



**An investigation of ecological correlates with hand and foot
morphology in callitrichid primates.**

Journal:	<i>American Journal of Physical Anthropology</i>
Manuscript ID:	AJPA-2012-00419.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Smith, Joanna; University of Worcester, Institute of Science and the Environment Smith, Andrew; Anglia Ruskin University, Life Sciences
Key Words:	Monkeys, Limb morphology, Exudativory, Friction

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

1
2
3 An investigation of ecological correlates with hand and foot morphology in callitrichid
4
5
6 primates.
7
8
9

10 Joanna M. Smith¹, Andrew C. Smith²
11
12
13

14
15 ¹Institute of Science and the Environment, University of Worcester, Worcester WR2 6AJ, UK.
16

17 ²Animal and Environmental Research Group, Department of Life Sciences, Anglia Ruskin
18
19 University, Cambridge CB1 1PT, UK
20
21
22

23
24 36 pages, 3 figures, 5 tables
25

26 Abbreviated title: Hand morphology and exudativory in callitrichids
27

28 Key words: Monkeys, Limb morphology, Exudativory, Friction
29

30 Contact author: Dr. Joanna Smith, ISE, University of Worcester, Worcester WR2 6AJ, UK. Tel:
31

32 +44 (0) 1905 54 2372 E-mail: joanna.smith@worc.ac.uk
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Studies of primate taxonomy and phylogeny often depend on comparisons of limb dimensions,
9 yet there is little information on how morphology correlates and contributes to foraging
10 strategies and ecology. Callitrichid primates are ideal for comparative studies as they exhibit a
11 range of body size, limb proportions and diet. Many callitrichid species exhibit a high degree
12 of exudativory and to efficiently exploit these resources they are assumed to have evolved
13 morphologies that reflect a level of dependence on these resources. We tested assumptions by
14 considering measurements of limb proportion and frictional features of the volar surfaces in
15 preserved specimens of 25 species with relation to published life history and ecological data.
16 The degree of exudativory and utilization of vertical substrates during foraging were found to
17 correlate both with size and with size-corrected foot and hand dimensions. Smaller species,
18 which engage in greater degrees of exudativory, had proportionally longer hands and feet and
19 more curved claw-like tegulae (nails) on their digits to facilitate climbing on vertical substrates.
20 The density of patterned ridges (dermatoglyphs) on the volar surfaces of the hands and feet is
21 higher in more exudativorous genera, suggesting a role in climbing on vertical tree trunks
22 during foraging. Dermatoglyph comparisons suggest that ridges on the soles and palms may
23 facilitate food procurement by enhancing frictional grip during exudate feeding. Volar pad
24 features corroborate taxonomic relationships described from dental morphology.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Callitrichidae (Mammalia: Primates) includes over forty diverse species of New World
5
6 Monkey. These may be grouped into ‘marmosets’ (*Callibella*, *Callimico*, *Callithrix*, *Cebuella*,
7
8 and *Mico*) or tamarins (*Leontopithecus* and *Saguinus*) (Rylands et al., 2012). Prior to the
9
10 reassessment of taxonomic relationships by Rylands et al., (2000) and the subsequent
11
12 recognition of *Callibella* as a separate species (Van Roosmalen and Van Roosmalen, 2003),
13
14 *Callithrix* was the most diverse genus, with over twenty species. Since 2003 *Callibella*,
15
16 *Callimico* and *Cebuella* have been considered monotypic and fourteen species have been
17
18 removed from *Callithrix* to a new genus *Mico*, thereby making *Saguinus* the most diverse
19
20 callitrichid genus (Rylands et al., 2012). Recent analysis of phylogenetic relationships in all
21
22 primates (Perelman et al. 2011) further confirms the taxonomy described in Cortés-Ortiz
23
24 (2009): (*Saguinus* (*Leontopithecus* (*Callimico* (*Callithrix* (*Callibella* (*Cebuella/Mico*)))))).
25
26
27 Although their taxonomy is under seemingly constant review, callitrichids are ideal subjects to
28
29 investigate morphology and allometry trends in relation to ecology because they represent a
30
31 wide range of body sizes and exhibit variability in diet and foraging strategies both between
32
33 and within genera, despite close phylogenetic proximities.
34
35
36
37
38

39
40 Phylogeny and taxonomy of primates often depend on comparing limb proportions and
41
42 morphology (i.e. Falsetti et al., 1993; Shoshani et al., 1996; Anderson et al., 2000; Schmidt,
43
44 2005, 2008). The relationships between primate locomotor modes (i.e. vertical clinging and
45
46 leaping, quadrupedalism and bipedalism) and post-cranial morphology are well-known (e.g.
47
48 Anenome, 1990; Gebo, 1996; Lemelin and Schmitt, 1998; Garber and Leigh, 2001; Anapol et
49
50 al., 2005; Schmidt, 2005; Wright, 2007; Schmidt, 2008).
51
52
53
54

55 While diverse morphologically and ecologically, most callitrichids have a common trait
56
57 of consuming plant exudates, principally gums (see Smith, 2010). Consequently, many species
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 possess unique features that allow them to efficiently utilize this nutrition-poor, difficult to
5
6 access resource including specialist digestive systems in *Mico (Callithrix) emiliae* (Ferrari and
7
8 Martins, 1992), gouging incisors, and other craniofacial characteristics in *Callithrix*, *Cebuella*
9
10 and *Mico* (Forsythe & Ford, 2011). All callitrichids have elongated, laterally compressed and
11
12 hooked claw-like nails or ‘tegulae’ (Garber, 1980, Thorndike, 1968; Soligo and Müller, 1999).
13
14 Though originally considered a primitive character, it is now assumed that callitrichid tegulae
15
16 are a derived specialization which facilitate the gum-feeding behavior prevalent in the
17
18 marmosets and tamarins (Garber and Sussman, 1984; Sussman and Kinzey, 1984; Hamrick,
19
20 1998; Soligo and Müller, 1999). Garber et al. (1996) identified two major problems with this
21
22 inference: firstly, although the presence of ‘claws’ may be expected to aid vertical clinging, the
23
24 postural behavior most commonly associated with gum-feeding (Garber, 1992, 1993; Jackson,
25
26 2011), the link between gum-feeding and the presence of clawed digits has not been
27
28 demonstrated across species with differing degrees of exudativory; secondly, despite the
29
30 considerable variability in the extent to which callitrichids exploit gums, all possess tegulae.
31
32 Garber et al. (1996) agree with Cartmill (1979) that the presence of tegulae is an adaptation
33
34 which simply allows the family to exploit large-diameter vertical supports. Indeed recent
35
36 studies suggest access to fungi growing on large-diameter substrates is a major consideration
37
38 for some species (Porter and Garber, 2004; Hilário and Ferrari, 2010).
39
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 Studies on non-exudativorous climbing animals (e.g. birds (Pike and Maitland, 2004);
47
48 lizards (Zani et al., 2000; Ribas et al., 2004; Tulli et al., 2009); carnivores (Van Valkenburgh,
49
50 1987)) from both arboreal and saxicolous (rocky) habitats, have demonstrated positive
51
52 correlations between climbing and claw curvature. More frequent climbing behavior is
53
54 contingent on a more strongly decurved claw geometry (i.e. Feduccia, 1993). Such findings
55
56 may bolster suggestions that the presence of tegulae in the callitrichids is largely a result of
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 climbing requirements *per se* rather than specifically to exudativory. This study will consider
4 differences in tegulae in relation to the ecology of callitrichids in order to clarify the factors
5 underlying the presence of claw-like nails in marmosets and tamarins.
6
7
8
9

10
11
12 Bicca-Marques (1999) examined hand dimensions in insectivorous callitrichids, and
13 concluded that hand shape is driven by foraging technique, such that: generalist opportunists,
14 gleaning insects and other food from tree trunks and leaf surfaces, had relatively short hands
15 and manipulative foragers searching for insects within crevices had long, slender hands.
16
17 However, because manipulative insect foraging often occurs on large vertical supports such as
18 tree trunks (Sussman and Kinzey, 1984; Garber, 1992), it is difficult to dissociate the effects of
19 climbing from those of insectivory. Long hands would increase the angle subtended by fingers
20 and thumb when climbing on vertical supports to increase the effective grip on large diameter
21 supports (Cartmill, 1985). Furthermore, postural behaviors such as vertical clinging and trunk-
22 to-trunk leaping, are strongly linked with exudativory and typical on these supports (Garber,
23 1993; Smith, 1997; Youlatos, 1999a; Garber et al., 2009; Youlatos, 2009). We consider
24 whether intergeneric and interspecific differences in hand and foot morphology are influenced
25 by diet and positional behavior.
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 A number of arboreal non-primates have patterned, ridged skin on the ventral surfaces of
44 their hands and feet (e.g. tree shrews (*Tupaia glis*: Lemelin, 2000); common dormice
45 (*Muscardinus avellanarius*: Haffner, 1998); raccoons (*Procyon lotor*: Munger and Pubols,
46 1972); Virginia opossums (*Didelphus virginiana*: Lemelin, 2000); feathertail gliders
47 (*Acrobates pygmaeus*: Rosenberg and Rose, 1999) and koalas (*Phascolarctos cinereus*:
48 Henneberg et al., 1997)). Such patterns, referred to as dermatoglyphs, are also found in
49 primates and are believed to serve two important functions: first, these patterns enhance the
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 frictional grip in climbing (Cartmill, 1979; Hamrick, 1998; Lemelin and Jungers, 2007); and
4
5 second they enhance tactile sensitivity, particularly when associated with the fingertips
6
7 (Loesch and Martin, 1984; Dominy, 2004). Both functions are not mutually exclusive, indeed
8
9 both are likely to be important to a climbing animal to assess the physical profile of the
10
11 surfaces upon which they are moving to prevent slipping (Hoffman et al., 2004). The volar
12
13 surface dermatoglyphs of callitrichid primates will be examined in consideration of the
14
15 potential frictional role of epidermal patterning on volar surfaces during climbing and foraging.
16
17
18
19
20

21 Although a number of studies allude to relationships between morphology, positional
22
23 behavior and exudate foraging in callitrichids, none have considered quantitative relationships
24
25 with exudativory (Garber and Sussman, 1984; Garber, 1991, 1992, 1993; Bicca-Marques, 1999;
26
27 Lemelin and Jungers, 2007). Nash and Burrows (2010), discussing the high degree of
28
29 variability in exudate consumption by callitrichids, identified as an important gap in the current
30
31 understanding the lack of interspecific morphological comparisons. We analyse data derived
32
33 from published values in multiple field studies of foraging behaviour alongside morphological
34
35 data from museum specimens to address this gap focusing on how hand and foot morphology
36
37 relates to primate diet and food procurement using the Callitrichidae as a model.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

METHODS

1
2
3
4
5
6 Skins of 235 adult specimens from 25 species and six extant callitrichid genera (Table 1) were
7
8 photographed (with a Fujifilm Finepix s5700) at the Natural History Museum, London.

