**FACTORS INFLUENCING THE DIFFERENT PERFORMANCE OF FISH AND
PRIMATES ON A DICHOTOMOUS CHOICE TASK**

Laurent Prétôt^{1,2}, Redouan Bshary³ & Sarah F. Brosnan^{1,2,4}

¹*Department of Psychology, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303-5010, USA,*

²*Language Research Center, Georgia State University,* ³*Department of Behavioral
Ecology, University of Neuchâtel, CH-2000 Neuchâtel, Switzerland,* ⁴*Department of
Philosophy & Neuroscience Institute, Georgia State University*

Corresponding author

Laurent Prétôt, MS

Language Research Center

Department of Psychology

Georgia State University

P.O. Box 5010

Atlanta, GA 30303-5010

Email: lpretot1@student.gsu.edu

Phone: +001 404-713-2741

Word count

11018

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

Species vary in the ease with which they can solve apparently similar problems. This can be due to a variety of features. For instance, the ecological context of a problem will be interpreted differently by different species. This could relate to how they interpret the problem, but also, more basically, which cue they see as key. Differences in the latter may influence the ability to solve the task not because of variations in cognitive ability *per se*, but because one species has to first learn which cue is relevant before it is able to solve the task. In our previous work, cleaner fish learned faster than three species of primates to give an “ephemeral” food source priority over a “resident” food source, where the relevant cue was the plates (but the foods were identical). To determine the degree to which this cue influenced the primates’ ability to learn the task, relative to cleaner fish, we here repeated the task with both capuchin monkeys and cleaners, using two variations designed to be more salient to capuchins (the cleaners were also tested to see if these changes negatively impacted their performance). In the first, we changed the cue from the plate presenting the food (original plate task) to the color of the food itself (now the plates were identical). In the second, we hid the food rewards, as primates are known to have difficulties inhibiting responses to visible rewards. Primates did improve their performance on both adapted tasks. Interestingly, and contrary to our predictions, fish performed at the same level across all versions of the task.

Keywords: decision-making, dichotomous choice task, cues, ecological relevance, cognition, *Cebus apella*, *Sapajus apella*, *Labroides dimidiatus*

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

Animals' decisions are constrained by their ecology, their cognitive ability, and the ways in which they can interact with the world, among other factors. The ecological approach to cognition posits that ecology influences decision-making such that each species performs better on tasks that are naturally relevant to them (Kamil & Mauldin, 1987; Kamil, 1988; Balda & Kamil, 1989; Shettleworth, 2009). There are many possible mechanisms by which this could occur, but one likely possibility is that species have been selected to focus on cues that are relevant to them (Lotem & Halpern, 2012; for a review, see Rowe & Healy, 2014). Thus, species may be good at identifying problems that are relevant to their ecology and predisposed to look for some cues over others. For instance, research on food-caching birds has shown that nutcrackers (*Nucifraga columbiana*), a species that is highly dependent on stored food for surviving winters, outperform less cache-dependent species specifically in a spatial memory task, but not in a non-spatial, color memory task (Olson et al., 1995). Similar results were obtained for two populations of black-capped chickadees (Pravosudov & Clayton, 2002): Alaskan chickadees, which live in harsh environments and are highly dependent on food caching, performed better in spatial memory tests than Colorado chickadees, although the populations did not differ in a non-spatial version of the task. Somewhat surprisingly, such comparisons of performance between ecologically relevant and non-relevant tasks have remained rare (Shettleworth, 2009). Here, we extend work comparing two phylogenetically distant species, cleaner wrasses (*Labroides dimidiatus*) and brown capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*), that converge on their tendency to cooperate with conspecifics but perform differently in a dichotomous choice task derived from a cleaner-specific cooperative situation (Salwiczek et al., 2012).

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

92 In the wild, cleaner fish remove parasites and other material from client reef fish,
93 which visit them at their so-called cleaning stations. Clients have been categorized as
94 either residents with small territories or home ranges that allow them to access only one
95 cleaning station, or as choosy clients, which have larger home ranges that cover several
96 cleaning stations. Cleaners typically compete among each other over access to choosy
97 clients, while they each have exclusive access to their resident clients; consequently,
98 choosy clients are expected to use their choice options by visiting stations where the
99 service is better. Field observations found that choosy clients have priority for cleaning
100 access over the residents (Bshary, 2001); they also typically switch to another cleaner if
101 ignored, but are more likely to return to the same cleaning station if they are inspected
102 (Bshary & Schaffer, 2002), making thus the clients' choosiness likely the cause of this
103 priority of access.

104 To test this in the lab, Bshary & Grutter (2002) replaced client fish with plates;
105 one plate simulated the choosy client, while the other represented the resident. Fish could
106 feed on the choosy plate only if they started to feed on it before they went foraging on the
107 resident plate, otherwise the choosy plate was withdrawn while the fish was eating from
108 the resident plate, just as choosy clients leave if they are not inspected rapidly; the
109 resident plate, however, always stayed in the testing area until the fish had stopped
110 feeding on it, just as resident clients often queue for service if the cleaner fish inspects
111 another client. Crucially, both plates offered the same foods, in equal amount, and hence
112 were equally attractive as food patches. Within just a few trials, cleaner fish inspected the
113 choosy plate first, supporting previous field observations of this behavior.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

114 In a subsequent study, Salwiczek et al. (2012) tested cleaner fish, capuchin
115 monkeys, chimpanzees and orangutans on this plate task. The goal of this study was to
116 compare the performance of fish and primate species that converged on both their
117 tendency to cooperate with one another (e.g., capuchins: Brosnan, 2010; chimpanzees:
118 Boesch & Boesch, 1989) and their propensity to eat both mobile and immobile food
119 sources, which may roughly correlate with the stable resident and mobile choosy clients
120 (e.g., plant materials vs. hunting for insects and smaller vertebrates; Goodall, 1986;
121 Fragaszy et al., 2004), and to contrast this with orangutans, who primarily eat fruits
122 (Galdikas, 1988) and less frequently insects or other mobile animal protein sources
123 (Rijksen, 1978), but who do not cooperate to the same degree in natural situations (but do
124 in captivity: Chalmeau et al., 1997; Dufour et al., 2009). In the task, fish outperformed all
125 of the primate species. Although most of the monkeys (but not apes) eventually learned
126 how to solve the task, they did not do so as quickly as the fish.

127 Salwiczek et al. (2012)'s results may initially seem counterintuitive given the
128 primates' large brains and known problem-solving skills, however from the cue
129 perspective they make sense. The fish were presented with a task that was derived from
130 their own ecology, including the cues that were needed to solve it, whereas the primates
131 needed to first learn which cues were relevant, and only then could they learn to solve the
132 task. Of course, ecologically relevant cues are not the only possible causes for the
133 differences; differences in cognition may generally be due to how individuals perceive,
134 process, and/or act upon the available information or their motivation for the task itself
135 (Shettleworth, 2009). Therefore, to understand this more fully, we must test the primates
136 on alternate versions of the task that are designed to account for some of these other

potentially mediating factors. Additionally, to truly test the hypothesis, it is essential to test the fish on the modified tasks as well, to see whether and how their performance changes across the tasks. In the current paper, we independently tested two non-exclusive reasons that could explain the poor performance of primates in the original plate task, namely whether the primates understood which cue held the relevant information for the decision, and the tendency of primates to be distracted by seeing food during the choice presentation.

