

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

# Functional morphology, stable isotopes, and human evolution: a model of consilience

Justin D. Yeakel<sup>1</sup>, Nathaniel J. Dominy<sup>2</sup>, Paul L. Koch<sup>3</sup>, & Marc Mangel<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Ecology and Evolutionary Biology,

University of California Santa Cruz,

1156 High St., Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

[jdyeakel@gmail.com](mailto:jdyeakel@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Department of Anthropology,

Dartmouth College, Hanover, NH 03755, USA

<sup>3</sup>Department of Earth and Planetary Sciences

University of California Santa Cruz,

1156 High St., Santa Cruz, CA 95064, USA

<sup>4</sup>Center for Stock Assessment and Research &

Department of Applied Mathematics and Statistics,

University of California Santa Cruz, Santa Cruz, CA 95064,

USA and Department of Biology, University of Bergen, Bergen 5020, Norway

Received \_\_\_\_\_; accepted \_\_\_\_\_

18 Foraging is constrained by the energy within resources and the mechanics of  
acquisition and assimilation. Thick molar enamel, a character trait differentiating  
20 hominins from African apes, is predicted to mitigate the mechanical costs of chewing  
obdurate foods. The classic expression of hyperthick enamel together with relatively  
22 massive molars, termed megadontia, is most evident in *Paranthropus*, a lineage of  
hominins that lived ca. 2.7 to 1.2 million years ago. Among contemporary primates,  
24 thicker molar enamel corresponds with the consumption of stiffer, deformation-  
resistant foods, possibly because thicker enamel can better resist cracking under  
26 high compressive loads. Accordingly, plant underground storage organs (USOs) are  
thought to be a central food resource for hominins such as *Paranthropus* due to their  
28 abundance, isotopic composition, and mechanical properties. Here, we present a  
process-based model to investigate foraging constraints as a function of energetic  
30 demands and enamel wear among human ancestors. Our framework allows us to  
determine the fitness benefits of megadontia, and to explore under what conditions  
32 stiff foods such as USOs are predicted to be chosen as fallback, rather than preferred,  
resources. Our model predictions bring consilience to the noted disparity between  
34 functional interpretations of megadontia and microwear evidence, particularly with  
respect to *Paranthropus boisei*.

36 **KEY WORDS:** Hominin evolution, Enamel thickness, *Paranthropus*, Foraging models, Underground  
Storage Organs, Fallback foods

## *Introduction*

38

All animals must acquire and deliver food to their digestive systems. The mechanics  
40 of this process can result in the gradual wear, or senescence, of anatomical structures  
such as claws, beaks, and teeth. Such wear is detrimental to the foraging efficiency and  
42 reproductive success of a wide range of animals (Swennen et al. 1983; Raupp 1985; Juanes  
1992; Juanes and Smith 1995; King et al. 2005; Roitberg et al. 2005). For mammals, the  
44 oral processing, or chewing, of food is a necessary wear-inducing behavior (Stirling 1969;  
McArthur and Sanson 1988; Skogland 1988; Perez-Barberia and Gordon 1998), and natural  
46 selection is predicted to favor dental attributes that prolong chewing efficiency. Accordingly,  
considerable attention has been focused on the microstructure, morphology, and functional  
48 ecology of mammalian molars, particularly the enamel.

Enamel is a hard, mineralized tissue covering the elastic and vascularized dentin, and  
50 rooted by cementum to the jaws of most mammals (Lucas 2004). Oral comminution of  
food prior to digestion is, today, a uniquely mammalian behavior (Lucas 2004), although  
52 gizzards and pharyngeal teeth serve this function in birds and some teleosts, respectively,  
and some ornithischian dinosaurs did comminute food orally (Weishampel et al. 2004).  
54 Some mammals have ever-growing teeth, but primates replace their molar teeth only once,  
after which they face an adult life of wear and occasional catastrophic damage (Constantino  
56 et al. 2010). Thus, adult primates must find a balance between the opposing advantages of  
enamel preservation and the consumption of foods with different propensities for enamel  
58 wear. In this vein, the identification of contemporary form-function relationships between  
tooth enamel and diet have been instructive for inferring foraging behavior in the fossil  
60 record, and dental enamel has long informed debate in the discipline of paleoanthropology  
(Ungar and Sponheimer 2011).

62 For example, among living mammals, relatively thick molar enamel is widely associated

with the consumption of stiff, deformation-resistant (hard) foods, and it follows that  
64 hominins such as the genus *Paranthropus*, which possessed large ‘megadont’ molars with  
hyperthick enamel (McHenry 1988), also consumed such foods (Kay 1981, 1985; Wood and  
66 Constantino 2007; Lucas et al. 2008a,b; Vogel et al. 2008; McGraw and Daegling 2012;  
McGraw et al. 2012; Wood and Schroer 2012; Constantino 2013). However, the identity  
68 of these stiff food objects has long puzzled researchers and fueled hypotheses on the cost  
of dietary specialization (Balter et al. 2012). More recently, isotopic data from a range of  
70 hominin taxa, including *Paranthropus*, that reveal a heavy dependence on C<sub>4</sub>-photosynthetic  
plants (which have tissues enriched in <sup>13</sup>C and include tropical grasses and sedges) or  
72 possibly animals that consumed these plants (Sponheimer and Lee-Thorp 1999; Ungar and  
Sponheimer 2011). Depending on the tissue, C<sub>4</sub> plants can be highly resistant to fracture  
74 or deformation, with mechanical attributes that are expected to induce wear or chip the  
enamel of molar teeth. Indeed, the molars of *Paranthropus boisei* are often heavily worn  
76 and deeply chipped (Constantino et al. 2010); and yet, paradoxically, the occlusal surfaces  
of nine well-preserved molars evince a microwear fabric that indicates a diet of soft, pliable  
78 foods (Ungar et al. 2008, 2010, 2012). These discrepant lines of evidence - indicating a diet  
of C<sub>4</sub> foods that are simultaneously hard and soft - have been challenging to reconcile, and  
80 it is sometimes referred to as the “C<sub>4</sub> conundrum”.

For *Paranthropus*, the consumption of <sup>13</sup>C-enriched tissues might have included  
82 graminivorous insects and/or the leaves, seeds, and underground storage organs (USOs) of  
grasses and sedges (Sponheimer and Lee-Thorp 2003; Sponheimer et al. 2005; Yeakel et al.  
84 2007; Cerling et al. 2011; Lee-Thorp 2011). Recently, the USOs - bulbs, corms, and rhizomes  
- of grasses and sedges have attracted special attention (Dominy 2012; Lee-Thorp et al.  
86 2012) because they are widespread in many savanna habitats and a central food resource  
for some populations of baboons and humans (Post 1982; Barton et al. 1993; Youngblood  
88 2004; Alberts et al. 2005). Corms in particular are stiff and deformation-resistant (Dominy

et al. 2008) and a significant cause of tooth wear among savanna baboons (Galbany et al.  
90 2011). However, the mechanical and nutritional properties of these potential foods, as well  
as the anatomical constraints of hominin dentition, are seldom factored into interpretations  
92 of hominin foraging behavior, and the diet of *Paranthropus* remains obscured by disquieting  
discrepancies (Grine et al. 2012). Here we attempt to bring consilience to these discrepancies  
94 using a modeling framework.

The physiological and behavioral processes that yield inconsistent interpretations of  
96 diet can be explored with foraging models that depend on the anatomical and energetic  
states of potential foragers. Here we present a Stochastic Dynamic Programming (SDP)  
98 model (Mangel and Clark 1988; Mangel and Ludwig 1992; Houston and McNamara 1999;  
Clark and Mangel 2000) to quantify the optimal foraging decisions for organisms that must  
100 balance energetic gain with enamel wear, while accounting for the stochastic effects of a  
variable environment. We base our model on measurements for anthropoid primates and  
102 focus specifically on decisions affecting hominins in savanna-woodland environments. We  
determine decision matrices in which specific food resources are chosen to maximize an  
104 animal’s fitness conditional on two internal states: its energetic reserves and molar enamel  
volume.

106 This model-based approach is well-suited to test a variety of important questions about  
the effects of dental enamel on foraging, and we focus on three potentially informative  
108 lines of inquiry. First, and most essential, how does the quantity of enamel influence the  
foraging strategies of savanna-woodland anthropoid primates, and how does megadont  
110 dentition alter these strategies? Second, to what degree do these foraging decisions depend  
on resource quality and quantity, where the quality and quantity of particular food items  
112 can vary depending on the environmental conditions? Third, can extraday mechanical  
advantages, such as peeling, pounding, or cooking alter the influence of dental enamel, and

114 to what extent do these alterations provide fitness benefits? Finally, we relate our model  
predictions to paleontological evidence of hominin diets, and conclude by showing that the  
116 model framework presented here can be used to both predict and inform paleodietary data.

