1 Primate dietary ecology in the context of food mechanical properties

2

3 Susan Coiner-Collier^{a,b*}, Robert S. Scott^a, Janine Chalk-Wilayto^c, Susan M. Cheyne^{d,e}, Paul Constantino^f, Nathaniel J.
4 Dominy^g, Alison A. Elgart^h, Halszka Glowackaⁱ, Laura C. Loyola^j, Kerry Ossi-Lupo^k, Melissa Raguett-Schofield^l, Mauricio
5 G Talebi^m, Enrico A. Salaⁿ, Pawel Sieradzy^a, Andrea B. Taylor^{o,p}, Christopher J. Vinyard^q, Barth W. Wright^r, Nayuta
6 Yamashita^s, Peter W. Lucas^t, Erin R. Vogel^a

7

8 ^aDepartment of Anthropology, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, New Brunswick, NJ

9 ^bDepartment of Biological Sciences, University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, IN

10 ^cDepartment of Basic Medical Sciences, Mercer University School of Medicine, Macon, GA

11 ^dWildlife Conservation Research Unit (WildCRU), Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK

12 ^eOrang-utan Tropical Peatland Project (OuTrop), Palangka Raya, Indonesia

13 ^fDepartment of Biology, Marshall University, Huntington, WV

14 ^gDepartment of Anthropology, Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH

15 ^hDepartment of Social Sciences, Florida Gulf Coast University, Fort Myers, FL

16 ⁱSchool of Human Evolution and Social Change, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ

17 ^jDepartment of Biological Sciences, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, CA

18 ^kInterdepartmental Doctoral Program in Anthropological Sciences, Stony Brook University, Stony Brook, NY

19 ^lDepartment of Anthropology, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, IL

20 ^mDepartment of Environmental Sciences, Federal University of Sao Paulo, Campus Diadema, Sao Paulo, Brazil

21 ⁿCiencias Biologicas, Universidade Federal de Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil

22 ^oDepartment of Orthopaedic Surgery, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC

23 ^pDepartment of Evolutionary Anthropology, Duke University, Durham, NC

24 ^qDepartment of Anatomy and Neurobiology, Northeast Ohio Medical University, Rootstown, OH

25 ^rDepartment of Anatomy, Kansas City University of Medicine and Biosciences, Kansas City, MO

26 ^sInstitute for Population Genetics, University of Veterinary Medicine, Vienna, Austria; and the Austrian Academy of
27 Sciences

28 ^tSmithsonian Tropical Research Institute, Balboa, Panama

29

30

31 *Corresponding author

32 *E-mail address:* susan.coinercollier@rutgers.edu (S. Coiner-Colier)

33

34 *Keywords:* Food mechanical properties; Toughness; Young's modulus; Feeding behavior; Primate diet

35 **Abstract**

36 Substantial variation exists in the mechanical properties of foods consumed by a primate species. This variation
37 is known to influence food selection and ingestion among non-human primates, yet no large-scale comparative study has
38 examined the relationships between food mechanical properties and feeding strategies. Here, we present comparative data
39 on the Young's modulus and fracture toughness of natural foods in the diets of 31 primate species. We use these data to
40 examine the relationships between food mechanical properties and dietary quality, body mass, and feeding time. We also
41 examine the relationship between food mechanical properties and categorical concepts of diet that are often used to infer
42 food mechanical properties.

43 Traditional dietary categories, such as folivory and frugivory, did not faithfully track food mechanical properties.
44 Additionally, our estimate of dietary quality was not significantly correlated with either toughness or Young's modulus. We
45 found a complex relationship among food mechanical properties, body mass, and feeding time, with a potential interaction
46 between median toughness and body mass. The relationship between mean toughness and feeding time is straightforward:
47 feeding time increases as toughness increases. However, when considering median toughness, the relationship with feeding
48 time may depend upon body mass, such that smaller primates increase their feeding time in response to an increase in
49 median dietary toughness, whereas larger primates may feed for shorter periods of time as toughness increases. Our results
50 emphasize the need for additional studies quantifying the mechanical and chemical properties of primate diets so that they
51 may be meaningfully compared to research on feeding behavior and jaw morphology.

52 **Introduction**

53 Primates feed on a diverse array of plant items and animal tissues to meet their nutritional needs. Variation in the
54 mechanical properties of these items is hypothesized to exert a strong selective pressure on the dental and craniomandibular
55 morphologies and feeding behaviors of primates (Jolly, 1970; Kinzey, 1974, 1992; Hylander, 1975; Kay, 1975; Rosenberger
56 and Kinzey, 1976; Bouvier, 1986a, b; Daegling, 1992; Rosenberger, 1992; Silverman et al., 2001; Taylor, 2002; Lucas,
57 2004; Daegling and McGraw, 2007; Koyabu and Endo, 2009). These properties can influence food selection (Kinzey and
58 Norconk, 1990; Hill and Lucas, 1996; Yamashita, 1996; Teaforde et al., 2006), feeding (Ungar, 1995; Hill and Lucas, 1996;
59 Fragaszy et al., 2004; Yamashita et al., 2009; Reed and Ross, 2010; Yamashita et al., 2012), and digestion (Milton, 1981;
60 Milton and McBee, 1983; Milton, 1984; Lambert, 1998). Thus, accurate measurement of food mechanical properties
61 (FMPs) may improve our understanding of observed variation in diet selection among primates (Milton, 1981; Chapman,
62 1987; Kinzey and Norconk, 1990; Maisels et al., 1994; Ungar, 1995; Palombit, 1997; Wich et al., 2002; Knogge and
63 Heymann, 2003; Lambert et al., 2004; Yamashita et al., 2009; Tombak et al., 2012).

64 Here, we examine how FMPs relate to feeding time, body mass, and dietary quality (Sailer et al., 1985) in a
65 sample of 31 species of free-ranging primates. We also investigate the extent to which traditional dietary categories (e.g.,
66 frugivory, insectivory, folivory) accurately track the mechanical properties of foods eaten by primates. Understanding the
67 relationship among FMPs, dietary ecology, and feeding behavior is essential for informing hypotheses about primate
68 adaptations to diet and may help to untangle the complex relationship between FMPs and skull morphology (Ross et al.,
69 2012; Ross and Iriarte-Diaz, 2014).

70

71 *Predictions*

72 In this study, we evaluate the relationships between FMPs and dietary categories, dietary quality, food items,
73 body mass, and time spent feeding. These variables were selected because of their theoretical and empirical relevance to
74 FMPs and primate dietary ecology (e.g., Clutton-Brock and Harvey, 1977; Gaulin, 1979; Sailer et al., 1985; Ross et al.,
75 2009a).

76

77 1. Dietary categories are distinguishable by their FMPs. If dietary categories accurately reflect variation in the mechanical
78 properties of foods eaten by a primate, then FMPs should distinguish among traditional dietary categories (e.g., folivory,
79 frugivory, insectivory). For instance, frugivores are generally predicted to experience relatively smaller masticatory loads,
80 as fruits are often assumed to be soft and present fewer challenges to oral processing (Peters, 1987; Anapol and Lee, 1994;
81 Ravosa, 1996; Taylor, 2006). Frugivory, therefore, and particularly the consumption of ripe pulp, should be associated with

low values for toughness and/or Young's modulus, in contrast to the presumably more mechanically challenging diets of folivores.

2. Food items are distinguishable by their FMPs. We predict that broad categories of food items (e.g., fruits, leaves, bark) will separate out by FMPs. If traditional assumptions about the mechanical properties of food items are correct, then leaves should have the highest values for toughness. However, we expect that young leaves will be less tough than mature leaves (Coley, 1981; Choong, 1996; Teaforde et al., 2006; Vogel et al., 2008), and that ripe fruit will be less tough than unripe fruit (Vogel et al., 2008; although in some cases ripe fruits are known to be tougher than are unripe fruits; see e.g., Yamashita et al., 2012). We predict that ripe fruit will have lower measures of Young's modulus than does unripe fruit.

3. Dietary quality is inversely correlated with FMPs. Because data on the actual nutritional composition of individual food items are limited for most primate species (Chapman et al., 2003; Norconk et al., 2009; Rothman et al., 2011, 2012, 2013; Raubenheimer et al., 2015), we used dietary quality (DQ) as a proxy for the nutritional quality of the diet of a given primate species. Dietary quality approximates the available nutrients within a primate's diet (Sailer et al., 1985) and can be calculated from dietary composition data available in the literature. According to the Jarman-Bell Principle (Bell, 1971; Jarman, 1974; Gaulin, 1979), large-bodied animals are expected to eat large quantities of nutrient-poor (i.e., low-quality) foods, while small-bodied animals are expected to eat small quantities of nutrient-rich (i.e., high-quality) foods. In this model, a high value for DQ indicates a diet comprised of sources of readily available energy and nutrients, such as fruit or insects. A low value for DQ indicates reliance on foods that are abundant, such as leaves, but with relatively less available energy and fewer easily accessible nutrients. The DQ model is not intended to capture the full complexity of primate diets; for instance, it ignores nutrient balancing (Gaulin, 1979) and the effect of differential digestive adaptations on nutrient absorption (Milton, 1981, 1998; Milton and McBee, 1983; Lambert, 1998; Chapman et al., 2003; Amato et al., 2014a, b). Tough foods contain more fiber (Lucas et al., 2000), which is difficult to digest, thereby limiting access to nutrients (Van Soest, 1994; Lambert, 1998; Rothman et al., 2013). Some researchers have used the terms "low-quality" and "tough" interchangeably (e.g., Remis, 2003; Constantino et al., 2009; Pontzer et al., 2011; Scott, 2011), but the relationship between food toughness and nutrition is uncertain (but see Choong et al., 1992; Hill and Lucas, 1996; Lucas et al., 2000; Huang et al., 2010). Still, despite these limitations, it follows that a negative relationship might exist between DQ and toughness.

4. Body mass is positively correlated with FMPs. Larger-bodied primates consume lower quality foods more frequently than do smaller primates (Bell, 1971; Jarman, 1974; Gaulin, 1979). If FMPs can be used to infer nutritional quality, then, all else

being equal, we expect smaller primates with higher metabolic rates to rely on foods with lower toughness and Young's modulus, while larger primates will exploit foods with higher values for toughness and Young's modulus.

5. Feeding time is positively correlated with body mass. Body mass is positively related to metabolic rate (Kleiber, 1947; Elgar and Harvey, 1987; McNab, 2008) and negatively related to dietary nutrient density (Clutton-Brock and Harvey, 1977; Gaulin, 1979; Sailer et al., 1985). Larger-bodied animals can meet their metabolic needs by ingesting more food at once or by devoting more daily time to feeding. Thus, we expect that feeding time may also be positively correlated with body mass to allow primates to meet their metabolic needs. Previous studies found a weak relationship between feeding time and body mass that was strongly influenced by phylogeny (Ross et al., 2009a; Organ et al., 2011). Here, we re-test this relationship with a different dataset including different primate species and different values for time spent feeding.

6. Feeding time is positively correlated with FMPs. Experimental studies have shown that jaw movements and chewing patterns vary with mechanical properties within species (Agrawal et al., 1998, 2000; Vinyard et al., 2006; Wright et al., 2008; Thompson et al., 2011), and the ratio of toughness to Young's modulus has been empirically shown to influence the rate at which a food is broken down in humans (Agrawal et al., 1997). Feeding time has been shown to increase with leaf toughness in insects (Williams, 1954; Tanton, 1962), which is probably not surprising, given that tough foods can be higher in fiber and may therefore require more time to break down both orally and within the gut (Milton, 1984; Van Soest, 1994; Lambert, 1998). Thus, an animal that relies on a diet of tough foods may ultimately increase the proportion of the daily activity budget devoted to feeding time and/or the number of masticatory cycles (i.e., repetitive loading of the mandible) compared with an animal that relies on less mechanically challenging foods. While data are not available to directly test the relationship between FMPs and the number of masticatory cycles, we can use feeding time to explore the relationship between dietary toughness and time devoted to feeding, quantified as time spent orally processing food items.

Materials and methods

Study species

Our study sample comprises 31 wild primate species, including both haplorhines ($n = 26$) and strepsirrhines ($n = 5$) from a variety of habitats (Table 1). These species represent the majority of primate species for which FMP data have been collected using equivalent mechanical testing protocols and equipment (Darvell et al., 1996; Lucas et al., 2001).

142 *Mechanical properties*

143 For each primate species, we collected FMP data on food items consumed using the Darvell HKU tester. This
144 tester can be used in the field and has become the standard means of measuring FMPs in primates (Williams et al., 2005;
145 Wright, 2005; Teaford et al., 2006; Dominy et al., 2008; Taylor et al., 2008; Vogel et al., 2008; Yamashita et al., 2009;
146 Chalk et al., 2016). All samples were collected during focal feeding bouts or consisted of food items that are known to be
147 included in a primate species' diet, and were tested on the same day as collection when possible. For some primate species
148 (e.g., *Pongo pygmaeus wurmbii*), we were unable to test the most mechanically challenging items due to limitations of our
149 load cell and our inability to reduce the size of certain seeds (see Vogel et al., 2008, 2014 for details).

150 Toughness (R) was measured for plant foods, including plant parts, eaten by all species, while measurements of
151 Young's modulus (E) were recorded for foods eaten by 21 species (see Supplementary Online Material [SOM]). Although
152 fragmentation indices have been hypothesized as a potential driver of feeding adaptations in primates (Agrawal et al., 1997;
153 Lucas et al., 2002), our limited data on Young's modulus prevented us from including these indices in our analyses.

