1 **Landscaping the behavioural ecology of primate stone tool use**

2 Katarina Almeida-Warren[a,b*¶], Tetsuro Matsuzawa[c,d], Susana

3 Carvalho[a,b,e,f]

4 [a]Primate Models for Behavioural Evolution Lab, Institute of Human Sciences, University of

5 Oxford, Oxford, UK

6 [b]Interdisciplinary Center for Archaeology and Evolution of Human Behaviour (ICArEHB),

7 Universidade do Algarve, Faro, Portugal

8 [c]Chubu Gakuin University, Japan

9 [d]Division of the Humanities and Social Sciences, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena,

10 CA, USA.

11 [e]CEF (Centre for Functional Ecology), Coimbra, Portugal

12 [f]Gorongosa National Park, Sofala, Mozambique

13 [*]Corresponding Author

14 E-mail: katarina.almeida-warren@anthro.ox.ac.uk

15

16 [¶]This is the main author and contributor

17

Abstract

Ecology is fundamental to the development, transmission, and perpetuity of primate technology. Previous studies on tool site selection have addressed the relevance of targeted resources and raw materials for tools, but few have considered the broader foraging landscape. In this first landscape-scale study of the ecological contexts of wild chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes verus*) tool-use, we investigate the conditions required for nut-cracking to occur and persist over time at discrete locations in Bossou (Guinea). We examine this at three levels: selection, frequency of use, and inactivity. We find that, further to the presence of a nut tree and availability of raw materials, abundance of food-providing trees as well as proximity to nest sites were significant predictors of nut-cracking occurrence. This suggests that the spatial distribution of nut-cracking sites is mediated by the broader behavioural landscape and is influenced by non-extractive foraging of predictable resources, as well as non-foraging activities. Additionally, tool availability was greater at sites with higher frequency of nut-cracking and was negatively correlated with site inactivity. Our findings indicate that the technological landscape of the Bossou chimpanzees shares affinities with the 'favoured places' model of hominin site formation and provides new insights for reconstructing ancient patterns of landscape use.

1 Introduction

2 Ecology plays an important role in shaping non-human primate behaviour from foraging

3 strategies, to ranging patterns, and sociality (Robbins and Hohmann, 2006; Strier, 2011). Tool-

4 use, particularly for extractive foraging, is no exception. Recent studies have highlighted that

5 ecology is key in determining whether tool-use emerges in a population, how it manifests itself,

6 and how it is maintained once it is established (Carvalho et al., 2007, 2011; Grund et al., 2019;

7 Koops et al., 2013, 2014).

8 Stone tool-use is often recurrent in spatially discrete locations, frequently involves the reuse

9 of tools, and leaves a recognisable archaeological footprint that can be traced back thousands

10 of years (Falótico et al., 2019; Mercader et al., 2007). However, little is known about the

11 ecological factors influencing selection and repeated use of specific locations for these

12 activities and how they fit within the broader foraging landscape. Lithic-based foraging

13 technology has been recorded in several wild, non-human primate species including

14 chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes ssp.*; Whiten *et al.*, 1999), bearded capuchin monkeys

15 (*Sapajus libidinosus;* Ottoni and Izar, 2008), Burmese long-tailed macaques (*Macaca*

16 *fascicularis*; Gumert, Kluck and Malaivijitnond, 2009), and, most recently, in white-faced

17 capuchins (*Cebus capuchinus*; Barrett *et al.*, 2018).

18 Chimpanzees are of particular interest because they are our closest living relatives

19 (Langergraber et al., 2012), and they present the largest, most diverse and ecologically

20 adaptable technological repertoire compared to any other non-human species, reflecting a

21 level of cognitive flexibility akin to the earliest hominin toolmakers (Carvalho et al., 2013;

22 Carvalho and McGrew, 2012; Pascual-Garrido and Almeida-Warren, 2021; Rolian and

23 Carvalho, 2017). Chimpanzee nut-cracking assemblages have been found to have close

24 similarities to the low-density assemblages characteristic of the early hominin record

25 (Carvalho et al., 2008; Carvalho and McGrew, 2012). Thus, understanding how patterns of

1   nut-cracking behaviour accumulate across the landscape can provide valuable insights into

2   the formation and spatial distribution of early hominin assemblages and allow the modelling of

3   ancient landscape use and resource exploitation.

4   Previous research on chimpanzee nut-cracking has established that the availability and

5   location of nut trees and raw materials for tools influences site location and reuse, as well as

6   frequency and distance of tool transport (Carvalho et al., 2007, 2011). Nevertheless, nut-

7   cracking assemblages are yet to be explored within the context of the broader ecological and

8   foraging landscape. This requires the study of nut-cracking sites not only in relation to direct

9   ecological correlates such as access to raw materials and nuts, but also in relation to

10   ecological requirements of other daily activities critical to survival such as food, water, and

11   shelter.

12   Chimpanzees living in forested environments spend approximately 50% of their waking hours

13   foraging and travelling between feeding locations (Pruetz and Bertolani, 2009). Recent studies

14   have shown that chimpanzee ranging patterns are dynamic and are influenced by the spatial

15   distribution and seasonality of food (Trapanese et al., 2019), which may also determine where

16   non-foraging activities, such as nesting, take place (Basabose and Yamagiwa, 2002;

17   Hernandez-Aguilar, 2009; Janmaat et al., 2014). Their diet mainly consists of fruit (Morgan

18   and Sanz, 2006), but high-energy foods such as insects, nuts and honey acquired through

19   tool-assisted foraging are also important staples or nutritional supplements for many

20   chimpanzee populations (Sanz and Morgan, 2013). Yet, little is known about how extractive

21   foraging interacts with other feeding activities and the broader behavioural landscape. This

22   study explores this question for the first time in the context of chimpanzee nut-cracking using

23   stone tools.

24   Water is essential to life (Popkin et al., 2010). For non-human primate species living in

25   extremely arid conditions, such as savannah-dwelling chimpanzees and baboons, water is a

26   critical resource that constrains movement patterns and landscape use (Barton et al., 1992;

1   Pruetz and Herzog, 2017; Wessling et al., 2018). It has also featured in many discussions

2   surrounding early hominin evolution and behaviour (e.g. Joordens et al., 2019), and has been

3   spatially linked with early stone tool sites (e.g. Rogers et al., 1994). Similarly, the location of

4   chimpanzee nut-cracking sites has been suggested to coincide with the proximity to

5   hydrological features, such as streams and rivers (Carvalho et al., 2007), possibly because

6   they are the most likely sources of eroded lithic raw materials for tools (Carvalho, 2011),

7   although this remains to be empirically tested.

8   Chimpanzees habitually make a sleeping nest at the end of every day, and sometimes make

9   day nests for resting (Koops et al., 2012). They have been an important focus of research

10   since Sept (1992) recognised that they form clusters of debris akin to early hominin

11   assemblages, and saw their potential for understanding patterns of early hominin landscape

12   use and the origins of human shelter (Mcgrew, 2021). Subsequent research has linked choice

13   of nesting locations with a range of ecological parameters such as tree species and tree

14   architecture, as well as surrounding topography and vegetation types (Badji et al., 2018; Barca

15   et al., 2018; Carvalho et al., 2015; Hakizimana et al., 2015; Hernandez-Aguilar, 2009;

16   Hernandez-Aguilar et al., 2013; Hernandez-Aguilar and Reitan, 2020; Koops et al., 2012;

17   Ndiaye et al., 2018; Stewart et al., 2011). Other studies have found additional links between

18   nest sites and proximity to areas of high fruit availability (Basabose and Yamagiwa, 2002;

19   Furuichi and Hashimoto, 2004; Goodall, 1962; Janmaat et al., 2014). While the exact

20   conditions determining nest site suitability appears to be population-specific rather than

21   universal, these findings demonstrate that nesting activities shape chimpanzee landscape

22   use, and, in turn, are shaped by resource distribution and the local environment. Nevertheless,

23   little is known about how nesting relates to other activities such as spatially discreet forms of

24   tool use (e.g., nut-cracking and termite-fishing).

25   This is the first landscape-scale investigation of the ecological drivers of chimpanzee tool-use,

26   where we examine the conditions required for nut-cracking to occur and persist over time in

5

1 discrete locations at the long-term field site of Bossou (Guinea). This is divided into three

2 points of enquiry: 1) tool site selection; 2) tool site use; 3) tool site inactivity.

3 *Tool site selection* explores the ecological conditions that may determine where nut-cracking

4 sites are established within the chimpanzee home-range. This is critical to understanding how

5 technological activities occur within the broader behavioural landscape, and how these

6 activities produce locally discrete assemblages that can remain archaeologically identifiable

7 for thousands of years (e.g. Falótico et al., 2019; Mercader et al., 2007). There is a growing

8 body of research on habitat selection for daily activities such as foraging, travelling, socializing

9 and sleeping, particularly within the context of anthropogenic landscapes and the implications

10 for conservation (e.g. Bryson-Morrison et al., 2017; Potts et al., 2016). However, regarding

11 technological activities, although we are beginning to learn more about raw material selection

12 for tools (Carvalho et al., 2008; Pascual-Garrido and Almeida-Warren, 2021), the selection of

13 locations for tool use remains unexplored.

14 *Tool site use* focuses on the ecological factors that influence the frequency with which

15 established sites attract nut-cracking activity. How often a site is used can serve as a proxy

16 for inferring preference in relation to other sites. From an archaeological perspective, generally

17 the more a location is used for debris-generating activities, the larger and more conspicuous

18 an archaeological signature becomes. This has important implications for understanding the

19 spatial clustering of activities and material evidence over time and can offer many insights into

20 the formation and perpetuity of early hominin archaeological assemblages (Carvalho and

21 Almeida-Warren, 2019; McGrew, 2010). Ethoarchaeological studies of chimpanzee nests

22 have found that sleeping sites are frequently revisited and the nests themselves may be

23 reused (Hernandez-Aguilar, 2009; Sept, 1992; Stewart et al., 2011). However, comparable

24 literature on the use of tool sites is scarce, except for the reuse of stone tools (Carvalho et al.,

25 2009), and sources of perishable raw materials (Pascual-Garrido, 2018; Pascual-Garrido and

26 Almeida-Warren, 2021).

6

1   *Tool site inactivity* investigates the ecological conditions that may cause the cessation of nut-

2   cracking activity at an established tool site. Chimpanzees live in dynamic landscapes shaped

3   by environmental change. Whether natural or anthropogenic, these shifts often result in

4   changes in resource distributions that may in turn lead to the development of new behavioural

5   adaptations and ranging patterns (e.g. Kalan et al., 2020). New opportunities may arise (e.g.,

6   foraging food from crops: Hockings et al., 2015, 2012; nesting in novel plant species: McCarthy

7   et al., 2017), while formerly habitual activities may shift to new locations or become obsolete

8   (Gruber et al., 2012; Kühl et al., 2019). Environmental changes have been identified as

9   important drivers of our own evolutionary history (e.g. Bobe et al., 2002; Bobe and Carvalho,

10 2019; Joordens et al., 2019; Patterson et al., 2017; Potts, 1998; Potts et al., 2020; Reed,

11 1997), but few studies have addressed empirically how these changes may have affected

12 patterns of landscape use and the distribution of early hominin tool sites (e.g. Rogers et al.,

13 1994). Thus, investigating the conditions that influence the cessation of activity at chimpanzee

14 tool sites, can provide important clues as to the factors that lead to their temporary or long-

15 term abandonment.

