

1

---

2 **The role of cognition and movement of seed-dispersing**  
3 **animals in shaping plant distributions**

4

---

5 Benjamin Robira  <sup>1,\*</sup>

6

7 <sup>1</sup> Animal Ecology Unit, Research and Innovation Centre, Fondazione Edmund Mach, San Michele  
8 all'Adige, TN, Italy

9 \* Correspondence: Benjamin Robira  <benjamin.robira@normalesup.org>

10 **Abstract** | In the scenarios concerning the emergence and selection of spatiotemporal cognitive abilities in vagile plant-eating animals, there is always an implicit assumption: the distribution of plants does not change and ultimately shapes the cognitive abilities of the animals, hence their movement. Yet, if plant distribution patterns are likely to remain unchanged over short time periods, they may change over long time periods as a result of animal exploitation. In particular, animal movement can shape the environment by dispersing plant seeds. Using an agent-based model simulating the foraging behaviour of a seed disperser endowed with spatiotemporal knowledge of resource distribution, I investigated whether resource spatiotemporal patterns could be influenced by the level of cognition involved in foraging. This level of cognition represented how well resource location and phenology were predicted by the agent. I showed that seed dispersers could shape the long-term distribution of resources by materialising the routes repeatedly used by the agent with the newly recruited plants. This stemmed from the conjunction of two forces: competition for space between plants and a seed-dispersing agent moving from plant to plant based on spatiotemporal memory. In turn, resource landscape modifications affected the benefits of spatiotemporal memory. This could create eco-evolutionary feedback loops between animal spatiotemporal cognition and the distribution patterns of plant resources. Altogether, the results emphasise that foraging cognition is a cause and a consequence of resource heterogeneity.

11  **Keywords:** Agent-based model - Feedback loop - Foraging - Frugivory - Memory - Movement - Phenology - Zoochory

<b>12</b>	<b>Contents</b>	
<b>13</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>Material and Methods</b>	<b>6</b>
15	Agent-based model . . . . .	6
16	Environment . . . . .	6
17	Forager . . . . .	8
18	Analyses . . . . .	11
19	Characterisation of plant distribution patterns . . . . .	11
20	Research questions and associated scenarios . . . . .	12
<b>21</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>13</b>
22	Resource distribution is affected by the forager's cognition . . . . .	13
23	Engineered patterns affects the benefits of spatiotemporal cognition . . . . .	15
24	Route formation is reinforced because of opportunistic stops and by low plant space competition . . . . .	15
<b>26</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>27</b>	<b>Acknowledgements</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>28</b>	<b>Funding</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>29</b>	<b>Declaration of conflict of interest</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>30</b>	<b>Data and code availability</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>31</b>	<b>Appendix</b>	<b>25</b>
32	Using patchiness and alignment to characterise spatial point patterns . . . . .	25
33	Using Moran's Index to characterise plant synchrony . . . . .	25
34	Variations in resource range shrinkage intensity . . . . .	30
35	Variations in routine behaviour when no dispersal occurs . . . . .	30
36	Variations in fruiting dates . . . . .	30
37	Sensitivity to the agent's speed . . . . .	33
38	Sensitivity to the learning pathways following old plant mortality . . . . .	33

## I Introduction

Hypotheses about the evolution of vagile plant-eating foragers' spatiotemporal cognition (i.e., the ability to process, integrate, and utilise information on resource distribution and phenology) generally assume that foragers evolve in an unchanging environment (Rosati, 2017). However, while foragers' cognition is likely to be shaped by the distribution of resources (Boyer & Walsh, 2010; Bracis et al., 2015; Grove, 2013; Milton, 1981; Robira et al., 2021), the characteristics of the resources themselves could be the result of forager-induced selection (Lomáscolo & Schaefer, 2010; Rojas et al., 2021; Soldati et al., 2015). In the tropical rainforests, for example, the cognition of frugivorous primates has probably been shaped by the challenge of the ephemerality and dispersion of their food (Milton, 1981; Trapanese et al., 2019a; Zuberbühler & Janmaat, 2010), supporting complex (Janmaat et al., 2013; Janson, 1998, 2016; Robira et al., 2023a; Teichroeb & Vining, 2019; Trapanese et al., 2019b) and versatile (Janmaat et al., 2006; Robira et al., 2023b; Trapanese et al., 2022) movement heuristics. In turn, primates remember and forage for the most rewarding plants (Ban et al., 2014; Ban et al., 2016; Flörchinger et al., 2010). The most attractive plants are thus more likely to have their seeds dispersed, driving plant and landscape evolution [soldati2017long; Chapman et al. (2013); Lambert and Garber (1998)].