Considering the first potential explanation for the superior performance of the fish, the task simulated a natural situation for the fish but not the primates, so we hypothesize that only the fish could readily identify the relevant cue to solve the task (Lotem & Halpern, 2012). In the wild, cleaner fish consume small invertebrates on the surface of client reef fish (Randall, 1958; Côté, 2000), which only become visible at short range (i.e. that need to be searched and found). Parasite abundance varies between species, partly as a correlate of client body size (Grutter, 1995), therefore cleaners should prefer certain clients over others because of their quality as a food patch (Grutter et al., 2005). In other words, cleaners should focus on the way the food is presented, rather than the food itself. This was reflected in the original plate task adaptation, where the plate color and pattern were the relevant stimuli, rather than the foods, which were identical and uninformative (Salwiczek et al., 2012).

For primates, what is important is the food itself, not the patch. Although foods may be associated with specific surroundings (e.g., a species of tree may provide hidden fruits), the general details of the source (e.g., the specific leaf shape) do not change (e.g., the fruits will not suddenly be found in a different species of tree) and the patch may not

be informative about the quality of food (e.g., the position of the leaves won't tell whether the fruits are ripe; the fruits themselves must be inspected). Therefore, for this study, we tested to see whether a cue that was potentially more ecologically relevant to primates (and presumably less ecologically relevant to fish) would increase the primates' performance. For this, we kept the plates identical, but used different color food items. We predicted that if the difference in Salwiczek et al. (2012) was simply due to a difference between species in where attention was focused, the monkeys would outperform the fish in this task.

Considering the second potential explanation for the superior performance of the fish, primates are known to have difficulty making the correct choices when food is present. While primates certainly can make rational choices when food is visible, and can learn to overcome the prepotent response with modifications (e.g., using symbols to represent foods; Boysen et al., 1999; Murray et al., 2005), the original task by Salwiczek et al. (2012) may have been challenging for the primates because of the presence of this extraneous cue (see Pepperberg & Hartsfield, 2014). Therefore, for our second study, we adapted the task to minimize any influence of having visible foods during the subjects' choices. Note that due to the lack of studies on the influence of food visibility on decision-making in any context on cleaner wrasse, we had no prediction for whether visible versus non-visible food would affect their performance; on the one hand, if the plate design was the important cue, then in principle, this task should not have been more difficult, but on the other, swimming to the opposite side to claim food was presumably atypical for them and therefore this may have made the task more challenging.

An important aspect of our comparative approach concerned the choice of the experimental design. Due to the scarcity of non-human primate subjects, the capuchin monkeys were, by necessity, tested in a within-subjects design; therefore, it was essential to collect within-subjects data for fish as well, and to give the fish equivalent experience with the paradigm. To do this, we tested cleaner fish on the original plate task prior to the two other studies. This also allowed us to compare our results for these cleaner fish (from Moorea) with those from our earlier study (from the Philippines; Salwiczek et al., 2012). To summarize, we predicted that 1) as offering relevant information in the color of the food rather than some aspect of the plate (e.g., color and pattern) was more ecologically relevant for primates, they should outperform the fish in the first experiment, and 2) primates should solve the hidden-food task more quickly than the original plate task (we had no prediction for the effect of this alteration on the fish). If primates did notably better on one task than the other, it would provide evidence as to which of these factors were most important in driving primates' outcomes in the earlier task, whereas a failure to improve performance in either task for primates would be difficult to interpret.

METHODS

Subjects and housing

Capuchin monkeys

We tested nine captive born brown capuchin monkeys (5 males, average age: 12 years, range: 7-17 years, and 4 females, average age: 15 years, range: 12-18) from two stable social groups at the Language Research Center of Georgia State University, USA.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

All subjects participated in both studies. Subjects were always housed with their social groups except when they separated voluntarily for behavioral and cognitive testing. Subjects were fed a diet according to their species-specific needs that included primate chow and fresh fruits and vegetables. They also received enrichment foods several times per day. Animals were never food or water deprived for testing purposes. Running water was available *ad libitum*, including during testing. All of the capuchin monkey experiments were approved by the Georgia State University IACUC (A12015) and met the standards of the United States. Georgia State University is fully accredited by AAALAC.

The monkeys lived in two large indoor/outdoor enclosures. Each enclosure contained ample three-dimensional climbing space as well as trapezes, perches, and enrichment items. The enclosure for each social group was divided into an indoor area (approximately one-half of their total space) and an outdoor area. The subjects had previously been trained to enter test boxes attached to their indoor area, which allowed us to separate individuals from their group for testing. Monkeys were tested in these testing enclosures. Subjects could choose not to participate at any time by walking away from the experimenter. No subject was ever involved in more than one testing session of any of the studies on any given day.

Cleaner fish

14 adult wild cleaner wrasses of unknown sex were tested at the UC Berkeley Gump Field Station in Moorea, French Polynesia. Subjects were caught with hand-nets from reefs surrounding the field station, and then housed individually in glass aquaria

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

(approximately 50 x 40 x 40 cm) with a continuous flow of fresh seawater. All cleaners were supplied with an opaque Plexiglas shelter tube for hiding during the day and sleeping at night. Cleaners were first trained to feed off Plexiglas plates prior experiments. Individuals were fed mashed prawn flesh and kept for one to five weeks prior to commencing experiments. Once experiments started, subjects were tested every day, and were not given any additional food beside the testing time. All studies were conducted during a 4-week visit to the field station by the first author. At the end of the study, all subjects were returned to the location they were caught. This research was approved by the DRRT (Délégation Régionale à la Recherche et à la Technologie, Papeete, Tahiti).

General procedure

The experimental set-ups for both species are illustrated in Figure 1.

Capuchin monkeys

The experimental design was based on the studies of Bshary & Grutter (2002) and Salwiczek et al. (2012). Subjects had to choose between two stimuli, each assigned to one of two specific roles, permanent or ephemeral. Choosing the permanent stimulus (which simulated a “resident” client) always resulted in an immediate reward and this stimulus was available throughout the trial. The ephemeral stimulus (which simulated a “choosy” client) offered a same immediate reward, but only if it was the first one the subjects chose. If subjects chose the permanent stimulus first, the ephemeral stimulus was withdrawn out of reach and sight of the subject. Thus, the optimal outcome was to pick

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

the ephemeral plate first for a first reward, which allowed the subject to also obtain the permanent stimulus for an additional reward. The side on which each stimulus was presented for each trial was randomly determined but counterbalanced within a session so that they were on each side an equal number of times, but with no more than three trials in a row on the same side (see Salwiczek et al., 2012). Each subject received 10 sessions of 10 trials each (unless otherwise noted).

Subsequent to the initial learning test, subjects were tested on a reversal test (Rumbaugh, 1971, 1997; Salwiczek et al., 2012). The procedure was identical to the initial test, but the role of each stimulus was reversed (i.e., the previous ephemeral stimulus now behaved like the permanent one, while the previous permanent stimulus now became the ephemeral one). If subjects initially preferred the ephemeral stimulus and then reversed to prefer the newly ephemeral (formerly permanent) stimulus, this would indicate that they are consistent in their preference. The outcomes are more difficult to interpret if subjects initially preferred the permanent stimulus. Reversing to maintain a preference for the newly permanent (formerly ephemeral) stimulus would indicate a consistent preference for the permanent stimulus, however maintaining a preference for the newly ephemeral (formerly permanent) stimulus would be uninformative because we do not know whether they preferred that physical stimulus (e.g., the plate or food color), or whether they recognized the utility of choosing the ephemeral stimulus first when “forced” to do so after the stimuli switched. Although we report data on reversal tasks in all cases, it is difficult to know what these latter data mean.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

Choices were made using a choice apparatus designed for Salwiczek et al. (2012; see Figure 1). This apparatus was attached to the front of the monkey's test box and was designed to limit the monkey to a single choice. It consisted of two Velcro doors attached to each other by a string that worked in a drawbridge-like fashion, i.e. pulling one door closed when the other was pushed open (for further detail, see Salwiczek et al., 2012). Foods were presented to subjects on two plates placed on a single larger Plexiglas tray (to standardize the location of the plates) carried by the experimenter, who wore an opaque face shield at all times in order to minimize experimenter cueing (one subject was afraid of the face shield and so it was not worn for this subject). The larger tray had a central opaque barrier that kept the two choice plates clearly separated. The trial started once the subjects faced the two food options. If a subject chose the permanent option first, the ephemeral option was removed from the larger Plexiglas tray and put on the top of the testing box, out of sight of the animal. Subjects were tested in four to five sessions per week, but never in more than one session a day. The intertrial-time interval (ITI) was five minutes, chosen because, in previous testing, it was the ITI at which the monkeys did the best (Salwiczek et al., 2012, started with a 15-minute ITI, as with the fish, and tried a variety of different options until the monkeys succeeded). Rewards were 750mg banana-flavor precision pellets (Bio-Serv), which could be dyed to be different colors, as needed in Study 2. All monkey studies were carried out prior the fish studies.

