

1 Effects of Local Habitat Variation on the Behavioral Ecology of
2 Two Sympatric Groups of Brown Howler Monkey (*Alouatta*
3 *clamitans*)
4

5 Linda Jung^{1¶}, ~~Ítalo Mourthe~~^{2¶}, Carlos E. V. Grelle³, Karen B. Strier⁴, Jean P. Boubli^{5*}
6

7 ¹ Thuringian State Institute of Agriculture, Jena, Germany

8 ² Faculdade de Biociências, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio Grande do Sul, Porto Alegre,
9 Brazil

10 ³ Departamento de Ecologia, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

11 ⁴ Department of Anthropology, University of Wisconsin, Madison, USA

12 ⁵ School of Environment and Life Sciences, University of Salford, Salford, UK

13 [¶]These authors contributed equally to this work

14 * Corresponding author: j.p.boubli@salford.ac.uk
15
16

17 **Author contributions:** Conceived and designed the research: LJ IM JPB. Performed the fieldwork:
18 LJ. Analyzed the data: LJ IM JPB. Contributed materials/analysis tools: LJ IM CEVG KBS JPB.
19 Wrote the paper: LJ IM KBS JPB.
20

21 **Short title:** Ecology of howlers in contrasting microhabitats
22
23
24

25

26

27

28 **Abstract**

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Complex Script Font: 18 pt

29 Although the brown howler monkey (*Alouatta clamitans*) is a relatively well-studied Neotropical
30 primate, its behavioral and dietary flexibility at the intra-population level remains poorly
31 documented. This study presents data collected on the behavior and ecology of two closely located
32 groups of brown howlers during the same period at the RPPN Feliciano Miguel Abdala in
33 southeastern Brazil. One group occupied a primary valley habitat, henceforth the Valley Group
34 (VG), and the other group occupied a regenerating hillside habitat, the Hill Group (HG). We
35 hypothesized differences in the behavior and ecological parameters between these sympatric groups
36 due to the predicted harsher conditions on the hillside, compared to the valley. We measured several
37 habitat parameters within the home range of both groups and collected data on the activity budget,
38 diet and day range lengths, from August to November 2005, between dawn and dusk. In total,
39 behavioral data were collected for 26 (318 h) and 28 (308 h) sampling days for VG and HG,
40 respectively. As we predicted, HG spent significantly more time feeding and consumed less fruit
41 and more leaves than VG, consistent with our finding that the hillside habitat was of lower quality.
42 However, HG also spent less time resting and more time travelling than VG, suggesting that the
43 monkeys had to expend more time and energy to obtain high-energy foods, such as fruits and
44 flowers that were more widely spaced in their hill habitat. Our results revealed that different
45 locations in this forest vary in quality and raise the question of how different groups secure their
46 home ranges. Fine-grained comparisons such as this are important to prioritize conservation and
47 management areas within a reserve.

48

49 **Key words:** Atlantic Forest, *Alouatta*, habitat fragmentation, howler monkey

50

51

52

53 **Introduction**

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Complex Script Font: 18 pt

54 From the point of view of a primate, rainforest habitats are not homogeneous places. Fine-
55 grained variations in environmental conditions at the scale of a single study site are expected due to
56 variation in elevation (topography) and associated water table, steepness of terrain, soil nutrient
57 gradients among other factors [1]. In turn, these environmental variables will affect the structure
58 and composition of local plant communities contributing to the heterogeneity in local ecological
59 resources and conditions available to primates [2]. Primates with large home ranges negotiate such
60 fine-grained heterogeneity by traveling across the landscape seeking out patches of high quality
61 habitat (e.g., [3,4,5]). Species with small home ranges however, may need to restrict their ranges to
62 areas of higher quality habitats if they are to find their preferred foods while avoiding competitors
63 and predators (e.g., [4,-6,7,8]).

64 In situations of high population densities and with limited opportunities for dispersal, as is the
65 case in forest fragments with low predator abundances some primate groups might be pushed to
66 lower quality parts of the forest [9]. We expect animals inhabiting such lower quality habitats to be
67 under greater ecological stress to meet their daily nutritional requirements, i.e., having to travel
68 further each day to find preferred high quality foods (energy maximization) or having to rest more
69 to save energy while eating lower quality foods (time minimizing) [3,10,11], and consuming a
70 limited set of resources, including less fruit and more foliage [12,13].

71 Howler monkeys (*Alouatta* spp.) are folivorous-frugivorous, arboreal primates that generally do
72 not come to ground to feed, and rely on large trees of certain species. These primates often rely
73 heavily on mature and young foliage along the annual cycle and have a number of adaptations to
74 deal with this leaf-based diet such as an extensive hindgut area and slow passage rates [14-18]. The

75 brown howler monkey (*Alouatta clamitans*) is a mid-sized howler monkey with a wide
76 geographical distribution in the Atlantic forests of Brazil, and northeastern Argentina [19,20]. This
77 species is found at high density (29 ind./km²) in the 1,000 ha Atlantic Forest fragment of the RPPN-
78 FMA, in Caratinga, Brazil. At this site, howlers live in small groups (~5-6 individuals) and in small
79 home ranges [21,22].

80 Due to the hilly terrain and recent history of human disturbances (agriculture, fires, logging),
81 the forest in Caratinga is considerably heterogeneous [23]. There are open patches dominated by
82 bracken, young secondary forest growing on old coffee plantations, grasses and dirt roads. The
83 structure, floristic composition and amount of herbaceous vegetation also vary in significant ways
84 between the three main landscape features of the site: valleys, hillsides and hilltops [23].