9
10 Photographs were taken of full pelts from ventral and dorsal perspectives, of the ventral and
11
12 dorsal aspects of whole hands and feet, and of the tegulae and volar surfaces. To minimise
13
14 parabolic effects, specimens were laid flat and all photographs were taken from directly above
15
16 the specimen, at an angle perpendicular to the surfaces. Images were taken from a range of
17
18 distances (0.2 - 1.5m) with this distance dependent on the level of resolution necessary for the
19
20 area of interest being photographed. Full pelts were photographed from 0.6 – 1.5 m. To allow
21
22 measurements to be made from the resultant images, mm grids printed onto clear acetate were
23
24 placed centrally on the specimen for every individual image taken providing an image-specific
25
26 calibration point for every photograph. No measurements were taken from the margins of the
27
28 images.
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 Specimens used are recorded in the museum catalogue (Napier, 1976) and were wild-
36
37 caught by a variety of natural history collectors from the early 19th to late 20th century. Current
38
39 nomenclature was determined by cross-referencing the museum catalogue (Napier, 1976) with
40
41 more recent systematics (Rylands et al. 2008; Rylands and Mettiermeier 2009). Skins
42
43 identified in the catalogue as juveniles and those with no information about age but which were
44
45 significantly below the normal published size ranges for the species were excluded. Data from
46
47 individual specimens was only included if elements of morphology considered were
48
49 measurable from the skins, as features in some were obscured by methods of skin preparation
50
51 and general wear and tear. Specimens from which hand and foot measurements were made had
52
53 bones still intact within the fingers and toes. This study aimed to extend potential uses of skins,
54
55 which are a widely available museum resource, to allow direct comparisons of multiple
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 morphological measures (including soft-tissue measurements) made from a single specimen.
4
5 Differences between specimens in shrinkage, age and preparation techniques might be
6
7 expected to introduce error, but analysis of a subset of specimens for which collection
8
9 measurements of head-body length (HBL) and hindfoot length were available suggests that
10
11 relative trends in data are unaffected by these. A full list of exact specimens used can be
12
13 provided by the corresponding author on request.
14
15
16
17
18

19 The photographs taken were used to derive measurements for: HBL (distance measured
20
21 from tip of nose to proximal base of the tail: Martin et al. 2001)); foot length (from back edge
22
23 of heel to tip of longest toe: Martin et al. 2001); hand length (from proximal edge of palm to tip
24
25 of longest finger) and of the longest finger (finger 3) and toe (toe 2) from base of digit to tip
26
27 (these digits were selected for analysis due to their potential greater influence on prehensile
28
29 ability, as suggested in Lemelin and Jungers, 2007). All image analyses were carried out using
30
31 the free Java image processing program, ImageJ (Rasband, 2009).
32
33
34
35
36

37 For each individual, average density of dermatoglyphic ridges was determined from
38
39 analysis of between five and eight images of 2 mm x 2 mm sections of ventral surfaces of both
40
41 the hand (palmar) and foot (plantar). Sections were cropped from photographs of palmar and
42
43 plantar surfaces, using the calibration grid to standardize the size of each section. Ridge widths
44
45 were measured using ImageJ and used to calculate average number of ridges per mm of
46
47 hand/foot. Tegula curvature was determined via the method used by Pike and Maitland (2004)
48
49 for quantification of claw 'hookedness' in raptorial and scansorial birds, and using the angle
50
51 measuring tool in ImageJ. According to this method, a greater angle corresponds with a more
52
53 'hooked' tegula.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 An extensive literature search was conducted and data collated on several aspects of
5
6 species ecology, including: percentage of time spent foraging on different food types, such as
7
8 fruit, prey, and exudates; percentage of locomotory activity represented by scansorial (vertical
9
10 climbing) activity and by trunk to trunk leaping; and size and orientation of supports utilized
11
12 during foraging (Table 2). Studies were included if data was recorded from wild populations
13
14 and where behaviours were being recorded from single-species troops. Where several studies
15
16 had comparably collected/described data, average values were calculated. Data were collated
17
18 from results in the following studies: Garber, 1980¹; da Fonseca and Lacher, 1984²; Garber and
19
20 Sussman, 1984³; Yoneda, 1984⁴a, b; Garber, 1988⁵; Ayres and Clutton-Brock, 1992⁶; Egler,
21
22 1992⁷; Ferrari and Strier, 1992⁸; Garber, 1992⁹; Peres, 1992¹⁰; Rosenberger, 1992¹¹; Garber,
23
24 1993¹²; Peres, 1993¹³; Lopes and Ferrari, 1994¹⁴; Peres, 1994¹⁵; Garber and Pruetz, 1995¹⁶;
25
26 Ferrari and Digby, 1996¹⁷; Dietz et al., 1997¹⁸; Peres, 1997¹⁹; Garber, 1998²⁰; Hamrick, 1998²¹;
27
28 Youlatos, 1999a²²; Araújo et al., 2000²³; Corrêa et al., 2000²⁴; Heymann and Buchanan-Smith,
29
30 2000²⁵; Heymann et al., 2000²⁶; Martins and Setz, 2000²⁷; Oliveira and Ferrari, 2000²⁸; Garber
31
32 and Leigh, 2001²⁹; Miranda and Faria, 2001³⁰; Porter, 2001³¹; Regan et al., 2001³²; Lehman,
33
34 2004³³; Porter, 2004³⁴; Poveda and Sanchez-Palomino, 2004³⁵; Raboy and Dietz, 2004³⁶;
35
36 Bicca-Marques, 2005³⁷; Garber et al., 2005³⁸; Yépez et al., 2005³⁹; Cunha et al., 2006⁴⁰; Burity
37
38 et al., 2007⁴¹a, b; da Silva and Ferrari, 2007⁴²; de Castro and Araújo, 2007⁴³; Digby et al.,
39
40 2007⁴⁴; Garber, 2007⁴⁵; Lapenta and Procópio-de-Oliveira, 2008⁴⁶; Nadjafzadeh and Heymann,
41
42 2008⁴⁷; Porter et al., 2007⁴⁸; Raboy et al., 2008⁴⁹; Garber et al., 2009⁵⁰; Garber and Porter,
43
44 2009⁵¹; Porter et al., 2009⁵²; Rehg, 2009⁵³; Veracini, 2009⁵⁴; Youlatos, 2009⁵⁵; Hilário and
45
46 Ferrari, 2010⁵⁶; Porter and Garber, 2010⁵⁷; Smith, 2010⁵⁸. Superscript values indicate sources
47
48 for each of the species as indicated in Table 2.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Statistics were performed in SPSS Version 16.0. Morphological data for genera were
5
6 compared either using ANOVA or Kruskal-Wallis tests (following tests for equality of
7
8 variance). Post-hoc comparisons between genera were undertaken using Tukey or Mann-
9
10 Whitney U tests. All post-hoc tests reported for differences between genera are significant at
11
12 the $p < 0.05$ level.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

RESULTS

Morphological correlates with body size

Callitrichids show an approximate two-fold size range between the smallest (*Cebuella pygmaea*) and largest species (*Saguinus leucopus*) (Table 3). There are significant differences in mean HBL between genera (Table 4). Post-hoc Mann-Whitney U tests identified *Cebuella* as significantly smaller than all other genera and that *Leontopithecus* and *Saguinus* are significantly larger than *Callithrix* and *Mico*. This gives three distinct size categories of: ‘small’ (*Cebuella*); ‘medium’ (*Callithrix* and *Mico*) and ‘large’ (*Callimico*, *Saguinus* and *Leontopithecus*).

Proportional hand lengths were similar between differently sized species (Table 3). Rates of increase in hand ($HBL^{0.73}$) and finger length ($HBL^{0.73}$) between species, although reduced, are not significantly different from isometric expectations (Table 5: difference from slope of 1: $t_{hand} = 1.30$, 48 d.f., N.S.; $t_{finger} = 1.09$, 48 d.f., N.S.). There are significant differences between genera in proportional hand length and finger length (Table 4). Post-hoc Tukey and Mann-Whitney U tests identify that differences in forelimb dimensions result from *Leontopithecus* having significantly longer fingers and hands than *Callithrix*, *Cebuella*, *Mico* and *Saguinus*.

Hindlimb dimensions show smaller species have proportionally longer feet and toes than larger species (Table 3). Foot length and toe length both increase as $HBL^{0.65}$ between species, at a rate significantly less than isometric expectations (Table 5: difference from slope of 1: $t_{foot} = 2.48$, 46 d.f., $p < 0.05$; $t_{toe} = 2.44$, 46 d.f., $p < 0.05$). There are significant differences between genera (Table 4) in both proportional foot length and proportional toe length. Post-hoc Tukey tests identify that these resulted from differences in *Saguinus*, which had significantly shorter feet and toes than *Callithrix*, *Cebuella* or *Leontopithecus*.

1
2
3
4
5
6 In 18/25 (72%) species the palmar ridge density was greater than the plantar density (Table 3)
7
8 with this trend being statistically significant for seven species (paired t-tests: *C. jacchus*, $t = -$
9
10 3.06, 15 d.f., $p < 0.05$; *C. penicillata*, $t = -3.98$, 17 d.f., $p = 0.001$; *M. humeralifer*, $t = -4.63$, 3
11
12 d.f., $p < 0.05$; *S. fuscicollis*, $t = -6.22$, 42 d.f., $p < 0.001$; *S. geoffroyi*, $t = -3.69$, 4 d.f.; *S.*
13
14 *mystax*, $t = -2.24$, 17 d.f.,; *S. nigricollis*, $t = -2.57$, 11 d.f., $p < 0.05$ for all). There was a
15
16 marginally non-significant negative trend between body size (HBL) and palmar ridge density
17
18 across all species though a significant negative correlation with size occurs with plantar ridge
19
20 density (Table 5). At genus-level, palmar ridge densities are significantly greater than plantar
21
22 ridge densities (Figure 1) in both *Callithrix* (paired t-test: $t = 4.12$, 36 d.f., $p < 0.001$) and
23
24 *Saguinus* (paired t-test: $t = -6.00$, 119 d.f., $p < 0.001$).
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 There are significant differences between genera in both palmar ridge densities and plantar
32
33 ridge densities (Table 4 and Figure 1). Post-hoc Tukey tests identify that *Callimico*, *Saguinus*
34
35 and *Leontopithecus* have significantly lower palmar ridge densities than *Callithrix*, *Cebuella* or
36
37 *Mico*. *Callimico* and *Saguinus* have significantly lower plantar ridge densities than *Cebuella*,
38
39 *Callithrix* or *Mico* (Figure 1). There are significant differences in palmar ridge densities within
40
41 *Callithrix* (ANOVA: $F_{3,33} = 6.20$, $p < 0.005$), with *C. aurita* and *C. flaviceps* having
42
43 significantly lower palmar ridge densities than *C. jacchus* or *C. penicillata*. There were also
44
45 significant differences in palmar ridge densities for *Saguinus* species (ANOVA: $F_{11,109} = 3.50$,
46
47 $p < 0.001$), as a result of higher palmar ridge densities in *S. bicolor*.
48
49
50
51
52