154

155 Toughness Toughness (in J m^{-2}) is estimated here as the energy required to extend a unit area of a crack (Gordon, 1978;
156 Lucas and Pereira, 1990; Vincent, 1992; Lucas et al., 2000, 2011). We performed scissors tests for sheet-like items such as
157 leaves (Lucas and Pereira, 1990; Vincent, 1992), and employed wedge tests for thicker items (e.g., >2 mm). In both cases,
158 the blade(s) move progressively through the material being tested to determine the work done (force x displacement) to
159 force a crack in a specified direction (Lucas et al., 2001).

160

161 Young's modulus Young's modulus (in MPa), also termed the elastic modulus, is the ratio of stress to strain throughout
162 elastic deformation, and is defined as an object's ability to resist elastic deformation. The higher the Young's modulus, the
163 more resistant the object is to such deformation (Gordon, 1978; Williams et al., 2005). We measured modulus with both
164 bending and compression tests. Three-point bending was used to measure modulus in food items that could be prepared into
165 the beam-shaped format needed for this type of testing (Vincent, 1992; Yamashita et al., 2009), such as bark or branches.
166 Whenever possible, length to width ratios of 10:1 or greater were maintained. Compression tests entail the extraction of a
167 cuboid or cylindrical sample (Agrawal et al., 1997), which is then placed under compression to measure the associated
168 stress and strain during elastic deformation (Agrawal and Lucas, 2003).

169

170 It is unknown whether the mechanical properties of the most common food items in a primate's diet exert greater
171 selective pressures on primate feeding ecology than do the most challenging items (Rosenberger, 1992; Yamashita, 1998;

Lambert et al., 2004; Taylor et al., 2008; Wright et al., 2013; Vogel et al., 2014). Consequently, we used estimates designed to quantify both of these aspects of a primate's diet. To estimate the FMPs of a diet at its most challenging, we used maximum estimates of the *R* and *E* of the toughest and most resistant item in the diet, respectively. To illustrate, a fruit may have toughness data available for the exocarp, mesocarp, and endosperm, as these parts were measured separately. The maximum *R* and *E* of any eaten food part were used to represent the resistance or toughness of that food item. Thus, for example, if the exocarp had the highest value for *R*, that value was used to represent maximum toughness for that fruit. If the endocarp were to have the highest *R*, then that value determined the fruit's maximum toughness. Scaling up to the level of the whole diet, the maximum values for all foods eaten by a given primate species gave the maximum *E* or *R* for that primate (termed *MaximumE* and *MaximumR*, respectively).

We also generated two estimates—a weighted mean and a median measure—to approximate the typical dietary FMPs for each species. A mean *R* or *E* calculated for all of the food items in a species' diet implicitly assumes that an item eaten infrequently is weighted equally with an item eaten frequently. Certain barks and piths, for example, are extremely tough, but represent only a very small portion of the annual diet composition (Vogel et al., 2008). A robust estimate of the FMPs typically encountered by a primate requires weighting the FMPs of each item in the diet by the frequency of consumption, but these data were not available for every food item. Thus, we weighted FMP data by composition of a species' diet based on food category to avoid over- or under-representing the importance of specific food items. For example, if the proportions of leaves, seeds, flowers, and fruit (pericarp and whole fruit) in a species' diet were available, we calculated the mean *R* and *E* of all foods eaten for each of those categories. We constructed a hierarchical system of categories of food items (detailed in Fig. 1) to reflect data on dietary composition available in the literature, as well as variation in how food items were categorized during FMP testing. These category means were then weighted by the proportion of each category in a primate species' diet. Thus, if a primate ate 50% leaves, 20% seeds, 10% pericarp or whole fruit, and 10% insects (and FMP data were not available for insects), the weighted mean *R* for that species was:

$$(0.5 * \text{mean } R \text{ for leaves} + 0.2 * \text{mean } R \text{ for seeds} + 0.1 * \text{mean } R \text{ for pericarp or whole fruit})$$

This process resulted in the variables *WeightedR* and *WeightedE*.

Since extreme outliers minimally influence the median, we also computed medians for *R* and *E* for each food item eaten by a species. We first calculated a mean *R* and *E* of each food item. If a food item comprised multiple parts, we computed the mean across those parts. For example, for a fruit item, we first computed the mean *R* and *E* for exocarp, mesocarp, and endosperm. Finally, we calculated the median *R* and *E* values of all food items in a species' diet, resulting in the variables *MedianR* and *MedianE*, respectively.

201

202 *Dietary categories*

203 We established two dietary categories based on previous classification schemes taken from the literature. Our
204 *general* dietary classification identifies primate species as folivorous, frugivorous, or insectivorous based on dietary
205 composition (Table 1). Following the methodology of Muchlinski (2010), we classified a species as frugivorous if at least
206 50% of its diet (as measured from time spent feeding on different food items) is comprised of fruit. Once frugivores were
207 classified, the distinction between folivory and insectivory was determined by whether the non-fruit portion of the diet
208 consists of more leaves or more insects. We classified *Callithrix jacchus* as a gummivore (Sussman and Kinzey, 1984).

209 We also considered a *specific* classification system, following Plavcan and van Schaik (1992), to ensure that the
210 general, higher-level categories do not obscure meaningful biological differences in food properties. This specific
211 classification identified taxa as frugivorous, folivorous, insectivorous, gummivorous, frugivorous-folivorous, frugivorous-
212 insectivorous, or frugivorous-gummivorous (Table 1). Frugivores were given a mixed classification if the secondary
213 component of their diet comprised more than 15% (for leaves) or 25% (for insects and exudates) of the total diet.

214

215 *Food items*

216 As noted above, we classified food items into the categories listed in Figure 1 to examine FMP variation across
217 food types. For analyses testing the relationship between FMPs and food items, we set a threshold of $n \geq 15$ individual FMP
218 tests for inclusion. Thus, we included the food items highlighted in bold in Figure 1 (*R*: bamboo, bark, flower, pericarp and
219 whole fruit, leaf, seed, stem/stalk; *E*: bamboo, fruit, leaf, seed) and excluded those that fell below the threshold (cambium,
220 grass, pith, root/tuber/bulb part, shoot). After analyzing variation in FMPs for these food categories, we performed
221 additional analyses to test for differences in FMPs based on food ripeness or maturity. We separated pericarp and whole
222 fruit based on ripeness (ripe and unripe) and leaves based on maturity (young and mature). We categorized seeds separately
223 from pericarp and whole fruit because these items were frequently measured separately, and because seeds and whole fruits
224 often differ in mechanical properties (Lucas et al., 1991; Vogel et al., 2008, 2014; Daegling et al., 2011; Chalk et al., 2016).
225 We used values for *R* and *E* that represented either single tests of individual food items or an average of multiple tests of the
226 same plant species or category of food item, according to how these data were reported.

227

228 *Dietary quality*

229 Dietary quality (DQ) was calculated by using coefficients to weight the percentages of plant structural parts,
230 plant reproductive parts, and animal material consumed by a primate species (Sailer et al., 1985). Coefficients for dietary

quality were taken from Sailer et al. (1985): 1 for structural parts, 2 for reproductive parts, and 3.5 for animal matter. One species, *Callithrix jacchus*, consumes large quantities of exudates (Sussman and Kinzey, 1984). Because exudates are not included in the equation of Sailer et al. (1985), we elected to give exudates the same coefficient as animal matter (for the purpose of analyses of dietary quality), as excluding exudates would vastly underestimate DQ for *C. jacchus*. Principal components analysis of our sample showed that insects and exudates were co-related (Janson pers. comm. to ERV), meaning that they have similar nutritional value within the context of the DQ model. Moreover, available nutritional data comparing insects and exudates show that these food types have similar caloric content (Isbell et al., 2013). It is thus probably most appropriate to group exudates with animal matter (as opposed to plant structural or reproductive parts) in calculating DQ for the present study. DQ was calculated as $DQ = 1s + 2r + 3.5(a + e)$. We calculated the DQ index for each primate species using data on dietary composition (Table 1). Food items were assigned to categories as outlined in Figure 1 (e.g., pith and shoots were structural; seeds were reproductive). These data included either time spent feeding on different food items or percentage of feeding records devoted to different food items. Data reporting diet as a percentage of total items consumed were excluded. When possible, data on dietary composition were taken from the same populations as FMP data ($n = 29$). All other data were drawn from the available literature (Table 1). If the reported dietary composition did not add up to 100%, we adjusted the numbers to maintain relative proportions, using the equation:

$$\% \text{ structural (or reproductive, animal, exudate)} * 100 / \text{total recorded diet composition}$$

For example, as dietary composition for *Cebus libidinosus* was only recorded for 86% of its diet, and 51% of its diet was reproductive matter, we calculated an adjusted figure for reproductive matter as: $(0.51 * 100) / 0.86 = 59.3$. The individual DQ values reported in Table 1 are the adjusted values.

Body mass

Body mass data specific to the populations in our sample were used whenever possible ($n = 7$ of 31), while the remaining body mass estimates were taken from the literature (Table 1). We used species averages that included both males and females. When body mass estimates were presented separately for males and females, we averaged these estimates to achieve a species mean.

Feeding time

Following Ross et al. (2009b), we define feeding time as the percentage of the daily activity budget spent ingesting and orally processing foods. Gut digestion time is known to play an important role in primate diet selection (Milton, 1981, 1984; Lambert, 1998), but because these data were not available for many species in our sample, we did not

consider this variable in our analyses. Whenever possible, feeding times used here were drawn from the same study populations as those from which FMP data were collected ($n = 18$ of 31). When unavailable, we drew on feeding times from the literature (Table 1). For two species (*Chiropotes satanas* and *Ptilocolobus rufomitratus*), multiple feeding times were available, and none was specific to the sites where FMPs were measured. In these cases, we used the average of the available measures. We preferentially used feeding time data that did not include time spent foraging, as determined by the methodology of each paper (e.g., feeding and foraging were defined and measured separately). Chewing, feeding, and foraging are separate activities and are not always clearly distinguished in the literature. Ideally, data on feeding times would include an estimate of time spent chewing, but these data are only available for a limited number of captive species (Ross et al., 2009a, b).

We specifically excluded any papers that did not clearly define feeding or did not distinguish between feeding and foraging. Excluding foraging time likely underestimates time spent feeding for insectivorous primates, which tend to feed continuously while foraging (e.g., Terborgh, 1983; Robinson, 1986). However, in the absence of fine-grained data that separate insect feeding and foraging, we chose the more conservative approach of excluding foraging time.

Analyses

We used Kruskal-Wallis rank sum tests (Kruskal and Wallis, 1952) to test our predictions that dietary categories and food items are distinguishable by their FMPs. If food items were significantly distinguishable by either toughness or Young's modulus, we performed post hoc pairwise comparisons between food items using a Wilcoxon rank sum test (Wilcoxon, 1945).

We used correlation analysis to test our predictions relating FMPs to dietary quality, body mass, and feeding time. We used phylogenetic generalized least squares (PGLS) regression (Freckleton et al., 2002) to address the potential influences of phylogeny on the correlations. We used the GenBank consensus tree from 10kTrees (<http://10ktrees.nunn-lab.org/>; Arnold et al., 2010) to estimate phylogenetic relationships and divergence dates for primate species (Fig. 2). Because not all of the species in our sample are included in the 10kTrees database, we relied on published phylogenetic positions and divergence estimates for the missing species. We used a divergence date of 400,000 years for *Cebus libidinosus* and *C. apella* (Lynch Alfaro et al., 2012) and 178,000 years for *Pongo pygmaeus wurmbii* and *P. p. morio* (Nater et al., 2011). To test our hypothesis about feeding time and FMPs, we ran PGLS regressions incorporating an interaction between FMPs and body mass. If the interaction was not significant and did not trend toward significance, we then ran the models without the interaction.

For all analyses, the natural logs of body mass and FMPs were used, and feeding times were logit transformed.

291 We set the significance level for all tests at $\alpha < 0.05$ and noted trends toward significance at $0.05 < p < 0.1$. We used a
292 Bonferroni-Holm correction for multiple comparisons (Holm, 1979) to control for family wise error rate, applied separately
293 for models of R and E .¹ All analyses were performed using the R Statistical Programming Language version 3.1.0
294 (<http://www.R-project.org/>). Packages APE (Paradis et al., 2004) and caper (Orme et al., 2013) were used for PGLS.

295

296 **Results**

297

298 *Dietary categories and FMPs*

299 Dietary categories were not significantly distinguished by any estimate of toughness or Young's modulus (Table
300 2; Fig. 3).

301

302 *Food items and FMPs*

303 Toughness varied significantly among food items across primates (K-W test $\chi^2 = 171.23$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 4A).
304 Post hoc pairwise comparisons yielded several significant differences among food items; however, food items classified as
305 fruits, seeds, and leaves showed no differences in toughness (Table 3A). Bark and bamboo were not significantly different
306 from each other in toughness, but these items were both tougher than all other food items except for stems, which were
307 significantly less tough than bamboo but not bark. Flowers and seeds were not significantly different.

308 We also observed a significant difference in Young's modulus across food items (K-W test $\chi^2 = 66.59$, $p <$
309 0.001 ; Fig. 4B). Here, all food items were significantly different from each other (Table 3B). Bamboo had higher modulus
310 values than fruits or seeds, and fruits had higher values than seeds.