16 Throughout these steps we assess the effect of ecological parameters that have been found

17 to correlate with nut-cracking activities (nut availability; abundance of raw materials; distance

18 to water) as well as variables that encapsulate two key aspects of chimpanzee activity

19 patterns: non-extractive foraging (abundance of food resources: wild food trees; wild fruit

20 trees; THV - terrestrial herbaceous vegetation) and sleeping (distance to nesting site).

Methods

Study site and subjects

23 Bossou (7° 39' N, 8° 30' W) is located in the southeast of the Republic of Guinea (West Africa),

24 6 km from the foothills of Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve (Figure 1) (Humle, 2011a;

Figure 1 – Map of the Bossou Forest and surrounding area. Mount Nimba Strict Nature Reserve shapefile adapted from the WDPA database (UNEP-WCMC and IUCN, 2019)

1   Yamakoshi and Sugiyama, 1995). The chimpanzee community has been studied continuously

2   in both natural (since 1976) and experimental (outdoor laboratory since 1988) settings (Biro

3   et al., 2003; Carvalho et al., 2013; Matsuzawa et al., 2011; Sousa et al., 2009; Sugiyama and

4   Koman, 1979). Between 1976 and 2003 the population size ranged from 18 to 23 individuals

5   (Sugiyama, 2004), but has since declined largely due to a catastrophic flu-like epidemic from

6   which it never recovered (Humle, 2011b; Sugiyama and Fujita, 2011). At the time of this study,

7   the population consisted of seven individuals, but as of November 2020, it currently stands at

8   eight chimpanzees, following the birth of a female. The Bossou chimpanzees habitually crack

9   and consume oil-palm nuts (*Elaeis guineensis*) and are currently the only population known to

10   use portable stones as both hammers and anvils (Carvalho, Matsuzawa and McGrew, 2013;

11   but see Ohashi, 2015 for recent discoveries in Liberia). Bossou has two seasons – a short dry

1 season lasting from November to February, and a long rainy season extending from March to

2 October (Humle, 2011a; Yamakoshi, 1998). Nut-cracking occurs year-round, but is most

3 prevalent during peak wet season (June – August) and at the start of the dry season

4 (November – December) when fruit is less abundant (Yamakoshi, 1998).

5 The Bossou forest that constitutes the chimpanzee home range has an estimated area of 16

6 km^2 and is intersected by roads (Figure 2; Hockings, Anderson and Matsuzawa, 2006). Within

7 this, the chimpanzees range a core area of approximately 7 km^2 (Hockings et al., 2006). The

8 habitat is comprised of a composite of primary, secondary and riverine forests, savanna and

9 cultivated fields (Hockings et al., 2012). The northern slope of Mont Gban, in the Eastern part

10 of the forest, is considered a sacred area – forêt sacrée – by the local *Manon* culture, and

11 access is forbidden to outsiders. Out of respect to this tradition, no research was conducted

12 in this area.

Data collection

14 Data were collected over two field trips: 14DEC17-01MAY18 and 28OCT18-13DEC18,

15 encompassing approximately six months (160 days) of fieldwork. We employed a mixed-

16 method approach that combined direct behavioural observation through active group follows

17 of the chimpanzee population, with archaeological documentation of nut-cracking sites

18 (indirect behavioural observations), and ecological research using the transect and quadrat

19 method. At an initial stage, we targeted nut-cracking sites that had previously been

20 documented by co-author Susana Carvalho in 2006 and 2008-09. Further nut-cracking sites

21 were discovered during surveys and group follows throughout both research seasons. For

22 each nut-cracking site we established 1-km transects intersecting the site datum at 500

23 metres. Nut-cracking sites within 100 metres of a pre-established transect were either

24 assigned to that transect or became the mid-point of a new perpendicular transect, to ensure

25 even forest coverage. All transects were oriented N-S or E-W, except for two that were

26 oriented NE-SW and NW-SE due to access difficulties (Figure 2). 5-metre radius survey

Figure 2 – Map of the study area and surrounding area, highlighting the locations of recorded nut-cracking sites, quadrats, nests, and watercourses.

1   quadrats were established at every 100-metres along the transects starting from the midpoint

2   where the nut-cracking site was located. At each quadrat nut-cracking specific and general

3   ecological and vegetation data were collected (see sections below for further details).

4   We employed a fully digital method of data collection. Quadrat datums and all data entries

5   (food-providing vegetation, tools, raw materials) were georeferenced using an Arrow Gold

6   GNSS receiver (μ_{HRMS} = 2 metres; Almeida-Warren et al., 2021; EOS Positioning Systems

7   Inc., 2017). Coordinates were instantly downloaded via Bluetooth to the GeoGrafi-M

8   application (MGISS, 2019) on tablet where further data could be entered through custom made

9   forms.

10

1 *Oil palms*

2 For each oil palm encountered during quadrat surveys we documented diameter at breast

3 height (DBH), and number of fruit bunches (total and ripe). For 25 of the nut trees associated

4 to nut-cracking sites we also collected information on nut availability and new traces of nut-

5 cracking on a weekly basis during the first field season (22JAN18-03MAY18) and once at the

6 beginning and end of the second season (weeks of 29OCT18; 10DEC18). Additional data was

7 collected by Henry Camara during the weeks of 30SEP19, 27APR20, and 25MAY20. As per

8 Koops *et al.* (2013), we scored presence of edible nuts on the ground within a 2-metre radius

9 of the nut tree: (0) nuts absent; (1) 1-50 nuts; (2) 51-100 nuts; (3) > 100 nuts. With aid from

10 field guides, nut suitability was determined by checking a sample of randomly collected nuts

11 for whether the nuts contained an edible kernel or were rotten (following Koops *et al.*, 2013).

12 Nuts were not opened so as not to affect future availability, but the local people also crack oil

13 palm nuts and are able to identify whether they are edible or not (Humle and Matsuzawa,

14 2004).

15 *Tools and raw materials*

16 All lithic material was recorded for size, raw material type, and portability (whether loose or

17 imbedded in the ground). Adapted from Koops *et al.* (2013), size was scored into six

18 categories: (1) 1-2 cm; (2) 3-5 cm; (3) 6-10 cm; (4) 11-20 cm; (5) 21-30 cm; (6) >30 cm. Raw

19 materials used as tools and bi-products of nut-cracking tools were recorded as: (H) hammer;

20 (A) anvil; (H/A) used as hammer and anvil; (Frag) fragment that broke off during nut-cracking

21 and was not reused; (Hb) broken fragment that was reused as a hammer; (Ab) broken

22 fragment that was reused as an anvil. Tools and bi-products were defined as stones that

23 showed at least one of the following: a) traces of wear from nut-cracking; b) nutshell remains

24 on or around them; c) could be refitted with another stone with evidence of a) or b). For this

1 study, the variable *Tools* included all lithic materials used for nut-cracking excluding those

2 scored as Frag, as these were no longer or could no longer be used for nut-cracking.

3 The collective tool assemblage was also scored for status of nut-cracking activity. This was

4 estimated based on the clarity of nut-cracking traces on tools, the degree of decay of cracked

5 nut kernels and nut debris, as well as the field guides' accounts of behavioural observations

6 over the previous months. Tool-site status was classified into two categories: (Active) New

7 signs of nut-cracking activity were recorded during the fieldwork period. Nut powder or cracked

8 nut kernels were visible on top of or around tools, and there was at least one hammer and

9 anvil pair with impact points that had not rusted over; (Inactive) There were no signs of recent

10 nut-cracking activity during the entire fieldwork period. Cracked nut kernels were either absent

11 or present but showed clear signs of decay. Iron oxide or moss developing on tool impact

12 points.

Vegetation

14 We recorded all wild non-THV plants with a DBH > 2cm of species known to be consumed by

15 the chimpanzees of Bossou. We then cross-referenced the recorded species with the current

16 list of chimpanzee food resources to identify those which were sources of fruit – the preferred

17 food-type of chimpanzees. To distinguish permanent food sources from ephemeral food

18 sources, THV was documented separately. For this study, domesticated or crop species were

19 not included in the analysis.

Nests

21 Because few nests were documented at the quadrat level or along transects, additional forest-

22 wide nest surveys were conducted through random walks and strategic walks targeting areas

23 that were known nesting locations. When a nest was encountered, elevation and direction of

24 travel were maintained along topographical contours and all nests within 50-metres of the nest

1   and either side of the projected route were documented until no further nests were visible over

2   a 50-metre stretch (modified from Hernandez-Aguilar, 2009). For data analysis, nests were

3   divided into spatial clusters. A cluster was defined as a 50-metre radius area with a minimum

4   of 21 documented nests, representing a minimum of three sleep-events for the collective

5   chimpanzee population (n = 7) as a proxy for a habitual nesting location. This was achieved

6   on QGIS (Version 2.18.4), by creating a 50-metre buffer zone around each nest and using the

7   'count points in polygon' function to identify zones with a minimum of 21 nests. The *distance*

8   *to nearest nest cluster* variable used in the following analyses was computed with the 'distance

9   to nearest hub' function and was defined as the distance from a quadrat datum to the centre

10   of the nearest nest cluster.

11   *Watercourses*

12   Watercourse data was collected in 2008/2009 by co-author, Susana Carvalho. With the help

13   of field guides, streams and rivers were traced on foot and recorded using the track feature

14   on a Garmin hand-held GPS device. The *distance to nearest river* variable used in the

15   following analyses was computed in QGIS and was defined as the distance between a quadrat

16   datum to the nearest point along the watercourse polylines.

17   **Data analysis**

18   *Tool site selection*

19   Initial inspection of the data revealed that no nut-cracking sites occurred in quadrats where

20   nut trees were absent. This is consistent with previous literature describing that nut-cracking

21   occurs in close proximity to a nut tree (Carvalho et al., 2008). Additionally, there was very little

22   variation in the number of oil palms in each quadrat with only 15% of oil palm quadrats

23   documented with more than one oil palm. For these reasons, we restricted data analysis to

24   quadrats where an oil palm was present and did not include the number of oil palms as a

1   predictor, as this would mask the potential effect of the other variables of interest. The final

2   dataset has a total of 82 quadrats, 40 of which had traces of nut-cracking activity. We used a

3   binomial generalized linear model (GLM; Zuur *et al.*, 2009a) with a logit link function to

4   investigate the effect of five main predictors: raw materials, wild food trees, wild food THV,

5   distance to nearest nest cluster, distance to nearest river, on the presence (1) versus absence

6   (0) of a tool site in a given quadrat. We also analysed three sub-models to determine whether

7   more restricted variables yielded a better model fit (See Appendix, Table A2). The first sub-

8   model replaced raw materials with a subset of raw materials of size class corresponding to

9   the three most common tool size classes (95% of tools. Size class: 3, 4, 5; see Appendix,

10   Table A1). The second sub-model replaced wild food-providing trees with a subset formed

11   only of fruit-providing trees. The third sub-model included raw materials of size class 3-5 and

12   fruit-providing trees. Akaike's Information Criterion for small sample sizes (AICc) was used to

13   compare models (Burnham and Anderson, 2004), whereby the model with the lowest AICc

14   was chosen as the final model.

