LJMU Research Online

Towle, I, Irish, JD and Loch, C

 Paranthropus robustus tooth chipping patterns do not support regular hard food mastication

http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/16015/

Article

Paranthropus robustus tooth chipping patterns do not support regular hard food mastication

Ian Towle[a,*], Joel D. Irish[b,c], Carolina Loch[a]

[a] *Sir John Walsh Research Institute, Faculty of Dentistry, University of Otago, Dunedin 9054, New Zealand*

[b] *Research Centre in Evolutionary Anthropology and Palaeoecology, School of Biological and Environmental Sciences, Liverpool John Moores University, United Kingdom, L3 3AF*

[c] *The Centre for the Exploration of the Deep Human Journey, University of the Witwatersrand, Private Bag 3, WITS 2050, South Africa*

Corresponding author.

Email address: ian.towle@otago.ac.nz (I. Towle)

1.   Introduction

When a tooth contacts a hard object with enough force, the enamel can fracture to create a chip (Chai and Lawn, 2007; Constantino et al., 2010). The fractured area can vary depending on mechanical and structural properties of the enamel and object (Thomas, 2000; Constantino et al., 2010; He and Swain, 2008; Lawn, Lee, Constantino, and Lucas, 2009; Scott and Winn, 2011). Chips are not generated through a gradual process, although cumulative effects related to enamel fatigue and demineralization may contribute to fracture likelihood and location (Gao et al., 2016; Sanchez-Gonzalez et al., 2020). Importantly, it can take many years of subsequent wear to erase evidence of a chip, making them a crucial marker of past behavior and diet (Belcastro et al., 2018; Towle et al., 2017; Constantino, Markham, and Lucas, 2012).

Enamel chips can be caused by a variety of factors, including food processing, environmental contaminants (e.g., sand or grit), dietary items and social behavior (Constantino et al., 2012; Sauther, Sussman, and Cuozzo, 2002; Scott and Winn, 2011; Stojanowski, Johnson, Paul, and Carver, 2015; Van Valkenburgh, 2009). These different influences can generate unique patterns across the dentition, and allow inferences of dietary and behavioral factors in archaeological and paleoanthropological samples (Belcastro et al., 2007; Constantino et al., 2010; Scott and Winn, 2011; Nystrom, Phillips-Conroy, and Jolly, 2004; Towle et al., 2017). A range of recent human populations, fossil hominins and extant primates have been studied for evidence of chipping (e.g., Belcastro et al., 2007; Bonfiglioli et al., 2004; Gould, 1968; Lous, 1970; Molnar et al., 1972; Silva, Gil, Soares, and da Silva, 2016; Turner and Cadien, 1969; Constantino et al., 2010; Grine et al., 2010; Robinson, 1954; Tobias, 1967; Johanson and Taieb, 1976; Ward et al., 2001; Fox and Frayer, 1997; Scott and Winn, 2011; Stojanowski et al., 2015; Larsen, 2015; Lous, 1970; Molnar et al., 1972; Fannin et al., 2020). However, until recently, differences in recording methods have made inter-study comparisons challenging.

Enamel chipping may provide critical insights into the feeding habits of enigmatic hominins, such as the 'robust australopith' clade, e.g., *Paranthropus boisei* and *P. robustus*. *Paranthropus* species have long been inferred to be hard object feeders (durophagous), with large bunodont posterior teeth and robust cranial features thought to reflect adaptations related to habitually masticating hard foods (Rak, 1983; Jolly, 1970; Teaford and Ungar, 2000;

Constantino et al., 2018). However, the diets of these species are still debated, with a variety of dietary scenarios described (e.g., Martínez et al., 2016; Williams, 2015; Strait et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2015; Cerling et al., 2011; Van der Merwe et al., 2008; Wood and Strait, 2004). Additionally, there is often an apparent disconnect between diet and craniodental morphology in *Paranthropus*.

Direct evidence from enamel microwear studies of *P. boisei* suggests little to no hard object feeding (Ungar et al., 2008). In *P. robustus,* higher enamel surface complexity may indicate hard foods were consumed more frequently (Ungar, 2019; Scott et al., 2005; Peterson et al., 2018), potentially in the context of 'fallback foods'. However, the role of hard plant tissues in generating microwear features is currently debated (van Casteren et al., 2020; Teaford et al., 2020). From stable carbon isotopes, the diets of *P. robustus* and *P. boisei* appear substantially different (Cerling et al., 2011; Ungar and Sponheimer, 2011). Isotopic results for *P. boisei* are in concordance with microwear and some biomechanical evidence, suggesting that hard foods such as seeds and nuts did not make up a significant part of their diet; rather, C4 graminoids (e.g., grasses and sedges) were likely common foods (Guatelli-Steinberg, 2016; Macho, 2014; Dominy et al., 2008; Yeakel et al., 2007; Cerling et al., 2011; Kaiser et al., 2019). A more recent study on comparative biomechanical and morphological data in primates also suggests a soft-food niche for *Paranthropus* (Marcé-Nogué et al., 2020). Based on this and other evidence, many researchers now regard *Paranthropus* as non-hard object eaters (Ungar and Hlusko, 2016; Grine and Daegling, 2017; Kaiser et al., 2019), while others consider them dietary generalists (e.g., eurytopy; Wood and Strait, 2004; Strait et al., 2013).

Nonetheless, some maintain that hard foods were commonly consumed by *Paranthropus,* and/or played a significant role in the craniodental evolution of the genus (e.g., Constantino et al., 2009; Constantino et al., 2018; Paine et al., 2019; Strait et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2015). Chipping is usually one of the main forms of evidence proposed to support these hypotheses, typically to show that hard object consumption was common (Constantino et al., 2010, Constantino et al., 2018; Ungar, 2019; Paine et al., 2019). Given the microwear and isotopic results discussed above, most of this recent research focuses on hard-food mastication in *P. robustus*. Earlier work suggested that ingestion of grit or bones may instead be responsible for the chipping of their teeth (Robinson, 1954; Tobias, 1967).