85 We wanted to determine if habitats we perceived as lower quality for primates, i.e., hilltop and
86 hillsides that presented lower tree species diversity, greater number of deciduous trees, lower
87 structural complexity (fewer big trees, less connectivity and fewer canopy layers and less ground
88 vegetation) and a recent history of human disturbance [23], were in fact of lower quality to howlers.
89 Such information is important for better understanding howler habitat preferences and requirements,
90 which ultimately is invaluable information for the management and zoning of priority areas for
91 conservation within this reserve.

92 We chose to follow two howler monkey groups of similar size and composition; one in a valley
93 bottom habitat that we considered high quality, henceforth Valley Group (VG) and another on a
94 hillside next to the VG, a lower quality habitat, henceforth Hillside Group (HG). The VG
95 experienced high local humidity characterized by mature forest with few deciduous trees whereas
96 the HG experienced a more disturbed 40-year-old secondary forest at a hillside location with drier
97 conditions and many deciduous tree species [23]. We compared diet, time budget, and travel
98 distances of these two closely located groups of howler monkeys inhabiting these contrasting
99 habitats.

100 Primary consumers are challenged with the highly variable nutritional content and
101 spatiotemporal distribution of their potential foods [3,4,24-26]. In a folivorous-frugivorous diet
102 such as that of the howler monkeys, increased leaf consumption is hypothesized to lead to an
103 increased feeding time because leaves are low in energy and more food is needed to achieve
104 satiation [3,27,28]. Due to its low energy content, a leaf-based diet is often associated with energy-
105 saving strategies i.e., a greater amount of time spent inactive during the day and reduced travel time
106 (time-minimizing-strategy) [3,10,29-31]. Consequently, increasing leaf consumption leads to
107 shorter travel distances while increasing fruit consumption, a source of high energy, has the
108 opposite effect. Although howlers are generally thought to have a leaf-dominated diet and to be
109 energy-limited, some studies have indicated that they are not [32,33]. We hypothesized that the HG
110 would be under greater ecological stress due to the lower quality of this habitat. Thus, we predicted
111 that 1) HG howlers would consume less fruit and more mature leaves than the VG howlers and; 2)
112 due to the energetically poorer diet, the HG would devote more time to feeding and resting and less
113 time to travelling (time-minimizing-strategy) than the VG.

115 **Methods**

116 **Ethics statement**

117 We declare that this research was observational only and that all observations were carried out in
118 accordance with the current laws of Brazil. Our research protocols were approved by the
119 administration of the RPPN Feliciano Miguel Abdala and adhered to the Code of Best Practices for
120 Field Primatology of the American Society of Primatologists and International Primatological
121 Society (www.asp.org/resources/docs/Code%20of_Best_Practices%20Oct%202014.pdf).
122

123 **Site and species**

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Complex Script Font: 18 pt

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold, Not Italic, Complex Script Font: 16 pt

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold, Not Italic, Complex Script Font: 16 pt

124 The study was conducted at the RPPN Feliciano Miguel Abdala (RPPN-FMA), a privately
125 owned reserve located in the state of Minas Gerais, southeastern Brazil (19°50'S, 41°50'N; ~~Figure~~
126 ~~S1 Fig.in S1 File~~). The area is hilly with varying altitudes between 400 to 680 m [34]. The RPPN-
127 FMA comprises an area of approximately 1,000 ha of Atlantic forest, which represents an important
128 forest remnant in a highly fragmented forest landscape. The region is characterized by a temperate
129 climate with a strongly seasonal pattern of hot rain-laden summers (rainy season) and dry winters
130 (dry season), as described after Köppen (Cwa) [35]. More than 80% of the annual rainfall occurs
131 during the rainy season, which lasts from November to April. The annual temperature and rainfall
132 average $20.6 \pm 2.9^{\circ}\text{C}$ (2002-2004) and $1,119.8 \pm 262.75$ mm (1986-2001, updated from [36],)
133 respectively.

134 We selected two study locations in the Jaó Valley, the northern part of the reserve (~~S1 Fig.-S1~~
135 ~~in S1 File~~), lying in close vicinity of each other (ca. 300 m), each one inhabited by one group of
136 brown howlers. Although closely located, the study groups used non-overlapping areas (~~S1 Fig.-S1~~
137 ~~in S1 File~~). The first site comprised a valley and surrounding hills. The valley was characterized by
138 evergreen forest with a small number of deciduous tree species (i.e. those that lost their leaves
139 during the dry season). The second study site was located along a hillside that had been used as a
140 coffee plantation in the past. The vegetation consisted of a 40-year-old secondary forest with a great
141 number of deciduous trees. Boubli et al. [23] contrasted the structure and floristic composition of
142 valley and hill forest habitats at RPPN-FMA. They found valley habitats to be richer in tree species
143 (119 vs. 81 species for trees ≥ 10 cm diameter at breast height; DBH) and with larger trees (basal
144 area per tree was approximately double that of the hill habitats). Both habitats shared only 39
145 species of tree.

146 The study area comprising the valley will be referred to as the valley site from here on,
147 although it also includes hill-habitat, and the observed howler group is named VG. Likewise, HG is
148 the howler group inhabiting the hillside site. The VG consisted of six animals, i.e. one adult and one
149 subadult male, two adult females, one subadult female and one juvenile. The HG comprised five

150 individuals; one adult and one subadult male, and two adult females, one of them with a dependent
151 infant.