Cleaner fish

Subjects were tested in their aquarium, in which a separation with an opaque central sliding door was introduced at approximately four-fifths of the aquarium length to

create a large “experimental” compartment and a small “resting” compartment (see Figure 1; for previous training studies using a similar apparatus, see Bisazza et al., 2014; Miletto Petrazzini et al., 2015; Gierszewski et al., 2013). The foods were placed on two plates that were attached to handles so that they could be moved towards subjects but also be retracted rapidly. A given trial started by confining the subject to the resting compartment of the aquarium (subjects quickly learned to swim behind the door before a trial started). The stimuli were then placed at the opposite end of the experimental compartment. After a few seconds, the door opened and the cleaner could enter the experimental compartment at will. Fish received two sessions per day, consisting of 10 trials each. The ITI was set at 15 minutes (as in Salwiczek et al., 2012). The two plates were placed far enough apart that following a choice of the permanent option, the experimenter could remove the ephemeral option before the subject could take the food.

Prior to testing, a different set of fish from the same population were pre-tested for color preferences on a variety of colors to determine which ones to use during the testing. Pre-testing was done on a different set of fish to avoid the possibility of inadvertently biasing the test subjects themselves. Colors were based upon those used in the previous study (Salwiczek et al., 2012). Preferred colors for all fish were red and yellow, and non-preferred colors were green and black.

Learning criterion and statistics

We based success on the behavior of cleaner fish in previous experiments, which was a preference for the outcome that maximized their food intake (Bshary & Grutter, 2002; Salwiczek et al., 2012). Therefore, subjects were considered to have solved the test

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

when they met preference criterion for choosing the payoff maximizing ephemeral option. They failed if they either developed a preference for the permanent option (using the same criterion as for the ephemeral preference) or did not develop any preference within 100 trials. Subjects who developed a preference for either option were then tested on a reversal test so that all subjects had similar experience prior to subsequent studies. Subjects met the preference criterion when they showed a statistically significant preference for one of the options, which could be achieved by choosing the stimulus 1) 10/10 trials on one session, 2) 9/10 or 8/10 trials on two consecutive sessions, or 3) 7/10 trials on three consecutive sessions. These criteria were more conservative than those used by Salwiczek et al. (2012), in two ways. First, we still used the 10/10 criterion on one unique session, but only if the subject selected each of the two stimuli in at least one trial of a previous session (to ensure that they had experience with both outcomes). This did not apply to the reversal test, because a subject was considered already to have experienced both options in the initial phase. Second, the 9/10 criterion on one unique session was dropped because it came to our attention that, while used frequently as a criterion in cognitive and behavioral testing, Monte Carlo simulation showed that this criterion allowed for performance that exceeded chance levels (we now required two consecutive sessions of 9/10). Although we planned to limit subjects to 10 sessions, if a subject chose either option 9/10, 8/10, or 7/10 in the last session (i.e., session 10), it was given another set (or two, in the case of sessions with 7/10, followed by a second trial with 7 or more out of 10) of 10 trials to maximize its chances of reaching criterion (Prétôt et al., *in press*). Subjects then received reversal trials.

To compare subjects' performance across species and conditions, we used two statistical tests. First, a two-tailed exact Fisher's test allowed us to compare the number of individuals who met criterion for preferring the ephemeral option to those who did not; in this way, we could include data from all subjects, even those who developed a preference for the permanent option. We used a within-subjects design for the comparisons between tasks, and a between-subjects design to compare performance between species.

Our primary goal was to compare the capuchin monkeys' responses to those of the Moorean fish across all three tasks (the original plate task and the two new studies reported here). However, to do this, we also needed to test the Moorean fish on the original task (Salwiczek et al., 2012) in order to give them equivalent experience to the monkeys for our within-subjects analysis. Repeating this test also allowed us to compare the outcomes of this Moorean population of cleaner fish to the previous Philippine population. Second, a two-tailed exact Mann-Whitney U test allowed us to analyze species' differences in speed of learning. For this, we compared the results from the learning phase only for the Moorean fish and the capuchin monkeys because they were the only populations for which we had results from all three tests.

Study counterbalancing

We tested two groups of fish and two groups of monkeys. The two groups of fish were both first tested on the original plate task (Study 1) before being tested in either the color task (Study 2) or the cup task (Study 3). We were able to test some subjects who completed one task on the other task (the length of the field site visit constrained how many subjects could be tested in both conditions). All monkeys had previous experience

with the task from Salwiczek et al. (2012) and/or in an analogous computerized format (Prétôt et al., *in press*); two monkeys had experience only with the computerized format. Therefore, in monkeys we did not replicate the first study. The first group was tested in Study 2 and then Study 3, while the second group was tested in Study 3 before Study 2.

STUDY 1: PLATE TASK IN FISH

Procedure

We replicated the study of Salwiczek et al. (2012; original work: Bshary & Grutter, 2002), to allow for 1) the fish to have the same previous experience as most of the monkeys (all but two subjects had previously experienced this study) and 2) a within-subjects design in comparing how subjects did on the adapted tasks (Studies 2 and 3), as we do for the monkeys. This secondarily allowed for us to compare results from the two different populations of cleaner fish.

The 14 fish tested had a choice between two pieces of mashed prawn (0.001-0.005g) placed on two different Plexiglas plates. Each plate was marked with a central black dot to help both experimenters and fish to locate the food on the plate. Both plates had the same surface, but differed in shape, color and pattern. Plate 1 was rectangular, with two yellow/green-striped edges and a black triangle, while Plate 2 was square, with two edges in red and one in black (Figure 2). The colors were the same as the colors used in previous testing on the Philippine fish (see Salwiczek et al., 2012; we switched black for white because unlike in Salwiczek et al. (2012)'s task, the plates in the current study were white), and each contained one of the favored and one of the less-favored colors

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

based on our pre-testing of the Moorean fishes' color preferences (see General Procedure). Each plate was fixed to a wooden stick, which ended with a parafilm hook that allowed the experimenter to hang it to the inner glass surface of the aquarium. Both plates and food were presented at equal distance from the central sliding door. Half of the individuals were tested with Plate 1 as ephemeral choice, while the other half was tested with Plate 2 as the ephemeral choice. As described above, if a subject picked the ephemeral plate first, it was allowed to take the food from the permanent plate as well. In contrast, if it picked the food from the permanent plate first, the ephemeral plate was withdrawn from the aquarium and placed out of sight of the subject. All subjects were then tested on the reversal learning task.

Results

Individual data for all subjects are in Table 1.

Initial learning phase

Nine out of the 14 subjects tested on the initial learning phase solved the task within 110 trials (range: 20-110 trials, $X \pm SD = 54.44 \pm 34.68$ trials). More subjects met the criterion when Plate 2 was the ephemeral plate (seven of seven subjects) than when Plate 1 was the ephemeral plate (two of seven subjects), possibly indicating a preference for that plate (exact Fisher's test: $P = 0.02$).