Therefore, despite being crucial in elucidating the diet of *P. robustus*, a broad comparison specifically focusing on chipping patterns relative to other hominins and extant primates is still lacking. In particular, although data in the current article comes from published sources, because *P. robustus* was not the focus of these studies, it has led to misunderstandings of interpretation. For example, Paine et al. (2019:104) stated that *P. robustus* had a "significant degree of hard object feeding," with Towle et al. (2017) cited to support this claim. In fact, Towle et al. (2017) reported that *P. robustus* has the lowest rate of chipping of any hominin studied, with a prevalence similar to gorillas. Additionally, in previous studies *Paranthropus* species are often only compared to one another, or to other fossil hominins. For example, the *P. robustus* diet is said to have contained a "significant amount of hard food content," based on higher chipping prevalence than in *P. boisei* (Constantino et al., 2018:76). Therefore, chipping is often considered evidence of regular hard food consumption in *P. robustus*, but extant comparisons are needed to determine if these conclusions are supported in primates that are known hard-object feeders.

In three recent studies that include comparisons of chipping in a total of 25 primate species (Towle and Loch, 2021; Fannin et al., 2020; Towle et al., 2017), all samples show at least some chips. Therefore, the presence of chipping in a sample on its own may tell us little about diet or behavior. Instead, the evaluation of the patterns in extant primates with associated ecological data allows an understanding of chipping relative to diet and behavior. In this study, we compared these patterns in a range of extant primates and fossil hominins, to test whether prevalence and patterns in *P. robustus* support habitual, or occasional, durophagy. The extant primates analyzed include several species considered hard-object feeding specialists (sooty mangabeys, mandrills and sakis). Other species either focus on particular non-hard food items or have been reported to rarely consume hard foods (including several ape and colobus species), and those with a more varied diet, including eurytopic and terrestrial species (e.g., Japanese macaques, mandrills and baboons). As well as prevalence, the size and distribution of chips across the dentition when compared to other species may help elucidate behavioral factors that led to their occurrence in *P. robustus*.

2. Materials and Methods

Data were compiled from the recent literature. Fossil hominin samples include specimens assigned to *Homo naledi*, *Australopithecus africanus*, *P. robustus*, and *H.*

93　*neanderthalensis* (following Towle et al., 2017; Belcastro et al., 2018). Extant primates studied

94　include a range of Cercopithecidae species (n=11) and two species of Ceboidea (following

95　Towle and Loch, 2021; Towle et al., 2017). Species classification and sample sizes (number of

96　individuals and teeth) are presented in Table 1. An additional four species are added from

97　Fannin et al. (2020), where only fourth premolars and first molars were studied. Therefore

98　these data are only used in a separate comparison of these same teeth in each species (Figure

99　1). In all studies data collection methods were standardized, with only minor variations in

100　technique. As well as overall prevalence of chipping, teeth were also divided into types to

101　compare variation in chipping pattern across the dentition. Results refer to permanent teeth

102　only.

103　Teeth with minimal wear were removed for prevalence in Towle et al. (2017), but are

104　included here to allow direct comparisons with other samples, resulting in a slightly lower

105　prevalence than previously reported. For example, an additional 35 *P. robustus* teeth are

106　included here, giving a total of 270 permanent teeth. A further 132 *P. robustus* teeth are not

107　included due to *postmortem* damage (as in Towle et al., 2017). However, a separate analysis

108　is presented that does include both postmortem damaged and deciduous teeth in *P. robustus*,

109　to assess if their inclusion may explain differences in chipping prevalence with other studies.

110　The data on 57 deciduous *P. robustus* teeth come from previously unpublished data using the

111　same methods as Towle et al. (2017).

112　Antemortem fractures were only recorded if subsequent attrition is evident on the

113　chipped surface (i.e., the chip scar) to rule out postmortem damage (Scott and Winn, 2011;

114　Belcastro et al., 2018). Smoothing and coloration were used for this purpose i.e., postmortem

115　fractures displaying 'fresh' enamel brighter than the rest of the crown and with sharp edges

116　(Towle and Loch, 2021). The number of chips on each tooth was also recorded, allowing

117　inferences into the number of teeth with multiple chips (Belcastro et al., 2018; Towle et al.,

118　2017; Towle and Loch, 2021).

119　Fractures were recorded on a three-point grading system following Bonfiglioli et al.

120　(2004), except for the Towle and Loch (2021) extant primate species that were recorded on a

121　comparable three-point system but with measurements removed to allow comparison with

122　a larger range of primate tooth sizes. A summary of each grade is given below, with the

123   descriptions in Towle and Loch (2021); followed by that of Bonfiglioli et al. (2004) for each

124   grade:

        1) Small enamel chip (crescent-shaped) on the outer edge of the enamel. Dentine is not
125
126   exposed and the chip is restricted to the outer rim of the occlusal surface; slight crack
127   or fracture (0.5 mm), or larger but superficial enamel flake loss
128   2) Larger chip that extends near to the enamel-dentine junction. A small area of dentine
129   might be exposed;   square irregular lesion (1 mm) with the enamel more deeply
130   involved
131   3) Large irregular fracture in which a significant area of dentine is exposed. More dentine
132   than enamel was removed by the fracture.; crack bigger than 1 mm involving enamel
133   and dentine or a large, very irregular fracture that could destroy the tooth
134
135   **3.   Results**

136   Prevalence and overall patterns of permanent tooth chipping for each species are

137   summarized in Table 1. Hominins cover the range of prevalence in extant primates, with

138   chipping common in *Homo* (37–45% of all permanent teeth) and relatively rare in *P. robustus*

139   (11%). *Australopithecus africanus* falls between these two extremes, but closer to *P. robustus*,

140   with 17% of teeth displaying at least one fracture. The prevalence of chipping in *P. robustus*

141   is similar to the extant ape species studied, chimpanzees, gibbons and gorillas (Table 1). The

142   rate in extant primates considered to be hard-food specialists (e.g., sakis and mandrills, 28%

143   and 37% respectively) is several times greater than in *P. robustus* (Table 1). If all teeth are

144   included from the Towle et al. (2017) dataset (i.e., including postmortem damaged teeth)

145   there is a decrease of chipping prevalence in *P. robustus* to 7.46% (30/402). Additionally, if

146   deciduous teeth are also included, this rate drops to 6.97% (32/459).