The way seeds are dispersed contributes to the emerging pattern of resource distribution (Vittoz & Engler, 2007). Most of the world's trees (Tiffney & Mazer, 1995) and especially rainforest trees (Bagchi et al., 2011; Gottsberger & Silberbauer-Gottberger, 1983) are dispersed by animals (zoochory). Compared to other modes of dispersal, such as wind (anemochory) or gravity (barochory), zoochory induces a less patchy distribution of adult trees (Seidler & Plotkin, 2006; but see Hubbell, 1979). However, animal-dispersed fruit trees are still not homogeneously distributed (Hubbell, 1979). This is because although travelling long distances, animals may tend to revisit memorised sites regularly, if not exclusively (Addis et al., 2017; John et al., 2016; Soldati et al., 2015). Furthermore, the imperfection and limited size of spatial memory (Fagan et al., 2013) is expected to lead to different movement patterns (Avgar et al., 2013), and therefore potentially to different patterns of resource distribution (Côrtes & Uriarte, 2013).

By influencing the spatial distribution of plants, animals may also shape the relationship between the spatial and temporal availability of resources. Indeed, the tendency of animals to repeat travel decisions (i.e., their routine, Riotte-Lambert et al., 2017), may result in seeds being deposited along fixed spatial sequences. Thus, all trees fruiting at the same time may be deposited in the same place, affecting their local synchrony in food production. Synchrony in productivity can then be used by animals to optimise movement decisions (Janmaat et al., 2012). By being affected by cognition and by affecting resource dispersal, animal movement could thus lead to eco-evolutionary feedback loops between animal cognition and resource distribution (Borah & Beckman, 2022). In other words, foraging cognition could be both a cause and a consequence of resource heterogeneity.

To illustrate the possible retroactions between cognition and resource distribution, let's consider an extreme speculative scenario in which seed-dispersing frugivores are freely foraging (Figure 1). At start, assuming a random homogeneous distribution, long-term spatiotemporal memory can be advantageous and selected for (Bracis et al., 2015; Grove, 2013). Through zoochory, deliberate targeting of some resource patches over others may induce a change in resource distribution over time (e.g., increasing patchiness and local synchrony among trees), eventually making cognition more and more advantageous (Boyer & Walsh, 2010; Bracis et al., 2015; Grove, 2013). Gradually, by repeatedly targeting the same plants, the routes used by the foragers may begin to materialise through the seeds scattered along the way (Di Fiore & Suarez, 2007). However, in doing so, foragers who can only passively follow these routes due to their sensory abilities and have survived may also begin to become

85 very efficient: they should not even have to bear the cost of high cognitive ability, putting them at  
86 an advantage over foragers who bear the burden of cognition (Burns et al., 2011; Raichle, 2006).  
87 While the pattern of resource distribution can be maintained because the routes are used equally by  
88 all foragers (but through two different mechanisms: long-term memory vs taxis/kinesis, Benhamou &  
89 Bovet, 1992; Benhamou & Poucet, 1995), cognition could even start to be counter-selected.