53
54 There is an inverse relationship between tegula curvature and body size such that smaller
55
56 species have more hooked tegulae (Table 5). Genus-level differences in tegula shape are
57
58 significant (Table 4), though post-hoc tests do not identify the locations of significant
59
60

1
2
3
4 differences. Significant differences are noted in tegula curvature between the species within
5
6 *Callithrix* (ANOVA: $F_{3,25} = 4.96$, $p < 0.01$). Post-hoc testing reveals that *C. jacchus* have
7
8 significantly more curved tegulae than the less exudativorous *C. flaviceps*. Differences in
9
10 tegula curvature (ANOVA: $F_{10,72} = 2.27$, $p < 0.05$) were also demonstrated within *Saguinus*
11
12 resulting from increased tegula curvature in *S. leucopus* and *S. martinsi*.
13
14

15 16 17 **Morphological correlates with ecology** 18

19
20 Smaller species exhibit a greater degree of exudativory, scansorial activity and use of vertical
21
22 supports when foraging (Table 5). Species that use vertical supports to a greater extent during
23
24 foraging have proportionally longer feet (Fig. 2A: $R = 0.96$, $y = 10.45x - 1.86$, 5 d.f., $p < 0.005$)
25
26 and more curved tegulae (Fig. 2B: $R = 0.82$, $y = 0.61x - 1.05$, 5 d.f., $p = 0.05$). Species
27
28 utilising more trunk-to-trunk leaping have longer hands ($R = 0.92$, $y = 13.31x - 2.01$, 6 d.f., $p <$
29
30 0.005). More exudativorous species show greater degrees of scansorial activity ($R = 0.89$, $y =$
31
32 $2.01x - 0.11$, 6 d.f., $p < 0.01$) but there were no demonstrable species-level morphological
33
34 correlates with exudativory. More exudativorous genera have a non-significant tendency
35
36 towards increased palmar ridge densities (Fig 3A: $R = 0.75$, 5 d.f., N.S.) and a significant
37
38 increase in plantar ridge densities (Fig. 3B: $R = 0.83$, $y = 1.62x + 3.87$, 5 d.f., $p < 0.05$). No
39
40 correlations with palmar or plantar ridge density were found with either frugivory or prey
41
42 capture.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

DISCUSSION

Measurements from callitrichids in this study suggest that while relative proportions of the hands were conserved with respect to size, in general, all contributory elements of the feet were proportionally longer in smaller species. Smaller species of callitrichid exhibited greater degrees of exudativity. Consequently, it is to be expected that smaller species will also exhibit behaviors linked more frequently with exudativity, such as scansorial locomotion and use of vertical substrates. Given the greater reliance on exudativity in small species, an increase in relative proportions of the hind feet may confer more support when climbing vertical substrates. Norberg's (1986) evaluation of vertical climbing in the Eurasian tree creeper, *Certhia familiaris*, discusses how lengthening the foot reduces the forces necessary to maintain a grip on a vertical trunk. Furthermore, increasing the length of the foot would act to increase the effective grip while climbing, even without the additional benefit of 'claws' (Cartmill, 1985).

Arboreal primates have unique hand proportions and in particular possess relatively elongated fingers with a greater capacity for prehensility (Kirk et al., 2008). This feature of primates is usually explained as an adaptation to locomotion on small branches, allowing them to create a secure surrounding grip on narrow diameter branches and vines (Lemelin, 1999). As the fingers can bear a significant portion of the weight during locomotion, and since stresses on a digit are suggested to increase in direct proportion to length, expectations are that with increasing size, species should have adaptations for reducing the stress on these digits, such as shortening the functional length (Krakauer et al., 2002) or increasing development of broad, thickened cushion-like pads (described for arboreal rodents in Haffner, 1998). Lemelin and Jungers (2007) study of hand proportions in thirty species of strepsirrhines noted that as body size increases, toes and fingers become proportionally shorter. Such trends may mean that the ability to fully enclose wider diameter branches in an encircling grip is reduced in larger

1
2
3
4 species, but this might be compensated for by an increased coalescence of volar pads to
5
6 facilitate frictional force, a trend which is also described in strepsirrhines (Lemelin and Jungers,
7
8 2007). While callitrichids do not have discrete volar pads, they exhibit a tendency towards
9
10 shorter finger lengths with increasing size (albeit non-significant) though lower palmar ridge
11
12 densities are seen with increasing body size in callitrichids, perhaps counter to expectations
13
14 from comparisons in pad morphology in the strepsirrhines.
15
16
17
18

19
20 However, long, prehensile fingers in primates are also implicated in a greater ability to
21
22 manipulate objects (Lemelin, 1999). Specialist manipulative foragers such as *Leontopithecus*
23
24 have longer, narrower hands than other callitrichid genera (Bicca-Marques, 1999), linked to
25
26 their strategy of foraging in crevices such as bromeliads and tree holes (Dietz et al., 1997). The
27
28 present study also found that *Leontopithecus* had significantly longer hands (and fingers) than
29
30 *Callithrix*, *Cebuella*, *Mico* and *Saguinus*. *Saguinus* has proportionally shorter hands than other
31
32 genera. This was in concordance with Bicca-Marques (1999) who separates *Saguinus* into three
33
34 groups according to hand shape: those with long, narrow hands (*S. fuscicollis*, *S. nigricollis*, *S.*
35
36 *tripartitus*); those with intermediate shaped hands (*S. bicolor*, *S. geoffroyi*, *S. leucopus*, *S.*
37
38 *midas*, *S. oedipus*) and those with short, wide hands (*S. labiatus*, *S. mystax*). He suggested that
39
40 long, narrow hands were related to manipulative foraging for insects. The results of the present
41
42 study broadly supported these groupings, manipulatively foraging species *S. fuscicollis*, *S.*
43
44 *nigricollis* and *S. tripartitus* (Heymann and Buchanan-Smith, 2000), have long hands
45
46 compared with many congeners and consumed greater proportions of animal prey.
47
48
49
50
51

52
53 Stephenson et al.'s (2010) study of comparative hand morphology noted a diversity of
54
55 claw shapes in galagos, and they suggest that the observed gradient from nail to claw may be
56
57 evidence of an evolutionary response to allow exploitation of large diameter supports for
58
59
60

1
2
3 exudatory. However, their study did not present any quantitative analysis of either claw
4
5 curvature or exudatory levels. There is evidence from the present study that exudatory and
6
7 scansorial activity are correlated, and scansorial species which utilize vertical supports to a
8
9 greater degree have more hooked tegulae. Youlatos (1999b) examined the positional behavior
10
11 of six sympatric Ecuadorian primates and also found that small tegulae-bearing callitrichids
12
13 showed the highest proportions of large vertical support use. This was attributed to
14
15 requirements for exudatory but, again, no values are given for the proportion of exudates in
16
17 the different species' diets, supporting only observations in Garber et al. (1996; 2009) that the
18
19 presence of tegulae in callitrichids is linked to vertical foraging behavior. The advantages of
20
21 claws and claw-like nails in vertical substrate foraging was suggested to be of particular
22
23 importance for smaller-bodied species that regularly utilize vertical, large-diameter surfaces,
24
25 where they facilitate extra grip to compensate for limbs which have too short a reach to allow
26
27 an effective contact angle to be subtended (Soligo and Martin, 2006; Jackson, 2011).
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35 Bock & Miller (1959) describe how the curvature of the scansorial claw in woodpeckers
36
37 is key in allowing the tip of the claw to penetrate into the bark of tree trunks. The current study
38
39 found no direct link between the degree of exudatory and tegula curvature between species,
40
41 though as seen in Youlatos (1999b), smaller (and more exudatorious) species did have more
42
43 hooked tegulae. The more exudatorious species of *Callithrix* exhibit greater tegula curvature,
44
45 trends which are not observed within *Saguinus*. While *Saguinus* are opportunist exudatorious,
46
47 *Callithrix* are specialists with procumbent incisors to gouge and wound the trees to instigate
48
49 exudate production. To do this, *Callithrix jacchus* anchor themselves using their upper incisors
50
51 and then gouge upwards with their lower jaw, which is capable of producing an upwardly
52
53 directed force equivalent to eight times their own body weight to dig into the tree trunk
54
55 (Vinyard et al. 2009). Having tegulae with a greater curvature might be expected to increase
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interlocking capability with the rough bark substrate, and further help to anchor the monkeys to
4
5 increase stability on vertical substrates while engaged in gum-feeding. Further, proportionally
6
7 larger feet in the more exudativorous species, combined with better attachment to the substrate
8
9 could provide improved leverage to increase gouging efficiency.
10
11

12
13
14 Hamrick (2001) found that the breadths of papillary ridges on the toes of didelphid
15
16 marsupials were wider than on the fingers, i.e. ridge density was greater on the hands. Based
17
18 on the importance of the hands in tactile exploration, he argued that the increased density of
19
20 ridges on the hand serves a primarily sensory purpose via an increased distribution of
21
22 mechanoreceptors. It might be expected, if the key function of ridges on the volar skin is
23
24 sensory, that ridge density will be higher on the hands. In the majority of callitrichid species,
25
26 ridge densities *were* higher on the hands than on the feet, lending support to the hypothesis that
27
28 dermatoglyphic ridges have a function in improving touch discrimination. Such a role would
29
30 be particularly important to frugivorous primates, that judge fruit ripeness using a combination
31
32 of cues, including palpating fruit with the hand (Dominy, 2004). Hoffman et al.'s (2004) study
33
34 of the fingerprints of nine primate species found a positive correlation between the density of
35
36 sensory cells and frugivory yet the present study found no correlations between frugivory and
37
38 palmar or plantar ridge densities, although the genera with the lowest values for palmar ridge
39
40 density here are chiefly frugivorous, perhaps reducing the argument for a chiefly sensory role.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 Most primates have greater hindlimb than forelimb contact time when climbing on
49
50 arboreal supports (Cartmill et al., 2002), so if the purpose of volar skin patterning were to
51
52 increase friction, as suggested by Haffner's (1998) exploration of the microanatomy of the foot
53
54 pads of arboreal rodents, it might be expected that ridge densities would be greater on plantar
55
56 rather than palmar surfaces. On this evidence, the present study's results contradict a frictional
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 role for dermatoglyphic ridges. However, comparative studies of walking biomechanics have
5
6 found that, unlike most primates, *C. jacchus* exhibits relatively greater forelimb forces and
7
8 contact duration when walking (Young, 2009), galloping (Hanna et al., 2006) and climbing
9
10 (Schmitt, 2003). Cartmill et al. (2002) link longer hindlimb contact to the necessity to maintain
11
12 a firm grasp on thin flexible supports and, as callitrichids utilize forelimb-powered vertical
13
14 climbing on large diameter substrates to a significant extent (Hunt et al., 1996), increased
15
16 frictional contact of the forelimb might be of greater importance. Understanding of the
17
18 potential frictional role of palmar and plantar ridges in vertical climbing would significantly
19
20 benefit from consideration of biomechanics of locomotion in other callitrichids. As other
21
22 vertical climbers, such as the lorises (*Loris* and *Nycticebus*), also exhibit atypical impact forces
23
24 (Schmitt and Lemelin, 2004), the study of comparative hand/foot dermatoglyphs in primates
25
26 with typical and atypical gaits and forelimb vs. hindlimb powered climbing would be desirable.
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 The influence of other locomotor modes on the expression of plantar and palmar
34
35 dermatoglyphs, may be a key consideration. Although callitrichids are often categorized as
36
37 generalist arboreal quadrupeds (Connour et al., 2000) evidence from the literature suggests
38
39 many species utilize leaping locomotion to a significant extent. Observational and
40
41 biomechanical studies find that jumping in *Saguinus*, *Callimico*, *Callithrix* and *Cebuella* is
42
43 characterized by hindlimb-driven takeoff and forelimb-first landing (Garber, 1991; Garber et
44
45 al., 2009). It is therefore likely that the forelimbs act to absorb the shock of landing impact in
46
47 callitrichids (Garber and Leigh, 2001), and will form the initial frictional contact with a
48
49 substrate to counter slipping. This perhaps provides a further explanation of the increased
50
51 density of dermatoglyphic ridges on the palms of the hands in comparison to the soles of the
52
53 feet and potentially also the proportionally longer hands seen in callitrichids which more
54
55 commonly engage in trunk to trunk leaping in this study. It would be of interest to consider
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 comparative dermatoglyphs in specialist leaping primates such as indrids and lemurs, which
5
6 are well studied in terms of jumping biomechanics (Crompton et al., 1993; Demes et al., 1996,
7
8 2005), and which land hindlimb-first, to see if patterns in volar skin pattern are reversed.
9