147   Further direct comparisons are made with additional species from Fannin et al. (2020)

148   for first molars and fourth premolars in Figure 1, with *P. robustus* displaying the fourth lowest

149   rate of fractures out of 20 species studied. Further, this equates to a chipping prevalence for

150   these teeth approximately five times lower than both sooty mangabey and *H. naledi* (Figure

151   1). When divided into individual tooth types*,* all *P. robustus* teeth show consistently low

152   chipping rates, except canines and third premolars with a moderate prevalence (21% and 23%

153   respectively). Each *P. robustus* molar type (first, second and third) shows a low prevalence of

154   chipping, with each displaying one of the lowest rates relative to the same tooth in other

155   species (Table 2). Few *P. robustus* teeth exhibit multiple chips (6.7% of chipped teeth have

156   more than one fracture). *Paranthropus robustus* also has a high ratio of larger chips relative

157   to most other species (1.7 small chips for every large fracture); only chimpanzees, gibbons

158   and Neanderthals have similar proportions of large chips (2.3, 1.9 and 0.9 small chips for every

159   large fracture, respectively). When split into tooth categories, large chips were more frequent

160   on anterior teeth and premolars in *P. robustus*, with molars showing a low rate of larger

161   fractures similar to other species (Table 3).

162   **4.   Discussion and conclusions**

163   Chipping prevalence in extant primates links well with dietary and behavioral

164   observations. Hard object-feeding primates have a high prevalence (Towle and Loch, 2021;

165   Fannin et al., 2020). Species considered hard-object feeding specialists are >25%, with the

166   diets of sooty mangabeys, mandrills and sakis containing significant amounts of hard foods

167   (e.g., durophagy; Kinzey and Norconk, 1993; Fleagle and McGraw, 1999; McGraw et al., 2011;

168   Pampush et al., 2013; Fannin et al., 2020; vanCasteren et al., 2020). The overall prevalence in

169   *P. robustus* is far below this threshold (11%). Furthermore, the prevalence in first molars and

170   fourth premolars (for which most data are currently available) shows *P. robustus* with one of

171   the lowest rates.

172   Based on these results, *P. robustus* experienced significantly fewer crown chips than

173   other hominin species, and several times less than extant primates consuming hard objects

174   (e.g., food items and/or grit). The prevalence in *P. robustus* is similar to species not known to

175   regularly masticate hard items, including several apes, colobines, and guenons. The findings

176   do not corroborate *P. robustus* as a habitual hard-object feeder, at least to the extent of

177   modern durophagous primates such as sakis, mandrills, and sooty mangabeys. Daegling et al.

178   (2013) suggested that the large posterior teeth of Paranthropus may show a greater

179   occurrence of chips due to greater surface area. Crown fractures are also more likely to form

180   on teeth with enamel defects or unusual wear (Soukup, 2019). The pitting enamel hypoplasia

181   present on a large proportion of *P. robustus* molars (Towle and Irish, 2019) suggests they may

182   have been more fracture prone. Thus, durophagy may have been even less frequent than the

183   low chipping rate suggests. The low rate of multiple chips on a single tooth supports this

184   conclusion.

185   Other factors influence chipping prevalence as well. In humans, chips are generally

186   more common on anterior teeth due to food processing, trauma, or non-masticatory cultural

behavior, though frequencies vary substantially among groups (Scott and Winn, 2011; Stojanowski et al., 2015; Bonfiglioli et al., 2004; Gould, 1968; Larsen, 2015; Lous, 1970; Molnar et al., 1972). Grit is also masticated by many primates, and likely influences chipping rates in certain species (e.g., Van Casteren et al., 2019; Fannin et al., 2020; Towle et al., 2017). Both factors are associated with an increase in frequency. Therefore, a low rate of chipping in *P. robustus* likely suggests that trauma related to food consumption and other factors such as grit mastication were rare. This rate is perhaps unexpected since *P. robustus* was likely more terrestrial and inhabited open environments, unlike most of other primates in the sample.

A possible exception is the moderate rate of large fractures on canines and third premolars, which may suggest a modest level of trauma in these regions. A low rate on *P. robustus* incisors suggests a non-masticatory explanation, since large fractures on these teeth would also be expected (Belcastro et al., 2018). Similarly, the size of fractures and the fact that molar and incisors seem relatively unaffected may suggest grit was not the cause of chipping, although further research is needed to test this hypothesis. One possible explanation could be specific masticatory behaviors, such as placing hard foods in these positions for the initial phase of mastication (e.g., breaking seeds or nuts). That said, the small sample size for individual tooth types makes inferences difficult, and the chipping rate is still only moderate relative to other species. Therefore, although it is possible that *P. robustus* did occasionally masticate hard foods, there is little evidence to suggest it was a common practice, and does not seem to have involved their large molars.

