The life aquatic: an association between habitat type and skin thickness in snakes
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An aquatic animal faces challenges not encountered by its terrestrial counterparts, promoting adaptive responses in multiple traits. For example, a thicker dermis might protect snakes when they are pushed against sharp objects by water currents, and might enable a snake to shed fouling organisms attached to its skin. We thus predicted that marine snakes should have thicker skin than terrestrial species, and that smaller sea snakes should have relatively thicker skin (because absolute, not relative, thickness determines vulnerability to fouling). Measurements of 192 snakes of 44 species supported those predictions. Many (but not all) sea snakes have skins 50% thicker than those of terrestrial and amphibious snake species, representing multiple independent evolutionary origins of thicker skin (in acrochordids, Laticauda sea kraits and both main clades of hydrophiine sea snakes). Marine snakes showed different allometries of skin thickness compared with their terrestrial counterparts; larger snakes had thicker skin within and among species of amphibious and terrestrial snakes, but larger aquatic snake species had thinner skin compared with smaller taxa. Interspecific variation in skin thickness was primarily due to increased collagen in the deep dermis, a physical barrier well suited to protecting against physical injury and to resisting penetration by epibionts.


INTRODUCTION

The skin is the largest organ in the body, and plays a critical role in buffering internal conditions (of temperature, hydration, pH, salinity, etc.) against external fluctuations (Montagna, 2012). The skin’s functions range from immune defence to sensory perception, and variation in skin structure among taxa plausibly reflects adaptive responses to selective forces imposed by ambient conditions (e.g. Daly et al., 2008; Wilde et al., 2014). The structure of skin varies considerably within squamate lineages. For example, sensory papillae and osteoderms occur in the scales of some squamate taxa but not others (Price, 1982; Crowe-Riddell et al., 2016). Function of the epidermis in snakes has attracted intensive research (e.g. Hazel et al., 1999; Rivera et al., 2005; Klein et al., 2010; Klein & Gorb, 2012; Baum et al., 2014), but the overall thickness of skin has been less well studied. Nonetheless, adaptive bases for interspecific differences in skin thickness may include reducing water loss in arid environments (Abo-Eleneen & Allam, 2011), resisting abrasion while burrowing (e.g. Klein & Gorb, 2012), and as armour against retaliation by prey (Han & Young, 2018).

We propose an additional influence on skin thickness: the challenges posed by aquatic life. First, aquatic snakes may be pushed against sharp objects (such as coral edges) by turbulent water. Second, sea snakes frequently are colonized by commensal (fouling) organisms such as algae, barnacles, hydroidzoans, polychaetes, molluscs and bryozoans (e.g. Darwin, 1851, 1854; Zann et al., 1975; Jeffries & Voris, 1979; Key...
et al., 1995; Badrudeen, 2000; Alvarez & Celis, 2004; Ohba et al., 2005; Pfaller et al., 2012). These epibionts can impair hydrodynamics and reduce swimming speeds (Shine et al., 2010). Sloughing (shedding) the outer layers of the skin can eliminate most fouling organisms (Fig. 1), perhaps explaining why sea snakes slough their skins more frequently than terrestrial snakes (Kropach & Soule, 1973; Heatwole, 1999; Lillywhite & Menon, 2019). However, sloughing does not always eliminate fouling organisms that penetrate deeply into the skin (Foster, 1987; Heatwole, 1999). Epibionts cling to substrates using chemical adhesives (e.g. pedal glue in gastropods, byssus in bivalves) and etching of the substrate to provide traction (Fletcher & Callow, 1992; Bromley & Heinberg, 2006). Fouling algae can produce extensive rhizoid systems that penetrate deep into the substrate, causing physical breakdown of the surfaces to which they attach (Moss & Woodhead, 1970). A thicker skin might enable a sea snake to divest itself of fouling organisms that would otherwise impede its movements.