90 While some facets of this scenario may be rooted in empirical evidence (e.g., forest elephant paths  
91 matching with food distribution, Blake et al., 2009; Blake & Inkamba-Nkulu, 2004; Campos-Arceiz  
92 & Blake, 2011), most of it remains speculative. The aim of this study is to put such a scenario to  
93 the test using an agent-based model simulating the movement of seed-dispersing frugivores (Figure  
94 2). Specifically, I aim to identify the conditions that favour the emergence of an eco-evolutionary  
95 feedback loop between animal spatiotemporal cognition and resource distribution. To do this, I first  
96 varied two forager traits (the amount of knowledge about plant location and phenology, and move-  
97 ment rules) and one plant trait (spatial competition) to measure how this affected plant aggregation  
98 (patchiness), the formation of materialised routes by the plants (alignment), and the local synchrony  
99 of plant phenology (spatial autocorrelation in fruiting dates) after the forager foraged for a long time  
100 and seed dispersal occurred. I predicted that higher spatiotemporal knowledge would lead to the  
101 emergence of route-like patterns (see Appendix, Using patchiness and alignment to characterise spa-  
102 tial point patterns for how this is evidenced by resource patchiness and alignment values) with locally  
103 synchronous fruiting as a consequence of routine movements. As animals may show different levels  
104 of opportunistic exploration *en route* to the target (e.g., stopping by to all plants, or heading directly to  
105 the target), I tested whether the magnitude of changes varied with the agent movement rules (i.e., if  
106 the agent stopped at all plants encountered on the way to the target plant, rather than passing all or  
107 only non-fruiting other perceived plants). In addition, as plants may also play a role in their own dis-  
108 tribution (e.g., through competition for space, Craine & Dybzinski, 2013), I repeated these scenarios  
109 considering different level of spatial competition between plants to test whether spatial competition  
110 could buffer (expected for high competition) or promote (expected for low competition) the observed  
111 changes induced by the forager's different cognitive levels. Second, I investigated whether variations  
112 in space engineering would affect the forager's foraging efficiency (i.e., the ability to find a lot of food  
113 by travelling a short distance). Following the illustrative aforementioned scenario, I expected that en-  
114 gineering should favour cognition (i.e., higher foraging efficiency) up to an extreme case (the formation  
115 of materialised travelling routes).



**Figure 1** – Theoretical expectations on eco-evolutionary feedback loops between animal spatiotemporal cognition and resource distribution

## II Material and Methods

### II.1 Agent-based model

---

118 The main objective of the model was to simulate the foraging behaviour of a single agent in an en-  
 119 vironment that is dynamical both on the short term, through an interplay between resource growth  
 120 and depletion, and on the long term, due to seed dispersal (Figure 2). For simplicity, I will refer to the  
 121 agent as the forager, and to resource patches as fruit plants. The arbitrary units for both space and  
 122 time makes this model a simplified representation of possibly a wide variety of systems, depending on  
 123 the set of parameters chosen. For example, assigning a spatial unit of one metre, a temporal unit of  
 124 one day, and low spatial competition between plants could be consistent with an asynchronous trop-  
 125 ical tree forest in which a large terrestrial mammal forages. The model was implemented in the C++  
 126 language in R software (v.4.2.1, R Core Team, 2022) based on the Rcpp package (Eddelbuettel, 2013;  
 127 Eddelbuettel et al., 2023; Eddelbuettel & François, 2011). The model parameterisation is available in  
 128 Table 1.


129 **Environment**

130 **Spatial distribution** I modelled the environment as a flat square map of side 1000 arbitrary spatial  
 131 units (su). Within this map, 1000 plants were initially homogeneously distributed (uniform distribution  
 132 of their  $x$  and  $y$  coordinates, resulting in a Poisson distribution of plant density).

133 **Resource growth** Time was cyclical, with a season of 365 arbitrary time units (tu). Each plant pro-  
 134 duced resource (fruit containing seeds) for 30 tu only once every season. Periods of productivity of  
 135 each plant were randomly distributed (i.e., uniform distribution of the start date). Thus, resource was  
 136 seasonal at the plant-level, but not at the map-level. Productivity was characterised by a triangular-  
 137 shaped pattern of the quantity of food over time: at start of the productive period, food quantity  
 138 started to increase linearly up to 1 arbitrary food unit (fu), mimicking progressive fruit ripening, and  
 139 then decreased linearly to 0 fu, mimicking fruit rotting. The depletion of the food by the forager had  
 140 no effect on this dynamic. Food could continue to ripen (though never to the same extent as if it  
 141 had not been depleted) and rot. At a given time, the quantity of food available at a given plant thus  
 142 depended on the productivity of the plant at that time, as well as the depletion history by the forager,  
 143 creating a short-term dynamics of resource temporal distribution.

