

1 **The Meat of the Matter: A thumb rule for scavenging dogs?**

2

3 Anandarup Bhadra¹, Debottam Bhattacharjee¹, Manabi Paul¹ and Anindita Bhadra^{1*}

4

5 ¹Behaviour and Ecology Lab, Department of Biological Sciences, Indian Institute of Science

6 Education and Research-Kolkata, West Bengal, India

7

8

9

10 ***Corresponding author:**

11 Behaviour and Ecology Lab,

12 Department of Biological Sciences,

13 Indian Institute of Science Education and Research – Kolkata

14 P.O. BCKV Main Campus, Mohanpur,

15 Nadia PIN 741252,

16 West Bengal, INDIA

17 *tel.* 91-33-25873119

18 *fax* +**91-33-25873020**

19 *e-mail:* abhadra@iiserkol.ac.in

20

21

22 **Abstract**

23 Animals that scavenge in and around human localities need to utilize a broad range of
24 resources. Preference for any one kind of food, under such circumstances, might be
25 inefficient. Indian free-ranging dogs, *Canis lupus familiaris* are scavengers that are heavily
26 dependent on humans for sustaining their omnivorous diet. The current study suggests that
27 because of evolutionary load, these dogs, which are descendents of the decidedly carnivorous
28 gray wolf, still retain a preference for meat though they live on carbohydrate-rich resources.
29 The plasticity in their diet probably fosters efficient scavenging in a competitive
30 environment, while a thumb rule for preferentially acquiring specific nutrients enables them
31 to sequester proteins from the carbohydrate-rich environment.

32

33 **Keywords: scavenging; nutrition; thumb rule; *Canis familiaris*; food preference**

34 **Introduction**

35 Dogs (*Canis lupus familiaris*) are thought to have evolved from gray wolves (*Canis lupus*
36 *lupus*) in East Asia about 15000 years ago with multiple founding events(Clutton-Brock
37 1995; Cohn 1997; Vila 1997; Savolainen et al. 2002). There is much controversy over the
38 exact time of origin as well as the precise path of evolution (Pennisi 2002) of modern dogs
39 which are currently recognized, not as a distinct species, but as a subspecies of wolves. Yet,
40 behaviourally dogs are significantly different from their ancestors, the gray wolves (Miklosi
41 2007). Much of these differences may have arisen because of domestication, while some
42 could have actually driven the process of evolution from the wolves to the dogs (Trut 1999;
43 Axelsson et al. 2013). Unlike wolves, which hunt for meat and occasionally scavenge (Mech
44 & Boitani 2003; Forbes & Theberge 1992), their modern-day descendants - the domesticated
45 dogs are fed by their owners in controlled amounts, often leading to over feeding. Free-
46 ranging dogs exist in many countries like Mexico (Daniels & Bekoff 1989; Ortega-Pacheco
47 et al. 2007), Italy (Boitani 1983), Zambia (Balogh 1993), Zimbabwe (Butler et al. 2004), Sri
48 Lanka (Matter & Wandeler 2000), India (Pal 2001; Vanak & Gompper 2009), Ecuador
49 (Kruuk & Snell 1981), Philippines (Childs et al. 1998), Nepal and Japan (Kato & Yamamoto
50 2003) etc, and live almost entirely by scavenging (Vanak & Gompper 2009; Vanak et al.
51 2009), with occasional hunting and begging for food. This makes them an ideal model system
52 to study the effects of the earliest form of domestication. Indian free-ranging dogs have
53 perhaps existed as an integral part of human settlements for millennia. Their earliest mention
54 dates back to the Mahabharatha, the Indian epic which has been dated to a period ranging
55 from 9th century BC to 4th century CE (van Buitenen 1973; Debroy 2008). The dog has
56 appeared in many ancient Indian texts and folklores over the ages, sometimes as a
57 domesticated animal and sometimes as a stray (Debroy 2008). Dogs breed annually, and
58 hence they have lived in their current state in India for at least 1000 generations. This should

59 have provided enough opportunities for adapting to the scavenging lifestyle that they lead as
60 an integral part of the human ecology today (Pal 2001).