311 Variation was found in maturity stage in both leaves and fruits (K-W test $\chi^2 = 17.8$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 4C). The
312 toughness of young leaves did not differ from that of mature leaves, ripe fruit, or unripe fruit (Table 3C). Ripe fruit was less
313 tough than unripe fruit and mature leaves. Unripe fruit and mature leaves did not differ.

314 There was no significant difference in Young's modulus between ripe and unripe fruit (K-W test $\chi^2 = 3.01$, $p =$
315 0.08).

316

317 *Dietary quality and FMPs*

318 There was no significant correlation between our estimate of dietary quality and any of our estimates of FMPs

1 A stepwise algorithm less conservative than the Bonferroni procedure. First, order p -values from lowest to highest. Calculate α/m (where m is the number of p -values). Reject the first hypothesis and stop the procedure if the first p -value is greater than or equal to α/m . Otherwise, move to the second p -value and compare to $\alpha/(m-1)$, etc.

319 (Table 4). However, there was a trend towards a negative correlation between *MaximumE* and dietary quality.

320

321 *Body mass and FMPs*

322 There was no relationship between body mass and any of our estimates of toughness (Table 5; Fig. 5A-C),
323 although *MedianR* trended towards an inverse relationship with body mass. In contrast, all estimates of Young's modulus
324 were significantly inversely correlated with body mass (Table 5; Fig. 5D-F).

325

326 *Feeding time and body mass*

327 Feeding time was significantly correlated with body mass ($F(1, 29) = 5.18, p = 0.03, R^2 = 0.12$; Fig. 6). This
328 model resulted in a maximum-likelihood estimate of 0 for λ .

329

330 *Feeding time and FMPs*

331 We found a complex relationship between feeding time and all three estimates of toughness (Table 6). PGLS
332 models including interactions between body mass and FMPs were run first to consider the possibility that any relationship
333 between FMPs and feeding time might be contingent on body size. If the interaction term was not significant and did not
334 trend toward significance ($0.05 < p < 0.1$), the result without the interaction is presented in Table 6. For *MaximumR* and
335 *WeightedR*, the interaction term was not significant, and we then ran models excluding the interaction. *WeightedR* and
336 feeding time were positively correlated (Table 6A), but the overall significance of the model including *MaximumR* was
337 driven by body mass (Table 6C), and *MaximumR* was not correlated with feeding time.

338 In the case of *MedianR*, inclusion of the interaction with body mass (Table 6B) resulted in a positive relationship
339 with feeding time for primates with smaller body sizes and a negative one for primates with larger body sizes (Table 6B;
340 Fig. 7B). Thus, as body mass increases, tough foods move from apparently increasing feeding time to potentially reducing
341 feeding time.

342 The regression lines shown in Figure 7 suggest an effect of body size on the relationships between feeding time and
343 *WeightedR* (Fig. 7A) and feeding time and *MedianR* (Fig. 7B) by showing the slopes of these relationships for a large
344 primate (the size of *Gorilla beringei*, the largest species in the sample), shown in black, and a small primate (the size of
345 *Callithrix jacchus*, the smallest species in the sample), shown in gray. In this figure, the body mass of each species is
346 represented by the area of each point, with larger species plotted with larger data points. Both OLS (solid lines) and PGLS
347 (dashed lines) relationships are shown to demonstrate the potential effect of phylogeny. The OLS and PGLS lines for the

large body mass slopes (in black) are quite similar, suggesting that among larger primates there may be little in the way of phylogenetic signal. In contrast, the difference between the OLS and PGLS slopes for small body mass (in gray) indicates an effect of phylogeny possibly associated with the smaller-bodied strepsirrhines in the sample.

For the relationship between Young's modulus and feeding time, none of the overall models was significant (Table 6). Body mass was significant for the models including *WeightedE* and *MedianE* (Table 6D, E).

Discussion

Dietary categories, food items, dietary quality, and FMPs

None of our dietary categories or food items were distinguishable by their FMPs. The lack of significant differences suggests that these categorical descriptors of primate diets do not sufficiently describe a potential relationship between FMPs and primate diets. As noted by previous researchers (Teaford et al., 2006; Vogel et al., 2008; Yamashita et al., 2009), the mechanical properties of foods vary within as well as between specific food items. Thus, for example, categorizing a primate as "folivorous" might fail to characterize the full range of mechanical variation within folivory, given that primate folivores consume leaves with a wide range of values for toughness and Young's modulus, as well as a variety of non-leaf foods. Similarly, maturity stage may influence FMPs to such an extent that ripe fruits are less tough than are unripe fruits or mature leaves are more tough than immature leaves. From such a perspective, it might seem surprising that there was no difference in toughness between young and mature leaves in our dataset. However, maturity level was not reported for all leaves in our sample, and the toughest leaves were thus excluded from this analysis (see Fig. 1). Moreover, because our data examine relationships across primates, our results may overlook variation that exists within species (e.g., the leaf lamina of mature leaves consumed by Bornean orangutans is tougher than immature leaf lamina [Vogel et al., 2008]). At the very least, it is safe to say that, on average, a primate that exclusively consumes leaves does not necessarily ingest tougher foods than does a primate that specializes on fruit. Still, primates do appear to make decisions about food consumption based on detectable properties of foods (Milton, 1984; Kinzey and Norconk, 1990; Hill and Lucas, 1996; Yamashita, 1996; Teaford et al., 2006; Vogel et al., 2008), including toughness. Thus, FMPs may in part determine the range of foods eaten by primates: extremely tough foods, whether leaves or fruits, may be avoided because of their mechanical challenges.

Our results are consistent with previous studies that have argued against the use of categorical descriptions of primate diets because they do not adequately track FMPs and support the continued shift towards more fine-grained studies

of feeding behavior that include data on the mechanical properties of the specific food or food part being ingested and masticated (Kay, 1975; Rosenberger and Kinzey, 1976; Lucas et al., 1985; Rosenberger, 1992; Yamashita, 1996, 1998; Wright and Willis, 2012). This impacts broader questions in functional morphology, because if FMPs influence feeding system adaptations in primates (Jolly, 1970; Kinzey, 1974, 1992; Hylander, 1975; Kay, 1975; Rosenberger and Kinzey, 1976; Bouvier, 1986a, b; Daegling, 1992; Rosenberger, 1992; Silverman et al., 2001; Taylor, 2002; Lucas, 2004; Daegling and McGraw, 2007; Koyabu and Endo, 2009, but see Ross et al., 2012; Ross and Iriarte-Diaz, 2014), the use of traditional dietary categories as proxies for FMPs will hinder attempts to link FMPs and feeding system morphology in both living and fossil species.

We also found no relationship between dietary quality and FMPs. Foods classified as low quality are typically those with higher fiber content, and fiber contributes to toughness (Hill and Lucas, 1996; Lucas et al., 2000, 2011). However, the relationship between food toughness and nutrition has received minimal attention (but see Choong et al., 1992; Hill and Lucas, 1996; Lucas et al., 2000; Huang et al., 2010). It is likely that certain mechanically challenging foods may be preferentially selected by primates because of their nutritional composition (Vogel et al., 2008, 2009, 2014; Daegling et al., 2011; Chalk et al., 2016). For example, sooty mangabeys consume mechanically challenging seeds year-round (i.e., not as a fallback food; Daegling et al., 2011), likely because of the oil content (Cornelius et al., 1970). Moreover, manual and oral processing of foods, as well as gut adaptations related to digestion, may allow primates to extract resources from foods that would otherwise be considered low-quality. The more simplistic DQ index used in this study and others (Sailer et al., 1985; Jaeggi and Van Schaik, 2011) assumes that all primates receive similar energetic benefits from all food items and ignores that different primate species have variable gut morphology and gut passage times. In fact, what may be considered a high quality diet for one species can be considered a low quality diet for another (Milton, 1981, 1993). Thus, it is conceivable that a mechanically challenging diet may also be characterized as nutritionally high-quality (Daegling et al., 2011). Resolution of the relationship between dietary quality and food mechanical properties requires direct measurement of nutrient composition and FMPs instead of the simple indices used here. While some research has addressed nutrient absorption and calorie intake in primates (Milton, 1981; Milton and McBee, 1983; Lambert, 1998; Chapman et al., 2003; Rothman et al., 2012), none has investigated the question of whether FMPs are related to measurable differences in nutritive quality.

Body mass, feeding time, and FMPs

Food mechanical properties exhibit complex, likely clade-specific, relationships with feeding time and body mass. First, with respect to feeding time scaling with body mass, our results are similar to those of previous studies (Ross et

al., 2009a; Organ et al., 2011), and suggest a weak relationship between body mass and feeding time. It may be the case that feeding time is too simplistic a measure and obscures a meaningful relationship between body mass and food intake. Our measures of feeding time were drawn from daily activity budgets, which are recorded and reported differently across studies. Alternatively, the relationship between chewing rate and feeding time may be informative. Experimental research has examined this relationship (Ross et al., 2009a, b; Thompson et al., 2011), but data remain too limited to enable large-scale, interspecific analysis (but see Williams et al., 2008; Vinyard et al., 2012). Thus, feeding time as drawn from data on daily activity budgets represents the best current measure for comparative study.

Our prediction that larger primates would eat more mechanically challenging foods was not supported, as we found no relationship between toughness and body mass, while dietary Young's modulus actually decreases in larger primates (Fig. 5D-F). This latter result may be a consequence of a sampling bias. FMPs were not always measured for the full range of foods eaten by a primate species; in some cases, the most challenging foods were excluded from analysis, due for example to limitations in the tester apparatus (e.g., Vogel et al, 2008, 2014). Moreover, we found that bamboo has, on average, higher values for Young's modulus than do fruits and seeds (Fig. 4). In our sample, measurements of Young's modulus for bamboo were taken only for *Trachypithecus phayrei* and the relatively small-bodied bamboo lemurs. Further sampling of the high-end range of Young's modulus on food items is critical for drawing conclusions about these relationships. Toughness is not significantly related to body mass after Bonferroni-Holm correction. However, as seen in Figure 5B and reflected by a significant result prior to Bonferroni-Holm correction (Table 5), the possibility of a weak effect whereby smaller primates consume tougher foods may be worth further investigation. We speculate that, to meet their daily caloric needs, smaller primates may turn to more mechanically challenging—yet nutrient-rich—food items that are avoided by larger primates with slower metabolisms. This result underscores the need to quantify the complete range of food properties from mechanical to chemical to nutritional.

Evaluating whether species with more mechanically challenging diets invest more time in feeding seems to depend in part on the way FMPs are quantified. First, there is clearly no relationship between feeding time and maximum toughness. This result is what we would expect if the toughest items in a primate's diet represent fallback foods that are important primarily during periods of low availability of preferred food items (Lambert et al., 2004; Laden and Wrangham, 2005; Marshall and Wrangham, 2007; Constantino et al., 2009).

Analysis of median toughness suggests the possibility that the relationship between median toughness and feeding time may be modulated by an interaction with body mass (although Table 6 implies a complex web of weak effects). Feeding time and median toughness appear to scale differently for smaller primates than for larger primates as indicated by the interaction shown in Figure 7B. For small primates, as median toughness increases, feeding time increases as well.

437 However, for larger primates, feeding time and toughness have a negative relationship (Fig. 7B). In other words, large
438 primates do not respond to increased dietary toughness by increasing the proportion of their activity budget devoted to
439 feeding as much as do smaller primates. While this result is not strong and there is no straightforward relationship between
440 median toughness and feeding time, failure to consider an interaction driven by body mass risks obscuring potentially
441 important relationships. This result may be a consequence of larger primates' hypothesized increased capacity for
442 masticatory force production (Greaves, 1978, 1988; Demes and Creel, 1988; Wroe et al., 2005), or of their slower metabolic
443 rates and thus relatively lower energetic demands (Kleiber, 1947; Gaulin, 1979; Elgar and Harvey, 1987; Lambert, 1998;
444 McNab, 2008). Differences in oral processing and digestion may also play a role. Mountain gorillas (*G. beringei*) excrete
445 long, fibrous strings of minimally processed food (Elgart-Berry, 2000) and are observed to use coprophagy as a method to
446 maximize available energy from fibrous foods (Harcourt et al., 1978; Mahaney et al., 1990).

447 In contrast, when we examined feeding time and weighted mean toughness, we found a more straightforward
448 relationship with no interaction. As weighted mean toughness increases, feeding time increases as well (Fig. 7A). This
449 relationship aligns with our predictions and suggests that tougher feeds require longer durations of chewing. However, as
450 mentioned, the dietary composition data used to calculate the weighted mean did not always reflect 100% of the diet, and
451 the food items for which FMPs were measured comprise only a portion of the total diet for most species. Moreover, feeding
452 time is at best a loose proxy for chewing time, and until the relationship between FMPs and chewing time is more fully
453 quantified, we can only speculate about the link between toughness and chewing. Consequently, and in light of the weak
454 interaction with body mass seen for median but not for weighted mean toughness, further research is needed to establish
455 which of these estimates of dietary toughness more accurately represents the true relationship with feeding time.