10
11
12 Smith (2010) suggests generic differentiation in terms of dental specializations for
13 gouging should predict *Cebuella* and *Callithrix* are the most exudativorous, *Saguinus*,
14
15 *Leontopithecus* and *Callimico* the least with *Mico* intermediate between the two groups. These
16
17 expectations are borne out by trends for generic exudate consumption in this study. As there
18
19 were generic-level correlations between ridge densities on hands and feet and exudativity,
20
21 ridge density values predict exudativity in a similar way to dental specialization. Significant
22
23 differences in palmar and plantar ridge densities result from *Callimico*, *Leontopithecus* and
24
25 *Saguinus* forming a distinct and separate group from *Callithrix*, *Cebuella* and *Mico*.
26
27
28
29
30
31

32
33 According to dental adaptations for gouging, *Callithrix* may be further split into three
34
35 groups (re Natori and Shigehara, 1992): (a) *C. jacchus* and *C. penicillata*; (b) *C. kuhli* and *C.*
36
37 *geoffroyi*; *C. aurita* and (c) *C. flaviceps*, in order of decreasing exudativity (Smith, 2010). Our
38
39 results for palmar ridge densities largely support these groupings of *C. jacchus* and *C.*
40
41 *penicillata* with similar values to one another for palmar ridge density, as do *C. aurita* and *C.*
42
43 *flaviceps*. Furthermore, *C. aurita* and *C. flaviceps* both have significantly lower palmar ridge
44
45 densities than either *C. jacchus* or *C. penicillata*. As discussed earlier, tegula curvature is
46
47 higher in more exudativorous species within this genus, suggesting that ridge density probably
48
49 has a greater role in gripping, driven by exudate feeding requirements, than in sensory
50
51 assessment of fruit ripeness. This demonstrates the need for careful consideration of the
52
53 various facets of a species' ecology which may influence morphology.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 *Callimico*, although genetically closer to *Callithrix*, *Cebuella* and *Mico* than to *Saguinus*
5
6 and *Leontopithecus* (Pastorini et al., 1998; Chaves et al., 1999) would not be recognized as
7
8 such based on dental morphology alone. *Callimico* have not only retained the third molar, a
9
10 dental feature typically absent from all other callitrichids (Cortés-Ortiz, 2009), but also do not
11
12 exhibit the specialist incisors typical of the ‘gouging’ marmosets (see Hill, 1959; Forsythe and
13
14 Ford, 2011) with which they are a close sister group. The relative morphology of volar surfaces
15
16 in *Callimico* were similarly problematic and confirmed the difficult-to-resolve position of this
17
18 genus within the Callitrichidae, ridge densities on both hands and feet suggested they were
19
20 significantly different from both the marmosets and the tamarins.
21
22
23
24
25

26 To conclude, results suggest that the potential role of volar skin morphology and tegula
27
28 curvature in the facilitation of exudativory bears further investigation. This is particularly
29
30 desirable as differences in both reflect trends in dental morphology with relation to levels of
31
32 exudativory, perhaps via similar evolutionary pressures related to food procurement and food
33
34 handling. Furthermore, trends in hand and foot dermatoglyph density appeared to group
35
36 species according to current taxonomy, aligning *Saguinus* with *Leontopithecus* and *Mico* with
37
38 *Callithrix* and *Cebuella* corroborating the very early tenet of Biegert (1963) who considered
39
40 the relationship of *Callimico* within the Callitrichidae, argued that combinations of ‘cheridial’
41
42 characters, (features of the hands/feet), including ‘claw’ presence and extent of frictional volar
43
44 skin were better taxonomic indicators than dental morphology. Although, it would be difficult
45
46 to argue based on our findings, that cheridial characters are stronger indicators than dental
47
48 morphology, the undoubted importance of the role of hand and foot morphology in facilitating
49
50 food procurement in the callitrichids certainly indicates this warrants further consideration,
51
52 particularly with respect to differences in reliance on exudativory between species.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Thanks to Louise Tomsett, Curator of Mammals at the Natural History Museum for
9
10 arranging access to specimens and for all her help and to Philip Pugh for comments on an
11
12 earlier version of the manuscript. Both authors would also like to acknowledge Isobel
13
14 Stephenson, Stephen Bearder, Guiseppe Donati and Johann Karlson whose presentation at the
15
16 IPS Edinburgh 2008 sparked an interest in the topic. JMS would additionally like to thank Dan
17
18 Thornham, for helpful discussions about statistics and climbing. Finally, the authors are
19
20 grateful for the comments of the two anonymous reviewers whose constructive comments
21
22 helped clarify the message of this paper.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Anapol F, Turner TR, Mott CS, Jolly CJ. 2005. Comparative postcranial body shape and
9 locomotion in *Chlorocebus aethiops* and *Cercopithecus mitis*. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 127: 231–
10 239.
11
12

13
14 Anderson MJ, Ambrose L, Bearder SK, Dixon AF, Pullen S. 2000. Intraspecific variation
15 in the vocalizations and hand pad morphology of Southern Lesser Bush Babies (*Galago*
16 *moholi*): A comparison with *G. senegalensis*. *Int J Primatol* 21 (3): 537–555.
17
18

19
20 Araújo A, Arruda MF, Alencar AI, Albuquerque F, Nascimento MC, Yamamoto ME.
21 2000. Body weight of wild and captive Common Marmosets (*Callithrix jacchus*). *Int J*
22 *Primatol* 21 (2): 317–324.
23
24

25
26 Ayres JM, Clutton-Brock TH. 1992. River boundaries and species range size in
27 Amazonian primates. *Am Nat* 140 (3): 531–537.
28
29

30
31 Bicca-Marques JC. 1999. Hand specialization, sympatry, and mixed-species associations
32 in callitrichines. *J Hum Evol* 36 (4): 349–378.
33
34

35
36 Bicca-Marques JC. 2005. The win-stay rule in foraging decisions by free-ranging titi
37 monkeys (*Callicebus cupreus cupreus*) and tamarins (*Saguinus imperator imperator* and
38 *Saguinus fuscicollis weddelli*). *J Comp Psychol* 119(3): 343–351.
39
40

41
42 Biegert J. 1963. The evaluation of characteristics of the skull, hands and feet for primate
43 taxonomy. In: Washburn SL. (Ed.) *Classification and Human Evolution*, Aldine Publishing Co.
44 Chicago, USA. p 116–145.
45
46

47
48 Bock WJ, Miller WD (1959) *The Scansorial Foot of the Woodpeckers, with Comments*
49 *on the Evolution of Perching and Climbing in Birds*. *Am Mus Nov* 1931 46pp.
50
51

52
53 Burity CHF, Cruz LD, Rocha VL, da Conceição NB, da Luz DE, da Silva Santos D, da
54 Costa Campos D, Pissinatti A. 2007a. Golden Lion Tamarins, *Leontopithecus rosalia*
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 (Linnaeus, 1766) in the Taquara Municipal Natural Park (Duque de Caxias, RJ): A Southern
5
6 extension of the known range. *Neotrop Primates* 14 (1): 30–31.

7
8 Burity CHF, Pissinatti A, de Souza AM. 2007b. Morphometry and allometry of outer
9
10 body in three species of the genus *Callithrix* Erxleben 1777 (Callitrichidae, Primates). *Revista*
11
12 *Brasileira de Zoociências* 9 (2): 177–184.

13
14
15 Cartmill M, Lemelin P, Schmitt D. 2002. Toward a predictive theory of symmetrical gaits.
16
17 *Zool J Linn Soc* 13: 401–420.

18
19 Cartmill M. 1979. The volar skin of primates: Its frictional characteristics and their
20
21 functional significance. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 50: 497–510.

22
23
24 Cartmill M. 1985. Climbing. In: Hildebrand M. et al. (Eds) *Functional Vertebrate*
25
26 *Morphology* Harvard University Press, London, UK. p 73–88.

27
28 Chaves R, Sampaio I, Schneider MP, Schneider H, Page SL, Goodman M. 1999. The
29
30 place of *Callimico goeldii* in the callitrichine phylogenetic tree: Evidence from von Willebrand
31
32 factor gene intron II sequences. *Mol Phylogenet Evol* 13 (2): 392–404.

33
34
35 Connour JR, Glander K, Vincent F. 2000. Postcranial adaptations for leaping in primates.
36
37 *J Zool* 251: 79–103.

38
39 Corrêa HKM, Coutinho PEG, Ferrari SF. 2000. Between-year differences in the feeding
40
41 ecology of highland marmosets (*Callithrix aurita* and *Callithrix flaviceps*) in southeastern
42
43 Brazil. *J Zool* 2525: 421–427.

44
45
46 Cortés-Ortiz L. 2009. Molecular phylogenetics of the Callitrichidae with an emphasis on
47
48 the marmosets and *Callimico*. In: *The Smallest Anthropoids: The Marmoset/Callimico*
49
50 *Radiation*: 3–24. Ford SM, Porter L, Davis LC (Eds). New York, NY: Springer.