61

62 In the absence of hunting and because of their dependence on human charity (begging for
63 food) and leftovers (feeding in garbage dumps) free-ranging dogs don't often encounter meat.
64 They live mostly on a carbohydrate rich omnivorous diet (biscuits, breads, rice, lentil, fish
65 bones, occasional pieces of decomposing meat from a carcass and even mangoes, cow dung
66 and plastic). The free-ranging dogs in India are often persecuted by humans and they live in a
67 highly competitive environment, such that territorial fights at feeding sites are common (Das
68 and Bhadra, in preparation). The competition over food is even translated to parent-offspring
69 conflict over food given by humans as early as 10 weeks of the pups' age (Paul et al, under
70 review). We wonder if they still have a strong preference for meat like the pets (Haupt et al.
71 1978) or whether they have lost the preference to maximize the utilization of available
72 resources as suggested by Thorne (1995).

73

74 **Methods**

75 We carried out several choice experiments in which a random dog was provided with three
76 food options simultaneously and the order of inspection and eating of the food was recorded.
77 We call this module the One Time Multi-option Choice Test (OTMCT). Since it is expected
78 that these dogs, living in a highly competitive environment, would eat the preferred food first,
79 we recorded the order in which the food was consumed. The data for only those cases where
80 all the options were at least inspected were used for analysis. The experiments were
81 conducted in Kolkata (22°34'10.92" N, 88°22'10.92" E), Kalyani (22°58'48" N, 88°28'48"
82 E) and Raiganj (25°37'12" N, 88°7'12" E), West Bengal, India.

83

84 In the OTMCT experiments we used small quantities of food (less than 10 ml) for each
85 option as we did not want the quantity of food to be a stimulus for the undernourished free-
86 ranging dogs. We used sample sizes of minimum 30, giving each dog the choice test only
87 once. This also eliminated the effect of learning and we could get a clear representation of the
88 preference already formed at the population level.

89

90 Absolute choice was defined as the total number of times each option was chosen in a
91 particular experiment. Choice was taken as the complete consumption of a particular option,
92 except in experiment 1, where both licking and consumption of an option was taken as
93 choice. In the cases where no clear absolute choice was seen, the eating order was computed
94 for each experiment. A 3x3 matrix was constructed with the three options in the columns and
95 the number of times each option was chosen first, second and third respectively in the rows.
96 Now, a contingency chi-squared test was done to determine whether the tables were random.
97 If they were significantly different from random, then the option that was chosen first the
98 highest number of times was taken to be chosen first at the population level, that is, the first
99 preference. Similarly the options chosen second and third were also determined.

100

101 **(i) Experiment 1**

102 In this experiment we wanted to test the preference, if any, between sources of protein and
103 carbohydrates that are known to adult free-ranging dogs, when visual cues were not present.

104 So the options we provided in the OTMCT were B1 (bread + chicken extract); B2 (bread +
105 water) and B3 (bread), where the 3 pieces of bread looked identical (please see OSM for
106 details of chicken extract preparation and protein content estimation). Chicken extract

107 contains a small percentage of proteins (less than 0.25% w/v as determined by Bradford

108 Method (Bradford 1976)) and we wanted to see if that is enough for the dogs to prefer it over

109 the carbohydrate rich bread. B2 is present as a control for moistness. We wanted to discount
110 the effect of the moistness of the chicken extract in this single experiment as pet dogs are
111 known to prefer moist food over dry food (Kitchell 1978). We used 30 adults for this
112 experiment.

113

114 B1 was chosen significantly more often than B2 or B3 (two tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p =$
115 0.00), which were chosen equally as often (two tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p = 1$) (Figure 1)
116 (Table 1). It seems that the dogs have a clear preference for proteins over carbohydrates. But
117 is this preference translated to real items of food in the highly competitive natural
118 environment when visual cues are provided?

119

120 **(ii) Experiment 2**

121 In this experiment the options we provided in OTMCT were A (bread); B (bread + chicken
122 gravy) and C (cooked chicken), such that the three options were visually different.