144 **Seed dispersal** Trees reproduced by ingestion of ripe fruit by the forager and subsequent dispersal.  
 145 Once the forager ate ripe fruit, seeds could be dispersed only one time up to 0.5 tu after ingestion.  
 146 Dispersal occurred at a probability of  $0.02 \text{ tu}^{-1}$ , independent of the quantity of fruit ingested. This  
 147 probability was considered low, to mimic the natural slow pace of land use changes. All fruit eaten  
 148 did not mandatorily lead to dispersal. Dispersal was eventually successful only if some space was  
 149 left available for the new plant: no plant had to be at a distance less than 3.61 su. This number was  
 150 obtained such that the cumulative (when non-overlapping) exclusive “lifespace” by plants (a circular  
 151 area of radius the aforementioned distance) could reach the area of a map of length 0.45 times that  
 152 of the full map (but other values, referred as spacing intensity were tested, see Route formation as a  
 153 product of two forces). If it happened that there was available space for the seedling to grow, then  
 154 the seedling location was sampled in the available space along the linear path linking the previous and  
 155 current locations. Otherwise, the seedling could not grow and died.

156 If the seedling was successfully dispersed and recruited, an old plant (already present in the map) was



**Figure 2** – Illustration of the model workflow

157 randomly selected and died to keep density constant. The start date of fruiting of the newly recruited  
158 plant was randomly sampled within a reduced Gaussian distribution (i.e., variance of one) centered  
159 on the start date of fruiting of the parent plant. Because memory size can affect foraging efficiency,  
160 to keep it constant, the location and fruiting time of the newly recruited plant were memorised if  
161 it replaced a plant that was part of the forager's memory (see Appendix, Sensitivity to the learning  
162 pathways following old plant mortality for a test of an alternative learning way). The newly recruited  
163 plant was considered as mature only the season after. Seed dispersal could thus induce a long-  
164 term dynamics of resource spatial distribution and of the distribution of starting dates in the plant  
165 population.

## 166 Forager

167 **Cognitive abilities** The forager was endowed with a gradient of knowledge abilities: from no mem-  
168 ory of the locations of plants (naive forager) and the timing of their period of productivity to perfect  
169 omniscience (i.e., all plant locations and associate phenology are known). Otherwise, it only knew a  
170 certain proportion (fixed for the whole simulation) of plant locations and their associated phenology  
171 (hereafter *spatiotemporal knowledge rate*). These plants were selected randomly at the start of the sim-  
172 ulation. When a plant was part of the forager's memory, the forager knew both the spatial (location)  
173 and temporal (fruiting timing) attributes. Thus, it could not know only one or the other.

174 **Movement rules** The forager was initially randomly located within the map. It is fully aware of  
175 plants present within sensory range fixed to 15.81 su. This actually corresponds to the average  
176 nearest-neighbour distance which equates  $\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\rho}}$ , with  $\rho$  the density of plants (here 0.001) at start of  
177 the simulation where plants are homogeneously distributed. It is also aware of plants that are part  
178 of its spatiotemporal long-term memory. To decide where to head next, the forager could either rely  
179 on its private knowledge (sensory or memory) or not. If all plants within its private knowledge did  
180 not yield any fruit (i.e., all having less than 0.001 fu), the forager was moving randomly. Random  
181 movements were performed by randomly choosing a direction (uniform distribution of the heading  
182 angle), while the step length was sampled within an exponential distribution of mean  $\lambda_{step\ length} =$   
183 0.01. An exponential distribution of step lengths is indeed classically observed in nature (Benhamou,  
184 2014). Otherwise, the forager attempted to maximise its predicted short-term foraging efficiency  
185 (i.e., of the next movement step) and targeted the closest plant which maximised it. Predicted short-  
186 term foraging efficiency was defined as the ratio between the move benefits, here the predicted  
187 food quantity at the plant (which accounts for depletion history), and the move costs, here linearly  
188 proportional to the distance to the plant. Nonetheless, the forager avoided to target plants recently  
189 visited within the previous 2 tu to avoid targeting recently depleted plants (Robira et al., 2021).