Tool site use

16   We investigate whether the hypothesized ecological variables (i.e., nut availability, raw

17   materials, food trees, distance to nearest nest cluster, and distance to nearest river) influenced

18   the frequency a nut-cracking site was used. From a total of 361 monitoring observations, only

19   35 cases of recent nut-cracking events were identified for 17 out of the 25 monitored nut-

20   cracking sites, where frequency of recent activity ranged between 1 and 4. Because sites

21   registering 2 events or 4 events had a sample size of one, frequency of activity was recoded

22   as "Low" (≤2 events; n = 10) and "High" (> 2 events; n = 7). The small sample size (n =17)

23   was deemed too small to justify a GL(M)M, therefore we only discuss descriptive statistics for

24   this question using two-sample t-tests (or Man-Whitney U tests when assumptions of normality

25   were not met).

26

Tool site inactivity

We used a binomial GLM with 'logit' link to investigate the effect of mean nut availability, raw materials, and food trees, on tool-site inactivity. The response variable included nut-cracking sites that were classified as active (response = 0) with those classified as inactive (response = 1). The final dataset included 40 tool sites, 16 of which were classified as inactive. Akin the model for tool site selection, we also investigated four sub-models with raw materials of size class 3-5, tools, and fruit tree subsets (See Appendix, Table A6). The model with the lowest AICc was then chosen as the final model.

General considerations

All analyses were processed in R Studio (version 1.1.383; R Studio Team, 2016), using R (version 4.1.0; R Core Team, 2021). Data exploration for each GLM, following the protocol described in Zuur, Ieno & Elphick (2010), did not raise any concerns. Collinearity among the explanatory variables was assessed by calculating the Variance inflation factors (VIF) using the function 'vif' of the car package (Fox and Weisberg, 2011). None of the models indicated any multicollinearity issues (Maximum VIF = 1.39, Quinn and Keough, 2002). To assess the significance of the full models and sub-models, we ran likelihood ratio tests (LRT) using the 'anova' function which compared each model to a corresponding null model from which all fixed effects were excluded (Dobson, 2002). We tested the significance of main effects for each model by systematically dropping them one at a time and comparing the resulting model with the full model using the 'drop1' function (Dobson, 2002). P-values for the individual effects were based on the LRT results from the 'drop1' function. The AICc for model selection was calculated using the 'MuMIn' package (Bartón, 2020). Model assumptions were verified by plotting residuals versus fitted values and versus each covariate in the model (Zuur and Ieno, 2016). Influential observations were assessed by calculating and plotting the Cook's distance

1   (Smith and Warren, 2019); all values were under the recommended threshold of 1, suggesting

2   no evidence of influential points (Fox, 2002; Smith and Warren, 2019).

3   For tool site use, comparisons between low and high frequency of nut-cracking activity were

4   computed for each of the variables of interest using unpaired two-sample t-tests or the non-

5   parametric equivalent, Wilcoxon rank-sum test (i.e., Mann-Whitney U test). Normality

6   assumptions were assessed using the Shapiro-Wilk test.

7   Threshold for statistical significance was set to $p \le 0.05$. Source code will be made available

8   at https://github.com/katarinawarren/bossou-chimps-analysis [to be replaced with DOI] and

9   relevant data will be provided upon request.

Results

Tool site selection

12   The sub-model where raw materials were replaced by a subset of size class 3 – 5 was the

13   best fitted model according to the AICc (See Appendix, Table A3), and had a clear effect on

14   the probability of a nut-cracking site occurring in a location where at least one oil palm was

15   present (full-null model comparison, LRT: $df = 5$, *deviance* = 56.52, $p < 0.001$). Raw materials

16   had a significant positive effect on tool site prediction ($p < 0.001$), as did food trees ($p = 0.02$),

17   while distance to nest cluster had a significant negative effect ($p = 0.01$) (Figure 3). All other

18   fixed effects were non-significant (see Table 1 for full model summary). The sub-model

19   replacing wild food trees with the fruit trees subset yielded the worst model fit in which fruit

20   trees were not a significant predictor (See Appendix, Table A3, Table A4).

21

22

Figure 3 – Probability of tool site presence in response to: a) Raw materials of size class 3 – 5; b) Trees that are sourced by chimpanzees for food; c) Distance to the nearest nest cluster.

1   **Table 1 – Results of the final GLM investigating potential predictors influencing tool**

2   **site selection**

Term	Estimate	SE	χ^2	p[a]
Intercept	-1.139	0.472		NI[b]
Raw materials (size class 3-5)	0.358	1.298	21.929	<0.001
Wild food trees	0.313	0.407	5.758	0.016
THV	-0.103	0.383	0.392	0.531
Distance to nearest nest cluster	-0.007	0.485	6.109	0.013
Distance to nearest river	0.005	0.411	1.397	0.237

[a] Results from the likelihood ratio test using the 'drop1' function.

[b] Not indicated because it has a limited interpretation.

3

4

1   Tool site use

2   Over a total period of 15 weeks, only 35 cases of nut-cracking were recorded for 17 out of 25

3   monitored tool sites. 10 of the 17 sites recorded one or two nut-cracking events (low

4   frequency), with the remaining seven showing recent traces between three and four times

5   during the monitoring period (high frequency). In general, mean nut availability was

6   significantly higher at nut-cracking sites that registered a higher frequency of nut-cracking

7   activity (T-test: $p = 0.03$; Figure 4; Table A5). Furthermore, distance to nearest nest cluster

8   revealed a negative trend, whereby high frequency sites tended to be nearer to nesting

9   locations (Wilcoxon rank-sum test: $p = 0.07$). For all other variables of interest (raw materials,

Figure 4 – Frequency of tool site use in relative to: a) Raw materials that have been used as tools; b) Distance to nearest nest cluster (km); c) Raw materials of size class 3 to 5; d) Wild trees that are sourced by chimpanzees for food; e) Wild trees that are sourced by chimpanzees for fruit; f) Distance to nearest river (km). Grey circles represent individual points, and means indicated by diamonds. ** p

1   mean fruit bunches, wild food trees and distance to nearest river) there were no significant

2   differences between the groups ($p > 0.15$; Figure 4; Table A5).

3 **Tool site inactivity**

4   Out of the sub-models, the tool subset model yielded the best fit, although the AICc for the

5   tool and fruit trees model was only marginally higher and produced comparable results (See

6   Appendix, Table A7, Table A8). Comparison of the tool subset model with the null model was

7   significant (LRT: $df = 3$, $deviance = 13.20$, $p < 0.01$). Overall, we found that lower values of

8   mean nut availability ($p < 0.01$) and a lower number of tools ($p = 0.02$) were both significant

9   predictors of tool site inactivity, while wild food trees had no effect (Figure 6; Table 3).

10   However, the data distributions shown in Figure 6 suggest that the model is not very robust.

11

Figure 6 – Probability of tool site inactivity in response to: a) Mean nut availability; b) Raw materials that have been used as tools.

1 **Table 3 – Results of the final GLM model investigating potential predictors influencing**

2 **tool site abandonment**

Term	Estimate	SE	χ^2	p[a]
Intercept	2.957	1.263		NI[b]
Mean. nut availability	-2.186	0.851	8.947	0.003
Tools	-0.186	0.093	5.183	0.023
Wild food trees	0.093	0.109	0.752	0.386

[a] Results from the likelihood ratio test using the 'drop1' function.
[b] Not indicated because it has a limited interpretation.

3

4 # Discussion

5 ## Tool site selection

6 From the initial inspection of the data, it is evident that a minimum of one oil palm, specifically

7 an oil palm in close proximity (within 10 metres), is required for nut-cracking to occur in a given

8 location. Further to this, our results show that the abundance of raw materials and food trees

9 as well as proximity to the nearest nest cluster are also important predictors for whether a tool

10 site is established at an oil palm location. This suggests that, in addition to the *ecological pre-*

11 *requisites* of nut-cracking, i.e., a producing oil palm and raw materials for tools, other

12 predictable resources that form part of the chimpanzee diet (wild food-providing trees), as well

13 as non-food related activities (sleep sites), are influential in the spatial distribution of nut-

14 cracking locations. In contrast, THV had a negative but non-significant effect on whether tool-

15 sites occurred. While THV is a frequently consumed food item by the chimpanzees of Bossou

16 (Humle, 2011a), it differs from other wild plant foods in that they have low calorific value and

17 an individual plant often can only be sourced once, after which it is permanently depleted. In

18 contrast, food trees are replenishable, often seasonally, and constitute reliable and predictable

19 resources that can be returned to on a seasonal basis. The fact that THV does not bear a

1   clear effect on tool site occurrence suggests that unpredictable food sources are not ecological

2   drivers of tool site selection.

3   Previous research has found that many primate species appear to have goal-orientated

4   foraging trajectories towards spatially permanent resources and that they likely use mental

5   maps to guide their resource exploitation strategies (Trapanese et al., 2019). Our results

6   provide tentative evidence that the chimpanzees of Bossou may behave in a similar way,

7   whereby nut-cracking activities take place within a foraging strategy that primarily targets

8   predictable, high-value foods, while low-energy unpredictable foods like THV act as part of an

9   opportunistic strategy during forage-on-the-go.

10   Raw materials within the 95% CI of the tool size range yielded a better model fit than all raw

11   materials encountered, suggesting that the availability of raw materials that fulfil certain

12   properties has an influence on tool site selection. Analyses including different raw material

13   types will help explore this further. However, due the impact of COVID-19 it has not yet been

14   possible to resume and complete the scheduled laboratory analysis of the lithic material.

15   Fruit trees alone did not have a significant effect on tool site location. Fruit is the most

16   prominent food item in the chimpanzee diet (e.g., Morgan and Sanz, 2006), including that of

17   the Bossou chimpanzees (Humle, 2011a; Yamakoshi, 1998). However, previous studies

18   referencing Bossou have indicated that nut-cracking activities peak when fruit availability is

19   low (Carvalho and McGrew, 2012; Humle, 2011a). Thus, it is possible that it is the presence

20   of predictable food sources other than fruit trees – e.g., gum, leaves, flowers – or the dietary

21   diversity of food sources that is predominantly driving the establishment of nut-cracking

22   locations.