123 There was no significant difference in terms of absolute choice (A vs B: two tailed Fisher's
124 Exact Test; $p = 1$, B vs C and A vs C: two tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p = 0.49$) (Table 1). In
125 terms of eating order these dogs clearly preferred chicken over bread soaked in chicken gravy
126 over dry bread (chi square = 45.37, $df = 4$, $p = 0.00$) (Table 2) (Figure 2a). So they do prefer
127 protein over carbohydrate when they are provided with a visually identifiable protein source
128 (cooked chicken). But do they follow a gradient of chicken even in the absence of visual
129 cues?

130

131 **(iii) Experiment 3**

132 In the third experiment all visual cues were removed by making the three options in the
133 choice test look alike. Any preference shown here can only be because of olfactory cues. A

134 controlled experiment was used to test the preference for increasing concentration of meat
135 smell in the free-ranging dogs. We assumed that the addition of low quantities of chicken
136 extract to a protein rich food source would not cause significant increase in its protein
137 concentration. Hence we soaked Pedigree (PEDIGREE® Puppy Chicken & Milk) tablets
138 containing 24% protein in different concentrations of chicken extract for this experiment to
139 create a gradient of chicken smell on a base of synthetic protein-rich food. . The three options
140 in the experiment 3A were T (Pedigree soaked in 100% chicken extract); I (Pedigree soaked
141 in 50% chicken extract) and S (Pedigree soaked in water) and those in experiment 3B
142 (control) were U (bread + 100% chicken extract); M (bread + 50% chicken extract) and L
143 (bread + water). Thus, if the olfactory cues convey any information about the absolute
144 nutritional content (let us call it the protein smell) the options in experiment 3A are not
145 expected to differ in this context. The dogs should not, therefore, display any preference for a
146 particular option in this experiment, if they choose food by smelling its protein content only.
147 However, in the control, the absolute concentration of protein is expected to be different in
148 the three choices. Thus, based on the protein smell, the dogs should display a preference for
149 increasing concentration of chicken extract. It is possible, however, that the dogs simply
150 prefer the smell of meat, irrespective of its nutritional value. Under such circumstances they
151 should clearly display a preference for increasing concentrations of chicken extract in both
152 the experiments. 30 adults each were used for the experiment and control conditions.

153

154 In terms of absolute choice there was no preference in both experiments 3A (T vs I: two
155 tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p = 0.71$, I vs S: two tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p = 0.53$, S vs T:
156 two tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p = 0.18$) and 3B (two tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p = 1$) (Table
157 1). But in both the experiments the eating order revealed a preference for higher
158 concentrations of chicken extract (3A: chi square = 24.00, $df = 4$, $p = 0.00$; 3B: chi square =

159 11.14, $df = 4$, $p = 0.02$) (Figure 2b and 2c) (Table 2). It is not unlikely that the dogs might be
160 using a simple thumb rule of choosing food that smells like meat over any other available
161 option. Such a thumb rule would then dictate them to ignore sources of more nutritious food
162 that does not smell like meat for a less nutritious food having meat smell.

163

164 **(iv) Experiment 4**

165 In this experiment we tested if such a thumb rule might exist by presenting an OTMCT to the
166 dogs where meat smell and protein were given in reverse gradients to the same set of dogs.

167 The options provided were F1 (90 pellets of pedigree soaked in water); F2 (45 pellets of
168 pedigree and half bread in 50% Chicken extract) and F3 (One and a half bread in 100%
169 chicken extract). The three options were mashed, and a pinch of turmeric powder was added
170 to each of them to make them visually identical. This experiment was video recorded and
171 analysis was carried out in the blind. The absolute protein gradient is equivalent to the
172 pedigree gradient. 30 dogs were used for this experiment.

173

174 In terms of eating order the dogs clearly preferred F3 over F2 over F1 (chi square = 16.99, df
175 = 4, $p = 0.00$), thereby confirming the presence of the thumb rule (Figure 2d) (Table 2).

176

177 **Discussion**

178 In the first experiment, bread with chicken extract was chosen over both wet and dry bread
179 (in terms of absolute choice) showing a preference for protein over carbohydrates. Since the
180 moist bread was not preferred, the preference of B1 can only be because of the presence of
181 chicken extract and not because of moistness. Unlike the pet dogs, the Indian free-ranging
182 dogs do not seem to have any preference for moist food over dry food (Kitchell 1978). Since
183 these dogs scavenge from dumps and human disposals, their food is likely to get dried and

184 desiccated due to prolonged exposure to the tropical sun. Under such circumstances, an
185 indifference to moistness of food is likely to help maximise the utilization of resources, and
186 increase the efficiency of scavenging in the face of intense competition.