Reversal learning phase

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

Two of the nine subjects who solved the initial learning task solved the reversal task within 80 trials (range: 40-80 trials, $X \pm SD = 60 \pm 28.28$ trials). Six of the seven subjects who did not reverse their preference showed a side bias (Binomial/Sign test: all $P_s < 0.01$), and the seventh one did so from trials 50-100 (Binomial/Sign test: $P < 0.01$).

Moorean vs. Philippine fish (between-subjects)

We compared the fishes' performance on the initial and reversal phases of the plate task to the performance of the Philippine fish population. There was no significant difference in the initial learning phase between Moorean fish (nine of 14 subjects succeeded in the task) and Philippine fish (all six subjects succeeded; exact Fisher's test: $P = 0.26$). However, more Philippine fish succeeded in the reversal phase (six of six subjects) than Moorean fish (two of nine subjects; exact Fisher's test: $P < 0.01$).

Fish vs. monkeys (between-subjects)

We compared the Moorean fishes' performance on the initial and reversal phases of the plate task to the performance of the capuchin monkeys in the previous study (Salwiczek et al., 2012). More fish succeeded on the initial phase (nine of 14 subjects) than did monkeys (all eight subjects failed in the task; exact Fisher's test: $P < 0.01$), while more monkeys succeeded on the reversal phase (seven of eight subjects) than fish (two of nine subjects; exact Fisher's test: $P = 0.02$).

Study 1 discussion

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

As with previous work in cleaner fish, Moorean fish learned the plate task more rapidly than capuchin monkeys in Salwiczek et al. (2012). This allowed us to continue with our central comparison, between the Moorean cleaner fish tested in the current study, who were able to solve the initial learning task, and capuchin monkeys, who were not. Unless otherwise specified below, all comparisons between monkeys and fish were with the Moorean fish in the current study.

Interestingly, however, although the two populations did not differ in performance on the initial learning task, the Moorean fish were less likely to solve the reversal task than were the Philippine fish. Although our task cannot determine why this difference exists, there are several possible (non-mutually exclusive) reasons. First, recent evidence from Australia suggests that client species density and diversity as well as cleaners density may have important effects on cleaner performance in cognitive tasks (Wismer et al. 2014; also see Salwiczek et al., 2012). While we do not have measures for these two parameters, they do appear to differ on basic measures of client diversity and density; reports find that the Philippines count at least twice as many species of reef fish than French Polynesia do (FishBase: <http://www.fishbase.org>), making it the richest concentration of marine life on the planet (Carpenter & Springer, 2005). It is possible that these (or other smaller-scale parameters) influence the two populations differently.

Second, the aquaria used in the current experiment were shorter in length than those used in the previous work with Philippine fish, which reduced the distance to make a choice. In primates, differences in the size of the enclosure (Bräuer et al., 2007), the orientation of the experimenter to the stimuli (Mulcahy & Call, 2009), and seemingly minor changes in procedure (e.g., providing one tool rather than two; Girndt et al., 2008)

influence responses in cognitive tasks, and it is possible that the same was true here. Supporting this, all of the Moorean fish who failed to reverse their preferences showed robust side biases, something not seen in previous work (Bshary, *personal communication*).

Finally, despite our use of the same colors as in our previous work (Salwiczek et al., 2012) and our efforts to make both plates equally attractive, the Moorean fish showed a preference for one of the plates (the one with red stripes) in the initial task. This was somehow surprising, because none adult fish showed such biases in our previous study, although one juvenile did so (Salwiczek et al., 2012). Unfortunately, the apparent color preference makes it somewhat more difficult to interpret our fish data, and may have influenced their ability to solve the reversal task. We find it very interesting that one population should show a much stronger color preference than the other, and we hope to further explore this topic in the future.

Because of the inconsistency between the two populations on the reversal task, we do not further compare the two populations of fish on the reversal phase, although we note that these population differences are a very fruitful avenue for future research.

STUDY 2: COLOR TASK

Procedure

The procedure was identical to the plate task described in Study 1, except that in this case, the plates were identical in color, pattern and design, and it was the foods on the plates that differed in color.

478

479 *Capuchin monkeys*

480 The two plates were green rectangular, and rewards were 750mg banana-flavor
481 precision pellets (Bio-Serv) that were colored pink or black with spray food coloring
482 (Figure 2). Of the nine subjects, six (in one social group) were tested first on this study
483 while the other three (in a separate social group) were tested first on Study 2.

484

485 *Cleaner fish*

486 The two plates were white rectangular (presented vertically, as opposed to Study
487 1) and the foods we used were colored yellow-orange and purple-pink with liquid food
488 coloring (Figure 2; these colors were chosen because both were favored by cleaners in
489 pilot testing). Only nine of the 14 fish were tested in this task (two of these nine subjects
490 were previously tested in Study 3). For the initial learning phase, four subjects were
491 tested using yellow-orange as the ephemeral choice, while five subjects started with
492 purple-pink as the ephemeral choice. One of these five subjects (D12) chose purple-pink
493 in 10/10 trials in each of the first four sessions and so was dropped from the study,
494 leaving a sample size of eight fish. Due to time constraints on how long the experimenter
495 could stay at the field site, one subject (D1) received three sessions on one day, and
496 another (D5) did so on two different days.

497

498 ***Results***

499 Individual data for all subjects are in Table 2.

500

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

501 *Initial learning phase*

502 All the nine monkeys reached the preference criterion within 100 trials; seven
503 individuals solved the task and preferred the ephemeral stimulus (range: 20-100 trials, X
504 $\pm SD = 50 \pm 27.08$ trials), while two developed a preference for the permanent one in 20
505 trials.

506 Seven of the eight fish tested reached the preference criterion within 100 trials;
507 six individuals solved the task and preferred the ephemeral stimulus (range: 50-100 trials,
508 $X \pm SD = 63.33 \pm 19.66$ trials), while one developed a preference for the permanent
509 stimulus in 20 trials.

510

511 *Reversal learning phase*

512 Six of the seven monkeys who solved the initial learning task also solved the
513 reversal task within 100 trials (range: 40-100 trials, $X \pm SD = 70 \pm 21.91$ trials). The two
514 subjects who preferred the permanent stimulus in the initial task reached criterion for the
515 ephemeral stimulus in 60 trials.

516 None of the fish who solved the initial task ($N = 6$) solved the reversal task,
517 although this population of fish was also unlikely to reverse in the original plate task (see
518 Study 1). The subject who preferred the permanent stimulus in the initial task reached
519 criterion for the ephemeral stimulus in 20 trials.

520

521 *Plate vs. color tasks (within-subjects)*

522 For the analysis, we only included subjects that completed both the plate and
523 color tasks (seven monkeys and eight fish). Significantly more monkeys succeeded in the

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

initial learning phase of the color task (five of seven subjects) than the original plate task (none of seven subjects; exact Fisher's test: $P = 0.02$; Figure 3).

The fish did not show any difference in performance between the color task (six of eight subjects succeeded) and the plate task (five of these eight subjects succeeded in the plate task; exact Fisher's test: $P = 1.00$; Figure 3).

Monkeys vs. fish (between-subjects)

There was no significant difference in the initial learning phase between monkeys (seven of nine subjects succeeded) and Moorean fish (six of eight subjects succeeded; exact Fisher's test: $P = 1.00$). Considering only the subjects who solved the initial task, there was no difference in speed of learning between species (exact Mann-Whitney U test: $U = 11.50$, $Z = -1.38$, $N_{\text{monkeys}} = 7$, $N_{\text{fish}} = 6$, $P = 0.20$).