23   Distance to nearest nest cluster was a significant predictor in all models, whereby the

24   likelihood of a tool site occurring increased with proximity to nest locations. Previous research

25   has found that nests sites occur in areas of high food availability (Basabose and Yamagiwa,

1 2002; Carvalho et al., 2015; Furuichi and Hashimoto, 2004; Goodall, 1962; Janmaat et al.,

2 2014). Given that nut-cracking sites are also located in areas with a greater number of food

3 providing trees, and bearing in mind that the Bossou chimpanzees source oil palms for a range

4 or other resources (e.g. fruit, pith, palm heart) and also nest in their crowns (Humle and

5 Matsuzawa, 2004, 2001; Yamakoshi and Sugiyama, 1995), it is possible that the relationship

6 between nut-cracking sites, proximity to nest sites, and food availability, is indicative that these

7 areas are activity hotspots, rich in resources and with habitat characteristics that are suitable

8 for a range of core chimpanzee activities.

9 Distance to the nearest river was not a significant predictor in any of the models. This

10 somewhat contradicts previous research in the nearby forest of Diecké, that identified that nut-

11 cracking locations occurred near waterlines (Carvalho et al., 2007). Emerging research on the

12 role and importance of water in shaping primate behaviour, adaptations, and landscape use,

13 is providing increasing evidence that there are differences in water-dependence between

14 populations. Rainforest-dwelling apes can usually obtain their daily hydration requirements

15 from the food they consume, and can go several days without drinking (Pontzer et al., 2021).

16 However, for primates that live in year-round or seasonally arid landscapes, such as the

17 chimpanzees of Fongoli or savannah-dwelling baboons, water is a critical resource that

18 shapes movement patterns and landscape use (Barton et al., 1992; Pruetz and Herzog, 2017;

19 Wessling et al., 2018). Fongoli chimpanzees usually drink water at least once a day and often

20 spend time near water sources during dry months to stay cool (Wessling, pers. comm.; Pruetz

21 and Bertolani, 2009). Conversely, the Bossou forest is much more humid, with a long-wet

22 season. It's many streams, and small forest area provide a hydrological landscape in which

23 the Bossou chimpanzees are rarely more than 300 metres away from water. Furthermore,

24 during a total of ~500 hours of focal follows, the Bossou chimpanzees were only seen to drink

25 water on eight occasions, suggesting that they can get most of their fluids from the foods they

26 consume, in line with the general trend for non-human apes (see Pontzer et al., 2021).

1 While water was not a significant predictor for Bossou, we predict that, contrary to Bossou,

2 proximity to water could be a major ecological driver regarding potential spatial distribution

3 and reuse of tool use locations by savannah-living chimpanzees, such as Fongoli. The Fongoli

4 chimpanzees do not crack nuts, but they engage in termite-fishing, which is a form of tool-use

5 that can also be considered to be spatially discrete and tethered to the location of termite

6 mounds (Bogart and Pruetz, 2011, 2008), much like nut-cracking.

7 Nevertheless, climatic or hydrological differences cannot explain, the discrepancy between

8 Bossou and Diecké. Given the proximity of both field sites (approx. 50 km) and similar climates

9 it is unlikely that this is due to differences in aridity or water availability. However, the

10 chimpanzees of Diecké crack different nut species, *Panda oleosa* and *Coula edulis*, which are

11 absent in Bossou and may be more water dependent than the oil palm. Thus, this discrepancy

12 may be connected to the different plant species exploited and their respective ecology and

13 distribution. However, further research is needed to investigate this.

14 Tool site use

15 Number of tools was the only variable of interest that differed significantly between sites with

16 low or high frequency of nut-cracking events. The fact that neither the number of raw materials,

17 nor raw materials of size class 3 – 5 differed between frequency classes, could indicate that

18 the visible traces of nut-cracking found on tools act as visual cues for stimulating further nut-

19 cracking behaviour. Similar hypotheses featuring local and stimulus enhancement have also

20 been discussed as processes of social learning (e.g. in the development of technical skills;

21 Musgrave et al., 2020; Tennie et al., 2020; Whiten, 2021) as well why some plants are sourced

22 more intensively than others for the manufacture of termite fishing tools (Almeida-Warren et

23 al., 2017). Conversely, it could indicate that chimpanzees prefer sites with material that they

24 are already familiar with and have used many times. Previous research, conducted in the

25 Bossou outdoor laboratory has demonstrated that chimpanzees reuse hammer-anvil pairs

26 (tool-sets) more often than others and that there is both group- and individual-level preference

23

1 for certain tool-sets (Carvalho et al., 2009). It is also possible that the number of tools reflects

2 the number of lithics that are preferred for their size and type of material. Archaeological

3 studies of raw material selection in Bossou have demonstrated that chimpanzees are selective

4 of the types of materials they use for nut-cracking (Carvalho et al., 2008). Analogous studies

5 on chimpanzee plant technologies, suggests similar patterns in the selection of materials for

6 termite-fishing, ant-dipping, honey gathering and water extraction (Almeida-Warren et al.,

7 2017; Lamon et al., 2018; Pascual-Garrido et al., 2012; Pascual-Garrido and Almeida-Warren,

8 2021).

9 Distance to nearest nest cluster showed a weak yet noteworthy difference, whereby the

10 frequency of nut-cracking events was marginally greater at tool sites that were closer to nest

11 locations. These results are similar to those found for tool-site selection and offer further

12 tentative support that active tool sites and their frequency of use is influenced by their

13 distribution relative to current activity hotspots.

14 Conversely, the data indicate that the number of wild food and fruit trees is largely the same

15 for all active nut-cracking sites. This suggest that, while food providing trees are good

16 indicators of tool-site selection, they may not good predictors of site use because the data

17 collected did not capture temporal changes in food availability or frequency of foraging activity.

18 On the other hand, nests are temporary features that rarely preserve for longer than six

19 months in non-savannah environments (Ihobe, 2005; Kamgang et al., 2020; Kouakou et al.,

20 2009; Zamma and Makelele, 2012), therefore, they are a better spatial proxy for recent ranging

21 patterns and possibly explains why differences were somewhat significant for nests, but not

22 for vegetation.

23 Nevertheless, statistical analyses of this nature are limited, and more data is needed to explore

24 these hypotheses further. For future research, it would be important to investigate whether

25 and how often chimpanzees visited the part of the forest where the tool site is located. This

1   could make the use of complementary data from camera traps placed in strategic locations,

2   as full-day focal follows are not permitted in Bossou.

3   Some consideration needs to be given as to the markedly low number of weekly traces of nut-

4   cracking events recorded per tool site during the 15-weeks of monitoring. There could be

5   several reasons for this. At a methodological level, it is possible that chimpanzees were

6   cracking nuts at tool sites that were not being monitored. Out of the nine nut-cracking events

7   witnessed during group follows, six took place at non-monitored sites. Alternatively, given that

8   tool sites were only monitored weekly, it is possible that nut-cracking occurred multiple times

9   during the same week. While there is not enough data to assess this from group follows, the

10   low overall number of observed nut-cracking events suggests this is unlikely. Nevertheless,

11   while nut-cracking occurs in Bossou year-round, the monitoring period may have coincided

12   with a low period of nut-cracking activity. There may be some evidence for this, given that 11

13   out of 35 traces of nut-cracking were recorded during the two weeks of monitoring that took

14   place at the start of the dry season (October – December), a period of low fruit availability

15   (Yamakoshi, 1998). This averages 5.5 events per week relative to the 2 events per week

16   average for the remainder of the monitoring period (January – April), when fruit availability is

17   highest (Yamakoshi, 1998).

18   It is also possible that the experimental outdoor laboratory, where nuts and stones were being

19   artificially provisioned for another project, may be skewing the natural occurrence of the

20   behaviour. The laboratory was first established in 1988 for the facilitation of experiments

21   relating to tool use (e.g. nut-cracking; leaf-dipping) in a natural setting (Matsuzawa, 2011;

22   Sousa and Matsuzawa, 2001). It has been running annually during a period of several weeks

23   for the last three decades, and was moved to a new location in the Bossou forest in 2009

24   (Matsuzawa, 2011). Chimpanzees frequently travel through the laboratory where they will find

25   edible nuts and raw materials. Thus, they may be favouring this location over naturally

26   occurring nut-cracking sites where nut availability is less predictable. The fact that a third of

1   nut-cracking events observed during group follows took place here provides some support

2   towards this argument, and is similar to patterns recorded by Hockings et al. (2009). Finally, it

3   is also possible that a small population in a forest that is comparatively rich in primary food

4   sources, may no longer need to depend as highly on nuts to supplement their diets. Further

5   research drawing from historical data, as well as contemporary behavioural data and activity

6   patters is needed to validate the potential effect of these factors on frequency of site use.

7   Tool site inactivity

8   Understanding the contexts of tool site inactivity is an important step in investigating the

9   conditions required for nut-cracking to occur and persist over time in a particular location, and

10   the factors that might lead to their abandonment. Our data suggests that mean nut availability,

11   used as a proxy for tree productivity, and a high abundance of tools are important in

12   maintaining the active status of a nut-cracking site. However, there are clear exceptions that

13   appear to not quite fit the model (Figure 6), suggesting that other factors that were not

14   considered in the analysis may also be at play.

15   The Bossou forest suffers from a great deal of human activity, particularly slash-and-burn

16   agriculture, which leads to frequent and rapid changes in the spatial distribution of resources

17   and localized vegetation composition (Hockings, 2011). While oil palms are not cut down

18   during this process and are highly resistant to fire (Yamakoshi, 2011), the changes in the

19   surrounding landscape and the increase in human presence may deter chimpanzees from

20   visiting those areas, especially if they are near the forest boundary. Conversely, cultivated

21   land that contains desirable food items (e.g. banana, mango, papaya) can often attract

22   chimpanzees (Hockings, 2011), and perhaps, under these conditions, the chimpanzees

23   prioritize the prized fruit over nuts that can be found almost anywhere. As with frequency of

24   tool site use, site inactivity could also be an artefact of population decline, whereby fewer

25   resources are sufficient to sustain the entire population. Previous literature has suggested that

26   the Bossou forest has a carrying capacity for around 20 chimpanzees (Sugiyama and Fujita,

1   2011), so it is possible that the chimpanzees are reducing the number of target nut-cracking

2   sites because nuts are no longer an important fallback food. A future longitudinal comparison

3   with historical data will help investigate and test this further.

Conclusions

5   Our results indicate that proximity to a nut tree, an abundance of raw materials and

6   predictable resources, as well as proximity to a nesting site are important ecological

7   parameters for the establishment of a nut-cracking site in a given location. Distance to

8   nearest nest cluster was also correlated with frequency of nut-cracking, which could

9   potentially indicate that nesting sites are important anchors for ranging and activity patterns.

10   Similarly, tool availability was significantly correlated with tool site use, as well as tool site

11   inactivity. The fact that raw materials were only significant for tool-site selection, suggests

12   that familiarity of materials used for tools or the visual cues of tool use, could be important in

13   the persistence of nut-cracking activities once a site has been established. While there was

14   no significant difference in nut availability among oil palms at active sites, the odds of tool

15   site inactivity were greater when mean nut availability was low, potentially indicating that a

16   decline in oil palm productivity at nut-cracking sites is driver of sites disuse. Together, these

17   results postulate that nut-cracking in Bossou is not only tethered to locations that provide the

18   necessary resources for this activity but is also intimately connected to a broader foraging

19   and behavioural landscape that is mediated by the spatio-temporal availability of primary

20   target resources, such as predictable food-providing trees, as well as the distribution of

21   frequently used nesting locations.