Previous studies on the skin of sea snakes have focused on aspects such as micro-ornamentation (Price, 1982), sensory papillae (Povel & Van Der Kooij, 1996; Westhoff et al., 2005; Crowe-Riddell et al., 2016), rugosity (Avolio et al., 2006a, b), water retention (Lillywhite & Menon, 2019), and rates of gas and water exchange (Dunson & Robinson, 1976; Lillywhite & Sanmartino, 1993; Lillywhite et al., 2009), and have looked at a small number of taxa (but see Price, 1982; Han & Young, 2018). To test the prediction that aquatic snakes have relatively thick skins, as an adaptation against physical damage and to expel fouling organisms during sloughing, we describe skin morphology in a range of aquatic, amphibious and terrestrial snakes.

Figure 1. A turtle-headed sea snake (Emydocephalus annulatus) showing algal fouling removed with sloughing. Photograph by Claire Goiran.

MATERIAL AND METHODS

STUDY SPECIES

Most snakes are terrestrial, but aquatic habits have evolved in several lineages (Heatwole, 1999). Exposure to fouling organisms is most relevant to two major clades (the Aipysurus and Hydrophis lineages) within the fully marine Hydrophiinae (Sanders et al., 2013; Lee et al., 2016). These two clades have adapted to marine habitats along different trajectories (Sanders et al., 2012). We sampled species from both groups. We also sampled one marine and one primarily freshwater species of fully aquatic filesnakes (Acrochordus, Acrochordidae), and an insular taxon of sea krait (Laticauda) that we also scored as ‘aquatic’. All sea kraits are amphibious to some degree, foraging at sea but returning to land to slough, digest, mate and lay eggs (e.g. L. colubrina: Shetty & Shine, 2002) although L. schistorhynchus rarely leaves the water (Guinea, 1994). In keeping with that characterization, a close relative of L. schistorhynchus, the primarily aquatic L. semifasciata, supports more epibiont species compared with more terrestrial sea kraits (Pfaller et al., 2012). Another subset of species in our sample were categorized as ‘amphibious’ because they show varying degrees of association with aquatic habitats. Ephalophis, Parahydrophis and Hydrelaps (all within the Hydrophiinae) often crawl on exposed mudflats as well as swim (Storr et al., 1986; Sweet, 1989; Nagelkerken et al., 2008), as do the homalopsids Cerberus, Enhydris, Fordonia and Myron (Murphy, 2007). All other taxa within our sample were classed as terrestrial, although some frequently enter the water (e.g. Tropidonophis mairii). Phylogenetically, our sample includes terrestrial species from the families Colubridae (N = 2), Elapidae (N = 8) and Pythonidae (N = 1), semi-aquatic members of the Homalopsidae (N = 4), Hydrophiinae (N = 3) and Laticauda sea kraits (N = 1), and aquatic members of the Acrochordidae (N = 2), Laticauda sea kraits (N = 1) and Hydrophiinae (N = 22).

METHODS FOR MEASUREMENTS

We examined snakes (formalin-fixed, alcohol-preserved) in the collection of the Northern Territory Museum (N = 142), supplemented by specimens from our private collections (G.P.B. and R.S., N = 50). On each animal, we recorded snout–vent length (SVL) as a measure of overall body size, and scored thickness of the skin three times, at each of three sites evenly spaced along the body (at 25, 50 and 75% of snake SVL). We measured scalar, not interscalar, sites on the skin. To do so, we made a small incision midway between the ventral shields and the uppermost part of the body (i.e. mid-lateral) and inserted the tip of a micrometer dial thickness gauge (Peacock G-1A, Ozaki Manufacturing;
accurate to 0.01 mm) beneath the resulting flap of skin. We then measured thickness under three adjacent scales by moving the tip of the micrometer around beneath the flap of skin. This procedure generated nine measures of skin thickness per specimen.

Where possible (14 species), we obtained measurements from five males and five females per species (sexed by tail shape and, if necessary, dissection) and encompassing a range of body sizes. We also obtained data on an additional 30 species represented by fewer specimens (one to three specimens per species), to broaden our sampling. Pilot analyses showed no effect of including vs. excluding these additional animals on our conclusions, so for simplicity we only report analyses of the total data set, except for intraspecific analyses comparing body length to skin thickness (conducted only on species for which we had ten specimens).