Study 2 discussion

More monkeys succeeded in the color task than in the plate task, which supports our hypothesis that for primates, food color is a more salient cue than the plate design. In contrast to our predictions, however, cleaner fish did as well on the color task as on the original plate task. This could be an indication that the fish were able to generalize to a novel cue (or that the cue was more salient than predicted), but we cannot rule out the possibility that their performance was due to a color preference.

STUDY 3: CUP TASK

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

547 *Procedure*

548 The procedure was identical to Study 1, except that in this case, the foods were
549 hidden by different stimuli (food was covered by cups in the case of capuchins and
550 placed behind the plates in the case of cleaners).

551

552 *Capuchin monkeys*

553 The food was placed under two opaque containers so that subjects could not see
554 the food prior the choice. We used two identical black plates to hold the containers, one
555 of which was yellow with one red dot on each side and the other of which was purple
556 with a blue triangle on each side (Figure 2). At the beginning of each trial, the subjects
557 saw the experimenter hiding each food items under the container. They were then
558 presented the choice between the two containers. Subjects indicated their choice by
559 touching a container, at which point they could either lift the cup themselves or the
560 experimenter lifted it for them to access the food underneath. One social group completed
561 this task prior to Study 2 and the other group completed this task subsequent to Study 2.

562

563 *Cleaner fish*

564 Instead of containers, which would not work under water, the food was placed on
565 the reverse side of the plates (i.e. away from the direction from which the individual
566 approached). Subjects made a choice by swimming behind the plate to obtain the food.
567 All the fish learned quickly (typically on the first trial) to swim to the reverse side of the
568 plates. The two plates were white triangular and only differed in color and pattern (both
569 sides of the plates were colored/patterned). Plate 1 had two vertical red lines, while Plate

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

2 had two diagonal yellow lines (Figure 2); for the initial learning phase, four subjects were tested using Plate 1 as the ephemeral choice, while the other four started with Plate 2 as the ephemeral choice. Eight subjects of the 14 fish were tested in this task (three of which had previous experience with Study 2). Note that due to time constraints, one subject (D12) received three sessions on two different days, while another subject (D8) was not tested on the reversal learning phase.

Results

Individual data for all subjects are in Table 3.

Initial learning phase

All the nine monkeys solved the task within 110 trials (range: 20-110 trials, $X \pm SD = 54.44 \pm 32.06$ trials), all preferring the ephemeral plate.

Seven out of the eight fish tested reached preference criterion within 110 trials; three individuals preferred the ephemeral stimulus (range: 40-60 trials, $X \pm SD = 53.33 \pm 11.55$ trials), while four individuals preferred the permanent one (range: 30-110 trials, $X \pm SD = 62.50 \pm 35.94$ trials).

Reversal learning phase

Seven of the nine monkeys who succeeded in the initial learning phase reversed their preference within 100 trials (range: 30-100 trials, $X \pm SD = 74.29 \pm 26.37$ trials).

None of the fish who solved the initial task ($N = 3$) solved the reversal task.

Among the three subjects who preferred the permanent stimulus in the initial task and

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

were tested in the reversal task (one was not, due to time constraints, see above), two reached criterion for the ephemeral stimulus in 10 and 60 trials, while the remaining did not reach criterion within 100 trials.

Plate vs. cup tasks (within-subjects)

For the analysis, we only included subjects that completed both the plate and cup tasks (seven monkeys and eight fish). More monkeys succeeded in the initial learning phase of the cup task (seven of seven subjects) than the original plate task (none of seven subjects; exact Fisher's test: $P < 0.01$; Figure 3).

The fish did not differ in performance between the cup task (three of eight subjects succeeded) and the plate task (five of these eight subjects succeeded in the plate task; exact Fisher's test: $P = 0.62$; Figure 3).

Color vs. cup tasks (within-subjects)

For the analysis, we only included subjects that completed both the cup and color tasks (nine monkeys and four fish). Monkeys did not show any difference in the initial learning phase between the color task (seven of nine subjects succeeded) and the cup task (nine of nine subjects succeeded, exact Fisher's test: $P = 0.47$).

The fish did not show any difference in the initial learning phase between the color task (two of four subjects succeeded) and the cup task (one of four subjects succeeded, exact Fisher's test: $P = 1.00$).

Monkeys vs. fish

Significantly more monkeys succeeded in the initial learning phase of the cup task (nine of nine subjects) than did fish (three of eight subjects; exact Fisher's test: $P < 0.01$; Figure 3). Considering only the subjects who solved the initial task, there was no difference in speed of learning between species (exact Mann-Whitney U test: $U = 11$, $Z = -0.47$, $N_{\text{monkeys}} = 9$, $N_{\text{fish}} = 3$, $P = 0.71$).

Study 3 discussion

As in the color task, monkeys improved their performance in the hidden-food task when compared to the original plate task, suggesting that the presence of food in the original task may have caused primates to act impulsively. The use of a method that obscured the food may have helped the monkeys to inhibit any possible prepotent response due to the presence of food rewards (see Boysen & Berntson, 1995; Boysen et al. 1999, 2001; Murray et al. 2005; Pepperberg & Hartsfield, 2014; Prétôt et al. *in press*).

Although fish did not show any difference in performance between the cup task and the two other tasks, their overall performance in the cup task was poorer as compared to the monkeys. If anything, this is somewhat surprising given that ectoparasites consumed by cleaners are so small in size that they are only visible from relatively close by, indicating that they are accustomed to not seeing food on their initial approach. One possibility is that they found the procedure more difficult; unlike the other tasks, this one required them to swim behind the plate to find food (although note that all subjects swam behind to obtain food on their first session of exposure to it). Alternately, subjects' performance might be due to a preference for one of the plates or some carry-over effects due to the fact that the same colors (the two that they most preferred) were used on

multiple tests. Based on our analyses, we propose that carry-over effects, if they existed, might have been small, because most subjects took a minimum of 40 trials to develop a preference for this plate, which indicates that their choice was not influenced by their previous exposure in the plate task. Nonetheless, subjects apparently had a preference for the red-striped plate (seven of eight individuals preferred that plate; Binomial/Sign test: $P = 0.07$), which may have hindered their overall performance in the task, independently of any carry-over effects.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

In the present paper, we tested two hypotheses about factors that may have caused primates to perform less well than cleaner wrasse on a previous dichotomous choice task based on the cleaners' ecology (Salwiczek et al., 2012). In particular, we altered two factors that we predicted might have made the original task more difficult for primates than fish. First, we changed the cue from being the plate (surrounding the food) to being the food itself, which we predicted would be more relevant to the monkeys. The primates' performance did improve, whereas the change did not impact the cleaners' performance (see details in Discussion of Study 2). Second, we hid the food (the cue was again the color/pattern of the plate), because visible foods are known to inhibit decision-making in primates. Again, the primates' performance improved, and the change did not impact the fish (see details in Discussion of Study 3). Taken together, these results indicate that, not surprisingly, many factors play into determining what species may learn

661 with more or less ease, and that, as predicted, the cues themselves are an important part
662 of decision-making.

663 Of course, while our results demonstrate the importance of these two factors in
664 the primates' decision-making, they do not rule out the (very likely) possibility that other
665 factors are also playing a role in how different species perform. For example, previous
666 work showed that parrots did as well as fish on the "fish" version of the task (Pepperberg
667 & Hartsfield, 2014). The authors of that study proposed that this could be due to the fact
668 that fish and parrots are constrained to making a single choice at a time (e.g., with a
669 mouth or bill), forcing them to prioritize, whereas monkeys are typically able to obtain
670 two things at once (e.g., with hands). As a result, the monkeys may have found the
671 limitations of the experimental task difficult. In fact, our own work showed that two
672 different species of monkeys do better on a computerized version of the task, in which
673 they chose an option with a joystick-controlled cursor, possibly because they are limited
674 to a single choice (by necessity rather than experimenter constraint; Prétôt et al., *in*
675 *press*). Continued work will help to identify all of the constraints on decision-making, as
676 well as interactions among them.