## *Models and Analysis*

118 Models based on Stochastic Dynamic Programming are recognized as one of the  
best ways of predicting the evolutionary end-points for natural selection. In this section,  
120 we outline the structure of the SDP model from which we determine fitness-maximizing  
foraging behaviors of hominin species. First, we define energetic state and enamel volume  
122 as the state variables of the model, and describe the processes that govern how these state  
variables change over time. We also introduce three factors that influence an organism's  
124 state: 1) the probability of finding different amounts of food (including not finding it), 2)  
the probability of losing a given amount of enamel as a function of chewing different foods,  
126 and 3) the quality of the environment at a given time. Second, we introduce the fitness  
function, which depends upon the state of the organism and time. Starting at a fixed final  
128 time, we show one can iterate the fitness function backwards in time, thus determining both  
fitness at earlier times and foraging decisions (the decision matrix) as a function of state.  
130 As the current time moves further and further from the final time, the decision matrix  
becomes independent of time (stationary), only depending upon physiological state. Third,  
132 we combine the stationary decision matrices with a Monte Carlo simulation going forward  
in time (forward-iteration) to examine the consequences of different foraging behaviors as a  
134 function of an organism's anatomical attributes and/or its ability to externally modify its  
food.

## STATE DYNAMICS

136

We model the foraging decisions of an organism as a function of two principle state variables: 1) its net energy reserves at time  $t$ ,  $X(t) = x$ , and 2) its enamel volume at time  $t$ ,  $V(t) = v$ , where time is measured in days. We model a single unit of energy as 10 Megajoules [MJ], equivalent to 2388 kcal and roughly equal to the energy in 1 kg of animal tissue (Wolfram Research 2012). Accordingly, the maximum potential energy reserves for an organism,  $x_{\max}$ , is its body size, such that  $x_{\max} = 70$  for a 70 kg organism. A unit of molar enamel volume  $v$  corresponds to  $100 \text{ mm}^3$ . Specific properties of molar anatomy correlate with body size (Shellis et al. 1998), and we use these relationships to approximate maximal (i.e. unworn) molar enamel volume,  $v_{\max}$  as a function of  $x_{\max}$ , for both non-megadonts and megadonts (see Appendix S1, Figure S1). Both the potential energy gained from food and its impact on an organism’s enamel change as a function of food mechanical properties. We consider an approximating measurement for the mechanical properties of food taking into account both the elasticity (Young’s modulus,  $E_i$ , [MPa]) and the fracture toughness ( $R_i$ , [ $\text{Jm}^{-2}$ ]) of food  $i$ , which approximates ‘hardness’, measured as  $\sqrt{E_i R_i}$  (Lucas et al. 2008b). We let  $\eta_i$  denote the digestibility of food  $i$  ranging between  $\eta_i = 0$  (indigestible) and  $\eta_i = 1$  (completely digestible) (*sensu* Lucas et al. 2000). We assume that an individual dies when its energy reserves fall below  $x_{\text{crit}} = (3/4)x_{\max}$  or its enamel volume falls below  $v_{\text{crit}}$  (see Appendix S1).

We let  $\gamma_i$  (in units of  $x$ ) denote an organism’s energetic gains for food type  $i$  and let  $\eta_i$  denote the digestibility of the food (Table 1). Because larger animals gain relatively more calories per foraging bout, energetic gain is calculated as  $\gamma_i = (\text{energy density}/2388) \cdot (x_{\max}/10)$ , where the constant  $(1/2388)$  normalizes the energy density of foods to units of  $x$ , and the modifier  $(x_{\max}/10)$  ensures that gain scales weakly with body size. We assume that foraging behavior is primarily governed by caloric, or

160

energetic, limitations (Rothman et al. 2011), and model the daily cost of foraging for food  
 162 type  $i$ ,  $c_i$  (in units of  $x$ ), as a function of an organism’s body size, and the aggregation  
 of food on the landscape. We modified the estimates of daily energetic expenditure  
 164 (kcal/day) by Leonard and Robertson (1997) to model daily energetic cost, such that  
 $c_i = C_1 \cdot \text{RMR} \cdot (1/\xi_i)/2388$ , and Resting Metabolic Rate is  $\text{RMR} = 69.1x_{\text{max}}^{0.761}$ , where  
 166  $C_1$  is the activity constant ( $C_1 = 3.80$  for moderate activity), the constant  $(1/2388)$   
 operates as before, and  $\xi_i$  is the mean encounter rate for food  $i$ , such that  $(1/\xi_i)$  is  
 168 proportional to foraging time. Foods that are encountered more frequently (high  $\xi_i$ ) thus  
 have lower per encounter foraging costs. We assessed a costlier version of the model, where  
 170  $c_i = (C_1 \cdot \text{RMR} \cdot (1/\xi_i) + C_2 \cdot \text{RMR})/2388$ , where  $C_2 = 1.2$ , accounting for additional daily  
 costs independent of food choice (Leonard and Robertson 1997).

172 We identify four general food groups: 1) a nutritious, mechanically pliable, patchily  
 distributed food (e.g. fruit), 2) a non-nutritious, mechanically hard, widely distributed  
 174 food (e.g. leaves from  $C_4$ -photosynthetic grasses), 3) a nutritious, mechanically hard,  
 widely distributed food (e.g. USOs), and 4) a highly-nutritious, potentially hard, patchily  
 176 distributed food (e.g. arthropods or more generally small quantities of animal tissue). We  
 set the food energy density to be 717, 150, 785, and 1518 kcal/kg for fruit, grass leaves,  
 178 USOs, and arthropods/animal tissue respectively (Wolfram Research 2012). The mechanical  
 properties of the food groups are measured by toughness [ $\text{Jm}^{-2}$ ]:  $R = (561, 330, 265, 1345)$ ,  
 180 and Young’s modulus [ $\text{MPa}$ ]; these are  $E = (1, 10, 5, 200)$  for fruits, grass leaves, USOs,  
 and arthropods with fracture-resistant exoskeletons, respectively (Lucas 2004; Williams  
 182 et al. 2005; Dominy et al. 2008; Yamashita et al. 2009). We used a conservatively low  
 value for the fracture toughness of grass leaves in our model ( $330 \text{ Jm}^{-2}$ ; Lucas 2004).  
 184 Although the fracture toughness of East African grasses is typically  $> 1000 \text{ Jm}^{-2}$  (N.J.  
 Dominy, unpublished data), we assume that a grazing primate with bunodont molars would  
 186 selectively consume tender grass leaves.



Many primates are known to modify the mechanical properties of foods before they  
188 are consumed (Altmann 2009). We consider four extraordinary processing capabilities: 1)  
none, where the mechanical properties are as described, 2) peeling, pounding, or cooking  
190 USOs, ( $R_{\text{USO}} = 138$  and  $E_{\text{USO}} = 5$ ; Dominy et al. 2008), 3) peeling arthropod exoskeletons  
( $R_{\text{arthropod}} = 306$  and  $E_{\text{arthropod}} = 0.22$ ) (alternatively, this mechanical advantage can  
192 account for swallowing arthropods with minimal chewing), and 4) a combination of  
mechanically altering both USOs and arthropods.

194 The energetic and enamel state of an organism change over time, and these changes  
are due to both deterministic and stochastic processes. The energetic state of an organism  
196 depends primarily on the number of resources found and the amount of energy spent in a  
given foraging period. We let the random variable  $K$  represent the number of food items  
198 found in a single foraging period and that with probability  $f_K(k)_i$  an individual finds  $k$   
items of food type  $i$ . In Appendix S2, we derive the negative binomial model used for food  
200 encounters. We maintain this notation, upper case for random variables and lower case  
for specific values, for all stochastic variables. Because an organism’s daily consumption is  
202 limited by gut volume, daily caloric gain is bounded by  $x_s = (1/5) \cdot x_{\text{max}}$  (proportional to  
average anthropoid % gut volume; Milton 1989). Thus, if  $k$  items of food type  $i$  are found  
204 in period  $t$

$$X(t + 1) = X(t) + \min(k\eta_i\gamma_i, x_s) - c_i. \quad (1)$$

Enamel volume decreases as an animal consumes resources. Although the underlying  
206 mechanisms of enamel loss are poorly understood (Lucas et al. 2008a), siliceous particulate  
matter is probably the most significant cause of abrasion (Lucas et al. 2012). We assume  
208 that hard foods (high  $\sqrt{E_i R_i}$  values) promote increased use of the dentition (cf. Organ  
et al. 2011), and that such use induces wear regardless of the specific cause. We set enamel

210 wear,  $\Delta v(\Omega)$ , to be a function of: 1) the mechanical properties of food  $i$  and 2) a stochastic  
 decrease in enamel volume (determined by  $\Omega$ ). Because enamel is a nonrenewable resource,  
 212 this wear cannot be undone. Teaford and Oyen (1989) showed that the consumption time  
 for vervet monkeys (*Chlorocebus*) that ate a diet of raw Purina monkey chow was 8x greater  
 214 than that for vervets fed on pre-mashed monkey chow. With respect to enamel wear, this  
 is equivalent to chewing 8x as much food. Teaford and Oyen also showed that the enamel  
 216 thickness decreased by ca.  $0.58 \mu\text{m day}^{-1}$  when vervets fed on the raw diet, versus ca.  
 $0.24 \mu\text{m day}^{-1}$  when they fed on the pre-mashed diet. We assumed a linear relationship  
 218 between the loss of enamel thickness (from Teaford and Oyen 1989), and consumption  
 time, or, alternatively, the amount of food consumed,  $k$  (with a slope  $b = 0.0425$ ). The  
 220 lower-bound of this relationship ( $\bar{\omega} = 0.24 \mu\text{m}$ ) represents the expected basal enamel wear  
 that occurs irrespective of consumption, and we used it to parameterize the stochastic  
 222 variable  $\Omega$ . Accordingly, given that  $A$  is the molar enamel surface area and  $E_{MC}$  and  $R_{MC}$   
 are scaling constants denoting the average Young’s modulus (50.44 MPa) and fracture  
 224 toughness ( $1030.55 \text{ Jm}^{-2}$ ) of monkey chow, respectively (Williams et al. 2005), when  $k$   
 items of food type  $i$  are found in period  $t$

$$V(t+1) = V(t) - \frac{A}{250} \underbrace{\left( \frac{bk\sqrt{E_i R_i}}{\sqrt{E_{MC} R_{MC}}} + \Omega \right)}_{\Delta v(\Omega)}. \quad (2)$$

226 The constant  $1/250$  scales tooth wear to ensure the organism attains its expected longevity  
 (Lindstedt and Calder III 1981), and accounts for 1) overestimation of molar enamel area  
 228 (our allometric estimation includes the lateral aspects of molar surfaces), and 2) the notion  
 that wear is a complex action affecting a small fraction of the occlusal surface at a given  
 230 time (Lucas 2004).