22   Preliminary comparisons with other sites regarding the importance of ecological features

23   such as the effect of water on tool use and ranging patterns, suggests that the ecology of

24   chimpanzee technology is context-specific and should be examined with this in mind. Further

25   studies investigating the technological landscapes of other chimpanzee populations, as well

26   as the integration of long-term data, will help better understand the effect of different

27

1   environmental and demographic contexts on the ecological factors driving the spatial

2   distribution and reuse of tool sites, adding further detail to this picture.

3   While current evidence suggests that early hominin and chimpanzee lithic technologies differ

4   in form and function (Arroyo and de la Torre, 2016; Sept, 1992; Toth et al., 2006), it is likely

5   they had similar plant-dominated diets supported by insects and sporadic meat consumption

6   (Panger et al., 2003). Thus, it is plausible that, like chimpanzees, early hominin tool-use

7   operated within behavioural landscapes conditioned by localized environmental parameters,

8   where foraging strategies were shaped by the distribution and availability of predictable food

9   sources, the dietary dependence on extractive foraging and the availability of the necessary

10 raw materials, as well as the location of safe places for sleeping. With the aid of primate

11 archaeological inference, visualizing the spatial distribution of hominin lithic assemblages

12 within this framework will be instrumental in providing crucial insights for reconstructing the

13 patterns of landscape use and resource exploitation.

14 The present study suggests that the technological landscape of the chimpanzees of Bossou

15 shares affinities with the 'favoured places' model (Schick and Toth, 1993; Schick, 1987), which

16 proposed that hominin tool sites formed at the centre of foraging areas where hominins would

17 process and consume food, rest and socialize, with sites being used more intensively in areas

18 with higher resource abundance. Such 'activity hotspots' would have acted as ecological

19 tethers, shaping early hominin movement and foraging patterns, which, in turn, would have

20 led to the formation and repeated use of tool sites over time. As the most conspicuous

21 evidence of these locations, stone tool assemblages may hold important clues for uncovering

22 behaviours beyond those associated to lithic technology and serve as starting points to search

23 for traces of other activities, such as sleeping, foraging, and insectivory, that are currently

24 extremely rare in the archaeological record. This research draws upon the work of Glynn Isaac

25 (e.g. Isaac, 1981; Isaac et al., 1981; Isaac and Harris, 1980) who pioneered the application of

26 landscape-scale approaches to the study of hominin assemblages, from which the first

27 concrete models of hominin site formation were developed. Further studies will help guide

1 future human origins research and provide an empirical framework for modelling and testing

2 hypotheses of early hominin behaviour associated to the archaeological record of our earliest

3 ancestors.

Acknowledgements

Competing interests

20 The authors declare no competing interests.

21

22

Bibliography

Almeida-Warren, K., Braun, D.R., Carvalho, S., 2021. The DistoX2: A methodological solution to archaeological mapping in poorly accessible environments. J. Archaeol. Sci. Reports 35, 102688. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JASREP.2020.102688

Almeida-Warren, K., Sommer, V., Piel, A.K., Pascual-Garrido, A., 2017. Raw material procurement for termite fishing tools by wild chimpanzees in the Issa valley, Western Tanzania. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 164, 292–304. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23269

Arroyo, A., de la Torre, I., 2016. Assessing the function of pounding tools in the Early Stone Age: A microscopic approach to the analysis of percussive artefacts from Beds I and II, Olduvai Gorge (Tanzania). J. Archaeol. Sci. 74, 23–34. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2016.08.003

Badji, L., Ndiaye, P.I., Lindshield, S.M., Ba, C.T., Pruetz, J.D., 2018. Savanna chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes verus*) nesting ecology at Bagnomba (Kedougou, Senegal). Primates 59, 235–241. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-017-0647-2

Barca, B., Turay, B.S., Kanneh, B.A., Tayleur, C., 2018. Nest Ecology and Conservation of Western Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes verus*) in Gola Rainforest National Park, Sierra Leone. Primate Conserv. 32, 133–139.

Barrett, B.J., Monteza-Moreno, C.M., Dogandžic, T., Dogandžic´3, D., Zwyns, N., Ibáñez, A., Crofoot, M.C., 2018. Habitual stone-tool-aided extractive foraging in white-faced capuchins, Cebus capucinus. R. Soc. Open Sci. 5. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.181002

Bartón, K., 2020. MuMIn: Multi-Model Inference. R package version 1.43.17.

Barton, R.A., Whiten, A., Strum, S.C., Byrne, R.W., Simpson, A.J., 1992. Habitat use and resource availability in baboons. Anim. Behav. 43, 831–844. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80206-4

Basabose, A.K., Yamagiwa, J., 2002. Factors affecting nesting site choice in chimpanzees at

1 Tshibati, Kahuzi-Biega national park: Influence of sympatric gorillas. Int. J. Primatol. 23,

2 263–282. https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013879427335

3 Biro, D., Inoue-Nakamura, N., Tonooka, R., Yamakoshi, G., Sousa, C., Matsuzawa, T.,

4 2003. Cultural innovation and transmission of tool use in wild chimpanzees: Evidence

5 from field experiments. Anim. Cog. 6, 213–223. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-003-

6 0183-x

7 Bobe, R., Behrensmeyer, A.K., Chapman, R.E., 2002. Faunal change, environmental

8 variability and late Pliocene hominin evolution. J. Hum. Evol. 42, 475–497.

9 https://doi.org/10.1006/jhev.2001.0535

10 Bobe, R., Carvalho, S., 2019. Hominin diversity and high environmental variability in the

11 Okote Member, Koobi Fora Formation, Kenya. J. Hum. Evol. 126, 91–105.

12 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2018.10.012

13 Bogart, S.L., Pruetz, J.D., 2011. Insectivory of savanna chimpanzees (Pan troglodytes

14 verus) at Fongoli, Senegal. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 145, 11–20.

15 https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.21452

16 Bogart, S.L., Pruetz, J.D., 2008. Ecological context of savanna chimpanzee (Pan troglodytes

17 verus) termite fishing at Fongoli, Senegal. Am. J. Primatol. 70, 605–612.

18 https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.20530

19 Bryson-Morrison, N., Tzanopoulos, J., Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T., 2017. Activity and Habitat

20 Use of Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes verus*) in the Anthropogenic Landscape of

21 Bossou, Guinea, West Africa. Int. J. Primatol. 38, 282–302.

22 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-016-9947-4

23 Burnham, K.P., Anderson, D.R. (Eds.), 2004. Model Selection and Multimodel Inference, 2nd

24 ed. ed, Model Selection and Multimodel Inference. Springer, New York, NY.

25 https://doi.org/10.1007/b97636

26 Carvalho, J.S., Meyer, C.F.J., Vicente, L., Marques, T.A., 2015. Where to nest? Ecological

determinants of chimpanzee nest abundance and distribution at the habitat and tree species scale. Am. J. Primatol. 77, 186–199. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.22321

Carvalho, S., 2011. Diécké Forest, Guinea: Delving into Chimpanzee Behavior Using Stone Tool Surveys, in: Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T., Sugiyama, Y. (Eds.), The Chimpanzees of Bossou and Nimba. Springer Japan, pp. 301–312. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-4-431-53921-6_31

Carvalho, S., Almeida-Warren, K., 2019. Primate Archaeology, in: Chun Choe, J. (Ed.), Encyclopedia of Animal Behavior. Elsevier, pp. 397–407. https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-809633-8.90156-0

Carvalho, S., Biro, D., McGrew, W.C., Matsuzawa, T., 2009. Tool-composite reuse in wild chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*): Archaeologically invisible steps in the technological evolution of early hominins? Anim. Cogn. 12, S103–S114. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-009-0271-7

Carvalho, S., Cunha, E., Sousa, C., Matsuzawa, T., 2008. Chaînes opératoires and resource-exploitation strategies in chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes*) nut cracking. J. Hum. Evol. 55, 148–163. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2008.02.005

Carvalho, S., Cunha, E., Sousa, C., Matsuzawa, T, 2011. Extensive surveys of chimpanzee stone tools: from the telescope to the magnifying glass, in: Matsuzawa, Tetsuro, Humle, T., Sugiyama, Y. (Eds.), The Chimpanzees of Bossou and Nimba. Springer Japan, Tokyo, pp. 145–155.

Carvalho, S., Matsuzawa, T., McGrew, W.C., 2013. From pounding to knapping: How chimpanzees can help us to model hominin lithics, in: Sanz, C., Call, J., Boesch, C. (Eds.), Tool Use in Animals. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp. 225–241. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511894800.015

Carvalho, S., McGrew, W.C., 2012. The origins of the Oldowan: Why chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) still are good models for technological evolution in Africa, in: Domínguez-

1   Rodrigo, M. (Ed.), Stone Tools and Fossil Bones: Debates in the Archaeology of

2   Human Origins. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, CA, pp. 201–221.

3   https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139149327.010

4   Carvalho, S., Sousa, C., Matsuzawa, T., 2007. New Nut-Cracking Sites in Diecké Forest,

5   Guinea: An Overview of the Surveys. Pan Africa News 14.

6   Dobson, A.J., 2002. An introduction to generalized linear models, New York. Chapman &

7   Hall/CRC, London.

8   EOS Positioning Systems Inc., 2017. Arrow Gold [WWW Document]. URL https://eos-

9   gnss.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/11/eos-arrow-gold-revC-v4.pdf (accessed 3.12.20).

10   Falótico, T., Proffitt, T., Ottoni, E.B., Staff, R.A., Haslam, M., 2019. Three thousand years of

11   wild capuchin stone tool use. Nat. Ecol. Evol. 3, 1034–1038.

12   https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-019-0904-4

13   Fox, J., 2002. An R and S-Plus companion to applied regression. Sage Publications.

14   Fox, J., Weisberg, S., 2011. An R Companion to Applied Regression, 2nd ed, Sage. Sage,

15   New York, NY.

16   Furuichi, T., Hashimoto, C., 2004. Botanical and Topographical Factors Influencing Nesting-

17   Site Selection by Chimpanzees in Kalinzu Forest, Uganda. Int. J. Primatol. 2004 254

18   25, 755–765. https://doi.org/10.1023/B:IJOP.0000029121.25284.7F

19   Goodall, J.M., 1962. Nest building behavior in the free ranging chimpanzee. Ann. N. Y.

20   Acad. Sci. 102, 455–467. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1962.tb13652.x

21   Gruber, T., Potts, K.B., Krupenye, C., Byrne, M.R., Mackworth-Young, C., McGrew, W.C.,

22   Reynolds, V., Zuberbühler, K., 2012. The influence of ecology on chimpanzee (*Pan*

23   *troglodytes*) cultural behavior: A case study of five ugandan chimpanzee communities.

24   J. Comp. Psychol. 126, 446–457. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028702

25   Grund, C., Neumann, C., Zuberbühler, K., Gruber, T., 2019. Necessity creates opportunities

26   for chimpanzee tool use. Behav. Ecol. 30, 1136–1144.

