Nathan P. Myhrvold VENTURES® INTELLEC



Abstract

Many previous studies have used growth rates to determine dinosaur metabolism. These studies compared the allometric scaling of maximum growth rate (G_{max}) as a function of maximum body mass (M) for dinosaurs with the scaling for extant groups in order to classify dinosaur metabolism as endothermic, ectothermic, or something in between (mesothermic).

Kleiber's Law holds that basal metabolic rate $BMR = a M^b$. Previous studies have shown that, with reasonably high correlation, $G_{\text{max}} = c M^d$ with roughly similar exponents 0.6 < *b*, *d* < 0.9, depending on the taxonomic group. It does not follow that G_{max} is related to *BMR*, however, because statistical correlation is not transitive. Prior studies used inappropriate regression variables that confounded this relationship by introducing a spurious rate studies alone.

correlation, which occurs because G_{\max} has M as an explicit factor.

I show that when the correct variable (i.e., maximum mass-specific growth rate rather than G_{max}) is used in the regression, available data show no correlation between growth rate and BMR. Moreover, the practice of using regressions across dinosaur taxa as a means to classify all dinosaurs is not alid, for both statistical and biological reasons.

My reanalysis of previously published data sets in fact finds that the growth rates of dinosaur taxa overlap with those of both endothermic an ectothermic extant animals. I conclude that one cannot determine the metabolism of either dinosaur or extant animal species by using growth-

Prior Work Built on "Case's Method"—A Method Case Rejected

Nearly all previous studies that use growth rates to analyze dinosaur metabolism use methods that build on pioneering work by Ted J. Case [1], which no universal law relating metabolic rate and body size—nor has one been these later studies cite (fig. 1). Case's own papers make clear, however, that he found in the years since. did not believe that metabolism can be deduced from growth rates (fig. 2).

In fact, Case was troubled by the fact that empirically there seemed to be



2009: Erickson, Rauhut et al.









2004: Erickson, Mackovicky et al. [4]

Figure 1. Ted Case's seminal 1978 paper examining growth rates of various species (top *left*) suggested possible connections between growth rate and metabolism, but concluder that the relationship was unreliable on both theoretical and empirical grounds (fig. 2). Nev theless, many recent studies on the growt d metabolism of dinosaurs have built up Case's method, on the faulty assumption that it has been proven to apply universally.

2014: Werner & Griebeler



Figure 2. In his 1978 article, Case plotted growth rate versus body weight for species of many kinds and noted substantial scatter that prevents assignment of a simple relationship between the two.

wнy, IN FACT, should growth rate and metabolic rate vary with body size at roughly the same rate? The answer is not at all obvious....

I conclude that an organism's growth rate is not solely determined by its metabolic rate, although the evolutionary achievement of endothermy seems to have resulted in lifting the physiological restraints upon growth rate enough to produce nearly a ten-fold increase over ectothermic growth rates.

—Ted J. Case, 1978 [1]

b, bats; i, insectivores; r, rodents; l, lagomorphs; f, fissiped carnivores; s, pinniped carnivores; e, proboscideans; u, ungulates; p, primates; c, cetaceans; •, edentates; m, marsupials; o, monotremes.

Maximum Growth Rate Does Not Determine Dinosaur Metabolism

Statistical Problems

In studies that have claimed to find evidence for dinosaur mesothermy [6, 7], investigators regressed averages of G_{max} versus averages of M for polyphyletic groups of species. They found that the endothermic groups cluster separately from ectothermic groups on log-log charts; dinosaur groups occupied an intermediate position, which researchers interpreted as mesothermy. However, my reanalysis of this approach and the underlying data sets identified several serious statistical problems that call these conclusions question [8, 9]. Four distinct kinds of statistical error are involved

1 Choosing the wrong regression variables yields misleading results.

The maximum growth rate is obtained by using the equation $G_{\text{max}} = k M e^{-1}$, where k is a growth-rate parameter. M is an inappropriate choice of regression variable because it is a factor in this equation and is thus inextricably



Figure 3. A convex hull surrounding data points published for several groups of animal species [seems to show that data sets for dinosaurs (*black outline*) overlap with several extant groups, whether plotted in terms of $k/e(\mathbf{A})$ or in terms of $G_{max}(\mathbf{B})$, where $G_{max} = M k/e$.