**METHODS FOR HISTOLOGICAL ANALYSIS**

We selected five species of aquatic snakes with relatively thick skin (*Acrochordus arafurae*, *Aipysurus laevis*, *Emydocephalus annulatus*, *Hydrophis curtus*), four aquatic snakes with thin skin (*Hydropis kingii*, *Hydrophis peronii*, *Hydrophis elegans*, *Hydrophis pacificus*), one amphibious species (*Laticauda colubrina*), and three terrestrial species (*Antaresia childreni*, *Demansia vestigiata*, *Tropidonophis mairii*). Each skin sample was taken from the small flap at the lateral mid-body made for thickness measurements (above). Each sample was approximately 1 cm long by 0.5 cm wide and incorporated the length of at least two scales. Samples were placed in 10% neutral buffered formalin, trimmed along the long (anterior–posterior) axis, processed in standard fashion for histology, embedded in paraffin wax on the thin lateral edge, sectioned at 5 μm, and stained with haematoxylin and eosin. Thicknesses of the epidermis, superficial dermis and deep dermis were measured at the mid-scale region (mid-way between two interscalar hinges) of two adjacent scales using a calibrated digital photomicroscope camera and associated software (Olympus DP 70 with CellSence software). The superficial dermis was defined as the area of dermis containing relatively loose, fine, collagen bundles, and the deep dermis the region with thicker, more densely packed collagen bundles, ending at the hypodermis (Dubansky & Close, 2018; Han & Young, 2018; see Fig. 2 inset). In *Acrochordus arafurae*, the skin was covered in variably sized raised bumps separated by relatively thin skin. Measurements for this species were taken from the mid-regions of two medium-sized bumps (Fig. 3D).

**METHODS FOR STATISTICAL ANALYSIS**

To quantify intraspecific allometry, we correlated an individual’s skin thickness with its SVL within each species (for the subsample of species for which we had ten specimens). To explore interspecific variation, we calculated mean SVLs, and skin thickness at 25, 50 and 75% of SVL, for each species, and used these means as the units in our analyses. Preliminary tests revealed no significant differences between conspecific males and females (except that \( P = 0.02 \) for *Cerberus australis* and *Hydrophis curtus*, but the differences disappeared when SVL was included as a covariate) so sex was not included as a factor in subsequent analyses. We then conducted analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) with the response variable being skin thickness (in micrometres) and the predictor variables being habitat type (terrestrial–amphibious–aquatic), location along the body (anterior–middle–posterior) and their interaction.

To compare interspecific allometries of skin thickness among snakes from different habitats, we treated data on skin thickness measurements at each location along the body as replicates of the dependent variable, and conducted ANCOVA with habitat type and mean SVL as factors, plus their interaction. To examine the impacts of habitat and location on the body, we used analysis of variance (ANOVA) with these predictor variables (and their interaction), and with species included as a random variable (because we had three measurements for each species). The above analyses were conducted in JMP 13.0 (SAS Institute).

To explore phylogenetic changes in skin thickness, we used the phylogenetic tree of Zheng & Wiens (2016), which we pruned to include only species in our database. We ran a phylogenetic generalized least square analysis (pgls) implemented in the R package ‘caper’ (Orme et al., 2014). For this we used the maximum likelihood value of the \( \lambda \) parameter to scale the variance–covariance phylogenetic distances matrix and compute contrasts. The phylogenetic model included skin thickness as the response variable and habitat (aquatic, amphibious and terrestrial) and SVL as predictors. Skin thickness and SVL were log\(_{10}\) transformed prior to analyses.

For analysis of histological data, we calculated species mean values for the 12 taxa for which we had samples (total of 21 specimens; see above). Most taxa were represented by two specimens, but only single specimens were available for *Hydrophis elegans*, *H. kingii*, *H. pacificus*, *H. peronii* and *Laticauda colubrina*. However this leaves \( 7 \times 2 + 5 = 19 \), not 21 specimens.