187

188 The experiment with real food provided visual cues in addition to olfactory ones, and
189 revealed a clear preference for chicken over bread soaked in chicken gravy over bread. In
190 fact, in some cases the choice was made even without close inspection. So, the free-ranging
191 dogs clearly are partial to chicken in various forms (cooked chicken, chicken extract or
192 gravy) as is apparent from the order of eating. This preference for meat (chicken being used
193 as the predominant meat of West Bengal and most other parts of India) is consistent with that
194 in pet dogs. Even as scavengers, the Indian free-ranging dogs seem to retain a preference for
195 meat, in direct contradiction to Thorne (1995). This clearly does not limit the utilization of
196 resources (since none of the options were completely rejected in the choice tests); instead it
197 ensures the differential utilization of preferred resources. The scavenging habit is maintained
198 by the flexibility of the diet and physiology of these dogs. But their physiology is also
199 constrained by an evolutionary load which is the requirement for proteins (since their
200 ancestors were predators subsisting solely on the meat of prey). Preferentially eating the meat
201 first might be a behavioural adaptation to maximize the utilization of resources that might
202 have any quantity of protein. Given the possibility of losing available resources to
203 competitors, the dogs should rightly eat valuable nutritious food as soon as they locate it. But
204 there is a clear preference for the actual meat over the gravy. This could be explained by the
205 visual cue of the chicken, the difference in the intensity of the meat smell between the two or
206 the nutritional difference (cooked meat has more protein than meat extract).

207

208 In experiment 3, although there was no difference in the absolute choice of the three options
209 in both the experiments, there was a clear preference for higher concentration of chicken
210 extract in terms of the order of eating. Moreover, there was no difference in the order of
211 selection in the two experiments (two tailed paired t-test, $df = 8$, $p = 0.69$) showing that the
212 dogs are indifferent to the presence of carbohydrate or protein, when they are given a gradient
213 of meat smell. It seems that the Indian free-ranging dogs not only have a preference for meat,
214 they actually are able to detect out higher intensities of meat smell. This is surely a great
215 advantage for protein-starved scavengers who constantly compete for food because a higher
216 meat smell, in nature, would mean higher quantity of meat and thus more protein and
217 nutrition.

218

219 It appears that Indian free-ranging dogs follow a thumb rule- “always choose a food with
220 higher intensity of meat smell first”. But this has not been clearly demonstrated in the third
221 experiment as chicken extract does have a small amount of protein, forming a protein
222 gradient (however slight) over and above the Pedigree in the three options in the experiment
223 3A. So, in a further experiment, the meat smell gradient and absolute protein gradient were
224 reversed: $F1 < F2 < F3$ in terms of the concentrations of both chicken extract and bread, while
225 $F1 > F2 > F3$ in terms of the concentrations of the synthetic protein as well as the absolute
226 protein. The preference shown by the dogs is clearly $F1 < F2 < F3$ in terms of the order of
227 eating (with no difference in absolute choice in terms of numbers). From our first experiment
228 we know that the dogs do not have a special preference for bread over chicken. So, the dogs
229 are clearly following the gradient of chicken extract and ignoring the absolute protein
230 content. Thus the dogs do seem to follow the “thumb rule” and must efficiently pick out food
231 with higher concentrations of meat proteins going simply by the meat smell.

232

233 It, therefore, appears that these dogs have adapted to their scavenging habit without actually
234 giving up the preference for meat. A possible mechanism might have been the development
235 of better digestion of carbohydrates which has now been demonstrated to be one of the major
236 genetic changes that the ancestors of dogs underwent during their transition from wolves
237 (Axelsson et al. 2013). Given the carbohydrate rich diet of these dogs, this would be an
238 advantage in terms of meeting their energy requirements, especially in areas like India where
239 the human diet is chiefly comprised of carbohydrates. However, it seems that the dogs have
240 behaviourally adapted to scavenging in human habitations by developing a thumb rule for
241 foraging- “if it smells like meat, eat it”. This would enable them to always choose the food
242 with a higher intensity of meat smell first, thus helping them sequester higher amounts of
243 protein in their diet.