Some hominin species, particularly *P. robustus and A. africanus*, were studied previously for chipping prevalence (e.g., Grine et al., 2010; Robinson, 1956; Wallace, 1973; Tobias, 1967; Constantino et al., 2018). Comparisons with these studies are difficult due to methodological differences and the teeth included (e.g., tooth sub-samples studied; inclusion of postmortem damaged teeth) and sample size (e.g., more samples have become available since the earlier studies). Constantino et al. (2018) reported a prevalence of 5% chipping for 557 *P. robustus* teeth. The difference for *P. robustus* in Towle et al. (2017) and Constantino et al. (2018) therefore likely relates to stricter criteria for inclusion in the former study (see above), with both studies recording approximately 30 chipped teeth. If all teeth are included from Towle et al (2017), i.e., including deciduous and postmortem damaged teeth, the prevalence is reduced to 6.97%. Therefore, chipping in *P. robustus* seems consistently low across studies when attempts are made to unify methods. Although a study using the

methods described here has not yet been published on a large sample of *P. boisei* teeth, recent results on chipping in this group suggests lower rates than *P. robustus* (Constantino et al., 2018; Constantino and Lawn, 2019). Thus, *Paranthropus* as a whole may be characterized by infrequent chipping.

It has been suggested that *Paranthropus* preferred soft or tough foods, but relied on harder 'fallback foods' (Constantino and Wright, 2009; Ungar et al., 2008). This hypothesis suggests they evolved large teeth and robust cranial structures to cope with dietary items that were rarely consumed. Extant primate chipping patterns may offer some insight. Species that evolved specialized dental characteristics for softer foods can still occasionally eat hard foods (e.g., van Casteren et al., 2019). Additionally, a primate that feeds occasionally on hard objects (e.g., seasonal or fallback foods) can evidence elevated chipping frequencies. To illustrate, while the diet of brown woolly monkeys is primarily based on soft fruits, at certain times of the year they consume seeds and hard fruits (Peres, 1994; Defler and Defler, 1996); this shift could explain their relatively high chipping prevalence, although further research is needed into the mechanical properties of these foods.

The orientation of the hard object and underlying enamel microstructure is crucial in chip formation, as are the size and shape of the tooth, the object, and resultant biomechanical forces (Xu et al., 1998; Lucas et al., 2008; Chai and Lawn, 2007). As such, species-specific enamel attributes (e.g., thickness and mechanical properties) likely evolved for functional reasons (Cuy et al., 2002; but see Constantino et al., 2012 who found relatively uniform mechanical properties among extant primates); species that regularly eat hard foods likely evolved dental characteristics in response to high biomechanical demands (Ungar and Lucas, 2010). It has been suggested that thick enamel may have evolved in some hominins, including *Paranthropus*, to delay fracture-related tooth loss (Kay, 1981; Lucas et al., 2008). Although chipping cannot conclusively be used to infer whether thick enamel evolved to counter attrition or fracture, it seems chipping should not be used to support the hypothesis that thick enamel evolved to protect against fracture in *Paranthropus*. This is especially the case since molars are often the focus of such research, and in *P. robustus* a low chipping prevalence is evident in these teeth.

Other enamel characteristics also need to be considered with microstructure (e.g., Hunter-Schreger band thickness and enamel prism density) and overall tooth morphology as

250 potential contributors to reducing fracture or limiting chip size (Constantino et al., 2009).

251 Further comparative studies can elucidate the functional and evolutionary implications of

252 enamel structure in *Paranthropus*. The present study suggests that dental chipping in

253 hominins most commonly regarded as hard-food eaters, *P. robustus*, was rare relative to

254 other hominins and extant durophagous primates. The ability of such enamel chips to deduce

255 selective pressures influencing the unique craniofacial morphology of *Paranthropus* remains

256 opaque. Additionally, differences in tooth properties among species, and how they influence

257 fracture likelihood, need to be more adequately explored (Constantino et al., 2012, Cuy et al.,

258 2002, and Darnell et al., 2010). Future work is needed to determine the causal factors for the

259 low chipping frequency in *Paranthropus*. However, based on extant primate comparisons,

260 chipping should not be used as evidence that *P. robustus* regularly masticated hard foods.

261 **References**

262 Belcastro, M. G., Mariotti, V., Riga, A., Bonfiglioli, B., Frayer, D. W. 2018. Tooth fractures in

263 the Krapina Neandertals. J. Hum. Evol. 123, 96-108.

264 Beynon, A. D., Wood, B. A. 1986. Variations in enamel thickness and structure in East African

265 hominids. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 70, 177-193.

266 Cerling, T. E., Mbua, E., Kirera, F. M., Manthi, F. K., Grine, F. E., Leakey, M. G., Sponheimer,

267 M., Uno, K. T. 2011. Diet of *Paranthropus boisei* in the early Pleistocene of East Africa. Proc.

268 Natl. Acad. Sci. *USA* 108, 9337-9341.

269 Cofran, Z. 2014. Mandibular development in *Australopithecus robustus*. Am. J. Phys.

270 Anthropol. 154, 436-446.

271 Constantino, P. J., Lawn, B. R. 2019. Dental fracture mechanics: What broken teeth can reveal

272 about diet and feeding behavior. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 168, 47-48.

273 Constantino, P. J., Wright, B. W. 2009. The importance of fallback foods in primate ecology

274 and evolution. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 140, 599-602.

275 Constantino, P. J., Borrero-Lopez, O., Lawn, B. R. 2018. Mechanisms of tooth damage and

276 *Paranthropus* dietary reconstruction. Biosurf. Biotribol. 4, 73-78.

277 Constantino, P. J., Lucas, P. W., Lee, J. J. W., Lawn, B. R. 2009. The influence of fallback foods

278 on great ape tooth enamel. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 140, 653-660.

279   Daegling, D. J., Judex, S., Ozcivici, E., Ravosa, M. J., Taylor, A. B., Grine, F. E., Teaford, M. F.,
280   Ungar, P. S. 2013. Viewpoints: Feeding mechanics, diet, and dietary adaptations in early
281   hominins. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 151, 356-371.

282   Defler, T. R., Defler, S. B. 1996. Diet of a group of *Lagothrix Lagothricha Lagothricha* in
283   southeastern Colombia. Int. J. Primatol. 17(2), 161-190.