1   https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arz062

2   Gumert, M., Kluck, M., Malaivijitnond, S., 2009. The Physical Characteristics and Usage

3   Patterns of Stone Axe and Pounding Hammers Used by Long-Tailed Macaques in the

4   Andaman Sea Region of Thailand. Am. J. Primatol. 608, 594–608.

5   https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.20694

6   Hakizimana, D., Hambuckers, A., Brotcorne, F., Huynen, M.-C., Kakizimana, D., 2015.

7   Characterization of Nest Sites of Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*) in

8   Kibira National Park, Burundi. African Primates 10, 1–12.

9   Hernandez-Aguilar, R.A., 2009. Chimpanzee nest distribution and site reuse in a dry habitat:

10   implications for early hominin ranging. J. Hum. Evol. 57, 350–364.

11   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2009.03.007

12   Hernandez-Aguilar, R.A., Moore, J., Stanford, C.B., 2013. Chimpanzee nesting patterns in

13   savanna habitat: Environmental influences and preferences. Am. J. Primatol. 75, 979–

14   994. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.22163

15   Hernandez-Aguilar, R.A., Reitan, T., 2020. Deciding Where to Sleep: Spatial Levels of

16   Nesting Selection in Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) Living in Savanna at Issa,

17   Tanzania. Int. J. Primatol. 41, 870–900. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-020-00186-z

18   Hockings, K.J., 2011. The crop-raiders of the sacred hill, in: Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T.,

19   Sugiyama, Y. (Eds.), The Chimpanzees of Bossou and Nimba. Springer Japan, pp.

20   211–220.

21   Hockings, K.J., Anderson, J.R., Matsuzawa, T., 2012. Socioecological adaptations by

22   chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes verus*, inhabiting an anthropogenically impacted habitat.

23   Anim. Behav. 83, 801–810. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.01.002

24   Hockings, K.J., Anderson, J.R., Matsuzawa, T., 2009. Use of wild and cultivated foods by

25   chimpanzees at Bossou, Republic of Guinea: feeding dynamics in a human-influenced

26   environment. Am. J. Primatol. 71, 636–646. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.20698

1   Hockings, K.J., Anderson, J.R., Matsuzawa, T., 2006. Road crossing in chimpanzees: A

2   risky business. Curr. Biol. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2006.08.019

3   Hockings, K.J., McLennan, M.R., Carvalho, S., Ancrenaz, M., Bobe, R., Byrne, R.W.,

4   Dunbar, R.I.M., Matsuzawa, T., McGrew, W.C., Williamson, E.A., Wilson, M.L., Wood,

5   B., Wrangham, R.W., Hill, C.M., 2015. Apes in the Anthropocene: Flexibility and

6   survival. Trends Ecol. Evol. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.02.002

7   Humle, T., 2011a. Location and Ecology, in: Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T., Sugiyama, Y. (Eds.),

8   The Chimpanzees of Bossou and Nimba. Springer Japan, Tokyo, pp. 13–22.

9   Humle, T., Matsuzawa, T., 2004. Oil palm use by adjacent communities of chimpanzees at

10   Bossou and Nimba Mountains, West Africa. Int. J. Primatol. 25, 551–581.

11   https://doi.org/10.1023/B:IJOP.0000023575.93644.f4

12 Humle, T., Matsuzawa, T., 2001. Behavioural Diversity among the Wild Chimpanzee

13   Populations of Bossou and Neighbouring Areas, Guinea and Côte d'Ivoire, West Africa.

14   Folia Primatol. 72, 57–68. https://doi.org/10.1159/000049924

15 Humle, Tatyana, 2011b. The 2003 Epidemic of a Flu-Like Respiratory Disease at Bossou, in:

16   Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T, Sugiyama, Y. (Eds.), The Chimpanzees of Bossou and

17   Nimba. Springer Japan, pp. 325–333.

18 Ihobe, H., 2005. Life Span of Chimpanzee Beds at the Mahale Mountains National Park,

19   Tanzania. Pan Africa News 12, 10–12.

20 Isaac, G.L., 1981. Stone Age visiting cards: approaches to the study of early land use

21   patterns, in: Hodder, I., Isaac, G.L., Hammond, N. (Eds.), Pattern of the Past: Studies in

22   Honour of David Clarke. Cambridge University Press, pp. 131–155.

23 Isaac, G.L., Harris, J.W.K., 1980. A method for determining the characteristics of artefacts

24   between sites in the Upper Member of the Koobi Fora Formation, East Lake Turkana,

25   in: Leakey, R.E.F., Ogot, B.A. (Eds.), Proceedings of the 8th Panafrican Congress on

26   Prehistory and Quaternary Studies. Nairobi: International Louis Leakey Memorial

1   Institute for African Prehistory, pp. 19–22.

2   Isaac, G.L., Harris, J.W.K., Marshall, F., 1981. Small is informative: the application of the

3   study of mini-sites and least effort criteria in the interpretation of the Early Pleistocene

4   archaeological record at Koobi Fora, Kenya, in: Isaac, B. (Ed.), The Archaeology of

5   Human Origins: Papers by Glynn Isaac. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, CA,

6   pp. 101–119.

7   Janmaat, K.R.L., Polansky, L., Ban, S.D., Boesch, C., 2014. Wild chimpanzees plan their

8   breakfast time, type, and location. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 111, 16343–16348.

9   https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1407524111

10 Joordens, J.C.A., Feibel, C.S., Vonhof, H.B., Schulp, A.S., Kroon, D., 2019. Relevance of

11   the eastern African coastal forest for early hominin biogeography. J. Hum. Evol. 131,

12   176–202. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JHEVOL.2019.03.012

13 Kalan, A.K., Kulik, L., Arandjelovic, M., Boesch, C., Haas, F., Dieguez, P., Barratt, C.D.,

14   Abwe, E.E., Agbor, A., Angedakin, S., Aubert, F., Ayimisin, E.A., Bailey, E., Bessone,

15   M., Brazzola, G., Buh, V.E., Chancellor, R., Cohen, H., Coupland, C., Curran, B.,

16   Danquah, E., Deschner, T., Dowd, D., Eno-Nku, M., Michael Fay, J., Goedmakers, A.,

17   Granjon, A.-C., Head, J., Hedwig, D., Hermans, V., Jeffery, K.J., Jones, S., Junker, J.,

18   Kadam, P., Kambi, M., Kienast, I., Kujirakwinja, D., Langergraber, K.E., Lapuente, J.,

19   Larson, B., Lee, K.C., Leinert, V., Llana, M., Marrocoli, S., Meier, A.C., Morgan, B.,

20   Morgan, D., Neil, E., Nicholl, S., Normand, E., Ormsby, L.J., Pacheco, L., Piel, A.,

21   Preece, J., Robbins, M.M., Rundus, A., Sanz, C.M., Sommer, V., Stewart, F., Tagg, N.,

22   Tennie, C., Vergnes, V., Welsh, A., Wessling, E.G., Willie, J., Wittig, R.M., Yuh, Y.G.,

23   Zuberbühler, K., Kühl, H.S., 2020. Environmental variability supports chimpanzee

24   behavioural diversity. Nat. Commun. 11, 4451. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-

25   18176-3

26 Kamgang, S.A., Carme, T.C., Bobo, K.S., Abwe, E.E., Gonder, M.K., Sinsin, B., 2020.

27   Assessment of in situ nest decay rate for chimpanzees (Pan troglodytes ellioti

1 Matschie, 1914) in Mbam-Djerem National Park, Cameroon: implications for long-term

2 monitoring. Primates 61, 189–200. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-019-00768-3

3 Koops, K., McGrew, W.C., de Vries, H., Matsuzawa, T., 2012. Nest-Building by

4 Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes verus*) at Seringbara, Nimba Mountains: Antipredation,

5 Thermoregulation, and Antivector Hypotheses. Int. J. Primatol. 33, 356–380.

6 https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-012-9585-4

7 Koops, K., McGrew, W.C., Matsuzawa, T., 2013. Ecology of culture: do environmental

8 factors influence foraging tool use in wild chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes verus*? Anim.

9 Behav. 85, 175–185. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.10.022

10 Koops, K., Visalberghi, E., van Schaik, C.P., 2014. The ecology of primate material culture.

11 Biol. Lett. 10, 20140508. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2014.0508

12 Kouakou, C.Y., Boesch, C., Kuehl, H., 2009. Estimating chimpanzee population size with

13 nest counts: validating methods in Taï National Park. Am. J. Primatol. 71, 447–457.

14 https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.20673

15 Kühl, H.S., Boesch, C., Kulik, L., Haas, F., Arandjelovic, M., Dieguez, P., Bocksberger, G.,

16 McElreath, M.B., Agbor, A., Angedakin, S., Ayimisin, E.A., Bailey, E., Barubiyo, D.,

17 Bessone, M., Brazzola, G., Chancellor, R., Cohen, H., Coupland, C., Danquah, E.,

18 Deschner, T., Dowd, D., Dunn, A., Egbe, V.E., Eshuis, H., Goedmakers, A., Granjon,

19 A.C., Head, J., Hedwig, D., Hermans, V., Imong, I., Jeffery, K.J., Jones, S., Junker, J.,

20 Kadam, P., Kambere, M., Kambi, M., Kienast, I., Kujirakwinja, D., Langergraber, K.E.,

21 Lapuente, J., Larson, B., Lee, K., Leinert, V., Llana, M., Maretti, G., Marrocoli, S.,

22 Martin, R., Mbi, T.J., Meier, A.C., Morgan, B., Morgan, D., Mulindahabi, F., Murai, M.,

23 Neil, E., Niyigaba, P., Ormsby, L.J., Orume, R., Pacheco, L., Piel, A., Preece, J.,

24 Regnaut, S., Rundus, A., Sanz, C., Van Schijndel, J., Sommer, V., Stewart, F., Tagg,

25 N., Vendras, E., Vergnes, V., Welsh, A., Wessling, E.G., Willie, J., Wittig, R.M., Yuh,

26 Y.G., Yurkiw, K., Zuberbühler, K., Kalan, A.K., 2019. Human impact erodes

27 chimpanzee behavioral diversity. Science. 363, 1453–1455.

1   https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau4532

2   Lamon, N., Neumann, C., Gier, J., Zuberbühler, K., Gruber, T., 2018. Wild chimpanzees

3   select tool material based on efficiency and knowledge. Proc. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. 285.

4   https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2018.1715

5   Langergraber, K.E., Prufer, K., Rowney, C., Boesch, C., Crockford, C., Fawcett, K., Inoue,

6   E., Inoue-Muruyama, M., Mitani, J.C., Muller, M.N., Robbins, M.M., Schubert, G.,

7   Stoinski, T.S., Viola, B., Watts, D., Wittig, R.M., Wrangham, R.W., Zuberbuhler, K.,

8   Paabo, S., Vigilant, L., 2012. Generation times in wild chimpanzees and gorillas

9   suggest earlier divergence times in great ape and human evolution. Proc. Natl. Acad.