The basal loss of enamel thickness has an expected value  $E(\Omega) = \bar{\omega} = 0.24 \mu\text{m}$ . As

232 such, chewing and the daily wear unassociated with chewing have variable effects on enamel  
wear (Lucas 2004) . Specifically, enamel wear is typically small, but occasionally large, and  
234 is realized when the organism chips or loses a tooth or part of a tooth (cf. Boccara 2004).  
To capture this property, we model the probability that  $\Omega$  falls within the small interval  
236  $\omega$  and  $\omega + d\omega$ ,  $f_{\Omega}(\omega)$ , by a lognormal distribution, where  $E(\Omega) = \bar{\omega}$  and  $\text{Var}(\Omega) = \sigma^2$  (see  
table 1).

238 Finally, we introduce changing habitat quality as a stochastic environmental variable  
that affects both the nutritional gains and foraging costs of foods at a given time. Habitat  
240 quality can be rich ( $Q(t) = r$ ) or poor ( $Q(t) = p$ ) at time  $t$ , and changes through time  
according to a transition probability matrix  $\boldsymbol{\rho} = (\rho_{rr}, \rho_{rp}; \rho_{pr}, \rho_{pp})$ , where - for example -  $\rho_{rp}$   
242 is the probability of transitioning from a rich quality habitat at time  $t$  to a poor quality  
habitat at time  $t + 1$ . Changes in habitat quality alter energetic gain, the mean encounter  
244 rate, and the dispersion of different foods. We set energetic gain to decrease by 10% in  
poor quality habitats relative to rich quality habitats. Moreover, the mean encounter rate  
246 ( $\xi_i$ ) as well as the dispersion of food ( $\nu_i$ ) are modified by  $Q(t)$ , such that food resources are  
more easily found (higher  $\xi_i$ ) and are less patchily distributed (higher  $\nu_i$ ) in rich quality  
248 habitats (see Appendix S2 for a detailed derivation of dispersion and encounter rates of  
foods). USOs are stored underground and have evolved to retain high nutrient loads during  
250 periods of environmental stress (Copeland 2004). We incorporate this quality by holding  
the energetic gain, encounter rate, and dispersion of USOs constant, irrespective of habitat  
252 quality.

With this basic framework, we assess the influence of ‘wet’, ‘dry’, and ‘autocorrelated’  
254 environmental conditions on foraging decisions. Wet environments have high values of  
 $\rho_{rr}$ ,  $\rho_{pr}$ , and low values of  $\rho_{rp}$ ,  $\rho_{pp}$  (such that habitat quality is generally rich), whereas dry  
256 environments are the opposite. Autocorrelated environments are unlikely to change from

their current state, and thus have high values of  $\rho_{rr}$ ,  $\rho_{pp}$ , and low values of  $\rho_{rp}$ ,  $\rho_{pr}$  (see table  
 258 1). We recognize that natural systems are more idiosyncratic, however this simplification  
 allows us to assess the effects of changing habitat quality over time with minimal added  
 260 complexity.

### MAXIMIZING FITNESS BY FOOD CHOICE

262 We consider a nonbreeding interval of length  $T$  during which only foraging decisions  
 influence fitness. This interval will ultimately become sufficiently large (see below) so that  
 264 we can use decisions that are independent of time (cf. Mangel and Clark 1988; Clark and  
 Mangel 2000), and assume that at the end of this interval, the fitness of an individual with  
 266 energy reserves  $x$  and enamel volume  $v$  is  $\Phi(x, v)$ . For numerical computations we use

$$\Phi(x, v) = \frac{1}{2} \left( 2 - \frac{x_{\text{crit}}}{x} - \frac{v_{\text{crit}}}{v} \right), \quad \text{where } \begin{cases} x > x_{\text{crit}} \\ v > v_{\text{crit}} \end{cases},$$

$$\Phi(x, v) = 0, \quad \text{otherwise.} \quad (3)$$

The maximum fitness at  $t = T$  is realized by an organism with  $X(T) = x_{\text{max}}$  and  
 268  $V(T) = v_{\text{max}}$ , and the rate of fitness decline increases as  $x$  and  $v$  approach  $x_{\text{crit}}$  and  $v_{\text{crit}}$ . We  
 explored alternatives such as  $\Phi(x, v) = (1 - x_{\text{crit}}x^{-1})(1 - v_{\text{crit}}v^{-1})$  and they had little effect  
 270 on the qualitative predictions. We scaled the terminal fitness function to be 1, so it is easiest  
 to consider it as survival after  $T$  for an individual whose end state is  $X(T) = x, V(T) = v$ .

272 We assume that natural selection has acted on behavioral decisions concerning diet  
 (food choice) conditioned on energetic state, enamel volume, and the probability of

274 transitioning from rich or poor habitat quality. We define fitness functions

$$F_r(x, v, t) = \max_i E \{ \Phi(X(T), V(T)) | X(t) = x, V(t) = v, Q(t) = r \}, \quad (4a)$$

$$F_p(x, v, t) = \max_i E \{ \Phi(X(T), V(T)) | X(t) = x, V(t) = v, Q(t) = p \}, \quad (4b)$$

where the maximization over  $i$  chooses the food that maximizes fitness given energy  
276 reserves, enamel volume, and habitat quality. By definition, at time  $T$

$$F_r(x, v, T) = F_p(x, v, T) = \Phi(x, v).$$

For time periods before the terminal time  $t = T$ , an organism must survive mortality  
278 independent of starvation or enamel loss and choose the fitness maximizing food, given  
the stochasticity in food encounter. If the probability of death in a single period is set  
280 to  $m$  ( $\approx e^{-10}$  or  $4.5 \times 10^{-5}$ , estimated for a subadult male chimpanzee; cf. Bronikowski  
et al. 2011), then  $F_r(x, v, T)$  and  $F_p(x, v, T)$  satisfy the equations of Stochastic Dynamic  
282 Programming (SDP), such that

$$F_r(x, v, t) = \max_i (1 - m) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}} f(k_r)_i \left( \rho_{rr} E_{\Omega} \{ F_r(x_r + \min(k\eta_i\gamma_i, x_s)_r - (c_i)_r, v - \Delta v(\Omega), t + 1) \} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \rho_{rp} E_{\Omega} \{ F_p(x_r + \min(k\eta_i\gamma_i, x_s)_r - (c_i)_r, v - \Delta v(\Omega), t + 1) \} \right) \right), \quad (5a)$$

$$F_p(x, v, t) = \max_i (1 - m) \left( \sum_{k=0}^{k_{\max}} f(k_p)_i \left( \rho_{pr} E_{\Omega} \{ F_r(x_p + \min(k\eta_i\gamma_i, x_s)_p - (c_i)_p, v - \Delta v(\Omega), t + 1) \} \right. \right. \\ \left. \left. + \rho_{pp} E_{\Omega} \{ F_p(x_p + \min(k\eta_i\gamma_i, x_s)_p - (c_i)_p, v - \Delta v(\Omega), t + 1) \} \right) \right), \quad (5b)$$

where the expectation  $E_{\Omega}$  is taken with respect to the random variable  $\Omega$  (equation 2).

284 These equations identify the food  $i$  that maximizes fitness for given energetic reserves

$X(t) = x$ , enamel volume  $V(t) = v$ , and habitat quality  $Q(t)$  at time  $t$ . As equations (5) are  
286 solved backward in time, in addition to obtaining the values of fitness, we create decision  
matrices  $D_r(x, v, t)$  and  $D_p(x, v, t)$  characterizing the optimal choice of food in a rich or  
288 poor environment given that  $X(t) = x$  and  $V(t) = v$ . Thus, the two decision matrices  
(for rich and poor quality) depend upon the habitat quality transition matrix  $\rho$ , but we  
290 suppress that notation for ease of reading.