456 Our results with median toughness suggest a possible limit on the active time a primate can devote to feeding.
457 Even highly insectivorous tarsiers spend no more than 60% of their daily activity budget foraging and feeding (Gursky,
458 2000). The demands of social behavior and social grooming may serve to constrain the amount of time primates can
459 dedicate to other behaviors (Aiello and Dunbar, 1993), including feeding. Assuming this upper limit, primates likely cannot
460 rely solely on increased chewing time to process tough diets. Jaw and tooth morphology may be of vital importance, as a
461 limit on feeding time would place an adaptive premium on dental morphology. The lack of a significant relationship
462 between feeding time and maximum toughness may result from selection pressure of fallback foods on tooth morphology.
463 We would then expect to see strong functional relationships between FMPs and cranial and dental morphology. Post-
464 ingestion processing in the form of gut adaptations related to digestion may also be crucially important to limiting feeding
465 time, either as an alternative to dentognathic morphology or in conjunction with it. Further research on primate microbiota
466 (Amato et al., 2014a, b; Gomez, 2014; Fogel, 2015) and gut transit time (Milton, 1984; Edwards and Ullrey, 1999) is

467 necessary to quantify the relationship between digestion and FMPs.

468

469 **Conclusion**

470 Our results deviated from traditional evaluations of primate diets based on the assumed mechanical properties of
471 food items or dietary categories. We found no significant differences in average FMPs between, for example, foods eaten by
472 frugivorous and folivorous primates. Dietary quality also failed to yield a relationship with FMPs. Moreover, the food items
473 that form the bulk of most anthropoid primates' diets—leaves, fruits, and seeds—are indistinguishable in terms of average
474 toughness.

475 The complex interrelationships among FMPs, feeding time, and body mass demonstrate that size influences
476 primate feeding ecology in complicated ways that have not been fully characterized by current research. Our analyses were
477 constrained by the availability of feeding data that can be compared across a large sample of primate species. Even
478 commonly recorded and widely available measures such as diet composition were not always available for the specific
479 primate populations for which dietary FMPs were measured. Further study is warranted and will benefit from improved
480 sampling and the integration of nutritional analyses. Thus, primate feeding ecology would benefit from FMPs collected in
481 tandem with detailed measurements of feeding behavior and non-mechanical food properties. Desirable data include
482 measurements of time and frequency of feeding on specific food items, time spent ingesting versus chewing, oral processing
483 versus chewing times and rates, seasonal or even monthly variations in FMPs and feeding behavior, food intake, bite counts,
484 food weight, and nutritional and chemical properties of individual food items. The variation in behavioral data collection
485 across sites (Schuelke et al., 2006) and the lack of site-specific data for all primates in our sample underscore the need for
486 greater consistency in data collection and more detailed fieldwork on the populations in which FMPs were collected.

487 Finally, we recommend that FMPs be utilized for further investigation of the relationship between diet and jaw
488 and tooth morphology. While some research has addressed the question of possible relationships between FMPs and
489 craniodental morphology (Taylor et al., 2008; Norconk et al., 2009; Vogel et al., 2014), a large-scale comparison of FMPs
490 and craniodental morphology may uncover meaningful form-function interactions that will provide new insight into the
491 evolution of primate mastication.

492

493 **Acknowledgments**

494 We are grateful to the editor and three anonymous reviewers for their feedback. We thank Dr. Charlie Janson for
495 assistance with dietary quality coefficients. ERV thanks the Tuanan research assistants and students, Tatang Mitra Setia,
496 Suci Utami Atmoko, the Fakultas Biologi Universitas Nasional (UNAS) in Jakarta, Zurich University, Dr. Janneke van
497 Woerden, Dr. Carel van Schaik, and Dr. Maria van Noodwijk. For support and research permits, we thank the Indonesian
498 State Ministry for Research and Technology (RISTEK), the Indonesian Institute of Science (LIPI), the Director General

Departemen Kehutanan (PHKA), Departemen Dalam Negeri, the BKSDA Palangkaraya, the local government in Central Kalimantan, the Bornean Orangutan Survival Foundation (BOSF), and Mawas in Palangkaraya for their permission and support to the project. For major financial support, we thank the National Science Foundation (BCS-0643122), USAID (No.AID-497-A-13-00005), The L.S.B. Leakey Foundation (20070517), The Denver Zoological Society, University of Zurich, the A.H. Schultz Stiftung, the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO), the Netherlands Foundation for the Advancement of Tropical Research (WOTRO), the Treub Foundation, the Dobberke Foundation and the Lucie Burgers Foundation for Comparative Behaviour Research, the World Wildlife Funds-NL Conservation Fund, and the University of Amsterdam. Observational protocols were approved by the UC-Santa Cruz Chancellor's Animal Research Committee (protocol #20061056-122204) and the George Washington University Institutional Animal Use and Care Committee (protocol #A186). JCW thanks Kat Schuhmacher, Marino Junior Fonseca de Oliveira, Luiz Carlos M. Biondi, and Giulia Sirianni for their assistance in the field and Marino Gomes de Oliveira and family for permission to conduct research at FBV. Permission to work in Brazil was granted by CNPq and the EthoCebus Research Group. This research was supported by NSF IGERT DGE-0801634, NSF HOMINID BCS-0725122, The Leakey Foundation, FAPESP, CNPq, and IBAMA. Observational protocols were approved by the IACUC committee at George Washington University. SMC thanks the Indonesian Institute of Research and Technology (RISTEK) and the Centre for International Cooperation in Management of Tropical Peatlands (CIMTROP) for permission to work in Indonesia. Her work was funded by The Conservation International Primate Action Fund, Primate Conservation Incorporated, and the Anthropology Department of George Washington University. PC thanks Alicia Krige for plant identification and Maricela Constantino for assistance with data collection. AAE thanks Erin Vogel, for the loan of the tester, and Pascale Sicotte, for assistance and permission to work at "her" site. HG thanks the Dian Fossey Gorilla Fund International's Karisoke Research Centre. Her work was funded by the American Society of Primatologists General Small Grant, International Primatological Society Research Grant, School of Human Evolution and Social Change Graduate Student Research Grant, and Institute of Human Origins Fellowship. LCL thanks Dr. Roberto A. Delgado, Directorate for Geosciences, NSF; Dr. Yaya Rayadin and Rustam M.P., Universitas Mulawarman; Elyya Novamalaisari S. Hut, Universitas Muawarman; Pak Slemat Rohmadi, Departemen Kehutanan; Pak Uddin, Pak Darim, Pak Willis - Prevab Camp, Kutai NP. Funding was provided through University of Southern California. KO's research was supported by National Science Foundation (NSF-DDIG # BCS-0647837), The Leakey Foundation, Wenner-Gren Foundation (Grant No. 7639), and the American Society of Primatologists, and approved by IACUC Stony Brook University (IDs: 20061120 to 20081120). For training and the loan of mechanical tester equipment, many thanks to Erin Vogel (Dept. of Anthropology, Rutgers), Nate Dominy (Dept. of Biological Sciences, Dartmouth), Peter Lucas (Dept. of BioClinical Studies, Kuwait University), and Andreas Koenig (Dept. of Anthropology and Vice President of Research, Stony Brook). MRS was funded by the National Science Foundation (DDIG 0622411), the Graduate College at University of Illinois, a Beckman Institute CS/AI Fellowship, Idea Wild, and Sigma Xi (Grant-in-Aid of Research). IACUC approval was through the University of Illinois. NY thanks (in Ranomafana National Park) Chris Vinyard, Chia Tan, the entire *Hapalemur* team, Cathy Williams, the staffs of MICET and Centre ValBio, Departement des Eaux et Forêt, and Madagascar National Parks; additionally, (in Beza Mahafaly special reserve) Mary Blanchard, Peter Lucas, Elahavelo, Ratsirarson Joel and ESSA, Alison Richard, Bob Sussman, and the staff of the reserve. NY was funded by the National Science Foundation (BCS 0420133), the Committee for Research and Exploration of the National Geographic Society, and the University of Southern California.

- 538 Agostini, I., Holzmann, I., Di Bitetti, M.S., 2010. Are howler monkey species ecologically equivalent? Trophic niche
539 overlap in syntopic *Alouatta guariba clamitans* and *Alouatta caraya*. *Am. J. Primatol.* 72, 173–86.
- 540 Agrawal, K.R., Lucas, P.W., 2003. The mechanics of the first bite. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. [Biol.]* 270, 1277–1282.
- 541 Agrawal, K.R., Lucas, P.W., Prinz, J., Bruce, I.C., 1997. Mechanical properties of foods responsible for resisting food
542 breakdown in the human mouth. *Arch. Oral. Biol.* 42, 1–9.
- 543 Agrawal, K.R., Lucas, P.W., Bruce, I.C., Prinz, J., 1998. Food properties that influence neuromuscular activity during
544 human mastication. *J. Dent. Res.* 77, 1931–1938.
- 545 Agrawal, K.R., Lucas, P.W., Bruce, I.C., 2000. The effects of food fragmentation index on mandibular closing angle in
546 human mastication. *Arch. Oral. Biol.* 45, 577–584.
- 547 Aiello, L.C., Dunbar, R., 1993. Neocortex size, group size, and the evolution of language. *Curr. Anthropol.* 34, 184–193.
- 548 Amato, K.R., Leigh, S.R., Kent, A., Mackie, R.I., Yeoman, C.J., Stumpf, R.M., Wilson, B.A., Nelson, K.E., White, B.A.,
549 Garber, P.A., 2014a. The gut microbiota appears to compensate for seasonal diet variation in the wild black howler
550 monkey (*Alouatta pigra*). *Microbial Ecol.* 69, 434–443.
- 551 Amato, K.R., Leigh, S.R., Kent, A., Mackie, R.I., Yeoman, C.J., Stumpf, R.M., Wilson, B.A., Nelson, K.E., White, B.A.,
552 Garber, P.A., 2014b. The role of gut microbes in satisfying the nutritional demands of adult and juvenile wild, black
553 howler monkeys (*Alouatta pigra*). *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 155, 652–664.
- 554 Anapol, F., Lee, S., 1994. Morphological adaptation to diet in platyrrhine primates. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 94, 239–261.
- 555 Araujo, A., Arruda, M.F., Alencar, A.I., Albuquerque, F., Nascimento, M.C., Yamamoto, M.E., 2000. Body weight of wild
556 and captive common marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Int. J. Primatol.* 21, 317–324.
- 557 Arnold, C., Matthews, L.J., Nunn, C.L., 2010. The 10kTrees website: A new online resource for primate phylogeny. *Evol.*
558 *Anthropol.* 19, 114–118.
- 559 Bell, R., 1971. A grazing ecosystem in the Serengeti. *Sci. Am.* 225, 86–93.
- 560 Bouvier, M., 1986a. A biomechanical analysis of mandibular scaling in Old World monkeys. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 69,
561 473–482.
- 562 Bouvier, M., 1986b. Biomechanical scaling of mandibular dimensions in New World Monkeys. *Int. J. Primatol.* 7, 551–567.
- 563 Boyle, S.A., Smith, A.T., 2010. Behavioral modifications in northern bearded saki monkeys (*Chiropotes satanas*
564 *chiropotes*) in forest fragments of central Amazonia. *Primates* 51, 43–51.
- 565 Chagas, J.A.B., Oleskovicz, N., Moraes, A.N. De, Flôres, F.N., Corrêa, A.L., Souza Júnior, J.C., Soares, A.V., Costa, Á.,
566 2010. Associação de cetamina S(+) e midazolam pelo método convencional de cálculo e pela extrapolação alométrica
567 em bugios-ruivo (*Alouatta guariba clamitans*): resposta clínica e cardiorrespiratória. *Ciênc. Rural* 40, 109–114.
- 568 Chalk, J., Wright, B.W., Lucas, P.W., Schuhmacher, K.D., Vogel, E.R., Fragaszy, D., Visalberghi, E., Izar, P., Richmond,
569 B.G., 2016. Age-related variation in the mechanical properties of foods processed by *Sapajus libidinosus*. *Am. J.*
570 *Phys. Anthropol.* 159, 199–209.
- 571 Chapman, C.A., 1987. Flexibility in diets of three species of Costa Rican primates. *Folia Primatol.* 49, 90–105.
- 572 Chapman, C.A., Chapman, L.J., Rode, K.D., Hauck, E.M., McDowell, L.R., 2003. Variation in the nutritional value of
573 primate foods: Among trees, time periods, and areas. *Int. J. Primatol.* 24, 317–333.
- 574 Cheyne, S., 2010. Behavioural ecology of gibbons (*Hylobates albibarbis*) in a degraded peat-swamp forest. In: Gursky-
575 Doyen, S., Supriatna, J. (Eds.), *Indonesian Primates*. Springer, New York, pp. 121–156.
- 576 Chiarello, A., 1993. Activity pattern of the brown howler monkey *Alouatta fusca*, Geoffroy 1812, in a forest fragment of
577 southeastern Brazil. *Primates* 34, 289–293.
- 578 Choong, M.F., 1996. What makes a leaf tough and how this affects the pattern of *Castanopsis fissa* leaf consumption by

579 caterpillars. *Funct. Ecol.* 10, 668–674.

580 Choong, M.F., Lucas, P.W., Ong, J., Pereira, B., Tan, H., Turner, I.M., 1992. Leaf fracture toughness and sclerophylly: Their
581 correlations and ecological implications. *New Phytol.* 121, 597–610.

582 Clutton-Brock, T., Harvey, P., 1977. Species differences in feeding and ranging behavior in primates. In: Clutton-Brock, T.
583 (Ed.), *Primate Ecology: Studies of Feeding and Ranging Behavior in Lemurs, Monkeys and Apes*. Academic Press,
584 London, pp. 557–584.