677 Turning now to the fish, we got two unexpected results. First, contrary to our
678 hypothesis, neither of these changes led to decreased performance for the cleaner fish on
679 the initial learning trials. Second, the Moorean fish were substantially worse at the
680 reversal task than were the original Philippine fish. These are somewhat difficult to
681 reconcile as they suggest two seemingly contradictory possibilities (on the one hand, that
682 the fish were able to generalize across stimuli in a way that the primates were not, and on

the other that the Moorean population was substantially less cognitively flexible than the Philippine fish). We discuss each of these in turn.

Considering the first outcome, cleaner fish performed similarly on the color and cup tasks as on the original plate task in Study 1, and did as well as the monkeys on Study 2, although the monkeys outperformed the fish on the cup task in Study 3. This is quite different than what is seen in the monkeys, who performed better on some versions of the task than others. There are a couple of possible explanations for this that we are unable to distinguish among. First, it is possible that this was partly an artifact of the fishes' apparent preference for some of our plates over others (although we note that the fact that this population is the only one thus far in which such a color preference has been found is potentially interesting in and of itself). Second, it is possible that the fish generalized from their experience in natural contexts, using cues derived from their own species' ecology, priming them to succeed in all versions of the task. This would be an impressive feat, in particular given the difficulty that the primates had in learning the task originally (even with what we predicted to be more ecologically relevant cues, the monkeys still did not learn the color task within fewer trials than the fish used in this study or the fish from the original study by Salwiczek et al. 2012). This possibility deserves further consideration, as of late, there is first evidence for generalized rule learning in cleaners (Wismer et al., 2016), and much evidence has emerged supporting greater cognitive ability in fish than was previously recognized (Agrillo et al., 2012; Brown, 2011; Bshary et al., 2014; Ferrari et al., 2005; Grosenick et al., 2007; Kendall et al., 2009; Piffer et al., 2013; Vail et al., 2013, 2014; for reviews, see Bshary et al., 2002, 2014; Brown, 2015). These results might thus indicate that fish have some form of

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

general intelligence that goes beyond the ability to readily solve problems only if presented within the precise ecological context.

Considering the second finding, we were very surprised by the Moorean fishes' inability to solve the reversal task, particularly in comparison with the performance of the original Philippine fish. Because we wished to 1) give the fish comparable experience to the primates, and 2) compare the fish to themselves in a within-subjects design, as we did with the primates, we initially tested the fish on the original version of the task (Study 1). This secondarily allowed us to compare two different populations of cleaners. We found that, while their outcomes were at least not significantly different for the initial learning trials (64% of the Moorean fish learned the task as compared to 100% of the Philippine fish), the Moorean fish were significantly worse at the reversal task than the original Philippine population. This may indicate differences in cognitive flexibility between these two populations, possibly due to differences in their interspecific social environment (such differences due to microecology have been described for cleaners caught from different microhabitats around Lizard Island, Great Barrier Reef; Wismer et al., 2014), experimental differences (such as the aforementioned differences in the length of the aquaria in the two new studies), or the unexpected plate preferences we found in our fish population. Unfortunately, we do not have access to the original Philippine population anymore, nor do we know exactly where they came from (they derived from a pet store), so it is difficult to test the first possibility directly. However, both the ecological and procedural possibilities can be tested by exploring population-level differences in cognition and behavior in both fish and other species. Although this was

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

not the primary focus of our study, we find it a very intriguing avenue of research and are excited by the possibility of fully integrating ecology into studies of cognition.

Overall, we find that changing the cues given to subjects can dramatically influence their ability to learn a task. This has important ramifications for comparative work, where scientists (including us!) work very hard to equalize every possible aspect of the task across a species or population. However, these results indicate that this may backfire, with subjects not living up to their potential because they are struggling with the cue of the task rather than the task itself. While there are undoubtedly many ways to approach this issue, we have done so by first running studies that are, to the degree possible, identical, and then iterating the design for the lesser-performing species to try to unpack what exactly caused the difficulty. This allows us to triangulate in on the fairest comparison. We are excited to see an increasing volume of research that integrates ecology, cognition and behavior to better understand the evolution of decision-making across species.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the UC Berkeley Gump Field Station for the field support on fish. We also thank Mélisande Aellen and Victor Anstett (University of Neuchâtel) for helping with the fish studies, and the staff at the Language Research Center of GSU for the monkey studies.

L. P. was funded by the Swiss Science Foundation (Doc.Mobility), a GSU Dissertation Grant and the Second Century Initiative in Primate Social Cognition, Evolution & Behavior (2CI-PSCEB) at Georgia State University. R. B. was funded by the Swiss Science Foundation. S. F. B. was funded by National Science Foundation grants SES 1123897 and SES 1425216.

ETHICAL APPROVAL

All applicable international, national, and/or institutional guidelines for the care and use of animals in this study were followed. All monkey procedures performed in this study were in accordance with the Georgia State University Institutional and Animal Care and Use Committee (capuchins: A12015), and met the standards of the United States. The fish procedures were performed in accordance with the DRRT (Délégation Régionale à la Recherche et à la Technologie), in Papeete, Tahiti, French Polynesia.

REFERENCES

- Agrillo, C., Miletto Petrazzini, M. E., Tagliapietra, C. & Bisazza A. 2012. Inter-specific differences in numerical abilities among teleost fish. *Frontiers in Psychology* 3:483.
- Balda, R. P. & Kamil, A. C. 1989. A comparative study on cache recovery by three corvid species. *Animal Behaviour* 38:486-495.
- Bisazza, A., Agrillo, C. & Lucon-Xiccato, T. 2014. Extensive training extends numerical abilities of guppies. *Animal Cognition* 17:1413-1419.
- Boesch, C. & Boesch, H. 1989. Hunting behavior of wild chimpanzees in the Tai National Park. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 78:547-573.
- Boysen, S. T. & Berntson, G. G. 1995. Responses to quantity: Perceptual versus cognitive mechanisms in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior Processes* 21:82-86.
- Boysen, S. T., Mukobi, K. L. & Berntson, G. G. 1999. Overcoming response bias using symbolic representations of number by chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Animal Learning and Behavior* 27:229-235.
- Boysen, S. T., Berntson, G. G. & Mukobi, K. L. 2001. Size matters: Impact of size and quantity on array choice by chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 115:106-110.
- Bräuer, J., Call, J., & Tomasello, M. 2007. Chimpanzees really know what others can see in a competitive situation. *Animal Cognition*, 10:439-448.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

- 817 Brosnan, S. F. 2010. What do capuchin monkeys tell us about cooperation? In: *For the*
818 *Greater Good of All: Perspectives on Individualism, Society, and Leadership*
819 (eds. Forsyth, D. R. & Hoyt, C. L.). Palgrave Macmillan, Basingstoke, 11-28.
- 820 Brown, C. 2015. Fish intelligence, sentience and ethics. *Animal Cognition* 18:1-17.
- 821 Brown, C., Laland, K. & Krause, J. 2011 Fish cognition and behaviour. In: *Fish*
822 *Cognition and Behavior* (eds. Brown, C., Laland, K. & Krause, J.). Oxford:
823 Wiley-Blackwell.
- 824 Bshary, R. 2001. The cleaner fish market. In: *Economics in Nature* (eds. Noë, R., van
825 Hooff, J. A. R. A. M. & Hammerstein, P.). Cambridge: Cambridge University
826 Press, 146-172.
- 827 Bshary, R. & Grutter, A. S. 2002. Asymmetric cheating opportunities and partner control
828 in the cleaner fish mutualism. *Animal Behaviour* 63:547-555.
- 829 Bshary, R. & Schäffer, D. 2002. Choosy reef fish select cleaner fish that provide high-
830 quality service. *Animal Behaviour* 63:557-564.
- 831 Bshary, R., Wickler, W. & Fricke, H. 2002. Fish cognition: A primate's eye view. *Animal*
832 *Cognition* 5:1-13.
- 833 Bshary, R., Gingins, S. & Vail, A.L. 2014. Social cognition in fishes. *Trends in Cognitive*
834 *Sciences* 18:465-471.
- 835 Carpenter, K. E. & Springer, V. G. 2005. The center of the center of marine shore fish
836 biodiversity: The Philippine Islands. *Environmental Biology of Fishes* 72:467-
837 480.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