As  $t$  moves backwards further and further away from  $T$  the fitness maximizing decisions  
292 become independent of time and depend only upon state, which accords with the intuition  
that far from the time at which fitness is assessed, the behavior of an organism is predicted  
294 to depend on its state and on the environment, but not on the current time. Decisions  
that maximize fitness at  $t \ll T$  are thus stationary with respect to time. We used these  
296 stationary decisions, which we denote by  $D_r^*(x, v)$  and  $D_p^*(x, v)$  for further analysis. We  
confirmed stationarity by calculating the summed square differences between decision  
298 matrix solutions from  $t + 1$  to  $t$ , such that  $\Delta D(t) = \sum_{v,x} (D(x, v, t + 1) - D(x, v, t))^2$ , for  
 $t = T - 1$  to  $t \ll T$  and we assumed stationary decisions had been reached when  $\Delta D(t) \rightarrow 0$   
300 for  $t \ll T$  (for an example, see Figure S2).

## FORWARD ITERATION

302 We used a Monte Carlo simulation moving forward in time (forward iteration algorithm  
(Mangel and Clark 1988; Clark and Mangel 2000) to assess the impact that fitness  
304 maximizing foraging decisions (given by  $D_r^*(x, v)$  and  $D_p^*(x, v)$ ) have on the expected future  
fitness of individuals by iteratively solving for the state dynamics of simulated foragers over  
306 time, given the state dynamics in equations (1) and (2). We let  $\tau$  denote forward-iterated  
time units experienced by simulated individuals making foraging decisions in accordance to  
308 the stationary decision matrices, as opposed to the time units  $t$  used to calculate stationary

decision matrices. At each time  $\tau$ , the  $n^{\text{th}}$  simulated individual, with states  $X_n(\tau)$  and  
 310  $V_n(\tau)$  forages for the food  $i$  determined by the decision matrices  $D^*(X_n(\tau), V_n(\tau)|Q(\tau))$ .

To test whether and to what extent mechanical advantages conveyed fitness  
 312 benefits to hominin primates, we quantified expected future fitness,  $\hat{F}(\tau|D^*, Q(\tau))$ , for  
 $n = 1, 2, \dots, N = 100$ , 50 kg individuals, with maximal foraging costs for days  $\tau = 1$  to  
 314  $\tau_{\text{max}} = 10950$  (expected lifespan of 30 years) given both the stationary decision solutions  
 and habitat quality. As energy reserves and/or enamel volume decrease over the lifetime of  
 316 an individual,  $\hat{F}$  is expected to decrease similarly. We quantified the expected future fitness  
 at time  $\tau$  of a population,

$$\hat{F}(\tau|D^*, Q(\tau)) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n=1}^N F^*(X_n(\tau), V_n(\tau)|D^*, Q(\tau)). \quad (6)$$

318 where  $F^*(X_n(\tau), V_n(\tau)|D^*, Q(\tau))$  is the optimal fitness for individual  $n$  at time  $\tau$  given its  
 physiological states and the environment.

320 We explored the potential adaptive benefits of megadontia and extradentary mechanical  
 advantages using two approaches. First, we compared the proportions of foods identified to  
 322 maximize fitness in accordance to the stationary decisions  $D_r^*(x, v)$  and  $D_p^*(x, v)$ . Organisms  
 that are predicted to utilize a particular resource across a greater proportion of states  $(x, v)$   
 324 may have fitness benefits in environments where those resources are plentiful. However,  
 although the percentage of foraging choices in decision matrices is an efficient summary  
 326 of potential dietary behavior, it should not be viewed as the proportional contribution  
 of food to an individual’s diet over time, which is calculated with the forward iteration  
 328 algorithm. To determine whether megadontia provided fitness benefits over the lifetime  
 of an individual organism, we compared expected future fitness,  $\hat{F}$ , for populations of  
 330 individuals with and without megadont dental anatomy (incorporated into the model by  
 altering  $v_{\text{max}}$ ; see Appendix S1), mechanical advantages, and during both wet environments  
 332 (where rich quality habitats are more likely) and dry environments (where poor quality

habitats are more likely).

## *Results*

334

Based on the stationary solutions, we predict that energy reserves and enamel volume  
336 have large consequences for diet choice. In rich quality habitats, foods with the energetic  
and mechanical properties of fruit maximize the fitness of animals without an extraordinary  
338 mechanical advantage across all potential states  $(x, v)$  (Figure 1). In poor quality habitats,  
such food maximizes fitness only if energy reserves are high; as reserves decline, the optimal  
340 resource shifts from fruit to plant USOs. Plant USOs confer similar energetic gain as fruit,  
however we hold the mean encounter rate and dispersion of USOs constant in both rich and  
342 poor quality habitats, whereas fruits are patchier in poor habitats (see Table 1). As enamel  
volume declines with age, the mechanical hardness of USOs, which produce greater enamel  
344 wear, is predicted to promote an increased reliance on riskier but mechanically pliable foods  
such as fruit.

346 Stationary decision matrices reveal that hominins with megadontia can maximize  
fitness by incorporating a relatively greater proportion of obdurate foods in poor quality  
348 habitats. With no mechanical advantage, megadont decision matrices show a reduction in  
the percentage of fruit, and an increase in USOs relative to non-megadonts (Figure 2). As  
350 mechanical advantages are introduced, megadont decision matrices show similar percentages  
of each food item as those of non-megadonts with one important difference: regardless  
352 of the mechanical advantage, megadont decision matrices include a greater percentage of  
USOs.

354 For all simulated populations, forward iterations reveal that expected future fitness  
decreases sharply early in life, but saturates as the population reaches its expected lifespan



356 of 30 years (10950 days) (Figure 3). This is due to wear on enamel and potential decline in  
energy reserves going forward in time, resulting in lower future fitness. Because the decision  
358 matrices for the USO mechanical advantage are nearly identical to the no mechanical  
advantage scenario, we show only forward equation results for the latter. Our results  
360 point to an important difference between the three mechanical advantage scenarios that  
are considered (none, arthropods, arthropods + USOs; Figure 3A,B; solid lines). Both  
362 arthropod and arthropod + USO mechanical advantages appear to have large impacts on  
expected fitness. For both wet and dry environmental conditions, having either mechanical  
364 advantage provides large fitness benefits, but the difference in fitness *between* mechanical  
advantages is small, particularly when habitat quality is generally rich (wet conditions).

366 The fitness advantages of megadontia are more obvious. Populations with this character  
trait have greater expected future fitness than those without megadontia - irrespective of  
368 mechanical advantage - and these differences are more exaggerated later in life (Figure  
3A,B; stippled lines). Moreover, the predicted fitness benefits generated by a mechanical  
370 advantage are generally less for populations with megadontia.

Because foraging costs scale nonlinearly with body size, optimal foraging decisions vary  
372 accordingly. For larger animals and for each environmental scenario in our model (wet, dry,  
and autocorrelated), a poor habitat quality is strongly associated with the consumption of  
374 riskier foods with higher energetic yields such as fruit, whereas more ubiquitous foods such  
as USOs are an important supplement (Figure 4A). Animals with smaller body sizes tend  
376 to rely on USOs exclusively. When habitat quality is rich, both smaller- and larger-bodied  
animals switch to a diet of energy dense foods (fruit). In the absence of an extradentary  
378 mechanical advantage, extremely energy dense, but relatively rare foods such as arthropods  
are avoided by animals of any size, regardless of habitat quality. As body size increases,  
380 the role of plant USOs remains constant, however arthropods (highest nutritional gain and

lowest probability of encounter) become favored over fruit (Figure 4). Thus, in both rich  
382 and poor quality habitats, large-bodied animals increase the percentage of risky foods if  
their mechanical properties can be altered to preserve enamel (Figure S3). Smaller-bodied  
384 animals lack the energetic reserves required to forage on rare, but energy dense foods such  
as arthropods, regardless of their mechanical advantages.

386 Given that the food choices in our SDP model are associated with a distribution of  
 $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values, we can use a forward iteration framework to explore how the accumulated  
388  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of individuals within a population change over time as a function of energetic  
reserves, enamel volume, and the prevailing environmental conditions (see Appendix S3  
390 for details). Our results show that the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of a simulated population of  $N = 100$ ,  
50 kg anthropoid foragers capable of mechanically altering both arthropods and USOs is  
392 influenced by both energetic reserves and enamel volume. In dry environments and where  
foraging costs are minimal, the mean  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  value of simulated foragers remains relatively  
394 high ( $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{avg}} \approx -10.5\text{‰}$ ; Figure 5A), due to a greater reliance on USOs (Figure S3). After  
day 3500,  $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{avg}}$  declines to  $-11.2\text{‰}$  as the proportional contribution of USOs decreases  
396 and that of fruits increases (Figure 5B). This highlights the increasing importance of foods  
that are less obdurate as enamel is worn - despite greater energetic costs - as well as the  
398 accompanying decrease in the mean  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  value of a consumer population over its lifespan.

If foraging costs are too great, low risk, obdurate foods are preferred despite greater  
400 enamel wear, resulting in a higher  $\delta^{13}\text{C}_{\text{avg}} \approx -8.8\text{‰}$  (Figure 5C). In this case, our model  
predicts  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values equivalent with those observed for *A. africanus* and *P. robustus*  
402 (Ungar and Sponheimer 2011). In costlier environments (where energetic cost includes both  
foraging costs as well as daily costs independent of food choice), USOs tend to maximize  
404 fitness until late in life (Figure 5D), when the cost of reduced enamel volume supersedes the  
risks of foraging on pliable but rare foods.