585 Coley, P.D., 1983. Herbivory and defensive characteristics of tree species in a tropical lowland forest. *Ecol. Monogr.* 53,
586 209–234.

587 Constantino, P.J., Lucas, P.W., Lee, J.J.-W., Lawn, B.R., George, T., 2009. The influence of fallback foods on great ape
588 tooth enamel. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 140, 653–60.

589 Cornelius, J.A., Hammonds, T.W., Leicester, J.B., Ndababweji, J.K., Rosie, D.A., Shone, G.G., 1970. New tropical oil
590 seeds III—Component acids of leguminous and other seed oils (continued). *J. Sci. Fd. Agric.* 21, 49–50.

591 Correa, H., Coutinho, P.E.G., Ferrari, S.F., 2000. Between-year differences in the feeding ecology of highland marmosets
592 (*Callithrix aurita* and *Callithrix flaviceps*) in south-eastern Brazil. *J. Zool.* 252, 421–427.

593 Daegling, D.J., 1989. Biomechanics of cross-sectional size and shape in the hominoid mandibular corpus. *Am. J. Phys.*
594 *Anthropol.* 80, 91–106.

595 Daegling, D.J., 1992. Mandibular morphology and diet in the genus *Cebus*. *Int. J. Primatol.* 13, 545–570.

596 Daegling, D.J., McGraw, W.S., 2007. Functional morphology of the mangabey mandibular corpus: Relationship to dietary
597 specializations and feeding behavior. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 134, 50–62.

598 Daegling, D.J., McGraw, W.S., Ungar, P.S., Pampush, J.D., Vick, A.E., Anderson, E., Bitty, E.A., 2011. Hard-object
599 feeding in sooty mangabeys (*Cercocebus atys*) and interpretation of early hominin feeding ecology. *PloS One* 6,
600 e23095.

601 Darvell, B.W., Lee, P.K.D., Yuen, T.D.B., Lucas, P.W., 1996. A portable fracture toughness tester for biological materials.
602 *Meas. Sci. Technol.* 7, 954–962.

603 Decker, B., 1994. Effects of habitat disturbance on the behavioral ecology and demographics of the Tana River red colobus
604 (*Colobus badius rufomitatus*). *Int. J. Primatol.* 15, 703–737.

605 Demes, B., Creel, N., 1988. Bite force, diet, and cranial morphology of fossil hominids. *J. Hum. Evol.* 17, 657–670.

606 Digby, L., Ferrari, S., Saltzman, W., 2006. Callitrichines: The role of competition in cooperatively breeding species. In:
607 Campbell, C., Fuentes, A., Mackinnon, K., Panger, M., Bearder, S. (Eds.), *Primates in Perspective*. Oxford University
608 Press, Oxford, pp. 85–106.

609 Dominy, N.J., Lucas, P.W., 2004. Significance of color, calories, and climate to the visual ecology of catarrhines. *Am. J.*
610 *Primatol.* 62, 189–207.

611 Dominy, N.J., Vogel, E.R., Yeakel, J.D., Constantino, P.J., Lucas, P.W., 2008. Mechanical properties of plant underground
612 storage organs and implications for dietary models of early hominins. *Evol. Biol.* 35, 159–175.

613 Duc, H.M., Baxter, G.S., Page, M.J., 2009. Diet of *Pygathrix nigripes* in Southern Vietnam. *Int. J. Primatol.* 30, 15–28.

614 Dunbar, R., 1992. Time: A hidden constraint on the behavioural ecology of baboons. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 31, 35–49.

615 Edwards, M.S., Ullrey, D.E., 1999. Effect of dietary fiber concentration on apparent digestibility and digesta passage in
616 non-human primates. II. Hindgut- and foregut-fermenting folivores. *Zoo Biology.* 18, 537–549.

617 Elgar, M., Harvey, P., 1987. Basal metabolic rates in mammals: Allometry, phylogeny and ecology. *Funct. Ecol.* 1, 25–36.

618 Elgart-Berry, A., 2000. The relationship of fracture toughness of plants to the morphology and durability of gorilla (*Gorilla*

619 gorilla) mandibles and teeth. Ph.D. Dissertation, Cornell University.

620 Fogel, A. 2015. The gut microbiome of wild lemurs: A comparison of sympatric *Lemur catta* and *Propithecus verreauxi*.
621 Folia Primatol. 86, 85–95.

622 Ford, S., Davis, L., 1992. Systematics and body size: implications for feeding adaptations in New World monkeys. Am. J.
623 Phys. Anthropol. 88, 415–468.

624 Fragaszy, D., Izar, P., Visalberghi, E., Ottoni, E.B., de Oliveira, M.G., 2004. Wild capuchin monkeys (*Cebus libidinosus*)
625 use anvils and stone pounding tools. Am. J. Primatol. 366, 359–366.

626 Freckleton, R.P., Harvey, P.H., Pagel, M., 2002. Phylogenetic analysis and comparative data: A test and review of evidence.
627 Am. Nat. 160, 712–726.

628 Gaulin, S.J., 1979. A Jarman/Bell model of primate feeding niches. Hum. Ecol. 7, 1–20.

629 Gaulin, S.J., Gaulin, C.K., 1982. Behavioral ecology of *Alouatta seniculus* in Andean cloud forest. Int. J. Primatol. 3, 1–32.

630 Gomez, A., 2014. The gut microbiome of the western lowland gorilla (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla*): implications for overall
631 ecology. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

632 Gordon, J., 1978. Structures, or, Why Things Don't Fall Down. Penguin, London.

633 Gould, L., Sussman, R.W., Sauther, M.L., 2003. Demographic and life-history patterns in a population of ring-tailed lemurs
634 (*Lemur catta*) at Beza Mahafaly Reserve, Madagascar: A 15-year perspective. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 120, 182–94.

635 Greaves, W., 1978. The jaw lever system in ungulates: A new model. J. Zool. 184, 271–285.

636 Greaves, W., 1988. The maximum average bite force for a given jaw length. J. Zool. 214, 295–306.

637 Gursky, S., 2000. Effect of seasonality on the behavior of an insectivorous primate, *Tarsius spectrum*. Int. J. Primatol. 21,
638 477–495.

639 Hai, T.D., 2007. Behavioural ecology and conservation of *Rhinopithecus avunculus* in Vietnam. The Australian National
640 University.

641 Harcourt, A.H., Stewart, K.J., 1978. Coprophagy by wild mountain gorillas. Afr. J. Ecol. 16, 223–225.

642 Hill, D.A., Lucas, P.W., 1996. Toughness and fiber content of major leaf foods of Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata*
643 *yakui*) in Yakushima. Am. J. Primatol. 38, 221–231.

644 Holm, S., 1979. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. Scand. J. Stat. 6, 65–70.

645 Huang, Z., Huo, S., Yang, S., Cui, L., Xiao, W. 2010. Leaf choice in black-and-white snub-nosed monkeys *Rhinopithecus*
646 *bieti* is related to the physical and chemical properties of leaves. Curr. Zool. 56, 643–649.

647 Hylander, W.L., 1975. Incisor size and diet in anthropoids with special reference to Cercopithecidae. Science 189, 1095–
648 1098.

649 Hylander, W.L., 1979a. An experimental analysis of temporomandibular joint reaction force in macaques. Am. J. Phys.
650 Anthropol. 51, 433–456.

651 Hylander, W.L., 1979b. The functional significance of primate mandibular form. J. Morphol. 160, 223–239.

652 Isbell, L.A., Rothman, J.M., Young, P.J., Rudolph, K., 2013. Nutritional benefits of *Crematogaster mimosae* ants and
653 *Acacia drepanolobium* gum for patas monkeys and vervets in Laikipia, Kenya. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 150, 286–
654 300.

655 Izar, P., Verderane, M.P., Peternelli-Dos-Santos, L., Mendonça-Furtado, O., Presotto, A., Tokuda, M., Visalberghi, E.,
656 Fragaszy, D., 2012. Flexible and conservative features of social systems in tufted capuchin monkeys: comparing the
657 socioecology of *Sapajus libidinosus* and *Sapajus nigritus*. Am. J. Primatol. 74, 315–331.

- 658 Jaeggi, A., Van Schaik, C., 2011. The evolution of food sharing in primates. *Behav. Ecol. Sociobiol.* 65, 2125–2140.
- 659 Janson, C.H., 1988. Food competition in brown capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*): Quantitative effects of group size and
660 tree productivity. *Behaviour.* 105, 53–76.
- 661 Jarman, P., 1974. The social organisation of antelope in relation to their ecology. *Behaviour.* 48, 215–267.
- 662 Jolly, A., 1985. The evolution of primate behavior. *Am. Sci.* 73, 230–239.
- 663 Jolly, C.J., 1970. The seed-eaters: A new model of hominid differentiation based on a baboon analogy. *Man* 5, 5–26.
- 664 Kay, R.F., 1975. The functional adaptations of primate molar teeth. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 43, 195–216.
- 665 Kay, R.F., 1981. The nut-crackers—A new theory of the adaptations of the Ramapithecinae. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 55,
666 141–151.
- 667 Kinzey, W., 1974. Ceboid models for the evolution of hominoid dentition. *J. Hum. Evol.* 3, 193–203.
- 668 Kinzey, W.G., Norconk, M.A., 1990. Hardness as a basis of fruit choice in two sympatric primates. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.*
669 81, 5–15.
- 670 Kleiber, M., 1947. Body size and metabolic rate. *Physiol. Rev.* 27, 511–541.
- 671 Knogge, C., Heymann, E.W., 2003. Seed dispersal by sympatric tamarins, *Saguinus mystax* and *Saguinus fuscicollis*:
672 Diversity and characteristics of plant species. *Folia Primatol.* 74, 33–47.
- 673 Koyabu, D.B., Endo, H., 2009. Craniofacial variation and dietary adaptations of African colobines. *J. Hum. Evol.* 56, 525–
674 536.
- 675 Kruskal, W., Wallis, W., 1952. Use of ranks in one-criterion variance analysis. *JASA.* 47, 583–621.
- 676 Laden, G., Wrangham, R.W., 2005. The rise of the hominids as an adaptive shift in fallback foods: Plant underground
677 storage organs (USOs) and australopith origins. *J. Hum. Evol.* 49, 482–98.
- 678 Lambert, J.E., 1998. Primate digestion: Interactions among anatomy, physiology, and feeding ecology. *Evol. Anthropol.* 7,
679 8–20.
- 680 Lambert, J.E., Chapman, C.A., Wrangham, R.W., Conklin-Brittain, N.L., 2004. Hardness of cercopithecine foods:
681 Implications for the critical function of enamel thickness in exploiting fallback foods. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 125,
682 363–368.
- 683 Le, Q.K., Nguyen, D.A., Vu, T.A., Wright, B.W., Covert, H.H., 2007. Diet of the Tonkin snub-nosed monkey
684 (*Rhinopithecus avunculus*) in the Khuat Ca area, Ha Giang Province, Northeastern Vietnam. *Vietnamese J. Primatol.* 1,
685 75–83.
- 686 Lucas, P.W., 2004. Dental Functional Morphology: How Teeth Work. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.
- 687 Lucas, P.W., Pereira, B., 1990. Estimation of the fracture toughness of leaves. *Funct. Ecol.* 4, 819–822.
- 688 Lucas, P.W., Corlett, R., Luke, D., 1985. Plio-Pleistocene hominid diets: An approach combining masticatory and
689 ecological analysis. *J. Hum. Evol.* 14, 187–202.
- 690 Lucas, P.W., Lowreytt, T.K., Pereira, B.P., Sarafjsw, V., 1991. The ecology of *Mezzettia leptopoda* (Hk. f. et Thoms.) Oliv.
691 (Annonaceae) seeds as viewed from a mechanical perspective. *Funct. Ecol.* 5, 545–553.
- 692 Lucas, P.W., Turner, I.M., Dominy, N.J., Yamashita, N., 2000. Mechanical defences to herbivory. *Annal. Bot.* 86, 913–920.
- 693 Lucas, P.W., Beta, T., Darvell, B.W., Dominy, N.J., Essackjee, H.C., Lee, P.K.D., Osorio, D., Ramsden, L., Yamashita, N.,
694 Yuen, T.D., 2001. Field kit to characterize physical, chemical and spatial aspects of potential primate foods. *Folia*
695 *Primatol.* 72, 11–25.
- 696 Lucas, P.W., Prinz, J., Agrawal, K.R., Bruce, I., 2002. Food physics and oral physiology. *Food Qual. Prefer.* 13, 203–213.