190 Once the target had been chosen (or random point, if none), the forager moved straight to the  
191 first plant that should have been theoretically perceived *en route* to the initial destination point if any  
192 (provided they were not recently visited), or the destination otherwise. When this destination was  
193 reached, it depleted all the food available and then re-estimated the best plant to target and so on.  
194 After each moving bout time was updated based on the distance travelled, knowing that the forager  
195 moved at a speed of 1000 su/tu (see Appendix, Sensitivity to the agent's speed for results with an  
196 agent moving at half, or twice, this speed). Then, the resource quantity available at each plant was  
197 updated.

198 In case all plants were empty (no food available in the environment, considered if the sum of food  
199 available was less than 1 fu), the forager entered a torpor period for 1 tu, and so on until food was  
200 available again. This was done to avoid biasing measure of foraging efficiency in case the forager  
201 could deplete entirely the environment while being unable to disperse to another area, as expected

<sup>202</sup> in nature if this happens.

Table 1: Model parameters

Modelling entity	Parameter	Definition	Value	Unit
Environment	Map size	Length of a side of the square environmental map	1000	su
Environment	Quadrat size	Length of a side of a square quadrat to calculate Lloyd index of patchiness	50	su
Environment	Period length	Length of a period before a given plant starts producing again	365	tu
Environment	Number of seasons	Number of seasons (with seed dispersal plus without seed dispersal) before the simulation is ended	100 + 5	-
Environment	Number of plants	Number of plants hosted by the environment	1000	-
Environment	Fruiting length	Time duration of the fruiting period of each plant	30	tu
Environment	Maximum food yielded at a plant	Food quantity that a plant might yield at best (peak of the triangular-shaped food distribution)	1	fu
Environment	Spacing intensity	Relative length of a square map whose area would correspond to the area of exclusive spaces of all plants without overlapping	5, 45, 85	-
Agent	Speed	Speed at which the forager moves	(500,1000,2000)	su/tu
Agent	Torpor time	Time duration for which the forager stops foraging in case no food is available in the environment	1	tu
Agent	Perceptual range	Distance at which the forager is aware of the environment	15.81	su
Agent	Knowledge rate	Proportion of plants of the environment for which the forager knows the location and prodution timing	(0, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 1)	-
Agent	No-return time	Time delay before a forager mentally decides to target a previously visited plant	2	tu
Agent	Dispersal time	Time duration during which seeds from a previously ingested fruit can be dispersed	0.5	tu
Agent	Probability of dispersal	Probability (per tu) that the seeds is actually dispersed	0.02	1/tu
Agent	lambda["step length"]	Average step length for random movements used to parameterise the exponential distribution	0.01	su

204 **Characterisation of plant distribution patterns**

205 To assess whether different levels of cognition resulted in different organisations of the spatial distribution  
 206 of plants at the end of the simulation, I focused on three metrics describing plant spatiotemporal  
 207 patterns: the *patchiness*, the *alignment* and the *spatial autocorrelation of fruiting timing*.

208 **Patchiness** Patchiness (i.e., the tendency of plants to aggregate into clusters) was measured using  
 209 Lloyd's index of patchiness (Lloyd, 1967). This index is given by the following formula

$$210 \quad P = N_{quadrat} \frac{\sum_i n_i(n_i-1)}{(\sum_i n_i)^2}$$

211 where  $n_i$  represents the number of plants in quadrat  $i$  and  $N_{quadrat}$  the number of quadrats. The map  
 212 was divided in 400 square quadrats of side 50 su. The quadrat size, provided sufficient length for  
 213 biological relevance, little affects the measurement (Lloyd, 1967). Lower values indicate homogeneous  
 214 distribution while larger values indicate heterogeneous and route distributions (see Appendix, Using  
 215 patchiness and alignment to characterise spatial point patterns).