406 Under the conditions imposed by our model, C<sub>4</sub> grass leaves cannot maximize fitness.  
However, we can explore under what conditions grass leaves do maximize fitness by altering  
408 model properties. We find that grass leaves become represented in the decision matrices of  
hominins both with and without megadontia if the abundance of grass is exaggerated (such  
410 that the encounter rate of grass leaves is increased from 4 to 5; Figure 6A,B). Even then,  
the consumption of grass leaves is shown to be a fallback behavior *in extremis*, selected only  
412 when enamel volume is high and energy reserves are extremely low. Moreover, megadontia  
leads to a relatively greater percentage of states where grass leaves maximize fitness (Figure  
414 6B), and this is in accordance with the elevated  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values observed for species in the  
genus *Paranthropus*.

416

## Discussion

Models have been used to explore the foraging behaviors of humans (Belovsky 1988),  
418 nonhuman primates (Boyer et al. 2006; Sayers et al. 2010), and their mutual interactions  
(Levi et al. 2011), but few have been applied to extinct primates (Dunbar 2005; Janssen  
420 et al. 2007; Griffith and Long 2010), and none have accounted for nonrenewable resources  
such as dental enamel. This omission is surprising given the functional and adaptive  
422 significance prescribed to molar enamel thickness. In this vein, a Stochastic Dynamic  
Programming (SDP) model is attractive because it demands the explicit expression of  
424 processes that determine fitness, as well as sources of external and internal stochasticity  
(Mangel and Clark 1988; Clark and Mangel 2000). We have developed an SDP model that  
426 assesses directly the role of enamel volume on food selection and fitness while quantifying  
the extent to which anatomical and behavioral attributes can alter foraging behaviors.

## THICK ENAMEL CONFERS A FITNESS ADVANTAGE

428

The relatively massive molar teeth of *Paranthropus* are invested with hyperthick  
430 enamel (Shellis et al. 1998; Lucas et al. 2008a). This combination of traits, or megadontia,  
is coupled with robust jaws and large chewing muscles, which together enable an immense  
432 bite force (Demes and Creel 1988; Constantino et al. 2010). Functional interpretations  
of these traits have long stressed the consumption of hard or obdurate foods (Kay 1981;  
434 Osborne 1981; Macho 1999), although a recent trend has emphasized tough foods that  
require repetitive loading (grinding) of the jaws and teeth (Ungar and Sponheimer 2011),  
436 particularly with respect to *P. boisei* (Ungar et al. 2008, 2012). In either case, debate has  
focused on a diet of grass seeds (Jolly 1970) or plant underground storage organs (USOs)  
438 as the primary drivers of this robust morphology (Laden and Wrangham 2005; Sponheimer  
et al. 2005; Yeakel et al. 2007; Dominy et al. 2008). The results of our SDP model agree well  
440 with these hypotheses by showing that hyperthick molar enamel reduces the mechanical  
costs of chewing harder foods over greater proportions of internal states  $(x, v)$  (Figure 2).  
442 Megadontia, then, provides an adaptive advantage in poor quality environments where hard  
foods such as grass seeds and USOs are relatively abundant.

444 Hominins were doubtless tool-users, and the ability to alter the physical properties of  
wear-inducing foods is expected to both increase dietary breadth and decrease fitness costs.  
446 In support of this prediction, the inclusion of an extradentary mechanical advantage in our  
model increased the proportion of high-risk foods in the predicted decision matrices (Figure  
448 2). A USO mechanical advantage increased the proportion of USOs in the diet, albeit  
marginally, whereas the consumption of fruit declined. By comparison, the extradentary  
450 mechanical advantage associated with arthropods or both arthropods and USOs had a large  
effect on the decision matrices. Arthropods were fitness-maximizing foods for hominins  
452 both with and without megadontia because they decreased the risk of obtaining rare or

patchily distributed foods, while reducing their reliance on fruit. Extradentary processing  
454 is therefore advantageous; however, it is telling that USOs always maximized fitness across  
a greater proportion of states for hominins with greater enamel volume.

456 Importantly, the predicted fitness advantages of thick enamel are variable due to the  
different rates of enamel wear over a lifetime (Figure 3). In this regard, our process-based  
458 model is relatively simplistic in that life-history stages are excluded; however, these  
simplifications enabled us to test and affirm three predictions regarding hominin foraging  
460 behavior: 1) behaviors that alter the mechanical properties of hard foods result in greater  
fitness; 2) these benefits are primarily realized in dry environments, where habitat quality  
462 is more likely to be poor and hard foods are relatively more abundant; and, 3) because  
megadontia results in relatively slower rates of wear, it confers relatively higher fitness, and  
464 these benefits are primarily realized later in life.

In summary, our SDP model demonstrates that different foraging choices are predicted  
466 to maximize fitness among hominins with varying degrees of megadontia, and that these  
foraging strategies have different expected lifetime fitness values. In the following sections  
468 we discuss how a forward iteration approach can be used to examine the isotopic differences  
observed among hominin species, and whether the mechanical and physiological constraints  
470 imposed by our model are predictive of the isotopic patterns observed in the fossil record.

## COMPARING MODEL PREDICTIONS TO ISOTOPIC DATA

472 Results from simulations of the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values accumulated over a lifetime of a hominin  
population help to resolve occasional discrepancies between craniodental morphology  
474 (indicating hard foods) and molar microwear (indicating soft foods) (Grine et al. 2012).  
Molar enamel is formed early in life (Lucas 2004) when food selection tends towards

476 mechanically hard foods with high  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values (Figure 5A,B). As enamel is worn, softer,  
less abundant foods with lower  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values are shown to maximize fitness. Because  
478 fossilized microwear is formed shortly before death (the ‘last supper effect’), our model  
results suggest that softer, more pliable foods will have a disproportionately large influence  
480 on the microwear of teeth, particularly for older individuals. Moreover, simulated foragers  
incorporated foods in proportions that are not predicted by their relative abundance on the  
482 landscape (Figure 5B,D), highlighting the importance of considering both mechanical and  
energetic constraints in addition to resource abundance.

#### 484 **FALLBACK FOODS ARE BODY SIZE-DEPENDENT**

Multiple lines of evidence suggest that plant USOs were important foods for early  
486 hominins. Plants with geophytic structures are both diverse and abundant in arid habitats  
(Pate and Dixon 1982; Vincent 1985; Procheş et al. 2006), and modern hunter-gatherers  
488 utilize these resources extensively, particularly in marginal environments (Campbell 1986;  
Marlowe 2003; Marlowe and Berbesque 2009). Associations between mole rats - known USO  
490 specialists - and hominins suggest that human ancestors lived in USO-abundant habitats  
(Laden and Wrangham 2005), and stable isotope analysis of both modern and fossil mole  
492 rats confirm that USO specialists have isotopic values similar to those of *A. africanus*  
and *P. robustus* (Yeakel et al. 2007). It is widely assumed that USOs served as fallback  
494 rather than preferred foods due to their lower nutritional content and relative availability  
(Schoeninger et al. 2001). The results of our model are in general agreement with this  
496 assumption, but show that the role of USOs as fallback foods varies - in part - as a function  
of an organism’s energy reserves and enamel volume, as well as body size.

498 In general, the consumption of USOs is predicted if enamel volume is relatively high and  
energy reserves are relatively low (Figure 1). However, our model also predicts a tradeoff

500 with respect to the role of USOs as fallback foods as body size is altered. Smaller-sized  
animals tend to use nutritious foods such as fruit in rich quality habitats and less nutritious  
502 but more ubiquitous foods such as USOs in poor quality habitats (Figure 4A). Thus, as  
energetic reserves become more limiting, as they are for smaller organisms with relatively  
504 higher resting metabolic rates, fruit and USOs alternatively serve as preferred foods when  
habitat quality is rich and poor, respectively. By comparison, larger body size enables risky  
506 foraging even when habitat quality is poor, and such risky foraging becomes commonplace  
if an organism can mechanically alter its food (Figure 4B,C,D). For all scenarios, larger  
508 animals resort to USO consumption when energy reserves are low. Accordingly, USOs  
are relegated to a fallback status, and are consumed if the act of foraging for preferred  
510 foods incurs relatively greater fitness costs on the organism. Although consumption of  
USOs reduces the costs of foraging in poor quality environments, our results also show that  
512 widespread but nutritionally poor and mechanically obdurate foods such as grass leaves are  
actively avoided, even when there are enamel and energetic reserves to spare.

514

### **GRASS LEAVES DO NOT MAXIMIZE FITNESS**

Despite the ubiquity of  $C_4$  grass leaves in hominin habitats, this potential food resource  
516 is an unlikely solution to the SDP, consistent with the aversion to  $C_4$  plants that is evident  
among savanna-dwelling chimpanzees (Sponheimer et al. 2006), modern lemurs (Crowley  
518 and Samonds 2013), and some hominin species including *Ardipithecus ramidus* (White et al.  
2009) and *Australopithecus sediba* (Henry et al. 2012). Because we used a conservatively  
520 low value for the fracture toughness of  $C_4$  grass leaves (see methods), the absence of this  
food from hominin decision matrices is a telling argument against the concept of a grazing  
522 hominin. The underlying reasons for this aversion are unknown, but  $C_4$  grass leaves are  
often more fracture-resistant (Boutton et al. 1978) and less nutritious (Barbehenn et al.