- 838 Chalmeau, R., Lardeux, K., Brandibas, P. & Gallo, A. 1997. Cooperative problem
839 solving by orangutans (*Pongo pygmaeus*). *International Journal of Primatology*
840 18:23-32.
- 841 Côté, I. M. 2000. Evolution and ecology of cleaning symbioses in the sea. *Oceanography*
842 *and Marine Biology: An Annual Review* 38:311-355.
- 843 Deaner, R. O., van Schaik, C. P. & Johnson, V. E. 2006. Do some taxa have better
844 domain-general cognition than others? A meta-analysis of nonhuman primate
845 studies. *Evolutionary Psychology* 4:149-196.
- 846 Dufour, V., Pelé, M., Neumann, M., Thierry, B. & Call, J. 2009. Calculated reciprocity
847 after all: Computation behind token transfers in orangutans. *Biology Letters*
848 5:172-175.
- 849 Ferrari, M. C. O., Trowell, J. J., Brown, G. E. & Chivers, D. P. 2005. The role of learning
850 in the development of threat-sensitive predator avoidance by fathead minnows.
851 *Animal Behaviour* 70:777-784.
- 852 Frigaszy, D., Visalberghi, E. & Fedigan, L. 2004. *The Complete Capuchin*. Cambridge:
853 Cambridge University Press.
- 854 Galdikas, B. M. F. 1988. Orang-utan diet, range, and activity at Tanjung Puting, Central
855 Borneo. *International Journal of Primatology* 9:1-35.
- 856 Gierszewski, S., Bleckmann, H. & Schluessel, V. 2013. Cognitive abilities in Malawi
857 cichlids (*Pseudotropheus* sp.): Matching-to-sample and image/mirror-image
858 discriminations. *PLoS ONE* 8:e57363.
- 859 Girndt, A., Meier, T. & Call, J. 2008. Task constraints mask great apes' ability to solve
860 the trap table task. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Animal Behavior*

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

- 861 *Processes* 34:54-62.
- 862 Goodall, J. 1986. The Chimpanzees of Gombe: Patterns of Behavior. Cambridge:
863 Harvard University Press.
- 864 Grosenick, L., Clement, T. S. & Fernald, R. D. 2007. Fish can infer social rank by
865 observation alone. *Nature* 445:429-432.
- 866 Grutter, A. S. 1995. Relationship between cleaning rates and ectoparasite loads in coral
867 reef fishes. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 118:51-58.
- 868 Grutter, A. S., Glover, S. & Bshary, R. 2005. Does client size affect cleaner fish choice of
869 client? An empirical test using client fish models. *Journal of Fish Biology*
870 66:1748-1752.
- 871 Kamil, A. C. 1988. Synthetic approach to the study of animal intelligence. In:
872 *Comparative Perspectives in Modern Psychology: Nebraska Symposium on*
873 *Motivation* (ed. Leger, D.W.). Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 230-257.
- 874 Kamil, A. C. & Mauldin, J. E. 1987. A comparative-ecological approach to the study of
875 learning. In: *Evolution and Learning* (eds. Bolles, R. C. & Beecher, M. D.).
876 Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, 117-133.
- 877 Kendal, J. R., Rendell, L. R., Pike T. W. & Laland, K. N. 2009. Nine-spined sticklebacks
878 deploy a hill-climbing social learning strategy. *Behavioral Ecology* 20:238-244.
- 879 Lotem, A. & Halpern, J. Y. 2012. Coevolution of learning and data-acquisition
880 mechanisms: A model for cognitive evolution. *Philosophical Transactions of the*
881 *Royal Society B* 367:2686-2694.
- 882 Miletto Petrazzini, M. E., Agrillo, C., Izard, V. & Bisazza, A. 2015. Relative versus
883 absolute numerical representation in fish: Can guppies represent “fourness”?

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

- 884 *Animal Cognition* 18:1007-1017.
- 885 Mulcahy, N. J. & Call, J. 2006. How great apes perform on a modified trap-tube task.
- 886 *Animal Cognition* 9:193-199.
- 887 Murray, E. A., Kralik, J. D. & Wise, S. P. 2005. Learning to inhibit prepotent responses:
- 888 Successful performance by rhesus macaques, *Macaca mulatta*, on the reversed-
- 889 contingency task. *Animal Behaviour* 69:991-998.
- 890 Olson, D. J., Kamil, A. C., Balda, R. P. & Nims, P. J. 1995. Performance of four seed-
- 891 caching Corvid species in operant tests of nonspatial and spatial memory. *Journal*
- 892 *of Comparative Psychology* 109:173-181.
- 893 Pepperberg, I. M. & Hartsfield, L. A. 2014. Can grey parrots (*Psittacus erithacus*)
- 894 succeed on a “complex” foraging task failed by nonhuman primates (*Pan*
- 895 *troglodytes*, *Pongo abelii*, *Sapajus apella*) but solved by wrasse fish (*Labroides*
- 896 *dimidiatus*)? *Journal of Comparative Psychology* 128:298-306.
- 897 Piffer, L., Miletto Petrazzini, M. E. & Agrillo, C. 2013. Large number discrimination in
- 898 newborn fish. *PLoS ONE* 8: e62466.
- 899 Pravosudov, V. V. & Clayton, N. S. 2002. A test of the adaptive specialization
- 900 hypothesis: population differences in caching, memory and the hippocampus in
- 901 black-capped chickadees (*Poecile atricapilla*). *Behavioral Neurosciences*
- 902 116:515-522.
- 903 Prétôt, L., Bshary, R. & Brosnan, S. F. (*in press*). Comparing species decisions in a
- 904 dichotomous choice task: Adjusting task parameters improves performance in
- 905 monkeys. *Animal Cognition*

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

- 906 Randall, J. E. 1958 A review of the labrid fish genus *Labroides*, with descriptions of two
907 new species and notes on ecology. *Pacific Science* 12:327-347.
- 908 Rijksen, H. D. 1978. A field study on Sumatran orangutans (*Pongo pygmaeus abelii*
909 Lesson 1827). Ecology, behaviour and conservation. PhD thesis, Agricultural
910 University of Wageningen.
- 911 Rowe, C. & Healy, S. D. 2014. Measuring variation in cognition. *Behavioral Ecology*
912 25:1287-1292.
- 913 Rumbaugh, D. M. 1971. Evidence of qualitative differences in learning processes among
914 primates. *Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology* 76:250-255.
- 915 Rumbaugh, D. M. 1997. Competence, cortex, and primate models: A comparative
916 primate perspective. In: *Development of the Prefrontal Cortex: Evolution,*
917 *Neurobiology, and Behavior* (eds. Krasnegor, N. A., Lyon, G. R. & Goldman-
918 Rakic, P. S.). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes, 117-139.
- 919 Salwiczek, L. H., Prôtôt, L., Demarta, L., Proctor, D., Essler, J., Pinto, A. I., Wismer, S.,
920 Stoinski, T., Brosnan, S. F. & Bshary, R. 2012. Adult cleaner wrasse outperform
921 capuchin monkeys, chimpanzees and orang-utans in a complex foraging task
922 derived from cleaner-client reef fish cooperation. *PLoS ONE* 7:e49068.
- 923 Shettleworth, S. J. 2009. Cognition, Evolution, and Behavior (2nd ed.). New York:
924 Oxford University Press.
- 925 Vail, A. L., Manica, A. & Bshary, R. 2013. Referential gestures in fish collaborative
926 hunting. *Nature Communications* 4:1765.
- 927 Vail, A. L., Manica, A & Bshary, R. 2014. Fish choose appropriately when and with
928 whom to collaborate. *Current Biology* 24:791-793.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