2 Regression is not transitive.

Some prior studies assume implicitly that regression is transitive: i.e., that if it is valid to regress A on B and to regress B on C, then it must be valid to regress A on C as well. But this is demonstrably not the case, as is well

3 Effects are not power laws.

Many studies of animal metabolism assume that growth rate varies with body mass as a simple power law in which a constant exponent applies to all organisms—or at least to all species within a broad taxonomic group. Researchers have mistakenly fit power-law functions to empirical measurements without checking whether other functional forms produce even better fits. In many cases, they do—and the best-fitting functions are comlex curves such as cubics, not simple exponentials. It is a statistical error to **Figure 4.** A reanalysis of growth and metabolic data presented by Werner and Griebeler [7] (*left*) fit data and claim a best fit has been found when only a subset of plausible functional forms have been tested.

In fact, using *M* in the regression effectively applies a geometric shear transformation, which produces high correlation and low scatter as an artifact (fig. 1B). The inappropriate choice of regression variable thus con-



But the choice of M as a regression variable is inappropriate because regressing G_{max} versus M effectively adds an unnecessary shear transformation (*blue grid in* **B**) that artificially reduces scatter and inflates the apparent correlation Figure from ref. [8]

nown in statistics [10]. In the case of dinosaur data, results of regression analysis can differ greatly depending on the choice and order of the variables used (fig. 6).



and (B) by Grady et al. [6] (right) finds that the best fit for altricial birds, eutherians, and other groups is not a simple power law but instead a cubic or some other complex curve [9]. Figures from ref. [9]

4 The ecological fallacy: averages can mislead.

BMR and G_{max} are both properties of individual species; if they are correlated, then that should occur at the single-taxon level—it applies only to individual species. Performing regressions on averages taken across wide groups of biologically distinct species can produce highly misleading results [10].

when, as in the case of metabolism, characteristics are not actually shared among all members of the group. Such overgeneralization is an example of a famous problem in statistical inference known as the ecological fallacy

Biological Problems

In addition to statistical issues, studies of dinosaur metabolism face substantial challenges imposed by fundamental constraints of biology. Three

biological problems in particular undermine confidence in the prior conclusions about the metabolism of dinosaurs.

1 Metabolism cannot depend on the average of a polyphyletic group.

cies or taxon. The parameter has no valid meaning when estimated from an or orders.

Basal metabolic rate (BMR) is a characteristic inherent to an individual spe- average of growth rates spanning broad taxonomic groups such as families

2 Growth rate can determine metabolism *only* at the level of species.

Animal species show a wide diversity of metabolic rates, and by definition this diversity cannot be "inherited" by a broad taxonomic group over millions of years of evolution—diversity *means* interspecies variation.

There exists no mechanism by which the metabolic rate of an extant species can reach back through time to inform, via some shared ancestor, the metabolic rate of a species on some other branch of the phylogenetic tree.

3 The metabolic theory of ecology is not supported by empirical data.

The metabolic theory of ecology, widely applied in these studies, assumes Moreover, when empirical data for *BMR* and *M* are plotted on a semilog that a simple power law, such as $BMR = a M^b$, relates metabolism to maximum body mass. But the value of the exponent *b* used in published studies law should produce (fig. 4). varies considerably; it is now clear that no single value applies universally.