216 As the forager is set up to forage in a square map with reflective boundaries, seed dispersal may lead  
 217 to the shrinkage of resource range towards the centre of the map (where recursions are inevitably  
 218 higher). As patchiness is estimated on the whole map, this shrinkage would contribute to inflating  
 219 the calculated patchiness. Indeed, patchiness measures the tendency of plants to have more neigh-  
 220 bours in their vicinity (i.e., quadrat size) than expected based on the density in their overall range. By  
 221 affecting this range, shrinkage may lead to more 'empty' patches and more 'crowded' plant patches,  
 222 but only because the area covered by plants has been reduced (forming one large patch, an artefact  
 223 not of interest here as the forager will limit foraging in this large patch), not because plants have been  
 224 regrouped into multiple patches (which is of interest here as this affects the benefits of cognition).  
 225 I therefore calculated a measure of shrinkage  $s$  as one minus the area covered by the 95% of the  
 226 Gaussian-based kernel distribution based on all plant locations divided by the map size ("kernelUD"  
 227 function of the *adehabitatHR* package (Calenge, 2006), with a smoothing parameter  $h$  set to 50; the  
 228 kernel was bounded by the map borders). To account for variations in shrinkage in the different simu-  
 229 lated scenarios (see Appendix, Variations in resource range shrinkage intensity), I corrected patchiness  
 230 such as  $P_c = P(1 - s)$ . In this way, for a similar spatial distribution, patchiness will be more important  
 231 if the overall range is large, that is, if the shrinkage is low.

232 **Plant alignment** Routes are (curvi-)linear features. To assess the tendency of plants to form linear  
 233 motifs, I quantified their alignment. For a given plant, alignment  $a$  was defined as one minus the  
 234 minimum of the sine of the angles of the triangle formed by the plant of interest and the two closest  
 235 plants. This varies from perfect alignment (value of 1), to no alignment (i.e., the minimum angle would  
 236 be at worst  $60^\circ$  hence an alignment of ca. 0.134). Therefore, I used a corrected alignment  $a_c$  varying  
 237 from 0 (no alignment) to 1 (perfect alignment) such as

$$238 \quad a_c = \frac{a - (1 - \sin(\pi/3))}{1 - (1 - \sin(\pi/3))}$$

239 An environment where routes are formed should result in many points having a high alignment (value  
 240 close to one) and fewer low values (close to zero, such as the hubs of the route network); this means  
 241 that high values should be over-represented compared to low values, resulting in a long left tail, also  
 242 known as negative skew. To have an index ranging from 0 (low alignment) to 1 (high alignment), I

247 defined the general alignment for a given environmental map as the opposite of the skewness of  
248 alignment values of all plants in the map. In this case, positive values indicate the existence of linear  
249 motifs while negative values indicate no obvious linear motifs. As confirmed from simulations, random  
250 distributions (homogeneous or heterogeneous) should show moderate positive values, while a route  
251 pattern should have a high positive value (see Appendix).

252 **Spatial autocorrelation of fruiting timing** Spatial autocorrelation of fruiting timing (i.e., the ten-  
253 dency of fruiting date of plants to more closely match that of neighbours than of distant plants) was  
254 calculated as the Moran Index,  $I$ , applied to the start of fruiting dates. Since the "start of fruiting dates"  
255 corresponds to a circular variable, I followed (Schmal et al., 2017) to adapt existing functions of the  
256 *ape* package (Paradis & Schliep, 2019) to circular variables. Moran's  $I$  was therefore defined as

$$257 \quad I = \frac{1}{\sum_{ij} w_{ij}} \frac{\sum_{ij} w_{ij} d(t_i, \bar{t}) d(t_j, \bar{t})}{N^{-1} \sum_i d(t_i, \bar{t})^2}$$

258

260 where  $N$  is the number of plants,  $t$  is the fruiting date (transformed to radian), and  $d(t_1, t_2) =$   
261  $\text{atan2}(\sin(t_1 - t_2), \cos(t_1 - t_2))$ ,  $\bar{t} = \text{atan2}(1/N \sum_i \sin(t_i), 1/N \sum_i \cos(t_i))$ , that is the angular dif-  
262 ference between the two circular variables  $t_1$  and  $t_2$ . I used the inverse of the Euclidean distance  
263 between plant locations as weights  $w$ . Values of  $I$  close to 0 indicate absence of spatial autocorrela-  
264 tion. Values close to -1 indicate negative spatial autocorrelation. Values close to 1 indicate positive  
265 spatial autocorrelation.