152

153 **Microhabitat characterization**

154 To characterize the microhabitats used by the study groups, we used a modification of Boubli et
155 al. [37] and August [38] methods. Habitat structural attributes were assessed by an observer
156 positioned at the center of fifty imaginary 100 m² quadrats located within the range of each group.
157 The location of the quadrats was determined as follows: 50 points were chosen at 20 m distance
158 along walking trails crossing the study habitats. From each point we walked 10 m perpendicular to
159 the trail into the forest, this new point being the middle of each 100-m² quadrats within which the
160 following variables were assessed: number of emerging trees (trees that emerged above the canopy),
161 number of canopy layers, canopy height (height of majority of trees), canopy density (density of the
162 canopies of all trees), connectivity (connection of all layers that are important for monkey
163 travelling, regarding the connection of the vegetation within the quadrat as well as its connection to
164 the adjacent vegetation in walking direction), canopy continuity (opposite to canopy fragmentation),
165 and density of lianas. Number of emergent trees, number of layers, and canopy height were
166 estimated directly. All other variables were evaluated using a subjective scale varying from 0-4 (0 =
167 absent, 1 = 1-25%, 2 = 26-50%, 3 = 51-75%, 4 = 76-100%) [37]. Only a single observer (LJ)
168 assessed these variables to avoid inter-observer biases.

169 To estimate tree density we used the point-quadrant method [39]. At each point we measured
170 the diameter at breast height (DBH) and the distance from each tree to the central point for the
171 nearest tree ≥ 10 cm DBH in each quarter and their identification whenever possible. Several trees in
172 our samples had multiple trunks, in which case we considered the quadratic DBH that is the square
173 root of all summed squared DBHs (i.e., $\sqrt{DBH_1^2 + DBH_2^2}$) [23]. The diversity and evenness of
174 trees in the valley and hillside areas were estimated using Shannon Index (H'), calculated in the

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold, Not Italic, Complex Script
Font: 16 pt

175 natural log basis, and Pielou Index (J) [40]. H' is a quantitative measurement of diversity that
176 accounts for the number of species present and their relative abundances. The higher the H' the
177 higher the diversity. J is derived from H' and represents the uniformity in the distribution of the
178 individuals between the species in the sampled assemblage, varying from 0 to 1 (maximal
179 uniformity).

180

181 **Behavioral data collection**

182 Both groups were already partially habituated to human presence due to previous research work
183 in the area [41] and the presence of local people living close by. However, prior to systematic data
184 collection, a brief habituation period of 6 to 8 days was conducted to familiarize the howler groups
185 with the presence of the observer (LJ). Behavioral data were collected from August to November
186 2005, using the Scan Sampling method [42], with a 5-min scan conducted at 15 min intervals,
187 starting between 5:15-6:15 a.m. and finishing when the howler monkeys entered their sleeping tree
188 in the evening, i.e., between 5:15-6:00 p.m. each sampling day. This method allowed us to obtain
189 data from all individuals per scan except in cases when some individuals were out of sight [42].
190 Data collection of a group was preceded by a search period, which generally took about 2-4 hours
191 and was carried out in the morning. Once one of the study groups was found, data were collected
192 for a maximum of eight consecutive and complete (8-12 h) days before switching to the other
193 group. This period was termed sample session. The time between two sample sessions never
194 comprised more than 6 days. A total of three sample sessions was conducted for each group during
195 26 (318 h) and 28 (308 h) sampling days for VG and HG, respectively.

196 During each scan, the first activity state lasting at least 5 s for each individual sighted was
197 recorded. Behavioral records were classified into six categories: resting, moving (within the same
198 tree), travelling (between trees), feeding (inspection of food, bringing it to the mouth, chewing and
199 swallowing), social interaction (grooming, social play behaviors), and others (e.g. defecation,

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold, Not Italic, Complex Script
Font: 16 pt

urination, social vocalization, copulation). When animals were observed feeding, an effort was made to identify and record the plant part ingested (fruit, mature/immature leaf, mature/immature stem, flower) and its origin (liana or tree). Food sources were later identified to the lowest taxonomic level possible.

The percentage of each activity of the total time budget was calculated using the proportional method [43]: proportions of each activity were first calculated per scan and then averaged over all scans per day, all days, and finally months of the study. Dietary data were treated similarly but only feeding scans were considered in the calculation. This way, percentage of feeding time spent on different food items was determined, which served to quantify the relative importance of each food item in the diet. We used Spearman rank correlation coefficients between percentage of time spent by each group in different behavioral activities and food items consumed.

The location of the study group during every scan sample and the location of food trees were recorded with GPS (Garmim GPS 76) and subsequently plotted in a map (S1 Fig. S1 in the S1 File). Daily travel distances were estimated by summing the distance between consecutive group location records made throughout the day. Total home range used by each group was measured by using the Hawth's Tools Animal Movement extension of ArcGIS 9.1. We used the Minimum Convex Polygon option to calculate the areas of the home ranges. The dependent infant in HG was not included in behavioral sampling because it was generally carried by its mother and hidden from view during most of the time. Analyses were carried out in R [44]. As most data were not normally distributed, we used the nonparametric statistics, Spearman rank correlation (r_s) and Wilcoxon rank sum test (W) to correlate and compare data, respectively. Significance level was set at 0.05.

