. **(b)** Density distributions of mass-specific metabolic rates (log-transformed) across
 1586 experimental temperatures for fossorial and epigeal amphibians and reptiles. Data from Andrews
 1587 & Pough (1985) and Giacometti & Tattersall (2023).




Figure 5. Conceptual depiction of context-dependent landscapes of fossorial ecomorphology. (a) Pre-existing tunnels generate a broad performance plateau, allowing distinct morphological combinations to achieve similar performance. (b) Cohesive substrates generate multiple local optima associated with alternative locomotor strategies. (c) Loose and granular substrates produce a narrower optimum toward an integrated, highly derived phenotype, predicting convergence among lineages with different ancestral morphologies. In all panels, shading represents predicted performance, from lower (light) to higher (dark), across variation in cranial specialisation and the relative contribution of appendicular versus axial propulsion. Black circles indicate lineage-specific ancestral phenotypes.




Figure 6. Effects of soil compaction on the burrowing behaviour of four caecilian species. **(a)** Percentage of individuals that successfully burrowed under each level of soil compaction. **(b)** Mean time required for individuals to disappear into the substrate, illustrating the increasing difficulty of burrowing as soil compaction increased. Soil compaction was measured as the force required for soil penetration. Low < 0.0078 kg cm⁻², Mid = 0.078 kg cm⁻², and High = 0.250 kg cm⁻². Redrawn from Ducey *et al.*, (1993).