- Lucas, P.W., Copes, L., Constantino, P.J., Vogel, E.R., Chalk, J., Talebi, M.G., Landis, M., Wagner, M., 2011. Measuring the toughness of primate foods and its ecological value. *Int. J. Primatol.* 33, 598–610.
- Lynch Alfaro, J.W., Boubli, J.P., Olson, L.E., Di Fiore, A., Wilson, B., Gutiérrez-Espeleta, G. a., Chiou, K.L., Schulte, M., Neitzel, S., Ross, V., Schwochow, D., Nguyen, M.T.T., Farias, I., Janson, C.H., Alfaro, M.E., 2012. Explosive Pleistocene range expansion leads to widespread Amazonian sympatry between robust and gracile capuchin monkeys. *J. Biogeogr.* 39, 272–288.
- Mahaney, W.C., Watts, D.P., Hancock, R.G.V., 1990. Geophagia by mountain gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla beringei*) in the Virunga Mountains. *Rwanda Primates*. 31, 113–120.
- Maisels, F., Gautier-Hion, A., Gautier, J., 1994. Diets of two sympatric colobines in Zaire: More evidence on seed-eating in forests on poor soils. *Int. J. Primatol.* 15, 681–701.
- Marsh, C., 1981. Time budget of Tana River red colobus. *Folia Primatol.* 35, 30–50.
- Marshall, A.J., Wrangham, R.W., 2007. Evolutionary consequences of fallback foods. *Int. J. Primatol.* 28, 1219–1235.
- McNab, B.K., 2008. An analysis of the factors that influence the level and scaling of mammalian BMR. *Comp. Biochem. Phys. A*. 151, 5–28.
- Milton, K., 1981. Food choice and digestive strategies of two sympatric primate species. *Am. Nat.* 117, 496–505.
- Milton, K., 1984. The role of food-processing factors in primate food choice. In: Rodman, P., Cant, J. (Eds.), *Adaptations for Foraging in Nonhuman Primates*. Columbia University Press, New York, pp. 249–279.
- Milton, K., 1993. Diet and primate evolution. *Sci. Am.* 269, 86–93.
- Milton, K., McBee, R.H., 1983. Rates of fermentative digestion in the howler monkey, *Alouatta palliata* (Primates: Ceboidea). *Comp. Biochem. Phys.* 74A, 29–31.
- Morrogh-Bernard, H.C., Husson, S.J., Knott, C.D., Wich, S.A., Schaik, C.P. Van, Noordwijk, M.A. Van, Lackman-ancrenaz, I., Marshall, A.J., Kuze, N., Sakong, R., 2007. Orangutan activity budgets and diet: A comparison between species, populations and habitats. In: Wich, S.A., Utami Atmoko, S.S., Mitra Setia, T., van Schaik, C.P. (Eds.), *Orangutans: Geographic Variation in Behavioral Ecology and Conservation*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 119–133.
- Muchlinski, M.N., 2010. Ecological correlates of infraorbital foramen area in primates. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 141, 131–141.
- Nater, A., Nietlisbach, P., Arora, N., van Schaik, C.P., van Noordwijk, M. a, Willems, E.P., Singleton, I., Wich, S. a, Goossens, B., Warren, K.S., Verschoor, E.J., Perwitasari-Farajallah, D., Pamungkas, J., Krützen, M., 2011. Sex-biased dispersal and volcanic activities shaped phylogeographic patterns of extant Orangutans (genus: *Pongo*). *Mol. Biol. Evol.* 28, 2275–2288.
- Norconk, M.A., Wright, B.W., Conklin-Brittain, N.L. Vinyard, C.J., 2009. Mechanical and nutritional properties of food as factors in platyrrhine dietary adaptations. In: Garber, P., Estrada, A., Bicca-Marques, J., Heymann, E., Strier, K. (Eds.), *South American Primates: Comparative Perspectives in the Study of Behavior, Ecology, and Conservation*. Springer, New York, pp. 279–319.
- Oates, J.F., Davies, A., Delson, E., 1994. The diversity of living colobines-the natural history of African colobines. In: Davies, A., Oates, J.F. (Eds.), *Colobine Monkeys: Their Ecology, Behaviour, and Evolution*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 45–75.
- Organ, C., Nunn, C.L., Machanda, Z., Wrangham, R.W., 2011. Phylogenetic rate shifts in feeding time during the evolution of *Homo*. *P. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 108, 14555–14559.
- Orme, D., Freckleton, R., Thomas, G., Petzoldt, T., Fritz, S., Isaac, N., Pearse, W., 2013. The caper package: Comparative analysis of phylogenetics and evolution in R. R package version 0.5. 1–36.

740 Palombit, R.R., 1997. Inter-and intraspecific variation in the diets of sympatric siamang (*Hylobates syndactylus*) and lar
741 gibbons (*Hylobates lar*). *Folia Primatol.* 68, 321–337.

742 Paradis, E., Claude, J., Strimmer, K., 2004. APE: Analyses of Phylogenetics and Evolution in R language. *Bioinformatics*
743 20, 289–290.

744 Peters, C., 1987. Nut-like oil seeds: Food for monkeys, chimpanzees, humans, and probably ape-men. *Am. J. Phys.*
745 *Anthropol.* 73, 333–363.

746 Plavcan, J., van Schaik, C., 1992. Intrasexual competition and canine dimorphism in anthropoid primates. *Am. J. Phys.*
747 *Anthropol.* 87, 461–477.

748 Pontzer, H., Scott, J.R., Lordkipanidze, D., Ungar, P.S., 2011. Dental microwear texture analysis and diet in the Dmanisi
749 hominins. *J. Hum. Evol.* 61, 683–687.

750 Port-Carvalho, M., Ferrari, S., 2004. Occurrence and diet of the black bearded saki (*Chiropotes satanas satanas*) in the
751 fragmented landscape of western Maranhão, Brazil. *Neotrop. Primates* 12, 17–21.

752 Raguet-Schofield, M., 2010. The ontogeny of feeding behavior of Nicaraguan mantled howler monkeys (*Alouatta palliata*).
753 Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

754 Ratajszczak, R., Dang, N., Pham, N., 1992. A survey for Tonkin snub-nosed monkey (*Rhinopithecus avunculus*) in the
755 North Vietnam, March 1992. FFPS, London and WWF, London.

756 Raubenheimer, D., Machovsky-Capuska, G.E., Chapman, C.A., Rothman, J.M., 2015. Geometry of nutrition in field
757 studies: An illustration using wild primates. *Oecologia.* 177, 223–234.

758 Ravosa, M.J., 1996. Jaw morphology and function in living and fossil Old World monkeys. *Int. J. Primatol.* 17, 909–932.

759 Rawson, B.M., 2009. The Socio-Ecology of the Black-Shanked Douc (*Pygathrix nigripes*) in Monduliri Province,
760 Cambodia. Ph.D. Dissertation, The Australian National University.

761 Reed, D.A., Ross, C.F., 2010. The influence of food material properties on jaw kinematics in the primate, *Cebus*. *Arch.*
762 *Oral. Biol.* 55, 946–962.

763 Remis, M., 2003. Are gorillas vacuum cleaners of the forest floor? The roles of body size, habitat, and food preferences on
764 dietary flexibility and nutrition. In: Taylor, A.B., Goldsmith, M.L. (Eds.), *Gorilla Biology: A Multidisciplinary*
765 *Perspective*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 385–404.

766 Richard, A.F., Dewar, R.E., Schwartz, M., Ratsirarson, J., 2006. Life in the slow lane? Demography and life histories of
767 male and female sifaka (*Propithecus verreauxi verreauxi*). *J. Zool.* 256, 421–436.

768 Rímoli, J., Strier, K., Ferrari, S., 2008. Seasonal and longitudinal variation in the behavior of free-ranging black tufted
769 capuchins *Cebus nigritus* (Goldfuss, 1809) in a fragment of Atlantic Forest in Southeastern Brazil. *A Primatol. Brasil*
770 9, 130–146.

771 Robinson, J.G., 1986. Seasonal variation in use of time and space by the wedge-capped capuchin monkey, *Cebus olivaceus*:
772 implications for foraging theory. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

773 Rodman, P., 1977. Feeding behaviour of orang-utans of the Kutai Nature Reserve, East Kalimantan. In: Clutton-Brock, T.
774 (Ed.), *Primate Ecology: Studies of Feeding and Ranging Behavior in Lemurs, Monkeys and Apes*. Academic Press,
775 London, pp. 383–413.

776 Rosenberger, A.L., 1992. Evolution of feeding niches in New World monkeys. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 88, 525–562.

777 Rosenberger, A.L., Kinzey, W.G., 1976. Functional patterns of molar occlusion in platyrrhine primates. *Am. J. Phys.*
778 *Anthropol.* 45, 281–298.

779 Ross, C.F., Iriarte-Diaz, J., 2014. What does feeding system morphology tell us about feeding? *Evol. Anthropol.* 23, 105–
780 120.

781 Ross, C.F., Washington, R.L., Eckhardt, A., Reed, D.A., Vogel, E.R., Dominy, N.J., Machanda, Z.P., 2009a. Ecological
782 consequences of scaling of chew cycle duration and daily feeding time in primates. *J. Hum. Evol.* 56, 570–85.

783 Ross, C.F., Reed, D.A., Washington, R.L., Eckhardt, A., Anapol, F., Shahnoor, N., 2009b. Scaling of chew cycle duration in
784 primates. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 138, 30–44.

785 Ross, C.F., Iriarte-Diaz, J., Nunn, C.L., 2012. Innovative approaches to the relationship between diet and mandibular
786 morphology in primates. *Int. J. Primatol.* 33, 632–660.

787 Rothman, J.M., Raubenheimer, D., Chapman, C.A., 2011. Nutritional geometry: Gorillas prioritize non-protein energy
788 while consuming surplus protein. *Biol. Letters.* 7, 1–3.

789 Rothman, J.M., Chapman, C.A., van Soest, P.J.P., 2012. Methods in primate nutritional ecology: A user’s guide. *Int. J.*
790 *Primatol.* 33, 542–566.

791 Rothman, J.M., Vogel, E.R., Blumenthal, S., 2013. Diet and nutrition. In: Sterling, E., Bynum, N., Blair, M. (Eds.), *Primate*
792 *Ecology and Conservation: A Handbook of Techniques*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 195–212.

793 Sabbatini, G., Stamatii, M., Tavares, M., Visalberghi, E., 2008. Behavioral flexibility of a group of bearded capuchin
794 monkeys (*Cebus libidinosus*) in the National Park of Brasília (Brazil): Consequences of cohabitation with visitors.
795 *Braz. J. Biol.* 68, 685–693.

796 Sailer, L., Gaulin, S.J., Boster, J., Kurland, J., 1985. Measuring the relationship between dietary quality and body size in
797 primates. *Primates* 26, 14–27.

798 Scott, J.E., 2011. Folivory, frugivory, and postcanine size in the cercopithecoidea revisited. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 146,
799 20–27.

800 Schuelke, O., Chalise, M.K., Koenig, A., 2006. The importance of ingestion rates for estimating food quality and energy
801 intake. *Am. J. Primatol.* 68, 951–965.

802 Silva, S.S.B., Ferrari, S.F., 2009. Behavior patterns of southern bearded sakis (*Chiropotes satanas*) in the fragmented
803 landscape of eastern Brazilian Amazonia. *Am. J. Primatol.* 71, 1–7.

804 Silverman, N., Richmond, B.G., Wood, B.A., 2001. Testing the taxonomic integrity of *Paranthropus boisei* sensu stricto.
805 *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 115, 167–178.

806 Smith, R.J., Jungers, W.L., 1997. Body mass in comparative primatology. *J. Hum. Evol.* 32, 523–559.

807 Suarez, S.A., 2013. Diet of Phayre’s leaf-monkey in the Phu Khieo Wildlife Sanctuary, Thailand. *Asian Primates J.* 3, 2–12.

808 Sussman, R.W., Kinzey, W.G., 1984. The ecological role of the Callitrichidae: A review. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 64, 419–
809 449.

810 Talebi, M.G., 2005. Factors Affecting Food Choice of the Endangered Southern Muriquis (*Brachyteles arachnoides*,
811 *Primates*, E. Geoffroy, 1806) in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest. Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Cambridge.

812 Talebi, M.G., Lee, P.C., 2010. Activity patterns of *Brachyteles arachnoides* in the largest remaining fragment of Brazilian
813 Atlantic forest. *Int. J. Primatol.* 31, 571–583.

814 Talebi, M.G., Bastos, A., Lee, P.C., 2005. Diet of southern muriquis in continuous Brazilian Atlantic forest. *Int. J. Primatol.*
815 26, 1175–1187.

816 Tan, C.L., 2000. Behavior and ecology of three sympatric bamboo lemur species (genus *Hapalemur*) in Ranomafana
817 National Park, Madagascar. Ph.D. Dissertation, Stony Brook: State University of New York.

818 Tan, C.L., Ganzhorn, J., Arrigo-Nelson, S., Eppley, T., Donati, G., Ballhorn, D., submitted. High protein or carbohydrate
819 content in food as a possible offset for cost of cyanide detoxification in bamboo-eating gentle lemurs. *Int. J. Primatol.*

820 Tanton, M., 1962. The effect of leaf “toughness” on the feeding of larvae of the mustard beetle *Phaedon cochleariae* Fab.
821 *Entomol. Exp. Appl.* 5, 74–78.

822 Taylor, A.B., 2002. Masticatory form and function in the African apes. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 117, 133–156.

823 Taylor, A.B., 2006. Diet and mandibular morphology in African apes. *Int. J. Primatol.* 27, 181–201.

824 Taylor, A.B., Vogel, E.R., Dominy, N.J., 2008. Food material properties and mandibular load resistance abilities in large-
825 bodied hominoids. *J. Hum. Evol.* 55, 604–16.

826 Teaford, M.F., Lucas, P.W., Ungar, P.S., Glander, K.E., 2006. Mechanical defenses in leaves eaten by Costa Rican howling
827 monkeys (*Alouatta palliata*). *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 129, 99–104.

828 Team, R.C., 2014. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,
829 Vienna.

830 Teichroeb, J.A., Saj, T.L., Paterson, J.D., Sicotte, P., 2003. Effect of group size on activity budgets of *Colobus vellerosus* in
831 Ghana. *Int. J. Primatol.* 24, 743–758.