Results

Microhabitat comparison

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Complex Script Font: 18 pt

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold, Not Italic, Complex Script Font: 16 pt

224 In the hillside area, 3.5% of trees were > 40 cm DBH with the largest tree measuring 60.5 cm,
 225 whereas in the valley, 8% of the trees were above 40 cm DBH with the largest tree measuring 155 cm
 226 DBH. The density of trees was the same for the valley and hillside habitats (0.08 trees/m²). In total,
 227 74% of all 400 trees measured were identified. In the valley habitat, there were at least 43 species
 228 versus at least 29 species in the hillside habitat. Both habitats shared at least 19 of the identified
 229 species. The valley habitat was more diverse and even than the hill habitat ($H' = 3.47$; $J = 0.92$ and $H' = 2.39$; $J = 0.71$). In the hill habitat, *Dalbergia nigra* represented at least 30% ($n = 62$) of all trees
 230 sampled, explaining the low evenness obtained.
 231

232 The VG occupied an area with a more connected upper canopy layer, relatively denser shrub
 233 layer, and higher number of layers and emergent trees than the area used by the HG (Table 1).
 234 Although average DBH was not significantly different between the two habitats, there was a higher
 235 percentage of trees with multiple trunks in the hillside (21%) versus the valley (4%). Trees with
 236 multiple trunks are typical in young secondary forests at our study site [21]. None of the other
 237 variables measured here were significantly different between habitats.
 238

239 **Table 1.** Comparison of habitat characteristics between the home ranges of the Valley (VG) and
 240 Hill Group (HG) using Wilcoxon rank sum test. See methods for detailed description of variables.

Microhabitat variables	W	P	Mean ± SE	
			VG (n = 50)	HG (n = 50)
			Mean ± SE	Mean ± SE
Canopy density	1054	0.14	2.4 ± 0.10	2.2 ± 0.10
Canopy height	1124	0.38	15.2 ± 0.62	14.5 ± 0.56
DBH	10745	0.39	21.94 ± 1.14	19.46 ± 0.59
Tree height	10318	0.22	15.47 ± 1.14	13.14 ± 0.99

			0.58	0.34
Number of emergents	879	<0.001	0.4 ± 0.09	0.1 ± 0.07
Number of layers	676	<0.001	1.1 ± 0.13	0.3 ± 0.09
Connectivity	539	<0.001	2.9 ± 0.13	2.0 ± 0.11
Continuity	881	<0.01	2.4 ± 0.13	1.9 ± 0.11
Density of mid-store	1044	0.12	2.2 ± 0.12	2.0 ± 0.9
Density of lianas	1387	0.32	2.1 ± 0.14	2.3 ± 0.12
Density of shrub	969	0.03	2.6 ± 0.12	2.2 ± 0.11
Percentage of bare ground	837	<0.01	3.0 ± 0.11	2.5 ± 0.10

Howler monkey behavior and ecology

In total, 2,408 scan samples were collected, 1,274 for the VG and 1,234 for the HG. Howler monkeys fed on at least 58 plant species belonging to 24 families ([S1 Table-S1 in S1 File](#)). These species represent roughly 27% of the 214 woody plant species found in the study site [23].

VG diet included at least 44 plant species (26 identified trees plus 18 trees and lianas morphospecies) as compared to at least 34 species for HG (22 identified trees plus 12 trees and lianas morphospecies) ([S1 Table-S1](#)). Whereas the VG spread its diet more evenly across all species eaten, HG devoted a disproportionate amount of time to *Apuleia leiocarpa*, spending 23.3 % of all feeding time eating leaves (22%) and flowers (3%) from this tree species. The most important species in VG diet in this study was *Ficus sp.*, which comprised nearly 16 % of the monkeys' feeding time.

Trees were the most used food source in both groups. The consumption of tree items (68% vs. 78%; $W = 268$, $p = 0.10$) and liana items (22% vs. 15%; $W = 450$, $p = 0.14$) did not differ significantly between the VG and HG, respectively. The largest part of feeding time was spent on

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold, Not Italic, Complex Script
Font: 16 pt

leaves in both groups (Figure 1: 71% vs. 77%, respectively; $W = 266$, $p = 0.09$). Feeding time spent on mature leaves was significantly lower ($W = 241.5$, $p = 0.04$) in the VG (34%) compared to the HG (45%) but the groups did not differ from one another in their consumption of immature leaves ($W = 412.5$, $p = 0.4106$). Fruits and flowers were the second most important food item in the VG and in the HG, respectively. Feeding time on fruit was significantly shorter in the HG compared to the VG (3% vs. 15%, respectively; $W = 523$, $p < 0.01$). There was a tendency for higher flower consumption in the VG (11%) than in the HG (6%) ($W = 258.5$, $p = 0.05$).

Figure 1. Time spent feeding on different food items in % \pm SE for two groups of *Alouatta clamitans* from August to October 2005 at RPPN-FMA, Minas Gerais, Brazil. White bars = Valley group, grey bars = Hill Group. Asterisks indicate significant differences, as described in the text.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Both groups spent an equal amount of daytime resting (Figure 2: 59%; $W = 381.5$, $p = 0.7768$) and travelling (15%; $W = 329.5$, $p = 0.5556$; Figure 2). Feeding time was significantly lower in the VG, where it contributed 16% to overall time budget, than in the HG (22%; $W = 117$, $p < 0.0001$). In contrast, moving was significantly higher in the VG (5%) than in the HG (2%; $W = 585$, $p \leq 0.0001$), as was time spent in social interactions (3% vs. 1%, respectively; $W = 579$, $p \leq 0.00102$).

Figure 2. Time spent in different activities in % \pm SE for two groups of *Alouatta clamitans* from August to October 2005 at RPPN-FMA, Minas Gerais, Brazil. White bars = Valley group, grey bars = Hill Group. Asterisks indicate significant differences, as described in the text.

