Like for the first phalanges, I received from John Howe copies of his data on second phalanges (Ph2) on separated (10) sheets. A few data were redundant, in that cases I used their mean noted ’-X’. In Table 1, you may find the original data, in Table 2 - the ones I used, and in Table 3 - the same after sorting the anterior Ph2 from the posterior.

Uusually a scatter diagram of distal articular width (6) versus maximal length (1) separates easily the anterior Ph2 (shorter and wider) from the posterior. In this case, I used the sum of minimal width (3) and distal articular width (6) versus maximal length (Fig.1).

This scatter diagram shows a bulk of slender Ph2 with little overlap and one uncertain specimen. Besides, a few phalanges seem rather large ; three rather small.
The remaining specimens are too large and/or too robust to belong with the precedent group.

****Middle-sized slender Ph2 (*A*. cf. *pseudaltidens*)****
Statistics (Table 4) on 87 supposed anterior Ph2 are compatible with a single form. Size and shape are similar to extant *E. hemionus onager* apart a smaller proximal depth (5). The corresponding bone by bone Simpson’s diagram is in Fig.2.

Statistics on supposed 80 posterior Ph2 are also compatible with a single form, not very different from the extant *E. hemious onager* (Table 5). The corresponding bone by bone Simpson’s diagram is in Fig.3.

*Large slender Ph2*
There are eight of them (Fig.4). I suppose that they come from a different level of Natural Trap.

*Small slender Ph2*
I do not know what to make of these three small specimens (Fig.5). The posterior, extremely slender, may be a juvenile ?

****Caballine Ph2****
Five anterior and seven posterior are close in size and proportions (Fig.6). to extant *E. przewalskii* or Mongolian horses Ph2.

*****A. leoni*-like Ph2****
I refer to *A. conversidens* two anterior Ph2. Although I have no data on *A. leoni* Ph2, this is a logical assumption in the context of other fossils of Natural Trap. One Ph2 of an extant *E. africanus* is smaller but otherwise not very different (Fig.7).