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

287   Dominy, N. J. 2012. Hominins living on the sedge. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. *USA* 109.50 (2012):
288   20171-20172.

289   Fannin, L. D., Guatelli-Steinberg, D., Geissler, E., Morse, P. E., Constantino, P. J., McGraw, W.
290   S. 2020. Enamel chipping in Taï Forest cercopithecids: Implications for diet reconstruction in
291   paleoanthropological contexts. J. Hum. Evol. 141, 102742.

292   Fleagle, J. G., McGraw, W. S. 1999. Skeletal and dental morphology supports diphyletic origin
293   of baboons and mandrills. Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. *USA 96*, 1157-1161.

294   Gao, S. S., An, B. B., Yahyazadehfar, M., Zhang, D., Arola, D. D. 2016. Contact fatigue of human
295   enamel: Experiments, mechanisms and modeling. J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater. 60, 438-
296   450.

297   Grine, F. E., Daegling, D. J. 2017. Functional morphology, biomechanics and the retrodiction
298   of early hominin diets. C. R. Palevol. 16(5-6), 613-631.

299   Grine, F. E., Ungar, P. S., Teaford, M. F., El-Zaatari, S. 2006. Molar microwear in *Praeanthropus*
300   *afarensis*: evidence for dietary stasis through time and under diverse paleoecological
301   conditions. J. Hum. Evol. 51, 297-319.

302   Grine, F. E., Judex, S., Daegling, D. J., Ozcivici, E., Ungar, P. S., Teaford, M. F., Sponheimer, M.,
303   Scott, J., Scott, R.S., Walker, A. 2010. Craniofacial biomechanics and functional and dietary
304   inferences in hominin paleontology. J. Hum. Evol. 58(4), 293-308.

305   Guatelli-Steinberg, D. 2016. What Teeth Reveal About Human Evolution. Cambridge,
306   Cambridge University Press.

307   Jolly, C. J. 1970. The seed-eaters: A new model of hominid differentiation based on a baboon

308   analogy. Man 5(1), 5-26

309   Kaiser, T. M., Marce-Nogue, J., Puschel, T. A., Daasch, A. 2019. Morpho-functional traits of the

310   mandible suggest no hard food adaptation in the hominin lineage. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol.

311   168, 118-118.

312   Kinzey, W. G., Norconk, M. A. 1993. Physical and chemical properties of fruit and seeds eaten

313   by Pithecia and Chiropotes in Surinam and Venezuela. Int. J. Primatol. 14, 207-227.

314   Laden, G., Wrangham, R. 2005. The rise of the hominids as an adaptive shift in fallback foods:

315   Plant underground storage organs (USOs) and australopith origins. J. Hum. Evol. 49, 482-498.

316   Lucas, P. W., Gaskins, J. T., Lowrey, T. K., Harrison, M. E., Morrogh-Bernard, H. C., Cheyne, S.

317   M., Begley, M. R. 2012. Evolutionary optimization of material properties of a tropical seed. J.

318   R. Soc. Interface. 9, 34-42.

319   Macho, G. A., Shimizu, D. 2009. Dietary adaptations of South African australopiths: Inference

320   from enamel prism attitude. J. Hum. Evol. 57, 241-247.

321   Macho, G. A. 2014. Baboon feeding ecology informs the dietary niche of *Paranthropus boisei*.

322   PLoS One, 9, e84942.

323   Marcé-Nogué, J., Püschel, T.A., Daasch, A., Kaiser, T.M. 2020. Broad-scale morpho-functional

324   traits of the mandible suggest no hard food adaptation in the hominin lineage. Sci. Rep. 10,

325   6793.

326   Martínez, L. M., Estebaranz-Sánchez, F., Galbany, J., Pérez-Pérez, A. 2016. Testing dietary

327   hypotheses of East African hominines using buccal dental microwear data. PloS one, 11,

328   e0165447.

329   McGraw, W. S., Vick, A. E., Daegling, D. J. 2011. Sex and age differences in the diet and

330   ingestive behaviors of sooty mangabeys (*Cercocebus atys*) in the Tai Forest, Ivory Coast. Am.

331   J. Phys. Anthropol. 144, 140-153.

332   Nystrom, P., Phillips-Conroy, J. E., Jolly, C. J. 2004. Dental microwear in anubis and hybrid

333   baboons (*Papio hamadryas*, sensu lato) living in Awash National Park, Ethiopia. Am. J. Phys.

334   Anthropol. 125, 279-291.

335   Paine, O. C., Koppa, A., Henry, A. G., Leichliter, J. N., Codron, D., Codron, J., Lambert, J.E.,

336   Sponheimer, M. 2019. Seasonal and habitat effects on the nutritional properties of savanna

337   vegetation: Potential implications for early hominin dietary ecology. J. Hum. Evol. 133, 99-

338   107.

339   Pampush, J. D., Duque, A. C., Burrows, B. R., Daegling, D. J., Kenney, W. F., McGraw, W. S.

340   2013. Homoplasy and thick enamel in primates. J. Hum. Evol. 64(3), 216-224.

341   Peres, C. A. 1994. Diet and feeding ecology of gray woolly monkeys (*Lagothrix lagotricha cana*)

342   in central Amazonia: Comparisons with other atelines. Int. J. Primatol. 15, 333-372.

343   Peterson, A., Abella, E. F., Grine, F. E., Teaford, M. F., Ungar, P. S. 2018. Microwear textures

344   of *Australopithecus africanus* and *Paranthropus robustus* molars in relation to

345   paleoenvironment and diet. J. Hum. Evol. 119, 42-63.

346   Rabenold, D., Pearson, O. M. 2011. Abrasive, silica phytoliths and the evolution of thick molar

347   enamel in primates, with implications for the diet of *Paranthropus boisei*. PLoS One. 6,

348   e28379.