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Correlation between diet and time budget

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold, Not Italic, Complex Script
Font: 16 pt

The percentage of time spent in several behavioral activities by each group was significantly correlated with the time spent consuming different dietary items. These correlations are summarized in Table 2. Feeding time decreased significantly with an increasing intake of fruit and mature foliage in the HG and flowers in the VG. Resting time decreased with the intake of flowers and immature leaves and increased with the consumption of mature leaves in the HG. There was also a tendency for increasing resting time with increasing fruit consumption in HG. In general, no significant correlations were found between travel time and food type consumption. Moving time however, was positively influenced by fruit intake and negatively by the consumption of flowers in the VG. Time spent in social interactions was only significantly influenced by diet in the VG, being negatively correlated with feeding time on mature leaves and positively with immature leaves (Table 2). There was evidence for time budget limitation in both groups, for which resting and feeding time (VG: $r_s = -0.454$, $n = 28$, $p = 0.02$; HG: $r_s = -0.526$, $n = 26$; $p < 0.01$), as well as resting and travel time (VG: $r_s = -0.39$, $n = 28$, $p = 0.05$; HG: $r_s = -0.68$, $n = 26$, $p < 0.001$) were negatively correlated. Resting was also negatively influenced by moving time, but just in the VG (VG: $r_s = -0.47$, $n = 28$, $p = 0.01$; HG: $r_s = -0.36$, $n = 26$, $p < 0.07$).

Table 2. Spearman rank correlation coefficients of the relation between percentage of time spent by each group in different behavioral activities and items consumed. Significances are shown in parentheses. Number of samples for VG = 28 and HG = 26.

Activities	Item consumed			
	Fruit	Flowers	Mature leaf	Immature leaf
Feed VG	0.32 (0.10)	-0.48 (0.10)	0.36 (0.06)	-0.33 (0.09)
Feed HG	-0.45 (0.02)	0.26 (0.20)	-0.38 (0.054)	0.14 (0.48)
Move VG	0.54 (≤ 0.00301)	-0.43 (0.02)	-0.07 (0.73)	-0.20 (0.32)
Move HG	-0.0002 (1.00)	0.30 (0.14)	-0.18 (0.39)	0.12 (0.57)
Travel VG	-0.36 (0.06)	0.17 (0.37)	0.20 (0.32)	-0.09 (0.63)
Travel HG	-0.003 (0.99)	0.13 (0.53)	-0.31 (0.12)	0.34 (0.09)

Rest VG	-0.22 (0.27)	0.24 (0.22)	-0.19 (0.34)	0.26 (0.18)
Rest HG	0.37 (0.07)	-0.45 (0.02)	0.67 (≤ 0.001)	-0.59 (0.001)
Social VG	-0.11 (0.59)	0.03 (0.89)	-0.39 (0.04)	0.50 (≤ 0.01)
Social HG	0.21 (0.30)	0.36 (0.07)	-0.24 (0.24)	0.30 (0.14)

Ranging pattern

The home range of VG calculated for the duration of this study was smaller (5.03 ha) than that for the HG (15.80 ha). Total travel distance for the combined three months of the study was longer for the HG than for VG (13,015 m vs. 9,332 m, respectively). The HG travelled significantly longer distances per day than the VG, i.e. 542 ± 41 m vs. 389 ± 62 m, respectively ($W = 150$, $n = 24$, $p < 0.01$). As expected, daily travel distance was strongly and positively correlated with travel time in both groups (VG: $r_s = 0.790$, $n = 24$, $p < 0.001$; HG: $r_s = 0.727$, $n = 24$, $p < 0.001$). Feeding time decreased significantly with daily travel distance in the VG ($r_s = -0.583$, $n = 24$, $p < 0.01$) and showed the same tendency in the HG ($r_s = -0.389$, $n = 24$, $p = 0.06$). Furthermore, daily travel distance and time spent in social interactions were positively correlated in the HG ($r_s = 0.527$, $n = 24$, $p < 0.01$) but not in VG ($r_s = -0.07$, $n = 24$, $p = 0.74$). Interestingly, only feeding time on flowers correlated significantly and positively with travel distance per day in the VG ($r_s = 0.471$, $n = 28$, $p = 0.02$). Travel distance per day and intake of fruit were not correlated in any group, but showed a tendency for a negative correlation in the VG ($r_s = -0.352$, $n = 28$, $p = 0.09$) and a positive one in the HG ($r_s = 0.391$, $n = 26$, $p = 0.06$).

Discussion

This study revealed differences in diet, time budget, and travel distance between our two study groups. Although such variation has previously been documented between *A. clamitans* populations separated by several hundred kilometers [22,27,30,45,46] and within single *Alouatta* groups in

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold, Not Italic, Complex Script
Font: 16 pt

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Complex Script Font: 18 pt

323 different seasons [22,27,30], such ecological and behavioral differences in contrasting microhabitats
324 in the same area are rarely studied, e.g. [3].

325 In accordance with our first prediction, the HG consumed less fruit and more leaves than the
326 VG. The highest fruit intake in the VG occurred during September and was mostly due to several
327 very large fruit trees available in its home range. In particular, a large fig tree was an important
328 source of fruit to the VG during this study. Other authors have emphasized the importance of *Ficus*
329 in the diet of howler monkeys [3,17,47,48] and Serio-Silva et al. [49] suggested that the degree of
330 frugivory in howler monkeys is closely related with fig production; when no figs are present,
331 folivory dominates. At the hill site, only one small fig tree was recorded but it did not produce fruit
332 during the study period. We believe moving time was greater in VG because howlers in this group
333 spent more time foraging within such large fruit tree canopies to find ripe fruits.