266 **Routine emergence** For each simulation, I verified whether a routine behaviour emerged and par-  
267 alleled the variations in plant distribution. Routine was defined as the predictability of the plant visit  
268 sequences during five supplementary seasons in which dispersal could not occur, such as the spatial  
269 distribution (and plant id) remained unchanged. Predictability was defined as one minus the first-order  
270 conditional entropy ( $H_1$ ) of the plant id visit sequence (Riotte-Lambert et al., 2017).  $H_1$  characterises  
271 the average uncertainty about the next plant to be visited ( $T_v$ ), knowing the previous visit  $T_p$  (Riotte-  
272 Lambert et al., 2017), such as:  $H_1 = -\sum^* P(T_p) \sum_{v=1}^V P(T_v|T_p) \log_2(P(T_v|T_p))$  where  $\sum^*$  represents  
273 all possible  $T_p$ ,  $V$  the number of visits, and  $P()$  means "probability of". I computed the routine possibly  
274 up to only a first-order conditional entropy, as computing routine indices is computationally demand-  
275 ing and a first order is expected to be the most informative to describe a perfect traplining behaviour  
276 (Riotte-Lambert et al., 2017). The routine index varies from 0 (no routine) to 1 (perfect traplining).  
277 I computed the routine possibly up to only a first-order conditional entropy, as computing routine  
278 indices is computationally demanding and a first order is expected to be the most informative to de-  
279 scribe a perfect traplining behaviour (Riotte-Lambert et al., 2017). The routine index varies from 0  
280 (no routine) to 1 (perfect traplining).

## 281 **Research questions and associated scenarios**

282 **Q1. Does resource spatiotemporal distribution vary with cognition level?** To investigate whether  
283 different levels of cognition eventually led to different distribution patterns, I considered five forager  
284 types differing by the proportion of plants for which the location and phenology were known (from  
285 0 to 100%, at a step of 25). For each forager, 200 simulations were performed for a given condition  
286 (i.e., spatiotemporal knowledge rate, constant throughout the entire simulation), in which the forager  
287 foraged individually 100 seasonals.

288 **Q2. Does resource distribution engineering favour some cognition levels?** To investigate whether  
289 the engineered distribution of plants could in turn affect the foraging benefits purported by cognition,

290 I used the final plant distributions of simulations computed to answer question 1). For each of these  
291 plant distributions, in three different simulation runs, I let forage a forager endowed with no, interme-  
292 diate (i.e., half of plants known), or full (all plants known, omniscience) spatiotemporal knowledge. In  
293 these simulations, no seed-dispersal could occur. I measured the foraging efficiency after the forager  
294 foraged for 20 full seasons and compared them across environments and forager abilities. Foraging  
295 efficiency was computed as the cumulated quantity of eaten food, over the cumulated distance trav-  
296 elled. I verified that at the end of the simulation that foraging efficiency stabilised, which meant that  
297 I reached a foraging equilibrium. I considered that foraging efficiency stabilised when the foraging  
298 efficiency sampled after each moving bout during the fourth and fifth quintile of simulation times did  
299 not differ of more than 5% (reference is the minimum efficiency in the fourth or the fifth quintile of  
300 simulation times). I performed 200 simulations for a given condition (i.e., knowledge rate) .

301 **Q3. Route formation as a product of two supplementary forces? Plant competition for space and**  
302 **forager movement step rule** During the model construction, I noticed that two mechanisms could  
303 amplify the phenomenon of route formation, in addition to the use of memory: space competition  
304 between plants and sequential targeting of all plants seen *en route* to the target. To better quantify  
305 the effect of those two forces, I considered two other sets of 200 simulations each.

306 To assess the effect of competition for space between plants, I compared the final plant spatiotem-  
307 poral patterns when an omniscient forager (all plant locations and phenology known) was let foraging  
308 in the same setting as in question 1, with the only difference that the spacing intensity could be of  
309 5 (small lifespace, high local plant density), 45 (intermediate lifespace, intermediate local plant den-  
310 sity and reference setting) or 85% (large lifespace, low local plant density), so that the radius of this  
311 exclusive circular lifespace was always inferior to the perception range (12.89 su vs 15.81 su).