524 2004) than C<sub>3</sub> leaves, possibly due to the presence of bundle sheath cells. These factors  
have been cited to explain the avoidance of C<sub>4</sub> plants by herbaceous insects in grassland  
526 communities (Caswell et al. 1973; Boutton et al. 1978; Pinder III and Kroh 1987).

Yet, megadont hominins such as *P. boisei* have  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values  $\approx 0\text{‰}$ , which corresponds  
528 to a diet of 75-80% C<sub>4</sub> foods (Ungar and Sponheimer 2011). Such a heavy dependence on  
C<sub>4</sub> foods has led to speculation that *P. boisei* was potentially a grazing hominin (Lee-Thorp  
530 2011; Rabenold and Pearson 2011). Our model results indicate that grass leaves do have  
the potential to maximize fitness in extreme circumstances, though the benefits of this food  
532 source decline quickly as enamel is worn. This suggests that C<sub>4</sub> grass leaves are unlikely to  
confer fitness advantages even for hominins with megadontia.

## 534 CONCLUSION

Foraging behaviors are a consequence of both the mechanical and energetic costs of  
536 food and the constraints imposed by an organism's dentition. Dental enamel thickness  
is a highly conserved trait among individuals within modern human populations (Lucas  
538 et al. 2008b), yet it varies considerably across hominin lineages in the fossil record. This  
variability is an evolutionary consequence of interactions between the dentition and food,  
540 and process-based models that integrate these ingredients can inform both the possible  
roles of certain foods as well as the potential fitness benefits of different dental morphologies  
542 or extradentary mechanical advantages. Along this line, a similar SDP approach could be  
used to investigate the roles of different types of USOs - foods that include corms, tubers,  
544 bulbs, and rhizomes. Because these plant parts are distributed differently across C<sub>3</sub> and C<sub>4</sub>  
plant species, preference or avoidance of such potential foods - as a function of energetic  
546 and mechanical gains and costs - may help explain the surprisingly high  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values of  
hominins such as *P. boisei*. Regardless, we believe that the integration of data obtained



548 from the fossil record with mechanistic models that set physical constraints on potential  
behaviors will expand our understanding of these enigmatic organisms.

550 **Acknowledgements:** We thank CE Chow, AM Kilpatrick, TS Kraft, T Levi,  
PW Lucas, AD Melin, GL Moritz, M Novak, AO Shelton, and ER Vogel for insightful  
552 comments and helpful discussions. This work was partially supported by a National Science  
Foundation (NSF) Grant 2009-0417 to MM, and a NSF-GRF to JDY. The authors declare  
554 no conflicts of interest.

## REFERENCES

- 556 Alberts, S. C., J. A. Hollister-Smith, R. S. Mututua, S. N. Sayialel, P. M. Muruthi, J. K.  
Warutere, and J. Altmann, 2005. Seasonality and long-term change in a savanna  
558 environment. *in* D. K. Brockman and C. P. van Schaik, eds. *Seasonality in primates: Studies of living and extinct human and non-human primates*. Cambridge University  
560 Press, Cambridge.
- Altmann, S. A., 2009. Fallback foods, eclectic omnivores, and the packaging problem. *Am.*  
562 *J. Phys. Anthropol.* 140:615–629.
- Balter, V., J. Braga, P. Télouk, and J. F. Thackeray, 2012. Evidence for dietary change but  
564 not landscape use in South African early hominins. *Nature* 489:558–560.
- Barbehenn, R., Z. Chen, D. Karowe, and A. Spickard, 2004. C<sub>3</sub> grasses have higher  
566 nutritional quality than C<sub>4</sub> grasses under ambient and elevated atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.  
*Global Change Biol.* 10:1565–1575.
- 568 Barton, R. A., A. Whiten, R. W. Byrne, and M. English, 1993. Chemical composition of  
baboon plant foods: implications for the interpretation of intra- and interspecific  
570 differences in diet. *Folia Primatol.* 61:1–20.
- Belovsky, G., 1988. An optimal foraging-based model of hunter-gatherer population  
572 dynamics. *J. Anthropol. Archaeol.* 7:329–372.
- Boccaro, N., 2004. *Modeling complex systems*. Springer, New York.
- 574 Boutton, T., G. Cameron, and B. Smith, 1978. Insect herbivory on C<sub>3</sub> and C<sub>4</sub> grasses.  
*Oecologia* 36:21–32.
- 576 Boyer, D., G. Ramos-Fernandez, O. Miramontes, J. L. Mateos, G. Cocho, H. Larralde,

- 578 H. Ramos, and F. Rojas, 2006. Scale-free foraging by primates emerges from their  
interaction with a complex environment. *Proc. Roy. Soc. B* 273:1743–1750.
- Bronikowski, A. M., J. Altmann, D. K. Brockman, M. Cords, L. M. Fedigan, A. Pusey,  
580 T. Stoinski, W. F. Morris, K. B. Strier, and S. C. Alberts, 2011. Aging in the natural  
world: comparative data reveal similar mortality patterns across primates. *Science*  
582 331:1325–1328.
- Campbell, A., 1986. The use of wild food plants, and drought in Botswana. *J. Arid Environ.*  
584 11:81–91.
- Caswell, H., F. Reed, S. N. Stephenson, and P. Werner, 1973. Photosynthetic pathways and  
586 selective herbivory: a hypothesis. *Am. Nat.* 107:465–480.
- Cerling, T. E., E. Mbua, F. M. Kirera, F. K. Manthi, F. E. Grine, M. G. Leakey,  
588 M. Sponheimer, and K. T. Uno, 2011. Diet of *Paranthropus boisei* in the early  
Pleistocene of East Africa. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 108:9337–9341.
- 590 Clark, C. W. and M. Mangel, 2000. *Dynamic state variable models in ecology: methods  
and applications.* Oxford University Press, USA.
- 592 Constantino, P. J., 2013. The “Robust” Australopiths. *Nature Educ. Knowl.* 4:1.
- Constantino, P. J., J. J. W. Lee, H. Chai, B. Zipfel, C. Ziscovici, B. R. Lawn, and P. W.  
594 Lucas, 2010. Tooth chipping can reveal the diet and bite forces of fossil hominins.  
*Biol. Letters* 6:826–829.
- 596 Copeland, S., 2004. *Paleoanthropological implications of vegetation and wild plant resources  
in modern savanna landscapes, with applications to Plio-Pleistocene Olduvai Gorge,  
598 Tanzania.* Ph.D. thesis, Rutgers University.

- 600 Crowley, B. E. and K. E. Samonds, 2013. Stable carbon isotope values confirm a recent  
increase in grasslands in northwestern Madagascar. *Holocene* 23:1066–1073.
- 602 Demes, B. and N. Creel, 1988. Bite force, diet, and cranial morphology of fossil hominids.  
*J. Hum. Evol.* 17:657–670.
- 604 Dominy, N. J., 2012. Hominins living on the sedge. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*  
109:20171–20172.
- 606 Dominy, N. J., E. R. Vogel, J. D. Yeakel, P. J. Constantino, and P. W. Lucas, 2008.  
Mechanical properties of plant underground storage organs and implications for  
dietary models of early hominins. *Evol. Biol.* 35:159–175.
- 608 Dunbar, R. I. M., 2005. Socioecology of the extinct theropiths: a modelling approach. *in*  
*Theropithecus: the rise and fall of a primate genus*. Cambridge University Press,  
610 Cambridge.
- 612 Galbany, J., J. Altmann, A. Pérez-Pérez, and S. C. Alberts, 2011. Age and individual  
foraging behavior predict tooth wear in Amboseli baboons. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.*  
144:51–59.
- 614 Griffith, C. and B. Long, 2010. HOMINIDS: An agent-based spatial simulation model to  
evaluate behavioral patterns of early Pleistocene hominids. *Ecol. Model.* 221:738–760.
- 616 Grine, F. E., M. Sponheimer, P. S. Ungar, J. Lee-Thorp, and M. F. Teaford, 2012. Dental  
microwear and stable isotopes inform the paleoecology of extinct hominins. *Am. J.*  
618 *Phys. Anthropol.* 148:285–317.
- 620 Henry, A. G., P. S. Ungar, B. H. Passey, M. Sponheimer, L. Rossouw, M. Bamford,  
P. Sandberg, D. J. de Ruiter, and L. Berger, 2012. The diet of *Australopithecus*  
*sediba*. *Nature* 487:90–93.