334 In agreement with our second prediction, the HG spent significantly more time feeding than the
335 VG. Although this find is consistent with our results that HG ate more leaves than VG, we found a
336 negative relationship between time spent feeding and the consumption of mature leaves. This is
337 harder to interpret since we expected that, given the lower quality of leaves as compared to fruits in
338 terms of energy sources, HG monkeys had to devote more time to feeding than VG to meet their
339 daily energy demands. In addition, feeding time included the proportion of time the animals spent
340 chewing leaves; a greater proportion of feeding time is required for processing (chewing) highly
341 fibrous leaves than fruit and flowers that require less mastication per quantity ingested. Experiments
342 on captive *A. palliata* have shown that twice as much time is required for consuming the same
343 amount of fresh foliage compared to fruit [7]. Our interpretation of this result is that, on days when
344 howlers spent more time eating mature leaves, they required longer resting times in order to digest
345 this food item, which might have influenced the time devoted to feeding as time devoted to the six
346 activities recorded here are all interdependent.

347 Our prediction that the HG would spend more time resting and less time travelling than the VG,
348 was not confirmed. Both groups devoted the same amount of time to rest and travel. The reasoning

349 behind our initial prediction was that in tropical forests, higher quality foods have been shown to be
350 patchily distributed in space and time [3]. Travel and resting time have been related to food source
351 distribution [3,5,50,51+]. Thus, great travel distances, long travel times and consequently less
352 resting time have been associated with patchily distributed fruit, flowers and young leaves, whereas
353 short travel distances, small travel times and more resting with uniformly distributed mature leaves
354 [48,52,53].

355 We attribute our unexpected result to the marked differences in habitat quality we found
356 between HG and VG. During our study, the VG fed mostly on a few large trees available in their
357 home range that provided the majority of fruits consumed by this group. Sometimes, the group
358 spent almost the entire day feeding on one very large *Ficus sp.* tree, a large food patch that did not
359 require increased travelling to find fruit. Indeed, the effect of shorter day ranges associated with
360 camping out (and thus, resting) at large patches of preferred fruits has previously been described for
361 sympatric northern muriquis [54]. No large fruit feeding-patch was available at the hill site, where
362 fruit consumption thus required longer travel distances. With less time devoted to traveling, VG
363 spent more time resting while camping out near fruit sources. This was true during the late dry
364 season-early rainy season months of this study. Comparisons over a complete annual cycle would
365 be necessary to evaluate whether the effects of microhabitats on howler behavior persist year-round,
366 particularly later in the rainy season, when food resources are likely to be more abundant in both
367 microhabitats [41,55]. On the other hand, as pointed out by Terborgh [56], it is in the dry season
368 that important differences in foraging can be observed in primates; in times of plenty, all primates
369 have very similar diets.

370 Differences in fruit production in both habitats may explain the dissimilarities found in the
371 behavior of howlers in our study site since the VG group had access to a number of large trees with
372 a large fruit production within its home range. The hillside howlers inhabited a lower quality habitat
373 in terms of structural and floristic aspects and the availability of preferred fruits, as indicated by
374 their more folivorous diet.

375 These findings raise the question of how different groups secure their home ranges. If some
376 home ranges are of higher quality than others, home range sites should become the object of contest
377 competition between groups. The result would be a hierarchical ordering of groups in the forest,
378 with higher-ranking groups securing better quality habitats. To date, such higher-level organization
379 has not yet been studied in howler monkeys.

380

381 **Supporting information**

382 **S1 File. Supplemental Information**

383 ~~This file contains supplementary information on the location of the study area, the area occupied~~
384 ~~by the howler groups studied and their dietary composition.~~

385 **S1 Table. Dietary composition of Valley and Hill groups.**

386 **S1 Fig. Location of the study area and home range of the two study groups.**

387

388

389 **Acknowledgments**

390 We thank the RPPN-FMA administration for permission to conduct this research and the
391 Abdala family for permission to work [in at](#) their reserve. We are most grateful to the team at RPPN-
392 FMA for logistic support and to Jairo Gomes and Roberto Pereira for field assistance. All analyses
393 were accomplished under the free software R 2.8.0 [44].

394

395 **References**

396 1. Kinupp VF, Magnusson WE. Spatial patterns in the understorey shrub genus *Psycotria* in central
397 Amazonia: effects of distance and topography. J Trop Ecol. 2005; 21: 363–374.