**RESULTS**

**Effect of location on the body on skin thickness**

The scales of terrestrial snakes were thinner towards the rear of the body, whereas this pattern was less pronounced in amphibious and aquatic snakes (Fig. 4). ANOVA showed a significant interaction between habitat and location...
Figure 2. Morphology of the skin of (A) a terrestrial elapid snake (*Demansia vestigiata*), and two species of sea snakes, (B) *Hydrophis kingii*, and (C) *H. curtus*, demonstrating variation in skin thicknesses and relative thickness of different layers. The photomicrographs show transverse histology sections with the epidermis upmost. The inset in panel A shows the location of the epidermis (E), superficial dermis (SD), deep dermis (DD) and hypodermis (H). The vertical bars in each panel show the margins of the superficial dermis (black bar) and deep dermis (white bar). The horizontal scale bar in panel C represents a length of 200 µm and applies to all images except the inset in panel A, in which the scale bar represents a length of 50 µm. Haematoxylin and eosin stain.

Figure 3. Morphology of the skin of four aquatic snakes: (A) *Aipysurus laevis*; (B) *Emydocephalus annulatus*; (C) *Laticauda colubrina*; and (D) *Acrochordus arafurae*, demonstrating variation in skin thicknesses and relative thickness of different layers. The photomicrographs show transverse histology sections with the epidermis upmost. The vertical bars in each panel show the superficial dermis (black bar) and deep dermis (white bar). The horizontal scale bar in panel (D) represents a length of 200 µm and applies to all images. Haematoxylin and eosin stain.
thick tissue that separates the skin from the underlying muscle. Aquatic species had thicker skin than terrestrial species in the forepart of the body. In terms of mean values, this difference was significant in ten species (Table 1). Mean skin thickness per species ranged from 260 to 586 µm in terrestrial species, from 286 to 554 µm in amphibious species, and from 274 to 554 µm in amphibious species (Fig. 4). Nonetheless, within the entire data set (44 species), the 11 species with the thickest skin (>590 µm) are all marine.

**Figure 4.** Overall thickness of skin on the lateral bodies of snakes belonging to three habitat-use categories (aquatic, terrestrial, amphibious) at 25, 50 and 75% of body length (anterior, middle, posterior). The figure shows mean values and associated standard errors, calculated from species means.

**Effect of habitat on skin thickness**

Despite the above-mentioned significant interaction term, the effect of habitat type ($F_{2,41} = 4.53, P < 0.02$) meant that aquatic snakes had thicker skin than terrestrial and amphibious snakes at all sites along the body (Fig. 4). Mean skin thickness averaged 564.8 µm in aquatic species, 421.5 µm in terrestrial species and 386.8 µm in amphibious species (Fig. 4). Despite this divergence in mean values, some aquatic snakes had skin as thin as that of most terrestrial and amphibious species (Table 1). Mean skin thickness per species ranged from 260 to 586 µm in terrestrial snakes, from 286 to 554 µm in amphibious snakes, and from 274 to 982 µm in aquatic snakes (Table 1). Considerable variation was evident even between species within genera, e.g. 456–867 µm in Aipysurus, 591–982 µm in Acrochordus and 274–866 µm in Hydrophis (Table 1).

**Effects of habitat and body length on skin thickness**

Within species for which we had data on ten specimens each, intraspecific correlations between SVL and skin thickness were positive and significant in five of six terrestrial species, one of two amphibious taxa, but just one of six aquatic species. An ANOVA on the strength of these correlations (combining amphibious with terrestrial to attain adequate sample sizes) showed a non-significantly higher mean $r^2$ value in non-aquatic taxa (mean $r^2 = 0.47$, range 0.02–0.71) than in aquatic taxa (mean $r^2 = 0.26$, range 0.07–0.47; $F_{1,12} = 3.35, P = 0.09$; that result becomes statistically significant ($F_{1,11} = 8.29, P < 0.02$) if we omit one terrestrial outlier (Notechis scutatus, $r^2 = 0.02$). Unlike all of the other taxa, our sample of this species comprised long-term captives collected from a very wide geographical area.

Interspecifically, an ANCOVA revealed that the effect of SVL on mean skin thickness differed among species. An interspecific correlation was positive and significant (combining aquatic and terrestrial taxa) for 11 species, respectively) makes it difficult to compare them (Fig. 5). Over the same SVL range, larger species of terrestrial snakes had thicker skin than larger species of aquatic snakes (Fig. 5). Unfortunately, low overlap in mean SVLs between amphibious species (generally small; mean 495 mm SVL) and the other categories (generally large; 912 and 853 mm SVL for marine and terrestrial taxa, respectively) makes it difficult to compare them (Fig. 5). Over the small range where SVLs overlap, aquatic and amphibious snakes had similarly thick skins (two longest amphibious snakes 540 ± 20 µm; five shortest aquatic snake species 514 ± 138 µm). Nonetheless, within the entire data set (44 species), the 11 species with the thickest skin (>590 µm) are all marine.