349   Rak Y. 1983. The Australopithecine Face. New York, Academic Press.

350   Richmond, B. G., Green, D. J., Lague, M. R., Chirchir, H., Behrensmeyer, A. K., Bobe, R.,

351   Bamford, M.K., Griffin, N.L., Gunz, P., Mbua, E., Merritt, S. R. 2020. The upper limb of

352   *Paranthropus boisei* from Ileret, Kenya. J. Hum. Evol. 141, 102727.

353   Robinson, J.T., 1956. The Dentition of the Australopithecinae. Transvaal Museum Memoir, 9.

354   Transvaal Museum, Pretoria

355   Rosenberger, A. L., Strier, K. B. 1989. Adaptive radiation of the ateline primates. J. Hum. Evol.

356   18, 717-750.

357   Sanchez-Gonzalez, E., Pinilla-Cienfuegos, E., Borrero-Lopez, O., Rodríguez-Rojas, F.,

358   Guiberteau, F. 2020. Contact damage of human dental enamel under cyclic axial loading with

359   abrasive particles. J. Mech. Behav. Biomed. Mater. 102, 103512.

360   Scott, J. E., Campbell, R. M., Baj, L. M., Burns, M. C., Price, M. S., Sykes, J. D., Vinyard, C. J.

361   2018. Dietary signals in the premolar dentition of primates. J. Hum. Evol. 121, 221-234.

362   Scott, J. E., McAbee, K. R., Eastman, M. M., Ravosa, M. J. 2014. Experimental perspective on

363   fallback foods and dietary adaptations in early hominins. Biol. Lett. 10, 20130789.

364   Scott, R. S., Ungar, P. S., Bergstrom, T. S., Brown, C. A., Grine, F. E., Teaford, M. F., Walker, A.

365   2005. Dental microwear texture analysis shows within-species diet variability in fossil

366   hominins. Nature 436, 693–695.

367   Sender, R. S., Hilko, A. S., Schwartz, G. T., Strait, D. S. 2020. Biomechanical implications of

368   variation in Hunter-Schreger Bands in early hominins. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 171, 258-258.

369   Smith, A. L., Benazzi, S., Ledogar, J. A., Tamvada, K., Pryor Smith, L. C., Weber, G. W., Spencer,

370   M.A., Lucas, P.W., Michael, S., Shekeban, A., l-Fadhalah, K. 2015. The feeding biomechanics

371   and dietary ecology of *Paranthropus boisei*. Anat. Rec. 298, 145-167.

372   Soukup, J., 2019. Traumatic Dentoalveolar Injuries. In: Lobprise, H.B., Dodd, J.R. (Eds.), Wigg's

373   Veterinary Dentistry Principles and Practice. Lippincott, New York, pp. 411-437.

374   Sponheimer, M., Passey, B. H., De Ruiter, D. J., Guatelli-Steinberg, D., Cerling, T. E., Lee-Thorp,

375   J. A. 2006. Isotopic evidence for dietary variability in the early hominin *Paranthropus robustus*.

376   Science 314, 980-982.

377   Strait, D. S., Constantino, P., Lucas, P. W., Richmond, B. G., Spencer, M. A., Dechow, P. C., Ross,

378   C.F., Grosse, I.R., Wright, B.W., Wood, B.A., Weber, G. W. 2013. Viewpoints: Diet and dietary

379   adaptations in early hominins: The hard food perspective. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 151, 339-

380   355.

381   Teaford MF, Ungar PS. 2000. Diet and the evolution of the earliest human ancestors. Proc.

382   Natl. Acad. Sci. *USA* 97, 506–13 511.

383   Teaford, M. F., Ungar, P. S., Taylor, A. B., Ross, C. F., Vinyard, C. J. 2020. The dental microwear

384   of hard-object feeding in laboratory *Sapajus apella* and its implications for dental microwear

385   formation. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 171, 439-455.

386   Thiery, G., Lazzari, V., Ramdarshan, A., Guy, F. 2017. Beyond the map: Enamel distribution

387   characterized from 3D dental topography. Front. Physiol. 8, 524.

388   Tobias, P.V., 1967. The Cranium of *Australopithecus* (*Zinjanthropus*) *boisei*. Olduva iGorge, vol.

389   2. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

390 Towle, I., Irish, J. D. 2019. A probable genetic origin for pitting enamel hypoplasia on the
391 molars of *Paranthropus robustus*. J. Hum. Evol. 129, 54-61.

392 Towle, I., Irish, J. D., De Groote, I. 2017. Behavioral inferences from the high levels of dental
393 chipping in *Homo naledi*. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 164, 184-192.

394 Towle, I., Loch, C., Irish, J. D., Veneziano, A., Ito, T. 2021. Chipping and wear patterns in extant
395 primate and fossil hominin molars: 'Functional' cusps are associated with extensive wear but
396 low levels of fracture. J. Hum. Evol. 151, 102923.

397 Towle, I., Loch, C. 2021. Tooth chipping prevalence and patterns in extant primates. Am. J.
398 Phys. Anthropol. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24232

399 Ungar PS, Grine FE, Teaford MF. 2008. Dental microwear and diet of the Plio-Pleistocene
400 hominin *Paranthropus boisei*. PLoS One, 3, e2044.

401 Ungar PS, Scott RS, Grine FE, Teaford MF. 2010. Molar microwear textures and the diets of
402 *Australopithecus anamensis* and *Australopithecus afarensis*. *Philos.* Trans. R. Soc. Lond. 365,
403 3345–3354.

404 Ungar, P. S. 2019. Inference of diets of early hominins from primate molar form and
405 microwear. J. Dent. Res. 98, 398-405.

406 Ungar, P. S., Hlusko, L. J. 2016. The evolutionary path of least resistance. Science 353, 29-30.

407 Ungar, P. S., Lucas, P. W. 2010. Tooth form and function in biological anthropology. In: Larsen,
408 C.S. (Ed.), A companion to Biological Anthropology. Wiley-Blackwell, Malden, pp. 516–529.