51
52
53 Crompton RH, Sellers WI, Gunther MM. 1993. Energetic efficiency and ecology as
54
55 selective factors in the saltatory adaptation of prosimian primates. *Proc Roy Soc B* 254: 41–45.

1
2
3
4 Cunha AA, Vieira MV, Grelle CEV. 2006. Preliminary observations on habitat, support
5
6 use and diet in two non-native primates in an urban Atlantic forest fragment: The capuchin
7
8 monkey (*Cebus* sp.) and the common marmoset (*Callithrix jacchus*) in the Tijuca forest, Rio de
9
10 Janeiro. *Urban Ecosystems* 9: 351–359.

11
12 da Fonseca GAB, Lacher TE. 1984. Exudate-feeding by *Callithrix jacchus penicillata* in
13
14 semideciduous woodland (Cerradão) in central Brazil. *Primates* 25 (4): 441–449.

15
16 da Silva SSB, Ferrari SF. 2007. Notes on the reproduction, behaviour and diet of
17
18 *Saguinus niger* (Primates: Callitrichidae) in a forest remnant at the National Primate Centre,
19
20 Ananindeua, Para. *Biologia Geral e Experimental* 7 (1): 19–28.

21
22 de Castro CS, Araújo A. 2007. Diet and feeding behaviour of Marmoset, *Callithrix*
23
24 *jacchus*. *Revista Brasileira de Ecologia* 14–19

25
26 Demes B, Franz TM, Garlson KJ. 2005. External forces on the limbs of jumping lemurs
27
28 at takeoff and landing. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 128: 348–358.

29
30 Demes B, Jungers WL, Fleagle JG, Wunderlich RE, Richmond BG, Lemelin P. 1996.
31
32 Body size and leaping kinematics in Malagasy vertical clingers and leapers. *J Hum Evol* 31:
33
34 367–388.

35
36 Dietz JM, Peres CA, Pinder L. 1997. Foraging ecology and use of space in wild golden
37
38 lion tamarins (*Leontopithecus rosalia*). *Am J Primatol* 41(4): 289–305.

39
40 Digby LJ, Ferrari SF, Saltzman W. 2007. Callitrichines: The role of competition in
41
42 cooperatively breeding species. In: Campbell CJ et al. (Eds) *Primates in Perspective*. Oxford
43
44 University Press, Oxford, UK.

45
46 Dominy NJ. 2004. Fruits, fingers, and fermentation: The sensory cues available to
47
48 foraging primates. *Integr Comp Biol* 44: 295–303.

49
50 Egler SG. 1992. Feeding ecology of *Saguinus bicolor bicolor* (Callitrichidae: Primates)
51
52 in a relict forest in Manaus, Brazilian Amazonia. *Folia Primatol* 59: 61–76.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 Falsetti AB, Jungers WL, Cole TM. 1993. Morphometrics of the Callitrichid forelimb: A
5
6 case study in size and shape. *Int J Primatol* 14 (4): 551–572.

7
8 Feduccia, A. 1993. Evidence from claw geometry indicating arboreal habits of
9
10 *Archaeopteryx*. *Science* 259 (5096), 790-793.

11
12 Ferrari SF, Digby LJ. 1996. Wild *Callithrix* groups: Stable extended families? *Am J*
13
14 *Primatol* 38: 19–27.

15
16 Ferrari SF, Martins ES. 1992. Gummivory and gut morphology in two sympatric
17
18 callitrichids (*Callithrix emiliae* and *Saguinus fuscicollis weddelli*) from western Brazilian
19
20 Amazonia. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 88 (1) 97–103.

21
22 Ferrari SF, Strier KB. 1992. Exploitation of *Mabea fistulifera* nectar by marmosets
23
24 (*Callithrix flaviceps*) and muriquis (*Brachyteles arachnoides*) in south-east Brazil. *J Trop Ecol*
25
26 8 (3): 225–239.

27
28 Forsythe EC, Ford SM. 2011. Craniofacial adaptations to tree-gouging among marmosets.
29
30 *Anat Rec* 294: 2131-2139.

31
32 Garber PA, Blomquist GE, Anzenberger G. 2005. Kinematic analysis of trunk-to-trunk
33
34 leaping in *Callimico goeldii*. *Int J Primatol* 26 (1): 223–239.

35
36 Garber PA, Leigh SR. 2001. Patterns of positional behavior in mixed-species troops of
37
38 *Callimico goeldii*, *Saguinus labiatus*, and *Saguinus fuscicollis* in northwestern Brazil. *Am J*
39
40 *Primatol* 54 (1): 17–31.

41
42 Garber PA, Porter LM. 2009. Trunk-to-trunk leaping in wild *Callimico goeldii* in
43
44 Northern Bolivia. *Neotrop Primat* 16 (1): 9-14.

45
46 Garber PA, Pruetz JD. 1995. Positional behavior in Moustached Tamarin monkeys: effect
47
48 of habitat on locomotor variability and locomotor stability. *J Hum Evol* 28: 411–426.

1
2
3
4 Garber PA, Rosenberger AL, Norconk MA. 1996. Marmoset misconceptions. In:
5
6 Norconk MA et al. (Eds) Adaptive radiations of Neotropical Primates. Plenum Press, New
7
8 York, USA. p 87–95.
9

10 Garber PA, Sallenave A, Blomquist GE, Anzberger G. 2009. A comparative study of the
11
12 kinematics of trunk-to-trunk leaping in *Callimico goeldii*, *Callithrix jacchus*, and *Cebuella*
13
14 *pygmaea*. In: Ford SM et al. (Eds.) The Smallest Anthropoids, Developments in Primatology:
15
16 Progress and Prospects. Springer, NY, USA.
17

18
19 Garber PA, Sussman RW. 1984. Ecological distinctions between sympatric species of
20
21 *Saguinus* and *Sciurus*. Am J Phys Anthropol 65: 135–146.
22

23
24 Garber PA. 1980. Locomotor behavior and feeding ecology of the Panamanian Tamarin
25
26 (*Saguinus oedipus geoffroyi*, Callitrichidae, Primates). Int J Primatol 1 (2): 185–201.
27

28
29 Garber PA. 1988. Diet, foraging patterns, and resources defense in a mixed species troop
30
31 of *Saguinus mystax* and *Saguinus fuscicollis* in Amazonian Peru. Behaviour 105(1-2): 18–34.
32

33
34 Garber PA. 1991. A comparative study of positional behavior in three species of tamarin
35
36 monkeys. Primates 32 (2): 219–230.
37

38
39 Garber PA. 1992. Vertical clinging, small body size, and the evolution of feeding
40
41 adaptations in the Callitrichinae. Am J Phys Anthropol 88: 469–482.
42

43
44 Garber PA. 1993. Feeding ecology and behaviour of the genus *Saguinus*. In: Rylands AB
45
46 (Ed) Marmosets and Tamarins: Systematics, Behaviour and Ecology. Oxford University Press,
47
48 Oxford, UK
49

50
51 Garber PA. 1998. Within- and between-site variability in Moustached Tamarin (*Saguinus*
52
53 *mystax*) positional behaviour during food procurement. In: Strasser E et al. (Eds) Primate
54
55 Locomotion: Recent Advances. Plenum Press New York, USA. p 61–78
56

57
58 Garber PA. 2007. Primate locomotor behaviour and ecology. In: Campbell, C.J. et al.
59
60 (Eds) Primates in Perspective. Oxford University Press, Oxford, UK

- 1
2
3
4 Gebo DL. 1996. Climbing, brachiation and terrestrial quadrupedalism: Historical
5
6 precursors of hominid bipedalism. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 101: 55–92.
7
8 Haffner M. 1998. A comparison of the gross morphology and micro-anatomy of the foot
9
10 pads in two fossorial and two climbing rodents (Mammalia). *J Zool* 244: 287–294.
11
12 Hamrick MW. 1998. Functional and adaptive significance of primate pads and claws:
13
14 Evidence from New World anthropoids. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 106 (2): 113–127.
15
16 Hamrick MW. 2001. Morphological diversity in digital skin microstructure of didelphid
17
18 marsupials. *J Anat* 198 (6): 683–688.
19
20
21 Hanna JB, Polk JD, Schmitt D. 2006. Forelimb and hindlimb forces in walking and
22
23 galloping primates. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 130: 529–535.
24
25
26 Henneberg M, Lambert KM, Leigh C. 1997. Fingerprint homoplasy: koalas and humans.
27
28 *naturalScience* (1). Available at: http://naturalscience.com/ns/articles/01-04/ns_hll.html
29
30 Heymann EW, Buchanan-Smith HM. 2000. The behavioural ecology of mixed-species
31
32 troops of callitrichine primates. *Biol Rev* 75: 169–190.
33
34 Heymann EW, Knogge C, Tirado Herrera ER. 2000. Vertebrate predation by sympatric
35
36 tamarins, *Saguinus mystax* and *Saguinus fuscicollis*. *Am J Primatol* 51(2): 153–158.
37
38 Hilário, R.R., Ferrari, S.F. 2010. Feeding ecology of a group of Buffy-Headed Marmosets
39
40 (*Callithrix flaviceps*): Fungi as a preferred resource. *Am J Primatol* 72: 515–521.
41
42
43 Hill WCO. 1959. The anatomy of *Callimico goeldii* (Thomas) *Trans Am Phil Soc* 49 (5):
44
45 1-116.
46
47 Hoffman JN, Montag AG, Dominy NJ. 2004. Meissner corpuscles and somatosensory
48
49 acuity: The prehensile appendages of primates and elephants. *Anat Rec* 281A: 1138–1147.
50
51
52 Hunt KD, Cant JGH, Gebo DL, Rose MD, Walker SE, Youlatos D. 1996. Standardized
53
54 descriptions of primate locomotor and postural modes. *Primates* 37 (4): 363–387.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Jackson CP (2011) The positional behaviour of pygmy marmosets (*Cebuella pygmaea*)
4 in northwestern Bolivia. *Primates* 52 (2): 171-178.
5

6
7
8 Kirk EC, Lemelin P, Hamrick MW, Boyer DM, Bloch JI. 2008. Intrinsic hand
9 proportions of euarchontans and other mammals: Implications for the locomotor behavior of
10 plesiadapiforms. *J Hum Evol* 55: 278–299.
11

12
13
14 Krakauer E, Lemelin P, Schmitt D. 2002. Hand and body position during locomotor
15 behavior in the Aye-Aye (*Daubentonia madagascariensis*). *Am J Primatol* 57: 105–118.
16

17
18
19 Lapenta MJ, Procópio-de-Oliveira P. 2008. Some aspects of seed dispersal effectiveness
20 of golden lion tamarins (*Leontopithecus rosalia*) in a Brazilian Atlantic forest. *Tropical*
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Conservation Science 1(2): 122–139.

Lehman SM. 2004. Biogeography of the primates of Guyana: Effects of habitat use and
diet on geographic distribution. *Int J Primatol* 25 (6): 1225–1242.