**Phylogenetic changes in skin thickness**

Phylogenetic trees (e.g. Zheng & Wiens, 2016; Sherratt et al., 2018) indicate multiple transitions in skin thickness. Our taxonomic sampling is insufficient to detect all changes, but we can identify at least five transitions between thin and thick skins (arbitrarily, $>200$ µm divergence between sister-groups), as follows:

1. amphibious hydrophiines (Ephalophis, Hydrelaps, Parahydrophis 286–311 µm) vs. the Aipysurus clade (Aipysurus–Emydocephalus 455–867 µm);
2. Aipysurus fuscus (455) vs. Aipysurus laevis (867 µm);
3. Aipysurus duboisii (458) vs. Aipysurus foliosquama (723 µm);
4. Hydrophis elegans (369) vs. H. curtus (866 µm); and
5. Acrochordus atrafurae (982) vs. Acrochordus granulatus (591 µm).

---

© 2019 The Linnean Society of London, Biological Journal of the Linnean Society, 2019, XX, 1–12
Table 1. Thickness of lateral skin in preserved snakes. SVL = snout–vent length

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Family</th>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>Mean SVL (cm)</th>
<th>Mean skin thickness (µm)</th>
<th>SE for skin thickness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Homalopsidae</td>
<td>Cerberus australis</td>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>409.6</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Homalopsidae</td>
<td>Enhydris polylepis</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>554.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Homalopsidae</td>
<td>Rodingia leucobella</td>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>393.3</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Ephalopsis gregae</td>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>311.1</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops darwiniensis</td>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Laticauda olubrana</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>525.6</td>
<td>112.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Homalopsidae</td>
<td>Myron richardsoni</td>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amphibious</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Parahydrophis mertoni</td>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>285.6</td>
<td>79.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Acrochordidae</td>
<td>Acrochordus arafune</td>
<td>Freshwater</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>982.1</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Acrochordidae</td>
<td>Acrochordus granulatus</td>
<td>Mangroves</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>590.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Aipysurus atrafrontalis</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>690.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Aipysurus dabeisi</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>458.9</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Aipysurus eydousii</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>867.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Aipysurus foliosquama</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>76.0</td>
<td>723.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Aipysurus fune</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>455.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Aipysurus laevis</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>856.1</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Eurydactylus annulatus</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>769.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops unicolor</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>347.8</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops curtus</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>93.5</td>
<td>866.2</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops cyanocinctus</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>143.0</td>
<td>437.8</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops cebalboshi</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>425.6</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops elegans</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>369.4</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops hardwichi</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>823.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops kingi</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>346.7</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops macouelli</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>356.6</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops major</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>478.8</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops ornatus (coelatus)</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>363.3</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops pacificus</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>274.4</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops peronii</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>368.5</td>
<td>76.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops platurus</td>
<td>Open ocean</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>466.7</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops shistoma</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>508.9</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Hydroaops stohesi</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>591.1</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Laticauda schoutoryncus</td>
<td>Coral reefs</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>708.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Aazunga praelongus</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>374.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Pythonidae</td>
<td>Amphisaurus chondrii</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>373.7</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Austrelaps superbus</td>
<td>Cool-temperate</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>461.1</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Dromia orientalis</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>269.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Notomia scutata</td>
<td>Cool-temperate</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>457.6</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Oxyuranus scutellatus</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>141.0</td>
<td>585.6</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Pseudechis australis</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>572.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Pseudechis ochlandi</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>109.0</td>
<td>542.2</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Colubridae</td>
<td>Stegorna australis</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>318.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Elapidae</td>
<td>Tropidophis carinatus</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>426.7</td>
<td>65.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial</td>
<td>Colubridae</td>
<td>Tropidophis mati</td>
<td>Savannah woodland</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>290.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Our criterion (>200 µm divergence) was also satisfied for at least one sister-group comparison among terrestrial elapids (*Demansia vestigiata* 261 µm vs. *Oxyuranus scutellatus* 586 µm).