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Complex Script Font: 18 pt

Formatted: Font: 18 pt, Complex Script Font: 18 pt

- 398 2. Dunn JC, Cristóbal-Azkarate J, Veà JJ. Seasonal variations in the diet and feeding effort of two
399 groups of howlers in different sized forest fragments. *Int J Primatol*. 2010; 31: 887–903.
- 400 3. Milton K. The foraging strategy of howler monkeys. New York: Columbia University Press;
401 1980.
- 402 4. Mourthé I. Response of frugivorous primates to changes in fruit supply in a northern Amazonian
403 forest. *Braz J Biol*. 2014; 74: 720–727.
- 404 5. Boubli JP, Tokuda M. Socioecology of black uakari monkeys, *Cacajao hosomi*, in Pico da
405 Neblina National Park, Brazil: the role of the peculiar spatial-temporal distribution of resources
406 in the Neblina forests. *Primate Rep*. 2008; 75: 3–10.
- 407 6. Milton K, Giacalone J, Wright SJ, Stockmayer G. Do frugivore population fluctuations reflect
408 fruit production? Evidence from Panama. In: Dew JL, Boubli JP, editors. *Tropical Fruits and*
409 *Frugivores*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Springer; 2005. pp. 5–35.
- 410 7. Nagy KA, Milton K. Energy metabolism and food consumption by wild howler monkeys
411 (*Alouatta palliata*). *Ecology*. 1979; 60: 475–480.
- 412 8. Strier KB. Atelinae adaptations: behavioral strategies and ecological constraints. *Am J Phys*
413 *Anthropol*. 1992; 88: 515–524.
- 414 9. Terborgh J, Lopez L, Percy Nuñez P, Rao M, Shahabudin G, et al. Ecological meltdown in
415 predator-free forest fragments. *Science*. 2001; 294: 1923–1926.
- 416 10. Schoener TW. Theory of feeding strategies. *Annu Rev Ecol Syst*. 1971; 2: 369–404.
- 417 11. Hixon MA. Energy Maximizers and Time Minimizers: Theory and Reality. *Am Nat*, 1982; 4:
418 596-599.
- 419 ~~Tattersall I. Recognizing species, present and past. *Evol Anthropol*. 2014; 23: 5–7.~~
- 420 12. Orihuela G, Terborgh J, Ceballos N, Glander K. When top-down becomes bottom up: behaviour
421 of hyperdense howler monkeys (*Alouatta seniculus*) trapped on a 0.6 ha island. *PLoS one*. 2014;
422 9: e82197.

Formatted: Indent: Before: 0 cm, First line: 0 cm

Formatted: Indent: Before: 0 cm, First line: 0 cm

- 423 13. Orihuela Lopez G, Terborgh J, Ceballos N. Food selection by a hyperdense population of red
424 howler monkeys (*Alouatta seniculus*). J Trop Ecol. 2005; 21: 445–450.
- 425 14. Leighton M, Leighton DR. The relationship of size of feeding aggregate to size of food patch:
426 Howler monkeys (*Alouatta palliata*) feeding in *Trichilia cipo* fruit trees on Barro Colorado
427 Island. Biotropica. 1982; 14: 81–90.
- 428 15. Dunn JC, Cristobal-Azkarate J, Veá JJ. Differences in diet and activity pattern between two
429 groups of *Alouatta palliata* associated with the availability of big trees and fruit of top food taxa.
430 Am J Primatol. 2009; 71: 654–662.
- 431 16. Chivers DJ, Hladik CM. Morphology of the gastrointestinal tract in primates: Comparisons with
432 other mammals in relation to diet. J Mammal. 1980; 166: 337–386.
- 433 17. Chaves OM, Bicca-Marques JC. Dietary flexibility of the brown howler monkey throughout its
434 geographic distribution. Am J Primatol. 2013; 75: 16–29.
- 435 18. Bicca- Marques JC. How do howler monkeys cope with habitat fragmentation. In: Marsh LK,
436 editor. Primates in fragments: ecology and conservation. New York: Kluwer Academics/Plenum
437 Press; 2003. pp. 283–303.
- 438 19. Gregorin R. Taxonomia e variação geográfica das espécies do gênero *Alouatta* Lacépède
439 (Primates, Atelidae) no Brasil. Revta Bras Zool. 2006; 23: 64–144.
- 440 20. Chiarello AG, Galetti M. Conservation of the brown howler monkey in south-east Brazil. Oryx.
441 1994; 28: 37–42.
- 442 21. Almeida-Silva B, Cunha AA, Boubli JP, Mendes SL, Strier KB. Population density and vertical
443 stratification on four primate species at the Estação Biológica de Caratinga/RPPN-FMA, Minas
444 Gerais, Brazil. Neotrop Primates. 2005; 13: 25–29.
- 445 22. Mendes SL. Estudo ecológico de *Alouatta fusca* (Primates, Cebidae) na Estação Biológica de
446 Caratinga, MG. Rev Nordest Biol. 1989; 6: 71–104.

23. Boubli JP, Couto-Santos FR, Strier KB. Structure and floristic composition of one of the last forest fragments containing the critically endangered northern muriqui (*Brachyteles hypoxanthus*, Primates). *Ecotropica*. 2011; 17: 53–69.
24. Milton K. Macronutrient patterns of 19 species of Panamanian fruits from Barro Colorado Island. *Neotrop Primates*. 2008; 15: 1–7.
25. Richard AF. *Primates in nature*. New York: W.H. Freeman and Company; 1985.
26. Lambert JE. Primate nutritional ecology — Feeding biology and diet at ecological and evolutionary scales. In: Campbell CJ, Fuentes A, Mackinnon KC, Panger M, Bearder SK, editors. *Primates in Perspective*. New York: Oxford University Press; 2007. pp. 482–495.
27. Chiarello AG. Diet of the brown howler monkey *Alouatta fusca* in a semi-deciduous forest fragment of southeastern Brazil. *Primates*. 1994; 35: 25–34.
28. Estrada A, Juan-Solano S, Matínez TO, Coates-Estrada R. Feeding and general activity patterns of a howler monkey (*Alouatta palliata*) troop living in a forest fragment at Los Tuxtlas, Mexico. *Am J Primatol*. 1999; 48: 167–183.
29. Julliot C. Diet diversity and habitat of howler monkeys. *Curr. ent Primatology*. 1994; 1: 67–72.
30. Chiarello AG. Activity pattern of the brown howler monkey *Alouatta fusca*, Geoffroy 1812, in a forest fragment of southeastern Brazil. *Primates*. 1993; 34: 289–293.
31. Wallace RB. Seasonal variations in diet and foraging behavior of *Ateles chamek* in a southern Amazonian tropical forest. *Int J Primatol*. 2005; 26: 1053–1075.
32. Amato KR, Garber PA. Nutrition and foraging strategies of the black howler monkey (*Alouatta pigra*) in Palenque National Park, Mexico. *Am J Primatol*. 2014; 76: 774–787.
33. Milton K. Physiological ecology of howlers (*Alouatta*): energetic and digestive considerations and comparison with the colobinae. *Int J Primatol*. 1998; 19: 511–548.
34. Hatton J, Smart N, Thomson K. In urgent need of protection – habitat for the woolly spider monkey. *Oryx*. 1984; 18: 24–29.