Lemelin P, Jungers WL. 2007. Body size and scaling of the hands and feet of prosimian
primates. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 133 (2): 828–840.

Lemelin P, Schmitt D. 1998. The relation between hand morphology and quadrupedalism
in primates. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 105 (2): 185–197.

Lemelin P. 1999. Morphological correlates of substrate use in didelphid marsupials:
implications for primate origins. *J Zool* 165–175.

Lemelin P. 2000. Micro-anatomy of the volar skin and interordinal relationships of
primates. *J Hum Evol* 38: 257–267.

Loesch DZ, Martin NG. 1984a. Finger ridge patterns and tactile sensitivity. *Ann Hum*
Biol 11 (2): 113–124.

Lopes MA, Ferrari SF. 1994. Foraging behavior of a tamarin group (*Saguinus fuscicollis*
weddelli) and interactions with marmosets (*Callithrix emiliae*). *Int J Primatol* 15 (3): 373–387.

1
2
3
4 Martins MM, Setz EZF. 2000. Diet of Buffy Tufted-Eared Marmosets (*Callithrix aurita*)
5
6 in a forest fragment in Southeastern Brazil. *Int J Primatol* 21 (3): 467–476.

7
8 Martin RE, Pine RH, DeBlase AF. 2001. A manual of mammalogy with keys to the
9
10 families of the world. McGraw Hill, Boston US.

11
12 Miranda GHB, Faria DS. 2001. Ecological aspects of Black-pincelled Marmoset
13
14 (*Callithrix penicillata*) in the cerradao and dense cerrado of the Brazilian Central Plateau. *Braz*
15
16 *J Biol* 61 (3): 397–404.

17
18
19 Munger BL, Pubols LM. 1972. The sensorineural organization of the digital skin of the
20
21 raccoon. *Brain Behav Evol* (5): 367–379.

22
23
24 Nadjafzadeh MN, Heymann EW. 2008. Prey foraging of red titi monkeys, *Callicebus*
25
26 *cupreus*, in comparison to sympatric tamarins, *Saguinus mystax* and *Saguinus fuscicollis*. *Am J*
27
28 *Phys Anthropol* 135(1): 56–63.

29
30
31 Napier PH. 1976. Catalogue of Primates in the British Museum (Natural History). I.
32
33 Families Callitrichidae and Cebidae. British Museum (Natural History), London, UK. p 5–33.

34
35
36 Nash LT, Burrows AM. 2010. Advances and remaining sticky issues in the understanding
37
38 of exudativory in primates In: Burrows A, Nash L. (Eds) *The Evolution of Exudativory in*
39
40 *Primates, Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects*. Springer, NY, USA. p 1–23.

41
42
43 Natori M, Shigehara N. 1992. Interspecific differences in lower dentition among Eastern-
44
45 Brazilian marmosets. *J Mammal* 73 (3): 668–671.

46
47
48 Norberg, RÅ. 1986. Treecreeper climbing mechanics, energetics and structural
49
50 adaptations. *Ornis Scand* 17: 191-209.

51
52
53 Oliveira ACM, Ferrari SF. 2000. Seed dispersal by black-handed tamarins, *Saguinus*
54
55 *midas niger* (Callitrichinae, Primates): Implications for the regeneration of degraded forest
56
57 habitats in eastern Amazonia. *J Trop Ecol* 16(5): 709–716.

1
2
3
4 Pastorini J, Forstner MRJ, Martin RD, Melnick DJ. 1998. A re-examination of the
5
6 phylogenetic position of *Callimico* (Primates) incorporating new mitochondrial DNA sequence
7
8 data. *J Mol Evol* 47 (1): 32-41.
9

10 Perelman P, Johnson WE, Roos C, Seuánez HN, Horvath JE, Moreira MAM, Kessing B,
11
12 Pontius J, Roelke M, Rumppler Y, Schneider MPC, Silva A, O'Brien SJO, Pecon-Slattey J.
13
14 2011. A molecular phylogeny of living primates. *PLoS Genet* 7(3): e1001342.
15
16

17 Peres CA. 1992. Prey-capture benefits in a mixed-species group of Amazonian tamarins,
18
19 *Saguinus fuscicollis* and *S. mystax*. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 31(5): 339–347.
20
21

22 Peres CA. 1993. Diet and feeding ecology of Saddle-back (*Saguinus fuscicollis*) and
23
24 Moustached (*S. mystax*) Tamarins in an Amazonian terra firme forest. *J Zool* 230: 567–592.
25
26

27 Peres CA. 1994. Structure and spatial organization of an Amazonian terra firme forest
28
29 primate community. *J Trop Ecol* 9 (3): 259–276.
30
31

32 Peres CA. 1997. Primate community structure at twenty Western Amazonian flooded and
33
34 unflooded forests. *J Trop Ecol* 13 (3): 381–405.
35
36

37 Pike AVL, Maitland DP. 2004. Scaling of bird claws. *J Zool* 262: 73–81.
38
39

40 Porter LM, Garber PA. 2004. Goeldi's monkeys: A primate paradox? *Evol Anthropol* 13:
41
42 104–115.
43
44

45 Porter LM, Garber PA. 2010. Mycophagy and its influence on habitat use and ranging
46
47 patterns in *Callimico goeldii*. *Am J Phys Anthropol* 142: 468–475.
48
49

50 Porter LM, Garber PA, Nascimento E. 2009. Exudates as a fallback food for *Callimico*
51
52 *goeldii*. *Am J Primatol* 71(2): 120–129.
53
54

55 Porter LM, Sterr SM, Garber PA. 2007. Habitat use and ranging behavior of *Callimico*
56
57 *goeldii*. *Int J Primatol* 28 (5): 1035–1058.
58
59

60 Porter LM. 2001. Dietary differences among sympatric callitrichinae in Northern Bolivia:
Callimico goeldii, *Saguinus fuscicollis* and *S. labiatus*. *Int J Primatol* 22 (6): 961–993.

1
2
3
4 Porter LM. 2004. Forest use and activity patterns of *Callimico goeldii* in comparison to
5
6 two sympatric tamarins, *Saguinus fuscicollis* and *Saguinus labiatus*. Am J Phys Anthropol
7
8 124(2): 139–153.

9
10 Poveda K, Sanchez-Palomino P. 2004. Habitat use by the White-Footed Tamarin,
11
12 *Saguinus leucopus*: A comparison between a forest-dwelling group and an urban group in
13
14 Mariquita, Colombia. Neotrop Primates 12 (1): 6–9.

15
16 Raboy BE, Canale GR, Dietz JM. 2008. Ecology of *Callithrix kuhlii* and a review of
17
18 Eastern Brazilian marmosets. Int J Primatol 29: 449–467.

19
20 Raboy BE, Dietz JM. 2004. Diet, foraging, and use of space in wild Golden-Headed Lion
21
22 Tamarins. Am J Primatol 63: 1–15.

23
24 Rasband WS. 2009. ImageJ. U.S. National Institute of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.
25
26 <http://rsb.info.nih.gov/ij/>
27

28
29 Regan BC, Julliot C, Simmen B, Viénot F, Charles-Dominique P, Mollon JD. 2001.
30
31 Fruits, foliage and the evolution of primate colour vision. Philos Trans Roy Soc Lond B Biol
32
33 Sci 356: 229–283.

34
35 Rehg JA. 2009. Ranging patterns of *Callimico goeldii* in a mixed species group. In: Ford
36
37 SM. et al. (Eds.) *The Smallest Anthropoids, Developments in Primatology: Progress and*
38
39 *Prospects*. Springer, NY, USA
40
41

42
43 Ribas SC, Velloso ALR, Teixeira-Filho P, Rocha-Barbosa O, Evangelista H, Santos EA.
44
45 2004. Structure of claws and toes of two tropidurid lizard species of Restinga from
46
47 Southeastern Brazil: adaptations to the vertical use of the habitat. Rev Chil Hist Nat 77: 599–
48
49 606.

50
51 Rosenberg HI, Rose R. 1999. Volar adhesive pads of the feathertail glider, *Acrobates*
52
53 *pygmaeus* (Marsupialia; Acrobatidae). Can J Zool 77: 233–248.
54
55

1
2
3
4 Rosenberger AL. 1992. Evolution of feeding niches in New World monkeys. *Am J Phys*
5
6 *Anthropol* 88: 525–562.

7
8 Rylands AB, Mittermeier RA, Coimbra-Filho AF, Heymann EW, de la Torre S, de Sousa
9
10 e Silva J, Kierulff MCM, Noronha MA, Röhe F. 2008. Marmosets and tamarins: Pocket
11
12 identification guide. Conservation International, Bogotá, Colombia.

13
14 Rylands AB, Mittermeier RA, Silva JS. 2012. Neotropical primates: taxonomy and
15
16 recently described species and subspecies. *Int Zoo Yb* 46: 11–24.

17
18 Rylands AB, Mittermeier RA. 2009. The diversity of the New World primates
19
20 (Platyrrhini): An annotated taxonomy. In: Garber PA et al. (Eds) *South American Primates,*
21
22 *Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects.* Springer, NY, USA. p 23–54.

23
24 Rylands AB, Schneider H, Langguth A, Mittermeier RA, Groves CP, Rodríguez L. 2000.
25
26 An assessment of the diversity of New World Primates. *Neotrop Prim* 8: 61–93.

27
28 Schmidt M. 2005. Hindlimb proportions and kinematics: are small primates different
29
30 from other small mammals? *J Exp Biol* 208: 3367–3383.

31
32 Schmidt M. 2008. Forelimb proportions and kinematics: how are small primates different
33
34 from other small mammals? *J Exp Biol* 211: 3775–3789.

35
36 Schmitt D, Lemelin P. 2004. Locomotor mechanics of the Slender Loris (*Loris*
37
38 *tardigradus*). *J Hum Evol* 47: 85–94.

39
40 Schmitt D. 2003. Evolutionary implications of the unusual walking mechanics of the
41
42 Common Marmoset (*C. jacchus*). *Am J Phys Anthropol* 122: 28–37.

43
44 Shoshani J, Groves CP, Simons EL, Gunnell GF. 1996. Primate phylogeny:
45
46 Morphological vs molecular results. *Mol Phylogenet Evol* 5 (1): 102–154.

47
48 Smith AC. 1997. Comparative ecology of Saddleback (*Saguinus fuscicollis*) and
49
50 Moustached (*Saguinus mystax*) tamarins. PhD Thesis, University of Reading, UK.