A quantitative phylogenetically based analysis of our data [of the 37 species present in the tree of Zheng & Wiens (2016)] reveals a medium-to-strong phylogenetic signal in the data (λ = 0.47). The intercept (i.e. skin thickness when log SVL = 0, or SVL = 1 mm) was significantly higher for aquatic species than for amphibious ones. Mean SVL, however, was marginally positively associated with thicker skin in amphibious snakes (slope 0.84 ± 0.43 SE; P < 0.06), but with a decrease in skin thickness in aquatic species (slope = −0.26; so for the log SVL × habitat interaction, P < 0.036). The model explained 32% of the variation in skin thickness.

**Microscopic structure of skin**

The epidermis was thin in all snakes, typically composed of a prominent basal layer of epidermal cuboidal cells followed by one to three less distinct, thin layers of flattened cells beneath a thin surface stratum corneum (see all photomicrograph figures, high-magnification detail in Fig. 2A inset). The margin delineating the superficial and deep dermis was abrupt in some species (e.g. *D. vestigiata*, *H. kingii* and *H. curtus*), in which the superficial dermis contained small collagen bundles widely separated by ground substance (evident histologically as clear space to pale eosinophilic or basophilic amorphous material; Fig. 2). Species with intermediate distinction between superficial and deep dermis included *Aipysurus laevis* (Fig. 3A) and *L. colubrina* (Fig. 3C). The two terrestrial species, *T. mairii* and *Antaresia childreni*, exhibited distinct margins between superficial and deep dermis (Fig. 6). Species with a gradual and indistinct transition between the size of collagen bundles of the superficial and deep dermis included *E. annulatus* (Fig. 3B), *H. elegans* (Fig. 7B) and *H. pacificus* (Fig. 7C).

---

**Figure 5.** Interspecific allometry of overall mean skin thickness (one value per species, based on N = 1–10 specimens) relative to mean snout–vent lengths of the animals measured. The different colours show data for amphibious species, aquatic species and terrestrial species, and regression lines fitted to these data. See Table 1 for the list of species in each category.

**Figure 6.** Morphology of the skin of two terrestrial snakes: (A) the colubrid *Tropidonophis mairii*; and (B) the python *Antaresia childreni*. The photomicrographs show transverse histology sections with the epidermis upmost. The vertical bars in each panel show the superficial dermis (black bar) and deep dermis (white bar). The horizontal scale bar in panel (B) represents a length of 200 µm and applies to all images. Haematoxylin and eosin stain.
In all species, the distinction between the deep dermis and loose hypodermal connective tissue was obvious, frequently delineated by a thin continuous line of collagen (e.g. see Figs 3A, C, 7A, C). While melanocytes were evident in the basal epidermis in most species, the predominant location of pigment was the dermis. In some species, for example D. vestigiata (Fig. 2A) and Antaresia childreni (Fig. 6B), pigment was primarily present in melanophores in the superficial dermis immediately beneath the epidermal basement membrane. This situation contrasts with other species such as H. kingii (Fig. 2B) and H. peronii (Fig. 7A) in which melanophores were densest at the margin of the superficial and deep dermis, and others such as H. curtus (Fig. 2C) and L. colubrina (Fig. 3C) in which melanophores continued into the upper third of the deep dermis.

Histological data on 12 species of snakes (21 specimens total) showed that the deep dermis was by far the thickest layer, comprising an average of 74% of the total thickness of the skin (range 44–95%). Hence, variation in the thickness of the deep dermis explained most of the variation in total skin thickness (N = 12, r² = 0.98, P < 0.0001; see Fig. 8C; for epidermis vs. total skin thickness N = 12, r² = 0.03, P = 0.60; for superficial dermis vs. total skin thickness N = 12, r² = 0.01, P = 0.91). Our measurements of skin thickness from histology were positively correlated with those from the micrometer method (N = 12 species, r² = 0.53, P < 0.008; without one outlier (Acrochordus araftuae), the fit improves to r² = 0.85, P < 0.0001).