244

245 **Acknowledgements**

246 This work was supported by grants from the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research,
247 India and the Indian National Science Academy to AB, and by IISER-Kolkata. The
248 experiments were designed by Anandarup Bhadra (ArB), and carried out by ArB, DB and
249 MP. AB supervised the work and co-wrote the paper with ArB. Tithi Roy helped with the
250 field work during these experiments. The authors would like to thank Dr. Ayan Banerjee,
251 IISER-Kolkata for his comments and suggestions on the experiment and Prof. Raghavendra
252 Gadagkar, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore for his comments on the manuscript. We
253 thank Dr. Tapas Kumar Sengupta, IISER-Kolkata and his students Paromita Banerjee and
254 Brinta Chakraborty for their help in the biochemical analysis. Our experiments comply with
255 the regulations for animal care in India.

256

257

258 **References**

259 **Axelsson, E., Ratnakumar, A., Arendt, M.-L., Maqbool, K., Webster, M. T., Perloski,**
260 **M., Liberg, O., Arnemo, J. M., Hedhammar, A. & Lindblad-Toh, K.** 2013. The genomic
261 signature of dog domestication reveals adaptation to a starch-rich diet. *Nature*, **000**, 1–5.
262 doi:10.1038/nature11837

263

264 **Balogh, K. De.** 1993. A dog ecology study in an urban and a semi-rural area of Zambia. *The*
265 *Onderstepoort Journal of Veterinary Research*, **60**, 437–443.

266

267 **Boitani, L.** 1983. Wolf and dog competition in Italy. *Acta Zoologica Fennica*, **174**, 259–264.

268

269 **Bradford, M.** 1976. A rapid and sensitive method for heterophil/lymphocyte ratio, heat
270 shock protein 70 the quantitation of microgram quantities of protein and body. *Analytical*
271 *Biochemistry*, **72**, 248–254.

272

273 **Butler, J., Toit, J. Du & Bingham, J.** 2004. Free-ranging domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*)
274 as predators and prey in rural Zimbabwe: threats of competition and disease to large wild
275 carnivores. *Biological Conservation*, **115**, 369–378.

276

277 **Childs, J., Robinson, L. & Sadek, R.** 1998. Density estimates of rural dog populations and
278 an assessment of marking methods during a rabies vaccination campaign in the Philippines.
279 *Preventive veterinary medicine*, **33**, 207–218.

280

281 **Clutton-Brock, J.** 1995. Origins of the dog: domestication and early history. In: *The*
282 *Domestic Dog: Its Evolution, Behaviour and Interactions with People*, (Ed. by J. Serpell),
283 Cambridge University Press.
284

285 **Cohn, J.** 1997. How wild wolves became domestic dogs. *BioScience*, **47**, 725–728.
286

287 **Daniels, T. J. & Bekoff, M.** 1989. Population and Social Biology of Free-Ranging Dogs ,
288 *Canis familiaris*. *American Society of Mammalogists*, **70**, 754–762.
289

290 **Debroy, B.** 2008. *Sarama and Her Children: The Dog in Indian Myth*. Penguin Books India.
291

292 **Forbes, G. J. & Theberge, J. B.** 1992. Importance of Scavenging on Moose by Wolves in
293 Algonquin Park, Ontario. *ALCES*, **28**, 235–241.
294

295 **Haupt, K. A., Hintz, H. F. & Shepherd, P.** 1978. The role of olfaction in canine food
296 preferences. *Chemical Senses*, **3**, 281–290.
297

298 **J. A. B. van Buitenen.** 1973. *The Mahabharata, Volume 1: Book 1: The Book of the*
299 *Beginning*. The University of Chicago Press.
300

301 **Kato, M. & Yamamoto, H.** 2003. Survey of the stray dog population and the health
302 education program on the prevention of dog bites and dog-acquired infections: a comparative
303 study in Nepal. *Acta Medica Okayama*, **57**, 261–166.
304

305 **Kitchell, R.** 1978. Taste perception and discrimination by the dog. *Advances in veterinary*
306 *science and comparative medicine*, **22**, 287–314.