1
2
3
4 Smith AC. 2010. Exudativory in primates: interspecific patterns. In: Burrows, A., Nash,
5
6 L. (Eds.). The Evolution of Exudativory in Primates. Developments in Primatology: Progress
7
8 and Prospects. Springer, NY, USA. p 45–87.
9

10 Soligo C, Martin RD. 2006. Adaptive origins of primates revisited. J Hum Evol 50: 414-
11
12 430.
13

14 Soligo C, Müller AE. 1999. Nails and claws in primate evolution. J Hum Evol 36, 97-
15
16 114.
17

18 Stephenson IR, Bearder SK, Donati G, Karlsson J. 2010. A guide to galago diversity:
19
20 Getting a grip on how best to chew gum. In: Burrows A, Nash L. (Eds). The Evolution of
21
22 Exudativory in Primates, Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects. Springer, NY,
23
24 USA. p 235–255.
25
26

27 Sussman RW, Kinzey WG. 1984. The ecological role of the Callitrichidae: A review. Am
28
29 J Phys Anthropol 64: 419–449.
30
31

32 Thorndike EE. 1968. A microscopic study of the marmoset claw and nail. Am J Phys
33
34 Anthropol (28): 247–262.
35
36

37 Tulli MJ, Cruz FB, Herrel A, Vanhooydonck B, Abdala V. 2009. The interplay between
38
39 claw morphology and microhabitat use in neotropical iguanian lizards. Zoology 112: 379–392.
40

41 Van Valkenburgh B. 1987. Skeletal indicators of locomotor behavior in living and extinct
42
43 carnivores. J Vert Paleo (7): 162–182.
44

45 Van Roosmalen MG, Van Roosmalen T. 2003. The description of a new marmoset genus,
46
47 *Callibella* (Callitrichinae, Primates), including its molecular phylogenetic status. Neotrop Prim
48
49 11: 1–10.
50
51

52 Veracini C. 2009. Habitat use and ranging behavior of the Silvery Marmoset (*Mico*
53
54 *argentatus*) at Caxiuanã National Forest (Eastern Brazilian Amazonia). In: Ford SM. et al.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (Eds.) The Smallest Anthropoids, Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects.

4
5
6 Springer, NY, USA

7
8 Vinyard CJ, Wall CE, Williams SH, Mork AL, Armfield BA, de Oliveira Melo LC,
9
10 Valenca-Montenegro MM, Valle YBM, de Oliveira MAB, Lucas PW, Schmitt D, Taylor AB,
11
12 Hylander WL. 2009. The evolutionary morphology of tree gouging in marmosets. In: Ford SM
13
14 et al. (Eds.) The Smallest Anthropoids, Developments in Primatology: Progress and Prospects.
15
16 Springer, NY, USA.

17
18
19 Wright KA. 2007. The relationship between locomotor behavior and limb morphology in
20
21 brown (*Cebus apella*) and weeper (*Cebus olivaceus*) capuchins. *Am J Primatol* 69 (7): 736–
22
23 756.

24
25
26 Yépez P, de la Torre S, Snowdon CT. 2005. Interpopulation differences in exudate
27
28 feeding of Pygmy Marmosets in Ecuadorian Amazonia. *Am J Primatol* 66: 145–158.

29
30 Yoneda M. 1984a. Comparative studies on vertical separation, foraging behavior and
31
32 traveling mode of Saddle-backed Tamarins (*Saguinus fuscicollis*) and Red-chested Moustached
33
34 Tamarins (*Saguinus labiatus*) in Northern Bolivia. *Primates* 25 (4): 414–422.

35
36
37 Yoneda M. 1984b. Ecological study of the Saddle Backed Tamarin (*Saguinus fuscicollis*)
38
39 in Northern Bolivia. *Primates* 25 (1): 1–12.

40
41 Youlatos D. 1999a. Positional behavior of *Cebuella pygmaea* in Yasuni National Park,
42
43 Ecuador. *Primates* 40 (4): 543–550.

44
45
46 Youlatos D. 1999b. Comparative locomotion of six sympatric primates in Ecuador.
47
48 *Annales des Sciences Naturelles* 20 (4): 161–168.

49
50 Youlatos D. 2009. Locomotion, postures, and habitat use by pygmy marmosets (*Cebuella*
51
52 *pygmaea*). In: Ford SM et al. (Eds.) The Smallest Anthropoids, Developments in Primatology:
53
54 Progress and Prospects. Springer, NY, USA.

1
2
3
4 Young JW. 2009. Substrate determines asymmetrical gait dynamics in marmosets
5
6 (*Callithrix jacchus*) and squirrel monkeys (*Saimiri boliviensis*). Am J Phys Anthropol 138:
7
8 403–420.
9

10 Zani PA. 2000. The comparative evolution of lizard claw and toe morphology and
11
12 clinging performance. J Evol Biol 13: 316–325.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

TABLES

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 Table 1: Museum specimens examined (species and numbers) and species abbreviations
9 used in text and in figures.
10

11
12 Table 2: Values (**average** (*s.e.*) *n*) calculated from literature for percentage of diet
13 represented by different nutritional sources, locomotor modes (% locomotion observations),
14 and support use (% foraging observations) in 20 species of callitrichid.
15
16
17

18
19 Table 3: Head-body lengths, palmar and plantar ridge densities, tegula curvatures and
20 hand and feet measurements relative to head-body length made from museum specimens of 25
21 species of callitrichid.
22
23
24

25
26 Table 4: Summary data for morphological parameters at genus level. Statistics for
27 comparison between genera using ANOVA (unless otherwise indicated: * = Kruskal-Wallis).
28
29

30 Table 5: Species-level correlation statistics between HBL, body dimensions and various
31 aspects of ecology in callitrichids (*log-log relationships; **arcsin-transformed data)
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1: Boxplots of palmar and plantar ridge density in six genera of callitrichid: the marmosets (*Mico*, *Callithrix*, *Cebuella*), *Callimico* and tamarins (*Leontopithecus* and *Saguinus*). Statistics in text.

Figure 2: Relationships between vertical support foraging and (A) proportional foot length and (B) tegula curvature. Statistics in text. Genera symbols \square *Callimico* \circ *Callithrix* \triangle *Cebuella* \diamond *Leontopithecus* \blacksquare *Mico* \bullet *Saguinus*. Species abbreviations as in Table 1.

Figure 3: Genus-level relationships between exudate consumption and (A) palmar ridge density and (B) plantar ridge density. Statistics in text. Genera symbols as Figure 2, species abbreviations as in Table 1.

Table 1: Museum specimens examined (species and numbers) and species

abbreviations used in text and in figures.

Common name	Scientific name	Authority	Abbreviation	n
Goeldii's monkey	<i>Callimico goeldii</i>	Thomas, 1901	Cmg	5
Buffy-tufted marmoset	<i>Callithrix aurita</i>	Geoffroy, 1812	Cau	1
Buffy-headed marmoset	<i>Callithrix flaviceps</i>	Thomas, 1903	Cfl	3
Common marmoset	<i>Callithrix jacchus</i>	Linnaeus, 1758	Cja	17
Black-tufted marmoset	<i>Callithrix penicillata</i>	Geoffroy, 1812	Cpe	23
Pygmy marmoset	<i>Cebuella pygmaea</i>	Spix, 1823	Ceb	11
Golden-headed lion tamarin	<i>Leontopithecus chrysomelas</i>	Kuhl, 1812	Lcr	1
Golden lion tamarin	<i>Leontopithecus rosalia</i>	Linnaeus, 1766	Lro	6
Silvery marmoset	<i>Mico argentata</i>	Linnaeus, 1766	Mar	3
Gold-and-white marmoset	<i>Mico chrysoleucus</i>	Wagner, 1842	Mcr	2
Black-and-white tassel-ear marmoset	<i>Mico humeralifer</i>	Geoffroy, 1812	Mhu	4
Golden-white bare-ear marmoset	<i>Mico leucippe</i>	Thomas, 1922	Mle	1
Black-tailed marmoset	<i>Mico melanurus</i>	Geoffroy, 1812	Mme	6
Pied tamarin	<i>Saguinus bicolor</i>	Spix, 1823	Sbi	2
Saddleback tamarin	<i>Saguinus fuscicollis</i>	Spix, 1823	Sfu	59
Geoffroy's tamarin	<i>Saguinus geoffroyi</i>	Pucheran, 1845	Sge	4
Red-bellied tamarin	<i>Saguinus labiatus</i>	Geoffroy, 1812	Sla	11
White-footed tamarin	<i>Saguinus leucopus</i>	Günther, 1877	Sle	2
Martin's tamarin	<i>Saguinus martinsi</i>	Thomas, 1912	Sma	1
Golden-handed tamarin	<i>Saguinus midas</i>	Linnaeus, 1758	Smi	24
Moustached tamarin	<i>Saguinus mystax</i>	Spix, 1803	Smy	20
Black-handed tamarin	<i>Saguinus niger</i>	Geoffroy, 1803	Snr	11
Black-mantled tamarin	<i>Saguinus nigricollis</i>	Spix, 1823	Sns	13
Cottontop tamarin	<i>Saguinus oedipus</i>	Linnaeus, 1758	Soe	3

Table 2: Values (**average** (*s.e.*) *n*) calculated from literature for percentage of diet represented by different nutritional sources, locomotory modes (% locomotion observations), and support use (% foraging observations) in 20 species of callitrichid.

Species	Percentage of diet represented by:			% vertical support use (foraging)	Percentage locomotion:		References
	Fruit	Animal	Exudates		Scansorial	Leaping	
<i>Cmg</i>	33 (4.1) 8	24 (5.9) 8	7 (2.0) 8	42 (7.5) 2	15 (0.6) 3	55 (-) 1	6, 11, 19, 29, 31, 34, 38, 48, 52, 53, 56
<i>Cau</i>	23 (7.0) 4	29 (4.1) 4	42 (7.4) 6	-	-	-	9,11, 24, 41b, 49, 27, 52, 58
<i>Cfl</i>	5 (2.4) 5	20 (2.0) 6	65 (10.3) 7	-	-	-	8, 11, 17, 24, 49, 52, 56
<i>Cja</i>	24 (2.4) 6	18 (2.6) 7	55 (3.0) 9	-	-	-	9, 11, 17, 21, 23, 40, 43, 44, 49, 50, 52, 56
<i>Cpe</i>	-	29 (-) 1	57 (13.5) 3	-	-	-	2, 11, 30
<i>Ceb</i>	-	22 (11.0) 2	69 (2.1) 2	60 (37) 2	36 (6.3) 3	37 (-) 1	6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 22, 55, 38, 39, 44, 45, 50, 52
<i>Lcr</i>	82 (-) 1	14 (-) 1	7 (-) 1	-	-	-	8, 9, 11, 41a
<i>Lro</i>	77 (7.7) 3	15 (0.4) 4	1 (0.6) 4	-	-	-	8, 9, 56, 11, 18, 21, 36, 44, 46
<i>Mar</i>	36 (-) 1	5 (-) 1	59 (-) 1	-	-	-	6, 24, 54
<i>Mhu</i>	-	-	27 (-) 1	-	-	-	6, 9, 52
<i>Sbi</i>	39 (-) 1	59 (-) 1	1 (-) 1	-	-	-	7
<i>Sfu</i>	59 (5.6) 10	23 (6.4) 10	14 (2.4) 10	33 (-) 1	16 (1.4) 3	32 (8.8) 2	4b, 5, 6, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 25, 26, 29, 31, 34, 37, 38, 44, 47, 53, 57
<i>Sge</i>	44 (6.2) 3	31 (8.9) 3	20 (5.2) 3	13 (-) 1	-	4 (-) 1	1, 9, 11, 38, 57
<i>Sla</i>	68 (8.1) 4	11 (-) 2	11 (2.0) 3	19 (-) 1	6 (0.5) 2	8 (0.2) 2	4a, 8, 11, 25, 29, 53, 31, 32, 34, 37, 38, 52
<i>Sle</i>	83 (-) 1	12 (-) 1	0 (-) 1	-	-	-	35
<i>Smi</i>	56 (8.5) 2	31 (-) 1	5 (-) 1	-	-	-	6, 9, 32, 33, 45
<i>Smy</i>	54 (5.6) 8	33 (7.2) 9	8 (2.5) 9	13 (4.2) 4	3 (0.4) 2	10 (0.9) 2	5, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 20, 25, 26, 37, 38, 44, 47, 52, 57, 58
<i>Snr</i>	84 (6.9) 3	7 (1.5) 3	13 (10.4) 2	-	-	-	11, 28, 42, 57
<i>Soe</i>	38 (-) 1	39 (-) 1	14 (-) 1	-	17 (-) 1	-	3, 9, 21, 52
<i>Str</i>	40 (21.5) 2	48 (26.5) 2	12 (-) 1	-	16 (-) 1	18 (-) 1	38, 45, 57

Table 3: Head-body lengths, palmar and plantar ridge densities, tegula curvatures and hand and feet measurements relative to head-body length made from museum specimens of 25 species of callitrichid.