409 van Casteren, A., Strait, D. S., Swain, M. V., Michael, S., Thai, L. A., Philip, S. M., Saji, S., Al-
410 Fadhalah, K., Almusallam, A.S., Shekeban, A., McGraw, W. S. 2020. Hard plant tissues do not
411 contribute meaningfully to dental microwear: Evolutionary implications. Sci. Rep. 10, 582.

412 van Casteren, A., Wright, E., Kupczik, K., Robbins, M. M. 2019. Unexpected hard-object
413 feeding in Western lowland gorillas. Am. J. Phys. Anthropol. 170, 433-438.

414 Van der Merwe, N. J., Masao, F. T., Bamford, M. K. 2008. Isotopic evidence for contrasting
415 diets of early hominins *Homo habilis* and *Australopithecus boisei* of Tanzania. S. Afri. J. Sci.
416 104, 153-155.

417 Vogel, E. R., van Woerden, J. T., Lucas, P. W., Atmoko, S. S. U., van Schaik, C. P., Dominy, N. J.

418 2008. Functional ecology and evolution of hominoid molar enamel thickness: *Pan troglodytes*

419 *schweinfurthii* and *Pongo pygmaeus wurmbii*. J. Hum. Evol. 55, 60-74.

420 Wallace, J.A., 1973. Tooth chipping in the australopithecines. Nature 244, 117–118.

421 Williams, F. L. E. 2015. Dietary proclivities of *Paranthropus robustus* from Swartkrans, South

422 Africa. Anthropol. Rev. 78, 1-19.

423 Wood, B., Strait, D. 2004. Patterns of resource use in early *Homo* and *Paranthropus*. J. Hum.

424 Evol. 46, 119-162.

425 Yeakel, J. D., Bennett, N. C., Koch, P. L., Dominy, N. J. 2007. The isotopic ecology of African

426 mole rats informs hypotheses on the evolution of human diet. Proc. R. Soc. Lond. B. Biol. Sci.

427 274, 1723-1730.

428

429 **Figure legend**

430 **Figure 1.** Chipping prevalence for first molars and fourth premolars for different extant

431 primate and fossil hominin species. Species are organized by increasing chipping prevalence.

Table 1

Prevalence of chipping in different primate species, by tooth type, jaw, and size of chips. Data refers to all permanent teeth unless stated.

Species	Common name	Number of individuals	Posterior teeth	Anterior teeth	All teeth %	Multiple chipped teeth %	Small:large chip ratio	Reference
Homo naledi			46.39 (45/97)	20.75 (11/53)	37.33 (56/150)	50.00	8.33	Towle et al. (2017)
Australopithecus africanus			20.16 (50/248)	7.32 (6/82)	16.97 (56/330)	16.07	10.20	Towle et al. (2017)
Paranthropus robustus			10.90 (23/211)	11.86 (7/59)	11.11 (30/270)	6.67	1.73	Towle et al. (2017)
Homo neanderthalensis	Neanderthals		31.53 (35/111)	64.86 (48/74)	44.86 (83/185)	9.00	0.90	Belcastro et al. (2018)
Gorilla gorilla gorilla	Western lowland gorilla	83	11.70 (137/1171)	5.25 (32/610)	9.49 (169/1781)	4.14	10.27	Towle et al. (2017)
Pan troglodytes	Chimpanzee	109	4.52 (65/1439)	4.13 (33/800)	4.38(98/2239)	2.04	2.27	Towle et al. (2017)
Cercopithecus denti	Dent's mona monkey	10	16.11 (29/180)	27.06 (23/85)	19.62 (52/265)	1.92	5.50	Towle and Loch (2021)
Cercopithecus mitis	Blue monkey	8	18.13 (29/160)	9.76 (8/82)	15.29 (37/242)	13.51	6.40	Towle and Loch (2021)
Mandrillus spp.	Mandrill	10	36.11 (39/108)	40.00 (8/20)	36.72 (47/128)	23.40	6.83	Towle and Loch (2021)
Presbytis femoralis	Raffles' banded langur	8	31.88 (51/160)	40.24 (33/82)	34.71 (84/242)	11.90	4.60	Towle and Loch (2021)
Presbytis potenziani	Mentawai langur	8	20.25 (32/158)	17.39 (12/69)	19.38 (44/227)	11.36	43.00	Towle and Loch (2021)
Hylobates klossii	Kloss's gibbon	15	5.60 (13/232)	11.90 (10/84)	7.28 (23/316)	0.00	1.88	Towle and Loch (2021)
Macaca fuscata	Japanese macaque	48	24.68 (171/693)	15.33 (44/287)	21.94 (215/980)	12.56	5.76	Towle and Loch (2021)
Simias concolor	Pig-tailed langur	20	16.61 (46/277)	19.70 (26/132)	17.60 (72/409)	12.50	7.00	Towle and Loch (2021)
Lagothrix lagothricha	Brown woolly monkey	7	21.79 (34/156)	11.27 (8/71)	18.50 (42/227)	0.00	7.40	Towle and Loch (2021)
Pithecia spp.	Saki	8	35.09 (60/171)	11.59 (8/69)	28.33 (68/240)	23.53	5.80	Towle and Loch (2021)
Papio hamadryas	Hamadryas baboon	20	26.49 (89/336)	9.89 (18/182)	20.66 (107/518)	8.41	7.23	Towle and Loch (2021)

Table 2

Prevalence of chipping (%) in different primate species, split by individual permanent tooth types. I: incisor; C: canine; PM: premolar; M: molar.