- 622 Houston, A. and J. M. McNamara, 1999. Models of adaptive behaviour. Cambridge  
University Press, Cambridge.
- 624 Janssen, M., J. Sept, and C. Griffith, 2007. Hominids foraging in a complex landscape:  
Could *Homo ergaster* and *Australopithecus boisei* meet their calories requirements?  
626 Takahashi, S., Sallach, D., & and Rouchier, J.(Eds.), Advancing Social Simulation.  
Springer Publishing Pp. 307–318.
- 628 Jolly, C. J., 1970. The seed-eaters: a new model of hominid differentiation based on a  
baboon analogy. *Man* 5:1–26.
- 630 Juanes, F., 1992. Why do decapod crustaceans prefer small-sized molluscan prey? *Mar.*  
*Ecol.-Prog. Ser.* 87:239–239.
- 632 Juanes, F. and L. Smith, 1995. The ecological consequences of limb damage and loss in  
decapod crustaceans: a review and prospectus. *J. Exp. Mar. Biol. Ecol.* 193:197–223.
- 634 Kay, R. F., 1981. The nut-crackers: A new theory of the adaptations of the Ramapithecinae.  
*Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 55:141–151.
- 636 ———, 1985. Dental evidence for the diet of *Australopithecus*. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.*  
14:315–341.
- 638 King, S. J., S. J. Arrigo-Nelson, S. T. Pochron, G. M. Semprebon, L. R. Godfrey, P. C.  
Wright, and J. Jernvall, 2005. Dental senescence in a long-lived primate links infant  
640 survival to rainfall. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 102:16579–16583.
- Laden, G. and R. Wrangham, 2005. The rise of the hominids as an adaptive shift in fallback  
642 foods: plant underground storage organs (USOs) and australopith origins. *J. Hum.*  
*Evol.* 49:482–498.

- 644 Lee-Thorp, J., 2011. The demise of "Nutcracker Man". *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*  
108:9319–9320.
- 646 Lee-Thorp, J., A. Likius, H. T. Mackaye, P. Vignaud, M. Sponheimer, and M. Brunet, 2012.  
Isotopic evidence for an early shift to C<sub>4</sub> resources by Pliocene hominins in Chad.  
648 *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 109:20369–20372.
- Leonard, W. and M. Robertson, 1997. Comparative primate energetics and hominid  
650 evolution. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 102:265–281.
- Levi, T., F. Lu, D. Yu, and M. Mangel, 2011. The behaviour and diet breadth of  
652 central-place foragers: an application to human hunters and Neotropical game  
management. *Evol. Ecol. Res.* 13:171–185.
- 654 Lindstedt, S. L. and W. A. Calder III, 1981. Body size, physiological time, and longevity of  
homeothermic animals. *Q. Rev. Biol.* 56:1–16.
- 656 Lucas, P. W., 2004. *Dental functional morphology: How teeth work*. Cambridge University  
Press, Cambridge.
- 658 Lucas, P. W., P. J. Constantino, and B. A. Wood, 2008a. Inferences regarding the diet  
of extinct hominins: structural and functional trends in dental and mandibular  
660 morphology within the hominin clade. *J. Anat.* 212:486–500.
- Lucas, P. W., P. J. Constantino, B. A. Wood, and B. R. Lawn, 2008b. Dental enamel as a  
662 dietary indicator in mammals. *Bioessays* 30:374–385.
- Lucas, P. W., R. Omar, K. Al-Fadhalah, A. S. Almusallam, A. G. Henry, S. Michael,  
664 L. A. Thai, J. Watzke, D. S. Strait, and A. G. Atkins, 2012. Mechanisms and  
causes of wear in tooth enamel: implications for hominin diets. *J. R. Soc. Interface*  
666 10:20120923.

- Lucas, P. W., I. M. Turner, N. J. Dominy, and N. Yamashita, 2000. Mechanical defences to  
668 herbivory. *Ann Bot-London* 86:913–920.
- Macho, G. A., 1999. Effects of loading on the biochemical behavior of molars of *Homo*,  
670 *Pan*, and *Pongo*. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 109:211–227.
- Mangel, M. and C. W. Clark, 1988. *Dynamic modeling in behavioral ecology*. Princeton  
672 University Press, Princeton.
- Mangel, M. and D. Ludwig, 1992. Definition and evaluation of the fitness of behavioral and  
674 developmental programs. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* 23:507–536.
- Marlowe, F. W., 2003. A critical period for provisioning by Hadza men implications for pair  
676 bonding. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* 24:217–229.
- Marlowe, F. W. and J. C. Berbesque, 2009. Tubers as fallback foods and their impact on  
678 Hadza hunter-gatherers. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 140:751–758.
- McArthur, C. and G. D. Sanson, 1988. Tooth wear in eastern grey kangaroos (*Macropus*  
680 *giganteus*) and western grey kangaroos (*Macropus fuliginosus*), and its potential  
influence on diet selection, digestion and population parameters. *J. Zool.* 215:491–504.
- 682 McGraw, W. S. and D. J. Daegling, 2012. *Primate Feeding and Foraging: Integrating*  
*Studies of Behavior and Morphology*. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 41:203–219.
- 684 McGraw, W. S., J. D. Pampush, and D. J. Daegling, 2012. Brief communication:  
Enamel thickness and durophagy in mangabeys revisited. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.*  
686 147:326–333.
- McHenry, H. M., 1988. New estimates of body weights in early hominids and their  
688 significance to encephalization and megadontia in “robust” australopithecines. *in*

- Evolutionary History of the "Robust" Australopithecines. Transaction Publishers,  
690 New Brunswick.
- Milton, K., 1989. Primate diets and gut morphology: implications for hominid evolution.  
692 *in* Food and evolution: toward a theory of human food habits. Temple University  
Press, Philadelphia.
- 694 Organ, C., C. L. Nunn, Z. Machanda, and R. W. Wrangham, 2011. Phylogenetic rate  
shifts in feeding time during the evolution of *Homo*. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA  
696 108:14555–14559.
- Osborne, J. W., 1981. Ageing. Pp. 352–356, *in* A. H. R. Rowe and R. B. Johns, eds. Dental  
698 Anatomy and Embryology Vol. 2: A comparison to dental studies. Blackwell, Oxford.
- Pate, J. S. and K. W. Dixon, 1982. Tuberous, cormous and bulbous plants: biology of  
700 an adaptive strategy in Western Australia. University of Western Australia Press,  
Nedlands, Australia.
- 702 Perez-Barberia, F. J. and I. J. Gordon, 1998. The influence of molar occlusal surface area  
on the voluntary intake, digestion, chewing behaviour and diet selection of red deer  
704 (*Cervus elaphus*). J. Zool. 245:307–316.
- Pinder III, J. E. and G. C. Kroh, 1987. Insect herbivory and photosynthetic pathways in  
706 old-field ecosystems. Ecology 68:254–259.
- Post, D. G., 1982. Feeding behavior of yellow baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*) the Amboseli  
708 National Park, Kenya. Int. J. Primatol. 3:403–430.
- Procheş, Ş., R. M. Cowling, P. Goldblatt, J. C. Manning, and D. A. Snijman, 2006. An  
710 overview of the Cape geophytes. Biol. J. Linn. Soc. 87:27–43.



- Rabenold, D. and O. M. Pearson, 2011. Abrasive, silica phytoliths and the evolution of  
712 thick molar enamel in primates, with implications for the diet of *Paranthropus boisei*.  
PLoS ONE 6:e28379.
- 714 Raupp, M. J., 1985. Effects of leaf toughness on mandibular wear of the leaf beetle,  
*Plagioderia versicolora*. Ecol. Entomol. 10:73–79.
- 716 Roitberg, B. D., D. R. Gillespie, D. M. J. Quiring, C. R. Alma, W. H. Jenner, J. Perry, J. H.  
Peterson, M. Salomon, and S. VanLaerhoven, 2005. The cost of being an omnivore:  
718 mandible wear from plant feeding in a true bug. Naturwissenschaften 92:431–434.
- Rothman, J. M., D. Raubenheimer, and C. A. Chapman, 2011. Nutritional geometry:  
720 gorillas prioritize non-protein energy while consuming surplus protein. Biol. Letters  
7:847–849.
- 722 Sayers, K., M. A. Norconk, and N. L. Conklin-Brittain, 2010. Optimal foraging on the  
roof of the world: Himalayan langurs and the classical prey model. Am. J. Phys.  
724 Anthropol. 141:337–357.
- Schoeninger, M. J., H. T. Bunn, S. S. Murray, and J. A. Marlett, 2001. Composition of  
726 tubers used by Hadza foragers of Tanzania. J. Food Compos. Anal. 14:15–25.
- Shellis, R. P., A. D. Beynon, D. J. Reid, and K. M. Hiiemae, 1998. Variations in molar  
728 enamel thickness among primates. J. Hum. Evol. 35:507–522.
- Skogland, T., 1988. Tooth wear by food limitation and its life history consequences in wild  
730 reindeer. Oikos 51:238–242.
- Sponheimer, M. and J. Lee-Thorp, 1999. Isotopic evidence for the diet of an early hominid,  
732 *Australopithecus africanus*. Science 283:368.