Species	HBL (mm)	Palmar ridge density (ridges/mm)	Plantar ridge density (ridges/mm)	Tegula curvature (°)	Lengths as proportion of HBL			
					Hand	Finger	Foot	Toe
<i>Cmdg</i>	247 (20) 5	4.0 (0.16) 5	3.7 (0.20) 5	138 (6.9) 4	0.19 (0.014) 5	0.063 (0.005) 5	0.22 (0.014) 5	0.069 (0.004) 5
<i>Cau</i>	278 (-) 1	3.9 (-) 1	4.7 (-) 1	103 (-) 1	0.14 (-) 1	0.056 (-) 1	0.21 (-) 1	0.068 (-) 1
<i>Cfl</i>	270 (20) 2	4.1 (0.70) 2	4.3 (0.60) 2	116 (3.9) 2	0.16 (0.007) 3	0.056 (0.004) 3	0.23 (0.013) 3	0.070 (0.002) 3
<i>Cja</i>	226 (5) 16	5.3 (0.13) 16	4.8 (0.14) 16	139 (3.8) 11	0.16 (0.004) 17	0.059 (0.002) 17	0.22 (0.006) 17	0.070 (0.003) 17
<i>Cpe</i>	220 (3) 18	5.3 (0.09) 18	4.8 (0.09) 18	135 (2.7) 15	0.16 (0.005) 23	0.060 (0.002) 23	0.22 (0.005) 23	0.070 (0.002) 23
<i>Ceb</i>	143 (4) 11	5.2 (0.14) 11	5.0 (0.17) 11	144 (3.8) 5	0.18 (0.007) 11	0.072 (0.003) 11	0.23 (0.008) 11	0.077 (0.004) 11
<i>Lcr</i>	239 (-) 1	4.3 (-) 1	5.1 (-) 1	145 (-) 1	0.29 (-) 1	0.098 (-) 1	0.26 (-) 1	0.082 (-) 1
<i>Lro</i>	278 (11) 6	4.5 (0.15) 6	4.2 (0.12) 6	-	0.20 (0.013) 6	0.071 (0.003) 6	0.23 (0.013) 6	0.075 (0.006) 6
<i>Mar</i>	216 (15) 3	5.1 (0.65) 3	5.1 (0.17) 3	133 (3.0) 2	0.17 (0.012) 3	0.056 (0.004) 3	0.22 (0.015) 3	0.073 (0.007) 3
<i>Mcr</i>	193 (15) 2	4.8 (0.35) 2	5.2 (0.10) 2	137 (-) 1	0.21 (0.025) 2	0.076 (0.007) 2	0.28 (0.067) 2	0.079 (0.017) 2
<i>Mhu</i>	247 (9) 4	5.2 (0.19) 4	4.7 (0.11) 4	145 (4.0) 3	0.16 (0.004) 4	0.051 (0.001) 4	0.21 (0.015) 4	0.067 (0.004) 4
<i>Mle</i>	213 (-) 1	4.9 (-) 1	5.5 (-) 1	137 (-) 1	0.16 (-) 1	0.062 (-) 1		
<i>Mme</i>	247 (10) 8	5.3 (0.41) 4	4.8 (0.26) 4	147 (9.5) 3	0.16 (0.004) 6	0.059 (0.003) 6	0.21 (0.006) 6	0.062 (0.004) 5
<i>Sbi</i>	240 (34) 2	6.3 (0.85) 2	4.9 (0.25) 2	118 (1.1) 2	0.16 (0.004) 2	0.063 (0.007) 2	0.21 (0.038) 2	0.069 (0.011) 2
<i>Sfu</i>	243 (3) 43	4.7 (0.07) 43	4.2 (0.06) 14	134 (2.2) 36	0.17 (0.003) 59	0.060 (0.001) 63	0.21 (0.003) 59	0.065 (0.001) 59
<i>Sge</i>	262 (10) 5	5.1 (0.19) 5	4.3 (0.23) 15	129 (9.3) 2	0.16 (0.012) 4	0.056 (0.005) 5	0.21 (0.018) 4	0.064 (0.007) 5
<i>Sla</i>	256 (8) 9	4.7 (0.19) 9	4.9 (0.20) 16	133 (5.3) 7	0.16 (0.007) 11	0.059 (0.004) 11	0.19 (0.011) 11	0.057 (0.004) 11
<i>Sle</i>	298 (17) 2	4.2 (0.35) 2	3.7 (0.10) 17	147 (7.5) 2	0.16 (0.004) 2	0.054 (0.005) 2	0.19 (0.017) 2	0.066 (0.001) 2
<i>Sma</i>	226 (-) 1	4.6 (-) 1	4.1 (-) 18	146 (-) 1	0.23 (-) 1	0.081 (-) 1	0.21 (-) 1	0.068 (-) 1
<i>Smi</i>	283 (6) 15	4.9 (0.13) 15	4.7 (0.15) 19	120 (4.8) 13	0.17 (0.009) 24	0.057 (0.003) 25	0.19 (0.004) 24	0.061 (0.001) 25
<i>Smy</i>	270 (6) 18	4.8 (0.10) 18	4.5 (0.14) 20	110 (12.5) 2	0.15 (0.005) 20	0.055 (0.002) 24	0.20 (0.005) 20	0.053 (0.003) 20
<i>Snr</i>	278 (6) 10	4.9 (0.14) 10	4.5 (0.17) 21	123 (4.9) 10	0.16 (0.006) 11	0.059 (0.004) 11	0.20 (0.007) 11	0.063 (0.003) 11
<i>Sns</i>	265 (8) 12	4.7 (0.12) 12	4.2 (0.16) 22	135 (4.0) 7	0.16 (0.006) 13	0.059 (0.002) 13	0.18 (0.009) 13	0.054 (0.004) 13
<i>Soe</i>	255 (15) 2	3.8 (0.10) 2	4.4 (0.45) 23	-	0.16 (0.004) 3	0.062 (0.005) 3	0.26 (0.025) 3	0.069 (0.006) 3
<i>Str</i>	239 (28) 2	4.6 (0.25) 2	4.4 (0.15) 24	123 (7.2) 2	0.17 (0.013) 2	0.077 (0.008) 2	0.22 (0.008) 2	0.071 (0.009) 2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Table 4: Summary data for morphological parameters at genus level. Statistics for comparison between genera using ANOVA (unless otherwise indicated: * = Kruskal–Wallis).

	Genus						Comparison	
	Callimico	Callithrix	Cebuella	Leontopithecus	Mico	Saguinus	Statistic	p <
Size class	Large	Medium	Small	Large	Medium	Large		
Head-body length (mm)	246 (20) 5	227 (4) 37	142 (4) 11	272 (10) 7	231 (7) 15	260 (2) 120	76.93*	0.001
Palmar ridge density (no/mm)	4.00 (0.16) 5	5.19 (0.10) 37	5.23 (0.14) 11	4.44 (0.13) 7	5.26 (0.21) 15	4.74 (0.04) 120	9.88	0.001
Plantar ridge density (no/mm)	3.66 (0.20) 5	4.81 (0.08) 37	5.03 (0.17) 11	4.29 (0.17) 7	4.93 (0.10) 15	4.39 (0.05) 120	9.68	0.001
Tegula curvature (°)	138.1 (6.88) 4	134.0 (2.50) 29	144.5 (3.76) 5	145.4 (-) 1	139.6 (3.61) 11	129.7 (1.66) 83	2.78	0.05
Hand length/HBL	0.18 (0.014) 5	0.16 (0.003) 37	0.18 (0.006) 11	0.21 (0.02) 7	0.17 (0.005) 16	0.16 (0.002) 152	6.57	0.001
Foot length/HBL	0.22 (0.014) 5	0.22 (0.004) 44	0.23 (0.008) 11	0.23 (0.01) 7	0.22 (0.01) 15	0.20 (0.002) 152	6.89	0.001
Finger length/HBL	0.063 (0.005) 5	0.059 (0.001) 44	0.072 (0.003) 11	0.075 (0.005) 7	0.059 (0.002) 16	0.058 (0.001) 164	22.70*	0.001
Toe length/HBL	0.069 (0.004) 5	0.070 (0.002) 44	0.077 (0.004) 11	0.076 (0.005) 7	0.068 (0.003) 15	0.061 (0.001) 154	8.38	0.001

Table 5: Species-level correlation statistics between HBL, body dimensions and various aspects of ecology in callitrichids (*log-log relationships; **arcsin-transformed data)

HBL vs.	R	df	p<	Equation
Hand length*	0.56	24	0.01	$y = 0.68x - 0.007$
Finger length*	0.50	24	0.01	$y = 0.72x - 0.496$
Foot length*	0.73	24	0.001	$y = 0.65x + 0.164$
Toe length*	0.41	24	0.05	$y = 0.62x - 0.301$
Palmar ridge density	0.38	24	0.06	NS
Plantar ridge density	0.56	24	0.01	$y = -0.008x + 6.49$
Tegulae (radians)	0.51	22	0.05	$y = -0.003x + 3.08$
Exudativory**	0.46	19	0.01	$y = -0.005x + 1.42$
Scansorial activity**	0.91	7	0.01	$y = -0.003x + 0.76$
Vertical supports**	0.84	5	0.05	$y = -0.003x + 1.01$

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 1
143x91mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Fig. 2
254x100mm (96 x 96 DPI)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60




Fig. 3
254x93mm (96 x 96 DPI)