832 Terborgh, J., 1983. Five New World Primates: A Study in Comparative Ecology. Princeton University Press, Princeton.

833 Thompson, C.L., Donley, E.M., Stimpson, C.D., Horne, W.I., Vinyard, C.J., 2011. The influence of experimental
834 manipulations on chewing speed during in vivo laboratory research in tufted capuchins (*Cebus apella*). *Am. J. Phys.*
835 *Anthropol.* 145, 402–14.

836 Tombak, K.J., Reid, A.J., Chapman, C.A., Rothman, J.M., Johnson, C.A., Reyna-Hurtado, R., 2012. Patch depletion behavior
837 differs between sympatric folivorous primates. *Primates.* 53, 57–64.

838 Ungar, P.S., 1995. Fruit preferences of four sympatric primate species at Ketambe, northern Sumatra, Indonesia. *Int. J.*
839 *Primatol.* 16, 221–245.

840 Van Soest, P., 1994. Nutritional Ecology of the Ruminant. Cornell University Press, Ithaca.

841 Vié, J.C., Richard-Hansen, C., Fournier-Chambrillon, C., 2001. Abundance, use of space, and activity patterns of white-
842 faced sakis (*Pithecia pithecia*) in French Guiana. *Am. J. Primatol.* 55, 203–21.

843 Vincent, J., 1992. Biomechanics–Materials: A Practical Approach, Oxford University Press, Oxford. Oxford University
844 Press, Oxford.

845 Vinyard, C.J., Wall, C.E., Williams, S.H., Johnson, K.R., Hylander, W.L., 2006. Masseter electromyography during
846 chewing in ring-tailed lemurs (*Lemur catta*). *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 130, 85–95.

847 Vinyard, C.J., Yamashita, N., Tan, C., 2008. Linking laboratory and field approaches in studying the evolutionary
848 physiology of biting in bamboo lemurs. *Int. J. Primatol.* 29, 1421–1439.

849 Vinyard, C.J., Glander, K.E., Teaford, M.F., Thompson, C.L., Deffenbaugh, M., Williams, S.H., 2012. Methods for
850 studying the ecological physiology of feeding in free-ranging howlers (*Alouatta palliata*) at La Pacifica, Costa Rica.
851 *Int. J. Primatol.* 33, 611–631.

852 Vogel, E.R., Woerden, J.T. Van, Lucas, P.W., Utami, S.S., Schaik, C.P. Van, Dominy, N.J., van Woerden, J.T., Utami
853 Atmoko, S.S., van Schaik, C.P., 2008. Funct. Ecol and evolution of hominoid molar enamel thickness: *Pan*
854 *troglodytes schweinfurthii* and *Pongo pygmaeus wurmbii*. *J. Hum. Evol.* 55, 60–74.

855 Vogel, E.R., Haag, L., Mitra-Setia, T., van Schaik, C.P., Dominy, N.J., 2009. Foraging and ranging behavior during a
856 fallback episode: *Hylobates albibarbis* and *Pongo pygmaeus wurmbii* compared. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 140, 716–
857 726.

858 Vogel, E.R., Zulfa, A., Hardus, M.E., Wich, S.A., Dominy, N.J., Taylor, A.B., 2014. Food mechanical properties, feeding
859 ecology, and the mandibular morphology of wild orangutans. *J. Hum. Evol.* 75, 110–124.

860 Wallace, R.B., 2001. Diurnal activity budgets of black spider monkeys, *Ateles chamek*, in a southern Amazonian tropical
861 forest. *Neotrop. Primates* 9, 101–107.

862 Watts, D.P., 1984. Composition and variability of mountain gorilla diets in the central Virungas. *Am. J. Primatol.* 7, 323–

863 356.

864 Watts, D.P., 1988. Environmental influences on mountain gorilla time budgets. *Am. J. Primatol.* 15, 195–211.

865 Whiten, A., Byrne, R., Henzi, S., 1987. The behavioral ecology of mountain baboons. *Int. J. Primatol.* 8, 367–388.

866 Wich, S.A., Fredriksson, G., Sterck, E.H.M., 2002. Measuring fruit patch size for three sympatric Indonesian primate
867 species. *Primates* 43, 19–27.

868 Wilcoxon, F., 1945. Individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biometrics Bull.* 1, 80–83.

869 Williams, L., 1954. The feeding habits and food preferences of Acrididae and the factors which determine them. *Trans. R.*
870 *Entomol. Soc. Lond.* 105, 423–454.

871 Williams, S.H., Wright, B.W., Truong, V., Daubert, C.R., Vinyard, C.J., 2005. Mechanical properties of foods used in
872 experimental studies of primate masticatory function. *Am. J. Primatol.* 67, 329–346.

873 Williams, S.H., Vinyard, C.J., Glander, K.E., Deffenbaugh, M., Teaford, M.F., Thompson, C.L., 2008. Telemetry system
874 for assessing jaw-muscle function in free-ranging primates. *Int. J. Primatol.* 29, 1441–1453.

875 Wright, B.W., 2005. Craniodental biomechanics and dietary toughness in the genus *Cebus*. *J. Hum. Evol.* 48, 473–92.

876 Wright, B.W., Willis, M.S., 2012. Relationships between the diet and dentition of Asian leaf monkeys. *Am. J. Phys.*
877 *Anthropol.* 148, 262–75.

878 Wright, B.W., Ulibarri, L., O'Brien, J., Sadler, B., Prodhan, R., Covert, H.H., Nadler, T., 2008. It's tough out there:
879 Variation in the toughness of ingested leaves and feeding behavior among four Colobinae in Vietnam. *Int. J. Primatol.*
880 29, 1455–1466.

881 Wright, B.W., Vinyard, C.J., Yamashita, N., Vogel, E.R., 2013. Applying Extreme Value Analysis in assessing the material
882 properties of the most challenging foods consumed by primates. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 150, 296.

883 Wroe, S., Mchenry, C., Thomason, J., 2005. Bite club: Comparative bite force in big biting mammals and the prediction of
884 predatory behaviour in fossil taxa. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. [Biol.]* 272, 619–625.

885 Yamashita, N., 1996. Seasonally and site specificity of mechanical dietary patterns in two Malagasy lemur families
886 (Lemuridae and Indriidae). *Int. J. Primatol.* 17, 355–387.

887 Yamashita, N., 1998. Functional dental correlates of food properties in five Malagasy lemur species. *Am. J. Phys.*
888 *Anthropol.* 106, 169–188.

889 Yamashita, N., 2008. Food physical properties and their relationship to morphology: The curious case of kily. In: Vinyard,
890 C., Ravosa, M.J., Wall, C. (Eds.), *Primate Craniofacial Function and Biology*. Springer US, Boston, pp. 387–406.

891 Yamashita, N., Vinyard, C.J., Tan, C.L., 2009. Food mechanical properties in three sympatric species of *Hapalemur* in
892 Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 139, 368–381.

893 Yamashita, N., Cuzzo, F.P., Sauter, M.L., 2012. Interpreting food processing through dietary mechanical properties: a
894 *Lemur catta* case study. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 148, 205–214.

895

Table 1. Species included in the study sample, with body mass, feeding time, dietary quality, and dietary categories.*

Species	Source of FMPs ¹	Body mass average (kg)	Feeding time (%)	Dietary quality ²	Diet % animal	Diet % reproductive	Diet % structural	Diet % exudates	Diet category (specific) ³	Diet category (simple) ³
<i>Alouatta clamitans</i>	Carlos Botelho State Park, Brazil (MT and ES)	4.84 ^a	18 ^l	130.3 ^{jj}	0	30.3	69.69	0	FO	FO
<i>Alouatta paliatta</i>	Ometepe, Nicaragua (MRS)	6.25 ^b	11.47^m	145.34^m	0	45.34	54.66	0	FO	FO
<i>Alouatta seniculus</i>	Iwokrama, Guyana (BW)	5.95 ^b	12.7 ⁿ	165.85	0	65.86	34.15	0	FL	FR
<i>Ateles paniscus</i>	Iwokrama, Guyana (BW)	8.78 ^b	18.9 ^o	194.92	0	94.92	5.08	0	FR	FR
<i>Brachyteles arachnoide s</i>	Carlos Botelho State Park, Brazil (MT and ES)	9.25^c	22.2^p	177.62^{kk}	0	77.62	22.38	0	FL	FR
<i>Callithrix jacchus</i>	Pernambuco, Brazil (CV)	0.35 ^d	35 ^q	317.45 ^{ll}	18.9	21.7	0	59.4	G	G
<i>Cebus apella</i>	Iwokrama, Guyana (BW)	3.09 ^b	16 ^r	180.23	0	80.23	19.77	0	FL	FR
<i>Cebus libidinosus</i>	Fazenda Boa Vista, Brazil	2.44 ^e	17 ^s	249.42^{mmm}	36.05	59.3	4.65	0	FI	I

(JC)

<i>Cebus olivaceus</i>	Iwokrama, Guyana (BW)	2.91 ^b	34.2 ^t	196.43	0	96.42	3.57	0	FR	FR
<i>Cercopithecus ascanius</i>	Kibale, Uganda (ND)	3.31 ^b	25	171.91ⁿⁿ	8.25	49.48	42.27	0.52	FL	FO
<i>Chiropotes satanas</i>	Iwokrama, Guyana (BW)	2.88 ^b	22.3 ^{u-w}	200	0	100	0	0	FG	FR
<i>Colobus guereza</i>	Kibale, Uganda (ND)	11.35 ^b	31	109ⁿⁿ	0	9	91	0	FO	FO
<i>Colobus vellerosus</i>	Boabeng- Fiema, Ghana (AE)	9.1 ^f	23.7^x	123.71^x	0	23.71	76.29	0	FO	FO
<i>Gorilla beringei</i>	Karisoke, Rwanda (HG)	130 ^b	55.4^y	101.18^{oo}	0	1.18	98.82	0	FO	FO
<i>Hapalemur aureus</i>	Ranomafana, Madagascar (NY)	1.46^g	34.4^z	104.21^{pp}	0	4.21	95.79	0	FO	FO
<i>Hapalemur griseus</i>	Ranomafana, Madagascar (NY)	0.93^g	37.42^z	105.15^{pp}	0	5.15	94.85	0	FO	FO
<i>Hylobates albibarbis</i>	Sabangau, Indonesia (SC)	5.85 ^b	29^{aa}	176.5^{aa}	1	74	25	0	FL	FR
<i>Lemur catta</i>	Beza Mahafaly, Madagascar	2.1^h	25.77	151.73	0	51.73	48.27	0	FL	FO

	(NY)									
<i>Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii</i>	Kibale, Uganda (ND)	38.2 ^b	27.7	196.43ⁿⁿ	0	85.71	14.29	3.06	FR	FR
<i>Papio ursinus</i>	Giant's Castle and Royal Natal, South Africa (PC)	22.3 ^b	56.6^{bb}	110.01^{qq}	0	10	89.9	0	FO	FO
<i>Piliocolobus badius</i>	Kibale, Uganda (ND)	8.29 ^b	39.9	114.9ⁿⁿ	0	13.13	86.87	0.51	FO	FO
<i>Piliocolobus rufomitratiss</i>	Tana River, Kenya (PS)	8.44 ^b	27.97 ^{cc,dd}	140.45 ^{cc}	0	40.45	59.55	0	FO	FO
<i>Pithecia pithecia</i>	Iwokrama, Guyana (BW)	1.76 ^b	19 ^{ee}	200	0	100	0	0	FG	FR
<i>Pongo abelii</i>	Ketambe, Indonesia (EV)	56.75 ^b	53.9^{ff}	194.03^{ff}	8.89	71.79	19.31	0	FL	FR
<i>Pongo pygmaeus morio</i>	Kutai, Indonesia (LL)	57.15 ^b	45.9^{gg}	158^{gg}	0.8	56	43.2	0	FL	FO
<i>Pongo pygmaeus wurmbii</i>	Tuanan, Indonesia (EV)	57.15 ^b	56 ^{ff}	191.16^{ff}	6.36	74.25	18.38	0	FL	FR

<i>Prolemur simus</i>	Ranomafana, Madagascar (NY)	2.57^g	41.2^z	100^{pp}	0	0	100	0	FO	FO
<i>Propithecus verreauxi</i>	Beza Mahafaly, Madagascar (NY)	2.8ⁱ	46.83	128.32	0	28.32	71.68	0	FO	FO
<i>Pygathrix nigripes</i>	Ni Chua, Vietnam (BW)	8.46^j	27.1 ^{hh}	144.57^{rr}	0	44.57	54.43	0	FO	FO
<i>Rhinopithecus avunculus</i>	Tonkin Snub- Nosed Monkey Species/Conser- vation Area, Vietnam (BW)	11.25 ^k	14.78 ⁱⁱ	162.87^{ss}	0	62.87	37.13	0	FL	FR
<i>Trachypithecus phayrei</i>	Phu Khieo, Thailand (KO)	7.09 ^b	27.9	158.1^{tt}	3.65	48.99	47.37	0	FL	FO

* Any data without a citation were provided by one of the authors. Data in bold font were taken from the same site where FMP data were collected.

¹Site name with initials of contributing author.

²Dietary quality was calculated from coefficients; see discussion in text. Numbers in columns to the right are the percentage of the diet consisting of animal matter, reproductive parts, structural parts, and exudates, with the source given for dietary composition. The dietary composition data were adjusted to equal 100% (see discussion in text); DQ indices were calculated based on adjusted figures.