307

308 **Kruuk, H. & Snell, H.** 1981. Prey selection by feral dogs from a population of marine
309 iguanas (*Amblyrhynchus cristatus*). *Journal of Applied Ecology*, **18**, 197–204.

310

311 **Matter, H. & Wandeler, A.** 2000. Study of the dog population and the rabies control
312 activities in the Mirigama area of Sri Lanka. *Acta tropica*, **75**, 95–108.

313

314 **Mech, L. & Boitani, L. Eds.** 2003. *Wolves: behaviour, ecology and conservation*. University
315 of Chicago Press.

316

317 **Miklosi, A.** 2007. *Dog Behaviour, Evolution, and cognition*. Oxford University Press.

318

319 **Ortega-Pacheco, A., Rodriguez-Buenfil, J. C., Bolio-Gonzalez, M. E., Sauri-Arceo, C.**
320 **H., Jiménez-Coello, M. & Forsberg, C. L.** 2007. A survey of dog populations in urban and
321 rural areas of Yucatan, Mexico. *Anthrozoös*, **20**, 261–274.

322

323 **Pal, S.** 2001. Population ecology of free-ranging urban dogs in West Bengal, India. *Acta*
324 *Theriologicala*, **46**, 69–78.

325

326 **Pennisi, E.** 2002. Canine evolution. A shaggy dog history. *Science*, **298**, 1540–1542.

327

328 **Savolainen, P., Zhang, Y., Luo, J., Lundeberg, J. & Leitner, T.** 2002. Genetic evidence
329 for an East Asian origin of domestic dogs. *Science*, **298**, 1610–1613.

330

331 **Thorne, C.** 1995. Feeding behaviour of domestic dogs and the role of experience. In: *The*
332 *Domestic Dog: Its Evolution, Behaviour and Interactions with People*, (Ed. by James
333 Serpell), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

334

335 **Trut, L.** 1999. Early Canid Domestication : The Farm-Fox Experiment. *American scientist*,
336 **87**, 160.

337

338 **Vanak, A. T. & Gompper, M. E.** 2009. Dietary niche separation between sympatric free-
339 ranging domestic dogs and Indian foxes in Central India. *Journal of Mammalogy*, **90**, 1058–
340 1065.

341

342 **Vanak, A. T., Thaker, M. & Gompper, M. E.** 2009. Experimental examination of
343 behavioural interactions between free-ranging wild and domestic canids. *Behavioral Ecology*
344 *and Sociobiology*, **64**, 279–287.

345

346 **Vila, C.** 1997. Multiple and Ancient Origins of the Domestic Dog. *Science*, **276**, 1687–1689.

347

348 **Das, Sayantan. & Bhadra, Anindita.** In preparation

349

350 **Paul, Manabi, Sreejoni Sen & Anindita Bhadra.** “Selfish mothers? An empirical test of
351 parent-offspring conflict over extended parental care.” Under review

352

353 **Legends to figures**

354

355 **Figure 1: Absolute choice data from experiment 1. B1 was chosen significantly more**
356 **often than B2 or B3 (two tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p = 0.00$), which were chosen**
357 **equally as often (two tailed Fisher's Exact Test; $p = 1$).**

358

359 **Figure 2a: Known protein experiment with visual cues (KPEVC): Eating order is**
360 **C>B>A (chi square = 45.37, df = 4, $p = 0.00$).**

361

362 **Figure 2b: Novel protein experiment with chicken smell (NPECS): eating oreder is**
363 **T>I>S (chi square = 24.00, df = 4, $p = 0.00$).**

364

365 **Figure 2c: Known protein experiment with chicken smell (KPECS): Eating order is**
366 **U>M>L (chi square = 11.14, df = 4, $p = 0.02$).**

367

368 **Figure 2d: Chicken and protein reverse gradient (CPRG): Eating order is F3>F2>F1**
369 **(chi square = 16.99, df = 4, $p = 0.00$)**