(fig. 5). Other researchers have similarly concluded that body mass and me-

Results

A reanalysis of the data on dinosaur growth and mass previously used to support claims of mesothermy [6, 7] finds that, when the errors mentioned tabolism are unrelated [11]. above are corrected, no meaningful correlation exists between G_{max} and M

$R^2 = 0.034$ k/e (1/y)





sets reveals a pronounced degree of overlap among dinosaurs and other an- bolic mode distinct from extant species. imals groups in both the endothermic and ectothermic metabolic catego-

Moreover, a comparison of the growth rates obtained from these data ries (fig. 6). This result challenges the idea that dinosaurs exhibited a meta-



Figure 6. Large groups of taxa do not divide cleanly into metabolic groups by growth rate. histograms of mass-adjusted growth rates assume a fixed exponent of ³/₄ for data sets from



Figure 7. BMR acts differently than G_{max} in that it can be cleanly separated between endothermic groups (blue in left chart, below dashed line in right chart) and exothermic groups. Figure from ref. [4]

Birds (altricia Birds (precocial) **Eutherian** Marsubial (A) ref [1] and (B) ref [6]. Mean values for each group are indicated by capped bars. Shaded bands highlight the growth rates that overlap among extant endotherms and ectotherms. Figure from ref. [4]



References and Acknowledgements

- T. J. Case. 1978. On the Evolution and Adaptive Significance of Postnatal Growth Rates in the Terrestrial Vertebrates. The Quarterly Review of Biology, 53(3): 243–282.
- G. M. Erickson, T. A. Tumanova. 2000. Growth Curve of Psittacosaurus mongoliensis Osborn (Ceratopsia: Psittacosauridae) Inferred from Long-Bone Histology. Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society, 130(4): 551–566. doi:10.1111/j.1096-3642.2000.tb02201
- G. M. Erickson. K. C. Rogers. S. A. Yerby. 2001. Dinosaurian Growth Patterns and Rapid Avian Growth Rates. Nature, 412: 429–433. doi:10.1038/35086558
- [4] G. M. Erickson, P. J. Makovicky, P. J. Currie, M. A. Norell, S. A. Yerby, C. A. Brochu. 2004. Gigantism an Comparative Life-History Parameters of Tyrannosaurid Dinosaurs. Nature, 430: 772–775. doi:10.1038/nature02699.
- G. M. Erickson, O. W. M. Rauhut, Z. Zhou, A. H. Turner, B. D. Inouye, D. Hu, M. A. Norell. 2009. Was Dinosaurian Physiology Inherited by Birds? Reconciling Slow Growth in Archaeopteryx. PLoS ONE, 4(10): e7390. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0007390.

Figure 5. Correlation is nontransitive among growth rate (k/e), metabolic rate (BMR), and maximum mass The author would like to acknowledge the assistance of J. Grady for providing data, and of W. Gibbs, A. Modoran, (M). The dramatic differences in results that occur when one performs pairwise regression of these variables and D. Sivam in the creation of this report. No funding was sought for this research. is illustrated here. The correlations are moderately strong for BMR versus M (**B**) and k/e versus M (**C**), but there is little correlation between BMR and k/e (**D**). Figure from ref. [8]

- J. M. Grady, B. J. Enquist, E. Dettweiler-Robinson, N. A. Wright, F. A. Smith. 2014. Evidence for Mesotherm in Dinosaurs. *Science*, 344: 1268–1272. doi: 10.1126/science.1253143.
- . Werner, E. M. Griebeler. 2014. Allometries of Maximum Growth Rate Versus Body Mass at Maximum Growth Indicate That Non-avian Dinosaurs Had Growth Rates Typical of Fast-Growing Ectothermic Sauropsids. *PLoS ONE*, 9(2): e88834. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0088834.
- [8] N. P. Mvhrvold. 2015. Comment on "Evidence for Mesothermy in Dinosaurs." *Science*, 348: 982–983. doi:10.1126/science.1260061
- [9] N. P. Myhrvold. 2015. Dinosaur Metabolism and the Allometry of Maximum Growth Rate. In press. [10] K. P. Burnham, D. R. Anderson. 2002. *Model Selection and Inference: A Practical Information-Theoretic Approach*.
- Springer-Verlag, New York. [11] B. G. Lovegrove. 2009. Age at First Reproduction and Growth Rate are Independent of Basal Metabolic Rate
- in Mammals. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B*, 179(4): 391–401. doi:10.1007/s00360-008-0322-4.