³See discussion in text. FO = folivore, FR = frugivore, G = gummivore, I = insectivore, FL = frugivore-folivore, FI = frugivore-insectivore, FG = frugivore-gummivore.

^aChagas et al., 2010

^bSmith and Jungers, 1997

^cTalebi, 2005

^dAraujo et al., 2000
^eFord and Davis, 1992
^fOates et al., 1994
^gVinyard et al., 2008
^hGould et al., 2003
ⁱRichard et al., 2006
^jWright and Willis, 2012
^kRatajszczak et al., 1992
^lChiarello, 1993
^mRaguet-Schofield, 2010
ⁿGaulin and Gaulin, 1982
^oWallace, 2001
^pTalebi and Lee, 2010
^qDigby et al., 2006
^rTerborgh, 1983
^sSabbatini et al., 2008
^tcited in Rímoli et al., 2008
^uBoyle and Smith, 2010
^vSilva and Ferrari, 2009
^wPort-Carvalho and Ferrari, 2004
^xTeichroeb et al., 2003
^yWatts, 1988
^zTan, 2000
^{aa}Cheyne, 2010
^{bb}Dunbar, 1992
^{cc}Decker, 1994
^{dd}Marsh, 1981
^{ee}Vié et al., 2001

^{ff}Morrogh-Bernard, 2007

^{gg}Rodman, 1977

^{hh}Rawson, 2009

ⁱⁱHai, 2007

^{jj}Agostini, 2010

^{kk}Talebi et al., 2005

^{ll}Correa et al., 2000

^{mm}Izar et al., 2012

ⁿⁿDominy and Lucas, 2004

^{oo}Watts, 1984

^{pp}Tan et al., submitted

^{qq}Whiten et al., 1987

^{rr}Duc et al., 2009

^{ss}Le et al., 2007

^{tt}Suarez, 2013

Table 2. The relationship between FMPs and dietary categories using Kruskal-Wallis rank sum tests, where dietary categories are the independent variables and FMPs are the dependent variables.^a

Dependent variable	Independent variable	χ^2	df	<i>p</i>
WeightedR	Specific diet category	6.75	5	0.239
WeightedR	Simple diet category	3.86	3	0.277
MedianR	Specific diet category	4.5	5	0.479
MedianR	Simple diet category	3.49	3	0.321
MaximumR	Specific diet category	0.86	5	0.973
MaximumR	Simple diet category	1.25	3	0.742
WeightedE	Specific diet category	3.66	5	0.596
WeightedE	Simple diet category	2.82	3	0.421
MedianE	Specific diet category	4.53	5	0.476
MedianE	Simple diet category	3.69	3	0.297
MaximumE	Specific diet category	3.62	5	0.605
MaximumE	Simple diet category	2.48	3	0.479

^a The general diet classification included four categories (folivore, frugivore, insectivore, and gummivore); the specific classification included seven (folivore, frugivore, insectivore, gummivore, frugivore-folivore, frugivore-gummivore, and frugivore-insectivore).

Table 3. The relationship between FMPs and categories of food items using a Wilcoxon rank sum test for post hoc analysis of a Kruskal-Wallis rank sum test, where food items are the independent variables and FMPs are the dependent variables.^a

A. Toughness.

	Bark	Flower	Fruit	Leaf	Seed	Stem
Bamboo	0.223	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.005
Bark		<0.0001	<0.0001	<0.0001	0.002	0.486
Flower			0.031	0.005	0.095	<0.001
Fruit				1 ^b	1	0.049
Leaf					1	0.068
Seed						1

B. Young's modulus.

	Fruit	Seed
Bamboo	<0.0001	<0.0001
Fruit		<0.01

C. Toughness by maturity level.

	Unripe fruit	Ripe fruit	Mature leaf
--	--------------	------------	-------------

Young leaf	0.086	1	0.061
Unripe fruit		0.023	1
Ripe fruit			0.003

^a Significant results are highlighted in bold. Results of Kruskal-Wallis tests were significant for both toughness ($\chi^2 = 122.48$, $p < 0.001$) and Young's modulus ($\chi^2 = 66.59$, $p < 0.001$), and for toughness by maturity level ($\chi^2 = 17.8$, $p < 0.001$).

^b Exact p -value cannot be computed for ties.

Table 4. The relationship between dietary quality and FMPs using PGLS, where dietary quality is the independent variable.^a

Dependent variable	<i>F</i>	df	Slope	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	<i>p</i>
WeightedR	1.12	29	-0.002	0.004	0.298
MedianR	0.07	29	-0.001	-0.032	0.788
MaximumR	0.13	29	-0.001	-0.029	0.721
WeightedE	2.85	19	-0.007	0.084	0.108
MedianE	2.27	19	-0.007	0.059	0.149
MaximumE	4.57	19	-0.009	0.152	0.046

^a $\lambda = 0$ for all results. After Bonferroni-Holm corrections, no results are significant.

Table 5. The relationship between body mass and measures of food mechanical properties using PGLS analyses, with body mass as the independent variable.^a

Dependent variable	<i>F</i>	df	Slope	Adjusted <i>R</i> ²	<i>p</i>
WeightedR	1.76	1, 29	-0.13	0.025	0.195
MedianR	4.73	1, 29	-0.209	0.11	0.038
MaximumR	<0.01	1, 29	-0.002	-0.034	0.989
WeightedE	22.94	1, 19	-0.572	0.523	0.0001
MedianE	28.12	1, 19	-0.645	0.576	<0.0001
MaximumE	10.75	1, 19	-0.48	0.327	0.004

^a Significant results after performing a Bonferroni-Holm correction for multiple comparisons are indicated in bold. $\lambda = 0$ for all results.

Table 6. PGLS results for models where feeding time is the dependent variable and body mass and different food material properties are the independent variables.^a

A. Feeding time vs body mass and *WeightedR*, no interaction ($F(2,28) = 5.57$, $\lambda = 0.242$, $R^2 = 0.23$, $p = \mathbf{0.009}$)

Independent variable	<i>t</i>	Slope	<i>p</i>
Body mass	2.66	0.09	0.013
WeightedR	2.62	0.162	0.014

B. Feeding time vs body mass and *MedianR* ($F(3,27) = 3.51$, $\lambda = 0.085$, $R^2 = 0.2$, $p = \mathbf{0.029}$)

Independent variable	<i>t</i>	Slope	<i>p</i>
Body mass	2.19	0.827	0.037
MedianR	2.13	0.986	0.043
Body mass * MedianR	-1.96	-0.109	0.061

C. Feeding time vs body mass and *MaximumR*, no interaction ($F(2,28) = 4.96$, $\lambda = 0$, $R^2 = 0.21$, $p = \mathbf{0.014}$)

Independent variable	<i>t</i>	Slope	<i>p</i>
Body mass	2.43	0.086	0.022
MaximumR	2.01	0.125	0.055

D. Feeding time vs body mass and *WeightedE* ($F(3,17) = 2.09$, $\lambda = 0.12$, $R^2 = 0.14$, $p = 0.139$)

Independent variable	<i>t</i>	Slope	<i>p</i>
Body mass	2.27	0.212	0.036
WeightedE	1.94	0.954	0.071
Body mass * WeightedE	-1.9	-0.115	0.074

E. Feeding time vs body mass and *MedianE* ($F(3,17) = 2.24$, $\lambda = 0.09$, $R^2 = 0.16$, $p = 0.12$)

Independent variable	<i>t</i>	Slope	<i>p</i>
Body mass	2.29	0.195	0.035
MedianE	1.96	0.843	0.065
Body mass * MedianE	-1.93	-0.1	0.07

F. Feeding time vs body mass and *MaximumE*, no interaction ($F(2,18) = 1.61$, $\lambda = 0.64$, $R^2 = 0.06$, $p = 0.228$)

Independent variable	<i>t</i>	Slope	<i>p</i>
Body mass	1.74	0.095	0.099
MaximumE	0.71	0.048	0.488

^a Models including interactions were run first; if the interaction term did not trend toward significance ($0.05 < p < 0.1$), the result without the interaction is presented.

Figure 1

<div>structural (R: N = 563, E: N = 54)<div><div>leaf (R: N = 441, E: N = 0) (R: 57-10357.18)<div><div>mature (R: N = 183, E: N = 0) (R: 57-4301.00)</div><div>young (R: N = 102, E: N = 0) (R: 60.7-4505.23)</div></div><div>shoot (R: N = 6, E: N = 1) (R: 243.36-1376.43, E: 4.76)</div><div>grass (R: N = 1, E: N = 1) (R: 3907.46, E: 3132.55)</div><div>root/tuber/bulb part (R: N = 8, E: N = 6) (R: 61.83-3327.3, E: 0.76-545.13)</div><div>stem/stalk (R: N = 24, E: 4) (R: 126.6-6695.65, E: 2.25-134.91)</div><div>pith (R: N = 7, E: 1) (R: 384-5817.51, E: 0.51)</div><div>bamboo (non-leaf) (R: N = 22, E: N = 21) (R: 346.5-10584.45, E: 52.92-10098.94)<div><div>sheath</div><div>shoot</div><div>culm pith</div><div>stalk/rachis</div></div></div><div>bark (R: N = 53, E: N = 3) (R: 152.9-15097.58, E: 1.35-1961.69)</div><div>cambium (R: N = 1, E: N = 1) (R: 2786.5, E: 282.9)</div></div></div></div>
<div>reproductive (R: N = 456, E: 234)<div><div>fruit<div><div>pericarp and whole fruit (R: N = 383, E: N = 182) (R: 15-5418.2, E: 0.006-1195)<div><div>ripe (R: N = 117, E: N = 68) (R: 24.65-3690.70, E: 0.006-1195)</div><div>unripe (R: N = 59, E: N = 55) (R: 26.60-3016.17, E: 0.106-13.08)</div></div></div><div>seed (R: N = 20, E: N = 47) (R: 64-2803, E: 0.52-169.07)</div><div>flower (R: N = 53, E: N = 5) (R: 3.1-7298, E: 0.21-1475.74)</div></div></div></div></div>
<div>animal (N = 0)</div>
<div>exudate (N = 0)</div>

Figure 2

Figure 3

A

B

Figure 4

A

B

C

Figure 5

Figure 6

Figure captions

Figure 1. Categorization of food items used for this study. Food items were grouped by type according to the second nested level (e.g., leaf, shoot). Sample sizes and min/max ranges for toughness (R) and Young's modulus (E) are provided in parentheses. Each sample corresponds to a specific test of a food item. In some cases, this represents an average of all food items of a particular type for a given species (e.g., the average of all tests for mature leaves eaten by *A. clamitans*) because of how data were reported. In other cases, the sample is a single measurement for a particular plant species. Items in bold are those that were analyzed for variations in FMPs (Table 4).

Figure 2. Phylogenetic tree used for PGLS. The consensus tree was taken from the 10kTrees website (Arnold et al., 2010) and pruned to fit our sample.

Figure 3. Plots by specific dietary category showing distributions of median FMPs. A is toughness and B is Young's modulus. FG = frugivore-gummivore, FI = frugivore-insectivore, FL = frugivore-folivore, FO = folivore, FR = frugivore, and G = gummivore. Species designations are listed in Table 1. No significant results were found.

Figure 4. Plots by food item showing distributions of FMPs. A is toughness and B is Young's modulus. C is toughness by ripeness/maturity. FMP values are not logged, so as to demonstrate clustering of FMPs. The carrot icon in 4C provides context.

Figure 5. Plots of FMPs (log) against body mass (log). A-C represent toughness (A: *WeightedR*, B: *MedianR*, C: *MaximumR*) and D-F represent Young's modulus (D: *WeightedE*, E: *MedianE*, F: *MaximumE*). A-C are not significant, but D-F are significant ($p < 0.01$). Data points are separated by taxon (open red triangles = hominoids, shaded teal triangles = cercopithecoids, purple squares = platyrrhines, blue circles = strepsirrhines). The carrot and almond icons are provided for context.

Figure 6. Plot of feeding time (logit) versus body mass (log). The OLS regression line is shown ($p = 0.03$, $R^2 = 0.12$) as PGLS analysis resulted in $\lambda = 0$. Data points are separated by taxon (open red triangles = hominoids, shaded teal triangles = cercopithecoids, purple squares = platyrrhines, blue circles = strepsirrhines).

Figure 7. Plot of feeding time versus *WeightedR* (A) and *MedianR* (B) intended to visualize the effect of body size on the relationship between feeding time and dietary toughness. The different trend lines for A and B are caused by the presence of an interaction between body mass and *MedianR* and the absence of an interaction between body mass and *WeightedR* (as seen in Table 6). The area of each data point is scaled to body mass (unlogged). (Red = hominoids, green =

cercopithecoids, purple = platyrrhines, blue = strepsirrhines.) The dashed trendlines correspond to the trend expected based on the PGLS model shown in Table 6 for a primate the size of the largest species (*Gorilla beringei*) in the sample (in black) and for a primate the size of the smallest species (*Callithrix jacchus*) in the sample (in gray). The solid trendlines are based on an OLS model (i.e., the model shown in Table 6 with λ set to 0). For A, the trendline shows an increase in feeding time as weighted mean toughness increases. For B, the trendlines describe the nature of the interaction between body mass and median toughness as correlates of feeding time. At smaller body sizes, feeding time increases as toughness increases, but at larger body sizes, the reverse is true.