10   Sci. 109, 15716–15721. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1211740109

11   Matsuzawa, T., 2011. Field Experiments of Tool-Use, in: Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T.,

12   Sugiyama, Y. (Eds.), The Chimpanzees of Bossou and Nimba. Springer Japan, pp.

13   157–164.

14   Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T., Sugiyama, Y., 2011. The Chimpanzees of Bossou and Nimba,

15   Primatology Monographs. Springer Japan.

16   McCarthy, M.S., Lester, J.D., Stanford, C.B., 2017. Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*) Flexibly

17   Use Introduced Species for Nesting and Bark Feeding in a Human-Dominated Habitat.

18   Int. J. Primatol. 38, 321–337. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-016-9916-y

19   McGrew, W.C., 2021. Sheltering Chimpanzees. Primates 1, 3.

20   https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-021-00903-z

21   McGrew, W.C., 2010. In search of the last common ancestor: New findings on wild

22   chimpanzees. Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B Biol. Sci. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0067

23   Mercader, J., Barton, H., Gillespie, J., Harris, J., Kuhn, S., Tyler, R., Boesch, C., 2007.

24   4,300-year-old chimpanzee sites and the origins of percussive stone technology. Proc.

25   Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A. 104, 3043–3048. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0607909104

26   MGISS, 2019. GeoGrafi-M - MGISS [WWW Document]. URL

1   https://mgiss.co.uk/product/geografi-m/ (accessed 9.20.19).

2   Morgan, D.B., Sanz, C.M., 2006. Chimpanzee feeding ecology and comparisons with

3   sympatric gorillas in the Goualougo Triangle, Republic of Congo, in: Gottfried, H.,

4   Robbins, M.M., Boesch, C. (Eds.), Feeding Ecology in Apes and Other Primates.

5   Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 97–122.

6   Musgrave, S., Lonsdorf, E., Morgan, D., Prestipino, M., Bernstein-Kurtycz, L., Mundry, R.,

7   Sanz, C., 2020. Teaching varies with task complexity in wild chimpanzees. Proc. Natl.

8   Acad. Sci. 117, 969–976. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1907476116

9   Ndiaye, P.I., Badji, L., Lindshield, S.M., Pruetz, J.D., 2018. Nest-Building Behaviour by

10   Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes verus*) in the Non-Protected Area of Diaguiri (Kedougou,

11   Senegal): Implications for Conservation. Folia Primatol. 89, 316–326.

12   https://doi.org/10.1159/000490945

13   Ohashi, G., 2015. Pestle-pounding and nut-cracking by wild chimpanzees at Kpala, Liberia.

14   Primates 56, 113–117. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-015-0459-1

15   Ottoni, E.B., Izar, P., 2008. Capuchin monkey tool use: Overview and implications. Evol.

16   Anthropol. 17, 171–178. https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.20185

17   Panger, M.A., Brooks, A.S., Richmond, B.G., Wood, B., 2003. Older than the Oldowan?

18   Rethinking the emergence of hominin tool use. Evol. Anthropol. Issues, News, Rev. 11,

19   235–245. https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.10094

20   Pascual-Garrido, A., 2018. Scars on plants sourced for termite fishing tools by chimpanzees:

21   Towards an archaeology of the perishable. Am. J. Primatol. 80, e22921.

22   https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.22921

23   Pascual-Garrido, A., Almeida-Warren, K., 2021. Archaeology of the Perishable. Curr.

24   Anthropol. 62, 333–362. https://doi.org/10.1086/713766

25   Pascual-Garrido, A., Buba, U., Nodza, G., Sommer, V., 2012. Obtaining raw material: Plants

26   as tool sources for Nigerian Chimpanzees. Folia Primatol. 83, 24–44.

1   Patterson, D.B., Braun, D.R., Behrensmeyer, A.K., Merritt, S., Zliobaite, I., Reeves, J.S.,

2   Wood, B.A., Fortelius, M., Bobe, R., 2017. Ecosystem evolution and hominin

3   paleobiology at East Turkana, northern Kenya between 2.0 and 1.4 Ma. Palaeogeogr.

4   Palaeoclimatol. Palaeoecol. 481, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.PALAEO.2017.05.001

5   Pontzer, H., Brown, M.H., Wood, B.M., Raichlen, D.A., Mabulla, A., Harris, J.A., Dunsworth,

6   H., Hare, B., Walker, K., Luke, A., Dugas, L.R., Schoeller, D., Plange-Rhule, J., Bovet,

7   P., Forrester, T.E., Thompson, M.E., Shumaker, R.W., Rothman, J.M., Vogel, E.,

8   Sulistyo, F., Alavi, S., Prasetyo, D., Urlacher, S.S., Ross, S.R., 2021. Evolution of water

9   conservation in humans. Curr. Biol. 31, 1–7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.02.045

10 Popkin, B.M., D'Anci, K.E., Rosenberg, I.H., 2010. Water, hydration, and health. Nutr. Rev.

11   68, 439–458. https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1753-4887.2010.00304.X

12 Potts, K.B., Baken, E., Levang, A., Watts, D.P., 2016. Ecological factors influencing habitat

13   use by chimpanzees at Ngogo, Kibale National Park, Uganda. Am. J. Primatol. 78,

14   432–440. https://doi.org/10.1002/AJP.22513

15 Potts, R., 1998. Environmental hypotheses of hominin evolution. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.

16   107, 93–136. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1096-8644(1998)107:27+<93::AID-

17   AJPA5>3.0.CO;2-X

18 Potts, R., Dommain, R., Moerman, J.W., Behrensmeyer, A.K., Deino, A.L., Riedl, S.,

19   Beverly, E.J., Brown, E.T., Deocampo, D., Kinyanjui, R., Lupien, R., Owen, R.B.,

20   Rabideaux, N., Russell, J.M., Stockhecke, M., deMenocal, P., Faith, J.T., Garcin, Y.,

21   Noren, A., Scott, J.J., Western, D., Bright, J., Clark, J.B., Cohen, A.S., Keller, C.B.,

22   King, J., Levin, N.E., Brady Shannon, K., Muiruri, V., Renaut, R.W., Rucina, S.M., Uno,

23   K., 2020. Increased ecological resource variability during a critical transition in hominin

24   evolution. Sci. Adv. 6, eabc8975. https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abc8975

25 Pruetz, J., Bertolani, P., 2009. Chimpanzee (*Pan troglodytes verus*) Behavioral Responses

26   to Stresses Associated with Living in a Savannah-Mosaic Environment: Implications for

1   Hominin Adaptations to Open Habitats. PaleoAnthropology 2009, 252–262.

2   https://doi.org/10.4207/pa.2009.art33

3   Pruetz, J.D., Herzog, N.M., 2017. Savanna Chimpanzees at Fongoli, Senegal, Navigate a

4   Fire Landscape. Curr. Anthropol. 58, S337–S350. https://doi.org/10.1086/692112

5   Quinn, G.P., Keough, M.J., 2002. Experimental Design and Data Analysis for Biologists.

6   R Studio Team, 2016. RStudio: Integrated Development for R.

7   Reed, K.E., 1997. Early hominid evolution and ecological change through the African Plio-

8   Pleistocene. J. Hum. Evol. 32, 289–322. https://doi.org/10.1006/jhev.1996.0106

9   Robbins, M.M., Hohmann, G., 2006. Primate feeding ecology: an integrative approach, in:

10   Hohmann, G., Robbins, M.M., Boesch, C. (Eds.), Feeding Ecology in Apes and Other

11   Primates. Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, pp. 1–13.

12   Rogers, M.J., Harris, J.W.K., Feibel, C.S., 1994. Changing patterns of land use by Plio-

13   Pleistocene hominids in the Lake Turkana Basin. J. Hum. Evol.

14   https://doi.org/10.1006/jhev.1994.1039

15   Rolian, C., Carvalho, S., 2017. Tool use and manufacture in the last common ancestor of

16   Pan and Homo, in: Muller, M., Wrangham, R., Pilbeam, D. (Eds.), Chimpanzees and

17   Human Evolution. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, pp. 602– 644.

18   Sanz, C.M., Morgan, D.B., 2013. Ecological and social correlates of chimpanzee tool use.

19   Phil Trans R Soc B 268, 20120416. https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2012.0416

20   Schick, K., Toth, N., 1993. Making silent stones speak. Simon and Schuster, New York.

21   Schick, K.D., 1987. Modeling the formation of Early Stone Age artifact concentrations. J.

22   Hum. Evol. 16, 789–807. https://doi.org/10.1016/0047-2484(87)90024-8

23   Sept, J., 1992. Was there no place like home?: A new perspective on early hominid

24   archaeological sites from the mapping of chimpanzee nests. Curr. Anthropol. 33, 187–

25   207. https://doi.org/10.1086/204050

1   Smith, C., Warren, M., 2019. GLMs in R for Ecology. Amazon Publishing, Seattle, WA.

2   Sousa, C., Biro, D., Matsuzawa, T., 2009. Leaf-tool use for drinking water by wild

3   chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*): Acquisition patterns and handedness. Anim. Cogn. 12.

4   https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-009-0278-0

5   Sousa, C., Matsuzawa, T., 2001. The use of tokens as rewards and tools by chimpanzees

6   (Pan troglodytes). Anim. Cogn. 4, 213–221. https://doi.org/10.1007/s100710100104

7   Stewart, F.A., Piel, A.K., McGrew, W.C., 2011. Living archaeology: Artefacts of specific nest

8   site fidelity in wild chimpanzees. J. Hum. Evol. 61, 388–395.

9   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2011.05.005

10 Strier, K.B., 2011. Primate behavioral ecology. Allyn and Bacon, Boston.

11 Sugiyama, Y., 2004. Demographic parameters and life history of chimpanzees at Bossou,

12   Guinea. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 124, 154–165. https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10345

13 Sugiyama, Y., Koman, J., 1979. Tool-using and -making behavior in wild chimpanzees at

14   Bossou, Guinea. Primates 20, 513–524. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02373433

15 Sugiyama, Yukimaru, Fujita, S., 2011. The Demography and Reproductive Parameters of

16   Bossou Chimpanzees, in: Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T., Sugiyama, Y (Eds.), The

17   Chimpanzees of Bossou and Nimba. Springer Japan, pp. 23–34.

18 Team, R.C., 2021. R: A language and environment for statistical computing.

19 Tennie, C., Bandini, E., van Schaik, C.P., Hopper, L.M., 2020. The zone of latent solutions

20   and its relevance to understanding ape cultures. Biol. Philos. 35, 55.

21   https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-020-09769-9

22 Toth, N., Schick, K., Semaw, S., 2006. A comparative study of the stone tool-making skills of

23   Pan, Australopithecus, and Homo sapiens, in: Toth, N., Schick, K. (Eds.), The Oldowan:

24   Case Studies into the Earliest Stone Age. Stone Age Institute Press, Gosport, IN, pp.

25   155–222.

1   Trapanese, C., Meunier, H., Masi, S., 2019. What, where and when: spatial foraging

2   decisions in primates. Biol. Rev. 94, 483–502. https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12462

3   UNEP-WCMC, IUCN, 2019. Protected Planet: The World Database on Protected Areas

4   (WDPA) [WWW Document]. URL www.protectedplanet.net (accessed 11.9.19).