370

Expt. No.	Expt. Name	Option 1	# Times Selected	Option 2	# Times Selected	Option 3	# Times Selected
1	KPE	B1: Bread + Chicken extract	28	B2: Bread + Water	7	B3: Bread	7
2	KPEVC	A: Bread	44	B: Bread + curry (chicken)	44	C: Bread + Chicken in curry	46
3A	NPECS	T: Pedigree soaked in 100% chicken extract	27	I: Pedigree soaked in 50% chicken extract	25	S: Pedigree soaked in water	22
3B	KPECS	U: Bread + 100% Chicken extract	26	M: Bread + 50% Chicken extract	26	L: Bread + Water	26
4	CPRG	F1: 90 pellets of pedigree soaked in water	14	F2: 45 pellets of pedigree and half bread in 50% Chicken extract	19	F3: One and a half bread in 100% chicken extract	21

371

372 **Table 1: Summary of experimental design and choices made in each experiment. KPE -**
373 **Known Protein Experiment, KPEVC - Known Protein Experiment with Visual Cues (n**
374 **= 46), NPECS - Novel Protein Experiment with Chicken Smell, KPECS - Known**
375 **Protein Experiment with Chicken Smell, CPRG - Chicken and Protein Reverse**
376 **Gradient (n = 30 for all other experiments).**

Expt . No.	Chi-square value	P value for chi square	Log-likelihood value	P value for log-likelihood	Degrees of Freedom	Option chosen first (no. of times)	Option chosen second (no. of times)	Option chosen third (no. of times)
2	45.371	0.000	42.875	0.000	4	C(29)	B(26)	A(26)
3a	24.007	0.000	23.430	0.000	4	T(18)	I(13)	S(13)
3b	11.139	0.025	11.570	0.021	4	U(15)	M(10)	L(12)
4	16.989	0.002	16.975	0.002	4	F3(15)	F2(11)	F1(7)

377

378 **Table 2: The results of the chi square tests performed to check for preference towards**


379 **different food types provided in four experiments.**

380

381

382

383 **Figure 1**



384

385

386

387 **Figure 2a**

388

389

390

391

392


393

394

395

396

397



398


399

400

401

402

403 **Figure 2b**



404


405

406

407

408

409 **Figure 2c**




410

411

412

413 **Figure 2d**

414



415

416

417

418 **Online Supplementary Material**

419

420 **Preparation of chicken extract**

421 • 50 gm of freshly cut chicken was put in 300 ml of commercially purified water and
422 heated for 12 mins.

423 • The pieces of chicken and large particles were sieved off.

424 • The remaining liquid was allowed to cool. This final product was called chicken
425 extract.

426

427 **Estimation of protein content in chicken extract**

428 Protein content was estimated using Bradford method. Since particles that remain suspended
429 in the extract may interfere with the Bradford method for protein estimation, we removed the
430 small particles from the extract during the extraction and quantified the dissolved protein in
431 the supernatant. Shimadzu UV-1800 was used for spectroscopy.

432 • A standard curve for light absorbance at $\lambda 595$ was generated by taking O.D. readings
433 for standard concentrations of BSA with commercially purified water as blank.


434 • 500 μ l of freshly made chicken extract (was taken in three separate microcentrifuge
435 tubes.

436 • Small particles were allowed to pellet down by spinning the tubes at 13.4 rpm for 2
437 mins.

438 • 2 μ l of the supernatant from each tube was added to 1ml Bradford reagent in a new
439 microcentrifuge tube and mixed by turning over a few times.

440 • Samples were then incubated at 37°C for 15 mins.

- 441 • O.D. was checked at λ_{595} for each sample.
- 442 • Using the standard curve, the protein concentration was calculated for each sample.



443

444 The three samples were found to have the following O.D.₅₉₅ readings: 0.058, 0.068 and
445 0.176.

446 So, protein concentrations are as follows: 1.35, 1.58 and 4.09 $\mu\text{g}/2\mu\text{l}$.

447 Therefore, 100 ml of the sample contains 0.067, 0.079 and 0.204 gm of protein.

448 Thus protein content in chicken extract is less than 0.25% (w/v)

449

450

451