- , 2003. Differential resource utilization by extant great apes and australopithecines:  
734 towards solving the C<sub>4</sub> conundrum. *Comp. Biochem. Phys. A* 136:27–34.
- Sponheimer, M., J. Lee-Thorp, D. de Ruiter, D. Codron, J. Codron, A. Baugh, and  
736 F. Thackeray, 2005. Hominins, sedges, and termites: new carbon isotope data from  
the Sterkfontein valley and Kruger National Park. *J. Hum. Evol.* 48:301–312.
- 738 Sponheimer, M., J. E. Loudon, D. Codron, M. E. Howells, J. D. Pruett, J. Codron, D. J.  
de Ruiter, and J. A. Lee-Thorp, 2006. Do “savanna” chimpanzees consume C<sub>4</sub>  
740 resources? *J. Hum. Evol.* 51:128–133.
- Stirling, I., 1969. Tooth wear as a mortality factor in the Weddell seal, *Leptonychotes*  
742 *weddelli*. *J. Mammal.* 50:559–565.
- Swennen, C., L. De Bruijn, P. Duiven, M. Leopold, and E. Marteiijn, 1983. Differences  
744 in bill form of the oystercatcher *Haematopus ostralegus*; a dynamic adaptation to  
specific foraging techniques. *Neth. J. Sea Res.* 17:57–83.
- 746 Teaford, M. F. and O. J. Oyen, 1989. Differences in the rate of molar wear between monkeys  
raised on different diets. *J. Dent. Res.* 68:1513–1518.
- 748 Ungar, P. S., F. E. Grine, and M. F. Teaford, 2008. Dental microwear and diet of the  
Plio-Pleistocene hominin *Paranthropus boisei*. *PLoS ONE* 3:e2044.
- 750 Ungar, P. S., K. L. Krueger, R. J. Blumenschine, J. Njau, and R. S. Scott, 2012. Dental  
microwear texture analysis of hominins recovered by the Olduvai Landscape  
752 Paleoanthropology Project, 1995-2007. *J. Hum. Evol.* 63:429–437.
- Ungar, P. S., R. S. Scott, F. E. Grine, and M. F. Teaford, 2010. Molar microwear textures  
754 and the diets of *Australopithecus anamensis* and *Australopithecus afarensis*. *Philos.*  
*T. Roy. Soc. B* 365:3345–3354.

- 756 Ungar, P. S. and M. Sponheimer, 2011. The diets of early hominins. *Science* 334:190–193.
- Vincent, A. S., 1985. Plant foods in savanna environments: a preliminary report of tubers  
758 eaten by the Hadza of Northern Tanzania. *World Archaeol.* 17:131–148.
- Vogel, E. R., J. T. van Woerden, P. W. Lucas, S. S. Utami Atmoko, C. P. van Schaik, and  
760 N. J. Dominy, 2008. Functional ecology and evolution of hominoid molar enamel  
thickness: *Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii* and *Pongo pygmaeus wurmbii*. *J. Hum.*  
762 *Evol.* 55:60–74.
- Weishampel, D. B., P. Dodson, and H. Osmólska, 2004. *The Dinosauria*. University of  
764 California Press, Berkeley.
- White, T. D., B. Asfaw, Y. Beyene, Y. Haile-Selassie, C. O. Lovejoy, G. Suwa, and  
766 G. Woldegabriel, 2009. *Ardipithecus ramidus* and the paleobiology of early hominids.  
*Science* 326:64–64, 75–86.
- 768 Williams, S. H., B. W. Wright, V. d. Truong, C. R. Daubert, and C. J. Vinyard, 2005.  
Mechanical properties of foods used in experimental studies of primate masticatory  
770 function. *Am. J. Primatol.* 67:329–346.
- Wolfram Research, 2012. *Wolfram—KnowledgeBase*. Wolfram Research, Inc, Champaign,  
772 Illinois.
- Wood, B. A. and P. J. Constantino, 2007. *Paranthropus boisei*: Fifty years of evidence and  
774 analysis. *Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.* 134:106–132.
- Wood, B. A. and K. Schroer, 2012. Reconstructing the diet of an extinct hominin taxon:  
776 the role of extant primate models. *Int. J. Primatol.* 33:716–742.
- Yamashita, N., C. J. Vinyard, and C. L. Tan, 2009. Food mechanical properties in three

778 sympatric species of *Hapalemur* in Ranomafana National Park, Madagascar. Am. J.  
Phys. Anthropol. 139:368–381.

780 Yeakel, J. D., N. C. Bennett, P. L. Koch, and N. J. Dominy, 2007. The isotopic ecology of  
African mole rats informs hypotheses on the evolution of human diet. Proc. Roy.  
782 Soc. B 274:1723–1730.

Youngblood, D., 2004. Identifications and quantification of edible plant foods in the Upper  
784 (Nama) Karoo, South Africa. Econ. Bot. 58:S43–S65.

Figures




Fig. 1.— Stationary solutions to the fitness-maximizing equations  $F_r(x, v)$  (rich quality habitat) and  $F_p(x, v)$  (poor quality habitat) for a 50 kg anthropoid primate with no mechanical advantages. There are no qualitative differences between wet, dry, or autocorrelated conditions. Gray elements to the left and bottom of the plots denote values of  $(x, v)$  resulting in mortality.




Fig. 2.— Ternary diagram showing the proportional contribution of fruit, USOs, and arthropods to the decision matrices of both 50 kg non-megadont and megadont primates under each mechanical advantage scenario. Results are shown for autocorrelated environmental conditions; results for wet and dry conditions were qualitatively similar.




Fig. 3.— Expected future fitness trajectories for  $N = 100$ , 50 kg non-megadont (solid) and megadont (stippled) hominins over an estimated lifespan with varying mechanical advantages (none, arthropods, arthropods + USOs), during both wet and dry environmental conditions.




Fig. 4.— The proportional contribution of foods to the decision matrices of anthropoid primates with body sizes ranging from 10 to 70 kg. Contributions of foods for the no mechanical advantage scenario (A.), the USO advantage scenario (B.), the arthropod advantage scenario (C.), and the arthropod + USO advantage scenario (D.). Grass leaves are not found to be optimal foraging solutions in any decision matrix. Results are shown for autocorrelated environmental conditions; results for wet and dry conditions were qualitatively similar.






Fig. 5.— Forward simulation of the  $\delta^{13}\text{C}$  values (black line denotes running mean; gray band denotes maximum and minimum values), mean enamel volume, and the proportional contribution of food-items to the diets of  $N = 100$ , 50 kg individuals foraging in a dry environment over an estimated lifespan. *A.* and *B.* When foraging costs are minimal, a dietary switch is observed to occur near day 3500, and labels I and II denote the pre- and post-diet switch. *C.* and *D.* The same simulation when foraging costs are elevated. In panels *B.* and *D.*, the red circles and triangles denote the mean encounter rate for each food in rich quality and poor quality habitats, respectively.




Fig. 6.— Stationary solutions for the fitness-maximizing equations,  $F_r(x, v)$  and  $F_p(x, v)$ , as a function of energy reserves  $x$  and enamel volume  $v$  for both non-megadont and megadont hominins when grass leaves are hyper-abundant and for the arthropod + USO mechanical advantage scenario. Gray elements to the left and bottom of the plots denote values of  $(x, v)$  resulting in mortality.

Parameter	Interpretation	Units	Value(s): Rich quality	Poor quality
$X(t) = x$	Energy reserves at time $t$	10 [MJ]	State Variable	
$V(t) = v$	Enamel volume at time $t$	100 [mm <sup>3</sup> ]	State Variable	
$K = k$	Number of food items found	Count	Stochastic Variable	
$\Omega = \omega$	Basal enamel wear	[mm]	Stochastic Variable	
$\gamma$	Energetic Gain	10 [MJ]	(1.5, 0.3, 1.6, 3.2)	(1.4, 0.3, 1.4, 2.9)
$c$	Energetic Cost (minimal)	10 [MJ]	(0.7, 0.5, 0.7, 2.2)	(1.1, 0.5, 0.7, 2.2)
	Energetic Cost (maximal)	10 [MJ]	(1.4, 1.2, 1.4, 2.8)	(1.8, 1.2, 1.4, 2.8)
$\xi$	Mean encounter rate	time <sup>-1</sup>	(3, 4, 3, 1)	(2, 4, 3, 1)
$\nu$	Dispersion	NA	(3, 5, 3, 2)	(2, 4, 3, 1)
$\eta$	Digestibility	NA	(0.9, 0.7, 0.8, 0.9)	Same
$A$	Molar surface area	[mm <sup>2</sup> ]	$\sum_{m=1}^3 \pi L_m^2$	Same
$b$	Slope of enamel wear	[mm/k]	0.0425	Same
$E$	Young's modulus	[MPa]	(1, 10, 5, 200)	Same
$R$	Fracture toughness	[Jm <sup>-2</sup> ]	(565, 330, 265, 1345)	Same
$\bar{\omega}$	Expected basal enamel wear	$\mu\text{m}$	0.24	Same
$\sigma$	Basal enamel wear SD	$\mu\text{m}$	1.6	Same
$d$	Prob. of death at time $t$	NA	$e^{-10}$	Same
$Q(t)$	Habitat quality at time $t$	binary	r	p
$\rho$	Quality transition probability matrix: $(\rho_{rr}, \rho_{rp}; \rho_{pr}, \rho_{pp})$	Wet	(0.8, 0.2; 0.2, 0.8)	
		Dry	(0.2, 0.8; 0.8, 0.2)	
		Auto.	(0.8, 0.2; 0.8, 0.2)	
$\Phi$	Terminal fitness function ( $t = T$ )			
$F$	Fitness function ( $t < T$ )			
$D^*(x, v)$	Stationary decision matrix			
$\hat{F}$	Expected future fitness			

Table 1: Parameters and variables in the dynamic state variable model. Parenthetical values (except for  $\rho$ ) are with respect to the foods: (fruit, grass leaves, USOs, arthropods). Values for  $E$  and  $R$  are those when no mechanical advantage is included. See methods for relevant references. Auto. = Autocorrelated.