5   Wessling, E.G., Kühl, H.S., Mundry, R., Deschner, T., Pruetz, J.D., 2018. The costs of living

6   at the edge: Seasonal stress in wild savanna-dwelling chimpanzees. J. Hum. Evol. 121,

7   1–11. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2018.03.001

8   Whiten, A., 2021. The burgeoning reach of animal culture. Science. 372, eabe6514.

9   https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abe6514

10 Whiten, A., Goodall, J., McGrew, W.C., Nishida, T., Reynolds, V., Sugiyama, Y., Tutin,

11   C.E.G., Wrangham, R.W., Boesch, C., 1999. Cultures in chimpanzees. Nature 399,

12   682–685. https://doi.org/10.1038/21415

13 Yamakoshi, G., 2011. Pestle-pounding behavior: the key to the coexistence of humans and

14   chimpanzees, in: Matsuzawa, T., Humle, T., Sugiyama, Y. (Eds.), The Chimpanzees of

15   Bossou and Nimba. Springer Japan, pp. 107–115.

16 Yamakoshi, G., 1998. Dietary responses to fruit scarcity of wild chimpanzees at Bossou,

17   Guinea: Possible implications for ecological importance of tool use. Am. J. Phys.

18   Anthropol. 106, 283–295. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1096-

19   8644(199807)106:3<283::AID-AJPA2>3.0.CO;2-O

20 Yamakoshi, G., Sugiyama, Y., 1995. Pestle-pounding behavior of wild chimpanzees at

21   Bossou, Guinea: A newly observed tool-using behavior. Primates 36, 489–500.

22   https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02382871

23 Zamma, K., Makelele, M., 2012. Comparison of the Longevity of Chimpanzee Beds between

24   Two Areas in the Mahale Mountains National Park, Tanzania. Pan Africa News 19, 25–

25   28. https://doi.org/10.5134/168176

26 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., 2016. A protocol for conducting and presenting results of regression-

1   type analyses. Methods Ecol. Evol. 7, 636–645. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-

2   210X.12577

3   Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Elphick, C.S., 2010. A protocol for data exploration to avoid common

4   statistical problems. Methods Ecol. Evol. 1, 3–14. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-

5   210x.2009.00001.x

6   Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Walker, N.J., Saveliev, A.A., Smith, G.M., 2009. GLM and GAM for

7   Absence–Presence and Proportional Data. pp. 245–259. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-

8   387-87458-6_10

9

10

11

12

13

Appendix

Table A1 – Summary of the response variables used in this study and their descriptions.

Variable	Description	Units	Range
Raw materials	Total number of stones in the survey quadrat	Counts	0 – 99
Raw materials (size class 3-5)	Number of stones with sizes within the 95% confidence interval of tools used of nut-cracking	Counts	0 – 81
Tools	Total number of stones used for cracking nuts; Excludes unused fragments	Counts	0 – 28
Food trees	Total number of plants know to provide food sources to Bossou chimpanzees; Excludes plants with diameter at breast hight (DBH) under 2 cm	Counts	0 – 12
Fruit trees	Total number of plants know to be sources of fruit to Bossou chimpanzees; Excludes plants with diameter at breast hight (DBH) under 2 cm	Counts	0 – 9
THV	Total number of individual terrestrial herbaceous vegetation (THV) plants that are part of the Bossou chimpanzee diet	Counts	0 – 10
Nut availability	Approximate amount of nuts with edible kernels; Mean nut availability used in analysis	Categorical	0 (none); 1 (< 50); 2 (50 – 100); 3 (> 100)
Distance to nearest nest cluster	Distance, in metres, to nearest cluster of 21 nests; Cluster defined as nests within a 50-metre radius	Metres	50.01 – 781.06
Distance to nearest river	Distance, in metres, to nearest water course	Metres	6.92 – 399.84

1 **Table A2 – Likelihood ratio test results of the Full-Null model comparisons of the site**

2 **selection models.**

Model	Resid. df	Resid. Dev	df	Deviance	*p*
~1 (Null model)	81	113.627			
~Raw materials + Wild food trees + THV + Nest +River	76	59.289	5	54.338	<0.001
~**Raw materials (size class 3-5)** + Wild food trees + THV + Nest +River	76	57.109	5	56.519	<0.001
~Raw materials + **Wild fruit trees** + THV + Nest +River	76	62.480	5	51.147	<0.001
~**Raw materials (size class 3-5)** + **Wild fruit trees** + THV + Nest +River	76	61.817	5	51.810	<0.001

3

4 **Table A3 – Results of the AICc-Based Model Selection of the GLM for the predictors of**

5 **tool site selection. Subset variables highlighted in bold.**

Model	df	AICc
~Raw materials + Wild food trees + THV + Nest +River	6	72.409
~**Raw materials (size class 3-5)** + Wild food trees + THV + Nest +River	6	70.229
~Raw materials + **Wild fruit trees** + THV + Nest +River	6	75.599
~**Raw materials (size class 3-5)** + **Wild fruit trees** + THV + Nest +River	6	74.937

9

10

1 **Table A4 – Results of the additional GLMs investigating potential predictors of tool**

2 **site selection. Subset variables highlighted in bold.**

Model	Term	Estimate	SE	χ^2	P [a]
~Raw materials + Wild food trees + THV + Nest +River	Intercept	-0.575	1.076		NI[b]
	Raw materials	0.195	0.057	19.748	<0.001
	Wild food trees	0.303	0.155	4.944	0.026
	THV	-0.101	0.159	0.419	0.518
	Distance to nearest nest cluster	-0.007	0.003	7.377	0.007
	Distance to nearest river	0.004	0.004	0.887	0.346
~Raw materials +**Wild fruit trees** + THV + Nest +River	Intercept	-0.305	1.052		NI[b]
	Raw materials	0.203	0.059	20.316	<0.001
	Wild fruit trees	0.241	0.193	1.753	0.185
	THV	-0.031	0.136	0.051	0.821
	Distance to nearest nest cluster	-0.008	0.003	8.469	0.004
		0.005	0.004	1.270	0.260
~**Raw materials (size class 3-5)** + **Wild fruit trees** + THV + Nest +River	Intercept	-0.700	1.079		
	Raw materials (size class 3-5)	0.351	0.102	20.978	0.000
	Wild fruit trees	0.199	0.202	1.049	0.306
	THV	-0.017	0.141	0.014	0.905
	Distance to nearest nest cluster	-0.007	0.003	7.715	0.005
	Distance to nearest river	0.006	0.004	1.967	0.161

[a] Results from the likelihood ratio test using the 'drop1' function.
[b] Not indicated because it has a limited interpretation.

3

4

5

1 **Table A5 – Descriptive statistics and test results of the comparison between tool sites**

2 **with low frequency (n = 10) and high frequency (n = 7) of nut-cracking events.**

	Low frequency		High frequency		Test results			
Variable	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Test[a]	*t/w*[b]	*df/z*[c]	*p*
Tools	7.100	3.143	11.429	3.780	tt	2.487	11.429	0.029
Distance to nearest nest cluster (m)	245.660	132.760	148.714	64.047	tt	-2.000	13.707	0.066
Raw materials (size class 3-5)	14.700	17.114	11.714	2.870	wt	50.000	-1.430	0.154
Raw materials[a]	20.000	26.204	14.286	2.928	wt	49.000	-1.320	0.186
Mean nut availability	1.296	0.489	1.410	0.371	tt	0.547	14.835	0.593
Wild fruit trees	3.000	3.300	3.571	2.760	tt	0.387	14.401	0.704
Distance to nearest river (m)	139.613	77.486	124.710	84.836	tt	-0.369	12.265	0.718
Mean fruit bunches	1.252	0.630	1.188	0.630	tt	-0.204	13.069	0.842
Wild food trees	4.000	3.916	4.286	2.690	tt	0.178	15.000	0.861

[a] Test used: tt = t-test; wt = Wilcoxon rank sum test

[b] Test statistic: t = t-statistic for t-tests; w = w-statistic for Wilcoxon rank sum tests

[c] Test parameter: df = degrees of freedom for the t-statistic; z = z-score for the w-statistic

3

4

5

48

1 **Table A6 – Likelihood ratio test results of the Full-Null model comparisons of the site**

2 **inactivity models.**

Model	Resid. df	Resid. Dev	df	Deviance	*p*
~1 (Null model)	81	113.627			
~Mean nut availability + Raw materials + Wild food trees	36	46.532	3	8.017	0.046
~Mean nut availability + **Raw materials (size class 3-5)** + Wild food trees	36	46.518	3	8.030	0.045
~Mean nut availability + **Tools** + Wild food trees	36	41.350	3	13.198	0.004
~Mean nut availability + Raw materials (size class 3-5) + **Wild fruit trees**	36	46.621	3	7.928	0.048
~Mean nut availability + **Tools + Wild fruit trees**	36	41.968	3	12.581	0.006

3

4 **Table A7 – Results of AICc-Based Model Selection of the GLM for the predictors of tool**

5 **site inactivity. Subset variables highlighted in bold.**

Model	df	AICc
~Mean nut availability + Raw materials + Wild food trees	4	55.675
~Mean nut availability + **Raw materials (size class 3-5)** + Wild food trees	4	55.661
~Mean nut availability + **Tools** + Wild food trees	4	50.493
~Mean nut availability + Raw materials (size class 3-5) + **Wild fruit trees**	4	55.764
~Mean nut availability + **Tools + Wild fruit trees**	4	51.110

10

1 **Table A8 – Results of the additional GLM models investigating potential predictors of**

2 **tool site inactivity. Subset variables highlighted in bold.**

Model	Term	Estimate	SE	χ^2	P [a]
~Mean nut availability + Raw materials + Wild food trees	Intercept	1.275	0.927		
	Mean nut availability	-1.909	0.788	7.757	0.005
	Raw materials (size class 3-5)	0.001	0.017	0.001	0.973
	Wild food trees	0.083	0.111	0.567	0.452
~Mean nut availability + **Raw materials (size class 3-5)** + Wild food trees	Intercept	1.310	0.923		NI[b]
	Mean nut availability	-1.911	0.787	7.796	0.005
	Raw materials (size class 3-5)	-0.003	0.022	0.015	0.903
	Wild food trees	0.086	0.109	0.625	0.429
~Mean nut availability + Raw materials (size class 3-5) + **Wild fruit trees**	Intercept	1.838	0.971		NI[b]
	Mean nut availability	-1.895	0.773	7.757	0.005
	Raw materials (size class 3-5)	0.004	0.022	0.036	0.849
	Wild fruit trees	-0.104	0.145	0.522	0.470
~Mean nut availability + **Tools** + **Wild fruit trees**	Intercept	3.282	1.268		NI[b]
	Mean nut availability	-2.077	0.812	8.491	0.004
	Tools	-0.170	0.088	4.689	0.030
	Wild fruit trees	-0.053	0.144	0.135	0.714

[a] Results from the likelihood ratio test using the 'drop1' function.
[b] Not indicated because it has a limited interpretation.

3

4

5