35. Peel MC, Finlayson BL, McMahon TA. Updated world map of the Köppen-Geiger climate classification. *Hydrol Earth Syst Sci.* 2007; 11: 1633–1644.
36. Strier KB, Mendes SL, Santos RR. Timing of births in sympatric brown howler monkeys (*Alouatta fusca clamitans*) and northern muriquis (*Brachyteles arachnoides hypoxanthus*). *Am J Primatol.* 2001; 55: 87–100.
37. Boubli JP, Couto-Santos FR, Mourthé IMC. Quantitative assessment of habitat differences between northern and southern muriquis (Primates, Atelidae) in the Brazilian Atlantic Forest. *Ecotropica.* 2010; 16: 63–69.
38. August PV. The role of habitat complexity and heterogeneity in structuring tropical mammal communities. *Ecology.* 1983; 64: 1495–1507.
39. Cottam G, Curtis JT. The use of distance measures in phytosociological sampling. *Ecology.* 1956; 37: 451–460.
40. Magurran AE. *Ecological diversity and its measurement.* New Jersey: Princeton University Press; 1988.
41. Strier KB, Boubli JP. A history of long-term research and conservation of northern muriquis (*Brachyteles hypoxanthus*) at the Estação Biológica de Caratinga/RPPN-FMA. *Primate Conserv.* 2006; 20: 53–63.
42. Altmann J. Observational study of behavior: sampling methods. *Behaviour.* 1974; 49: 227–267.
43. Clutton-Brock TH. Methodology and measurement. In: Clutton-Brock TH, editor. *Primate ecology: studies of feeding and ranging behaviour in lemurs, monkeys and apes.* London, New York, San Francisco: Academic Press; 1977. pp. 585–590.
44. R Development Core Team. *R: A language and environment for statistical computing.* Version 3.0.3 ed. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2014.
45. Miranda JMD, Passos FC. Hábito alimentar de *Alouatta guariba* (Humboldt) (Primates, Atelidae) em floresta de Araucária, Paraná, Brasil. *Revta Bras Zool.* 2004; 21: 821–826.

- 497 46. Aguiar LC, Reis NR, Ludwig G, Rocha VJ. Dieta, área de vida, vocalizações e estimativas
498 populacionais de *Alouatta guariba* em um remanescente florestal no norte do estado do Paraná.
499 Neotrop Primates. 2003; 11: 78–86.
- 500 47. Silver SC, Ostro LET, Yeager CP, Horwich R. Feeding ecology of the black howler monkey
501 (*Alouatta pigra*) in northern Belize. Am J Primatol. 1998; 45: 263–279.
- 502 48. Muñoz D, Estrada A, Naranjo E, Ochoa S. Foraging ecology of howler monkeys in a cacao
503 (*Theobroma cacao*) plantation in Comalcalco, México. Am J Primatol. 2006; 68: 127–142.
- 504 49. Serio-Silva JC, Rico-Gray V, Hernandez-Salazar LT, Espinosa-Gomez R. The role of *Ficus*
505 (Moraceae) in the diet and nutrition of a troop of Mexican howler monkeys, *Alouatta palliata*
506 *mexicana*, released on an island in southern Veracruz, Mexico. J Trop Ecol. 2002; 18: 913–928.
- 507 50. Bronikowski AM, Altmann J. Foraging in a variable environment: weather patterns and the
508 behavioral ecology of baboons. Behav Ecol Sociobiol. 1996; 39: 11–25.
- 509 51. Pavelka MSM, Knopff KH. Diet and activity in black howler monkeys (*Alouatta pigra*) in
510 southern Belize: does degree of frugivory influence activity level? Primates. 2004; 45: 105–111.
- 511 52. Valle YG, Muñoz D, Magaña-Alejandro M, Estrada A, Franco B. Uso de plantas como alimento
512 por monos aulladores, *Alouatta palliata*, en el Parque Yumká, Tabasco, México. Neotrop
513 Primates. 2001; 9: 112–118.
- 514 53. Palacios E, Rodriguez A. Ranging pattern and use of space in a group of red howler monkeys
515 (*Alouatta seniculus*) in a southeastern Colombian rainforest. Am J Primatol. 2001; 55: 233–251.
- 516 54. Strier KB. Ranging behavior of woolly spider monkey, or muriquis, *Brachyteles arachnoides*.
517 Int J Primatol. 1987; 8: 575–591.
- 518 55. Strier KB. Diet in one group of woolly spider monkeys, or muriquis (*Brachyteles arachnoides*).
519 Am J Primatol. 1991; 23: 113–126.
- 520 56. Terborgh J. Five new world primates. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press; 1983.
- 521
522
523
524