DISCUSSION

Correlations between environmental factors and organismal traits are found widely (e.g. Lynch, 2018), but most studies on aquatic snakes have focused on physiological issues such as adaptations to diving (e.g. Heatwole, 1999). Our data suggest that the evolutionary transition from terrestrial to aquatic habitats in snakes has been accompanied – in some but not all species – by an increase in thickness of the lateral skin. That thickening is due primarily to an increase in the deep dermis layer, which is far thicker than other layers (Figs 2, 3; consistent with Han & Young’s (2018) report that in 14 species of terrestrial snakes, the epidermis averaged 17.4 µm, the superficial dermis 45.3 µm and the deep dermis 253.4 µm).

We suggest that, because the earliest snakes were burrowers (Brandley et al., 2008), they may have had thick skin as an adaptation to resist abrasion underground (Klein & Gorb, 2012). However, most modern snakes are surface-active, not fossorial. They have relatively thin skin: about 400 µm thick based on our data and those of Han & Young (2018). Skin thickness varies with body size (and with location on the body, in terrestrial snakes), and among even closely related species from similar habitats (Table 1). Some of that variation may reflect ecological factors; for example, the Calabar burrowing python (Calabaria reinhardtii) may have evolved very thick skin (>2000 µm) in response to the threat posed by retaliating rodent prey (Han & Young, 2018).

Our study reveals broader habitat-associated divergences in skin thickness. Although some aquatic snakes retain the ancestral condition of thin skin, species in at least four lineages of snakes that have evolved aquatic habits (acrochordids, Laticauda sea kraits, and the Aipysurus and Hydrophis clades within the hydrophiine sea snakes) evolved skins that are about 50% thicker than that seen in most terrestrial or amphibious snakes (Fig. 4; Table 1). What factors associated with aquatic life might impose selection for thicker skin? The morphological changes seen in our sample falsify several possibilities. For example,
an aquatic snake might experience novel pressures associated with hydrodynamics and gas exchange (e.g. Heatwole, 1999; Lillywhite & Menon, 2019), sensory reception (Crowe-Riddell et al., 2016) and shifts in sexually selected traits such as a male’s ability to cling to a female during courtship (Avolio et al., 2016a, b). Such factors, however, should largely affect the superficial layer of the skin (the epidermis) or the superficial dermis (which contains blood vessels, nerve endings, etc.). Inconsistent with that prediction, the greater thickness of the skin in aquatic snakes is due to elaboration of collagenous material within the deep dermis rather than to modifications of more superficial layers (Fig. 8C). The primary function of the deep dermis is to provide a physical barrier against injury (e.g. Han & Young, 2018).

We suggest that two aspects of aquatic life might impose selection for thicker skin as a defence against injury. Although sea snakes are sometimes consumed by predators (e.g. Heatwole, 1999) and are subject to retaliatory attacks by prey (Goiran & Shine, 2015), we doubt that sea snakes are more vulnerable overall than terrestrial snakes in this respect. Instead, we suggest that aquatic snakes (1) are prone to injuries from water currents (waves, floods, etc.) pushing them against hard objects (such as coral), and (2) are vulnerable to fouling organisms whose attachment systems can penetrate deep within the skin (e.g. Zann, 1975).

An aquatic snake may be pushed against hard objects during periods of strong wave action (especially, cyclonic conditions) or in powerful currents (especially, floods) as it forages or as it surfaces to breathe. Terrestrial snakes would rarely be subject to such an injury. In keeping with that hypothesis, we have recorded frequent wounds on turtle-headed sea snakes (Emydocephalus annulatus) after periods of unusually rough seas (R. Shine & C. Goiran, unpubl. data, 2018). Similarly, the relatively thick skins of some sea kraits (Laticauda spp.) might protect them as they are thrown against the shore by waves while entering and leaving the water, when they are sometimes smashed against coral repeatedly (R. Shine, unpubl. observation, 2016). In contrast, amphibious snakes that inhabit mudflats (such as Ephalophis, Hydrelaps and Parahydrophis) would be less at risk.