Species	Common name	I1	I2	C	PM3	PM4	M1	M2	M3
Homo naledi		40 (6/15)	12.5 (2/16)	13.64 (3/22)	42.11 (8/19)	42.11 (8/19)	60.71 (17/28)	36.84 (7/19)	41.67 (5/12)
Australopithecus africanus		17.39 (4/23)	4.35 (1/23)	2.78 (1/36)	18.60 (8/43)	32.43 (12/37)	29.53 (13/49)	17.91 (12/67)	9.62 (5/52)
Paranthropus robustus		9.38 (3/32)	7.69 (1/13)	21.43 (3/14)	23.33 (7/30)	4.65 (2/43)	13.46 (7/52)	4.65 (2/43)	11.63 (5/43)
Gorilla gorilla gorilla	Western lowland gorilla	4.05 (9/222)	5.12 (11/215)	6.94 (12/173)	3.76 (8/213)	9.26 (20/216)	15.22 (44/289)	10.89 (28/257)	18.88 (37/196)
Pan troglodytes	Chimpanzee	2.79 (8/287)	4.06 (11/271)	5.79 (14/242)	2.22 (6/270)	1.87 (5/268)	5.18 (20/386)	3.46 (10/289)	10.62 (24/226)
Cercopithecus denti	Dent's mona monkey	38.71 (12/31)	34.62 (9/26)	7.14 (2/28)	8.57 (3/35)	10.81 (4/37)	26.32 (10/38)	15.79 (6/38)	18.75 (6/32)
Cercopithecus mitis	Blue monkey	17.86 (5/28)	4 (1/25)	6.90 (2/29)	3.13 (1/32)	15.63 (5/32)	18.75 (6/32)	25 (8/32)	28.13 (9/32)
Mandrillus spp.	Mandrill	55.56 (5/9)	50 (3/6)	0 (0/5)	13.64 (3/22)	33.33 (7/21)	50 (10/20)	50 (11/22)	34.78 (8/23)
Presbytis femoralis	Raffles' banded langur	52.17 (12/23)	46.15 (12/26)	34.48 (10/29)	18.75 (6/32)	31.25 (10/32)	40.63 (13/32)	31.25 (10/32)	37.5 (12/32)
Presbytis potenziani	Mentawai langur	18.18 (4/22)	22.22 (6/27)	10 (2/20)	6.45 (2/31)	31.25 (10/32)	29.03 (9/31)	31.25 (10/32)	3.13 (1/32)
Hylobates klossii	Kloss's gibbon	2.78 (1/36)	12.5 (4/32)	31.25 (5/16)	4.26 (2/47)	6.52 (3/46)	13.33 (6/45)	3.85 (2/52)	0 (0/42)
Macaca fuscata	Japanese macaque	22.62 (19/84)	16.28 (14/86)	9.40 (11/117)	17.91 (24/134)	18.66 (25/134)	27.92 (43/154)	25.17 (36/143)	33.59 (43/128)
Simias concolor	Pig-tailed langur	29.79 (14/47)	13.33 (6/45)	15 (6/40)	8.62 (5/58)	10.53 (6/57)	24.07 (13/54)	28.07 (16/57)	11.76 (6/51)
Lagothrix lagothricha	Brown woolly monkey	10.53 (2/19)	11.11 (3/27)	15.79 (3/19)	15.38 (4/26)	25.93 (7/27)	22.22 (4/18)	22.22 (6/27)	33.33 (6/18)
Pithecia spp.	Saki	13.33 (2/15)	16.67 (4/24)	8.70 (2/23)	26.67 (8/30)	24.14 (7/29)	37.5 (9/24)	44.44 (12/27)	50 (13/26)
Papio hamadryas	Hamadryas baboon	8.47 (5/59)	9.68 (6/62)	11.48 (7/61)	15.87 (10/63)	17.65 (12/68)	37.5 (27/72)	37.68 (26/69)	21.88 (14/64)

Table 3

Prevalence of large chips, split by tooth type. Number of large chips (severity 2 and 3) as a percentage of total chips.

Species	Common name	Molars	Premolars	Canines	Incisors
Paranthropus robustus		14.29 (2/14)	44.44 (4/9)	100 (3/3)	50 (2/4)
Homo naledi		17.24 (5/29)	6.25 (1/16)	0 (0/3)	0 (0/8)
Australopithecus africanus		6.67 (2/30)	10 (2/20)	100 (1/1)	0 (0/5)
Gorilla gorilla gorilla	Western lowland gorilla	7.34 (8/109)	10.71 (3/28)	0 (0/12)	20 (4/20)
Chimpanzees	Chimpanzee	35.19 (19/54)	27.27 (3/11)	42.86 (6/14)	10.53 (2/19)
Cercopithecus denti	Dent's mona monkey	22.73 (5/22)	0 (0/7)	0 (0/2)	14.29 (3/21)
Cercopithecus mitis	Blue monkey	8.70 (2/23)	33.33 (2/6)	0 (0/2)	16.67 (1/6)
Mandrillus spp.	Mandrill	17.24 (5/29)	10 (1/10)	n/a (0/0)	0 (0/8)
Presbytis femoralis	Raffles' banded langur	8.57 (3/35)	37.5 (6/16)	30 (3/10)	12.5 (3/24)
Presbytis potenziani	Mentawai langur	5 (1/20)	0 (0/12)	0 (0/2)	0 (0/10)
Hylobates klossii	Kloss's gibbon	50 (4/8)	20 (1/5)	40 (2/5)	20 (1/5)
Macaca fuscata	Japanese macaque	22.13 (27/122)	2.04 (1/49)	18.18 (2/11)	3.03 (1/33)
Simias concolor	Pig-tailed langur	11.43 (4/35)	9.09 (1/11)	0 (0/6)	20 (4/20)
Lagothrix lagothricha	Brown woolly monkey	18.75 (3/16)	0 (0/11)	33.33 (1/3)	0 (0/5)
Pithecia spp.	Saki	8.82 (3/34)	26.67 (4/15)	0 (0/2)	0 (0/6)
Papio hamadryas	Hamadryas baboon	11.94 (8/67)	9.09 (2/22)	14.29 (1/7)	18.18 (2/11)