- 929 Wismer, S., Grutter, A. S. & Bshary, R. 2016. Generalized rule application in bluestreak
930 cleaner wrasse (*Labroides dimidiatus*): Using predator species as social tools to
931 reduce punishment. *Animal Cognition* 1-10.
- 932 Wismer, S., Pinto, A. I., Vail, A. L., Grutter, A. S. & Bshary, R. 2014. Variation in
933 cleaner wrasse cooperation and cognition: Influence of the developmental
934 environment? *Ethology* 120:519-531.

935 **FIGURES & TABLES**

937

938 **Figure 1. Experimental set-up.** Subjects used a door system (fish: sliding door; monkeys: “Velcro” doors) before they could access
939 the plates and food (the dimensions of the aquarium and enclosure are given in centimeters).

940

941

942

943

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

	Plate Task		Color Task		Cup Task	
	1	2	1	2	1	2
Monkeys	<i>From Salwiczek et al. (2012)</i>
Fish

Figure 2. Sets of Stimuli. Pairs of stimuli (named 1 and 2) used in the plate, color and cup tasks.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

Figure 3. Initial Learning Phase. The number of trials required for Moorea fish and capuchin monkeys to develop a preference for the ephemeral stimulus in the plate task (capuchins data based on Salwiczek et al., 2012; note that one subject previously tested in the plate task was no longer available for the current study), and either stimulus in the color and cup tasks. Each dot represents one individual; black dots indicate a preference for the ephemeral stimulus, while white dots indicate a preference for the permanent stimulus. For monkeys, the grey dots designate new subjects not previously tested in the plate task. Fourteen fish were tested in the plate task, eight were tested only in the color or cup task, and four were tested in both the color and cup tasks. As in our previous work (Prétôt et al., *in press*), while criterion was set at 100 sessions, if subjects were in the process of meeting criterion on the 10th session

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

970 (e.g., preferred one stimulus on at least 7 out of 10 trials), they were allowed to continue until they either met criterion or failed to do
971 so. The label "*failed*" corresponds to subjects who did not reach preference criterion.

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

Table 1. Fish Plate Task. Number of trials needed for each fish subject to solve the plate task. The second column indicates the number of trials for the initial learning phase, while the third column indicates the number of trials for the reversal phase. Note that subjects who did not reach preference criterion in the initial learning phase were not further tested on the reversal phase.

Moorean Fish Plate Task

Subject	Initial	Reversal	Ephemeral
D1	60	40	Plate 1
D2	70	80	Plate 2
D3	20	>100	Plate 2
D4	20	>100	Plate 2
D5	20	>100	Plate 2
D6	30	>100	Plate 2
D7	60	>100	Plate 2
D8	100	>100	Plate 2
D9	110	>100	Plate 1
D10	>100	/	Plate 1
D11	>100	/	Plate 1
D12	>100	/	Plate 1
D13	>100	/	Plate 1
D14	>100	/	Plate 1

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

Table 2. Color Task. Number of trials needed for monkeys (left table) and fish (right table) to reach preference criterion in the color task. The second column of each table indicates the number of trials for the initial learning phase, the third column indicates the number of trials for the reversal phase, the fourth column indicates which stimulus (see Figure 2) was the ephemeral option, and the last column indicates the stimulus preference in the initial learning phase. Subjects who did not reach preference criterion in the initial learning phase were not further tested on the reversal phase.

Monkey Color Task

Subject	Initial	Reversal	Ephemeral	Preference
Wren ¹	20	50	Color 1	Ephemeral
Nala ¹	20	60	Color 2	Permanent
Lily	20	60	Color 2	Permanent
Logan	30	80	Color 2	Ephemeral
Nkima ²	40	40	Color 2	Ephemeral
Liam	40	100	Color 1	Ephemeral
Gambit ^{2, 3}	50	>100	Color 1	Ephemeral
Griffin ¹	70	70	Color 1	Ephemeral
Gabe	100	80	Color 1	Ephemeral

Fish Color Task

Subject	Initial	Reversal	Ephemeral	Preference
D10	20	20	Color 1	Permanent
D1 ¹	50	>100	Color 2	Ephemeral
D11	50	>100	Color 2	Ephemeral
D14	50	>100	Color 2	Ephemeral
D5 ¹	60	>100	Color 2	Ephemeral
D7	70	>100	Color 2	Ephemeral
D3	100	>100	Color 1	Ephemeral
D8	>100	/	Color 1	/

Note: 1. Subjects previously tested in Study 3
2. New subjects (not tested in Salwiczek et al., 2012)
3. Subject was tested without the opaque face shield

FACTORS INFLUENCING SPECIES' PERFORMANCE ON A CHOICE TASK

Table 3. Cup Task. Number of trials needed for monkeys (left table) and fish (right table) to reach preference criterion in the cup task. The second column of each table indicates the number of trials for the initial learning phase, the third column indicates the number of trials for the reversal phase, the fourth column indicates which stimulus (see Figure 2) was the ephemeral option, and the last column indicates the stimulus preference in the initial learning phase. Subjects who did not reach preference criterion in the initial learning phase were not further tested on the reversal phase.

Monkey Cup Task					Fish Cup Task				
Subject	Initial	Reversal	Ephemeral	Preference	Subject	Initial	Reversal	Ephemeral	Preference
Gabe ¹	20	30	Cup 1	Ephemeral	D1	30	60	Plate 2	Permanent
Wren	30	70	Cup 1	Ephemeral	D6	40	10	Plate 2	Permanent
Gambit ^{1, 2, 3}	30	100	Cup 2	Ephemeral	D10 ¹	40	>100	Plate 1	Ephemeral
Liam ¹	40	50	Cup 2	Ephemeral	D12 ¹	60	>100	Plate 1	Ephemeral
Lily	40	90	Cup 2	Ephemeral	D13	60	>100	Plate 1	Ephemeral
Nkima ^{1, 2}	50	80	Cup 2	Ephemeral	D4	70	>100	Plate 2	Permanent
Griffin	70	>100	Cup 1	Ephemeral	D8 ^{1, 4}	110	/	Plate 2	Permanent
Nala ¹	100	100	Cup 1	Ephemeral	D5	>100	/	Plate 1	/
Logan ¹	110	>100	Cup 1	Ephemeral					

- Note:
1. Subjects previously tested in Study 2
 2. New subjects (not tested in Salwiczek et al., 2012)
 3. Subject was tested without the face shield
 4. Subject was not tested on reversal test due to time constraints

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the UC Berkeley Gump Field Station for the field support on fish. We also thank Mélisande Aellen and Victor Anstett (University of Neuchâtel) for helping with the fish studies, and the staff at the Language Research Center of GSU for the monkey studies.

L. P. was funded by the Swiss Science Foundation (Doc.Mobility), a GSU Dissertation Grant and the Second Century Initiative in Primate Social Cognition, Evolution & Behavior (2CI-PSCEB) at Georgia State University. R. B. was funded by the Swiss Science Foundation. S. F. B. was funded by National Science Foundation grants SES 1123897 and SES 1425216.