A second factor is the possibility that an enhanced ability to dislodge epibionts (fouling organisms) may be advantageous to aquatic snakes. Algal fouling can reduce swimming speeds of sea snakes by about 20% (Shine et al., 2010). Sloughing rids the snake of most epibionts (Zann et al., 1975; Heatwole, 1999; Shine et al., 2010) but not all of them, because attachment systems can penetrate deeply below the epidermis (Zann, 1975; Heatwole, 1999). A thicker denser skin thus should make it more likely that epibionts cannot penetrate deeply enough to retain their hold on the snake after it sloughs. The primary thickening is in the deep dermis, which is not sloughed; however, reinforcement at that level may weaken epibiont attachments that penetrate through the epidermis. If resistance to epibiont retention depends upon absolute thickness, smaller
species of snakes (and smaller individuals within a species) may benefit from relatively thick skins. Locomotor performance of smaller snakes also may be more adversely affected by epibionts, because a given fouling organism is larger relative to snake body size. This hypothesis is supported by our results (Fig. 5). We note, however, that larger snakes also may carry more epibionts (e.g. Pfaller et al. 2012); further research on correlates of epibiont infestation rates would be of great interest. Amphibious snakes should be less vulnerable to epibionts, because their skin can dry out (killing superficial fouling organisms) whenever the snake is on land. Again, this pattern fits with our data.

We note, however, that many sea snakes have skins no thicker than that of terrestrial species, and that skin thickness is not the only trait that could influence resistance to epibionts. For example, rates of epibiont colonization are exacerbated by clear, shallow waters (Zann et al., 1975), so a sea snake that spent its time in turbid or deep water may experience few problems in this respect. The larvae of many epibionts are highly selective about the substrates upon which they settle, with darker-coloured snakes attracting higher burdens (Shine et al., 2010). Thus, lighter colour might reduce epibiont abundance. The latter hypothesis predicts that darker-coloured snake species may benefit more from thicker skin; subjectively, the thicker-skinned sea snake species (Table 1) tend to be darker in colour than their thinner-skinned counterparts. Another anti-fouling mechanism might be frequent sloughing; snakes could rid themselves of epibionts before the fouling organisms had time to develop deep attachments. The high rates of sloughing in some sea snakes (e.g. Zann, 1975; Heatwole, 1999) may reflect such an adaptation. If some taxa slough more often than others, they might resist epibiont attack without needing thick skin.

The thickness of skin may be important in other contexts too. For example, snakes can rid themselves of toxic pollutants (such as trace metals) when the skin is shed (e.g. Campbell & Campbell, 2001; Jones & Holladay, 2006). Thus, a thicker skin may increase the quantity of pollutants that are lost at sloughing. Because trace elements bind to melanin, a darker skin facilitates loss of those chemicals at sloughing (Goiran et al., 2017). Melanin occurs across different layers of snake skin (in the superficial epidermis, the basal epidermis and the dermis: Lillywhite & Menon, 2019), but only the most superficial of those layers would be sloughed. It is unclear whether an increase in overall skin thickness (which results primarily from thickening of the deep dermis, a component that is not shed) would affect loss of heavy metals at sloughing. Future work could usefully explore the distribution of trace elements across different layers within the skin, to evaluate whether a thicker deep dermis might increase expulsion of pollutants. Ecological studies on rates of epibiont fouling in free-living snakes would also be of great interest.

Another profitable avenue of research would be histology of epibionts in situ, to determine how deeply these organisms penetrate beneath the surface of the skin. More comprehensive sampling of sea snake species would also allow for comparisons of skin thickness to other ecological and morphological traits within this lineage. Species that do not fit the epibiont hypothesis – dark-coloured species that live in clear, shallow water but have thin skins – are of particular interest. For example, the reef shallows sea snake Aipysurus duboisii (which sometimes displays dark dorsal colouration) might be expected to experience high rates of settlement from larval epibionts, and yet has relatively thin skin. Does it slough more frequently, or do other aspects of skin morphology or chemistry render it less vulnerable to fouling organisms?

More generally, our data draw attention to how little we know about the morphology of snakes, and especially of aquatic species. The thickness of skin is a fundamental and easily measured trait, and yet we have no information about this trait for the vast majority of snake taxa. Multiple transitions from terrestrial to aquatic habits in snakes provide exciting opportunities to clarify the novel selective forces imposed by aquatic life.
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