312 To assess the effect of the movement rule of the forager on plant distribution patterns, I compared the  
313 final plant spatiotemporal patterns when an omniscient forager was let foraging in the same setting as  
314 in question 1) and while the stringency in skipping plants encountered *en route* varied. It could either  
315 stop at all plants perceived on the way to the initial target (mimicking a “monitoring” behaviour, as in  
316 all other simulations; small skipping stringency), stop only at plants currently fruiting (i.e., with at least  
317 0.001 fu, mimicking an opportunistic feeding only; intermediate skipping stringency) or move directly  
318 to the target (large skipping stringency).

319 **III Results**

320 **III.1 Resource distribution is affected by the forager’s cognition**

321 Using simulated environments (see Appendix), the expected patchiness for route patterns was 1.514  
322 times and 1.166 times superior to homogeneous and heterogeneous distribution patterns, respec-  
323 tively. Alignment was 2.913 times and 3.147 times higher in route patterns than in homogeneous and  
324 heterogeneous distribution patterns, respectively. In homogeneous environments, considering high  
325 local synchrony in fruiting dates resulted in spatial autocorrelation 23.454 times higher than consid-  
326 ering intermediate local synchrony . In heterogeneous environments it was 28.291 times higher than  
327 considering intermediate local synchrony. In both homogeneous and heterogeneous environment,  
328 Moran’s Index reached a value close to 0.008 for intermediate local synchrony, and was coherently  
329 close to 0 when no local synchrony was modelled (see Appendix, Using Moran’s Index to characterise  
330 plant synchrony). These benchmarks, useful to calibrate the magnitude of the changes, are shown in  
331 (Figure 3).

332 Foragers’ spatiotemporal knowledge rate affected the resource distribution emerging after it had



**Figure 3** – Seed-dispersing foragers can shape resource distribution | The notched box plots show the results of 200 simulations when a seed-dispersing forager with varying level of cognition (i.e., proportion of plant locations and associated phenology known), moving choice rules or space competition intensities between plants (the two latter being simulated with an omniscient forager; left to right) was let foraging for a long time. The resulting distribution pattern was assessed by its patchiness (the tendency of plants to be aggregated into patches; larger values indicate highly aggregated plants), its alignment (the tendency of plants to form linear geometries; larger values indicate the presence of linear geometries) and spatial autocorrelation in fruiting date (the tendency of plants to have fruiting dates closer/farther in time to their spatial neighbours; values close to -1 indicate negative spatial autocorrelation, values close to 0 indicate no spatial autocorrelation, values close to 1 indicate positive spatial autocorrelation). Indices' benchmarks obtained from simulated environments are represented by the horizontal lines (Homo. = Homogeneous, Hetero. = Heterogeneous, Synchro. = Synchrony) (see Appendix). Because of overlap, only alignment and intermediate synchrony in a homogeneous (and not heterogeneous) environment was plotted. The emerging movement behaviour of the forager was described in terms of routine behaviour (the tendency of the forager to target plants in a predictable way; values close to 0 indicate no predictable movement, values close to 1 indicate highly predictable movements).

333 been let foraging for a long time (Figure 3A). Both the patchiness (the tendency of plants to be ag-  
334 gregated into patches) and the alignment (the tendency of plants to form linear geometries) abruptly  
335 changed when the forager was cognitively endowed. Specifically, patchiness followed a ratchet ef-  
336 fect, abruptly increasing as soon as the forager was cognitively endowed (spatiotemporal knowledge  
337 rate  $\geq 0.25$ ) up to being 1.199 times superior to when a naive forager foraged. Alignment progres-  
338 sively increased with the forager's spatiotemporal knowledge, up to being 1.681 times superior to  
339 when a naive forager foraged. (Figure 3A). In other words route-like patterns started to emerge as a  
340 consequence of memory-driven movements.

341 Spatial autocorrelation in fruiting date (the tendency of plants to have fruiting dates closer/farther in  
342 time to their spatial neighbours) somehow followed the same trend as patchiness (Figure 3A). Specifi-  
343 cally, when a forager endowed with spatiotemporal knowledge foraged, the spatial autocorrelation in  
344 fruiting dates was about 7.713 times (mean value = 0.029) more important than when a naive forager  
345 foraged (with a spatial autocorrelation close to 0). In other words, the synchrony in fruiting among  
346 neighbouring plants started to emerge as a consequence of memory-driven movements.

347 Overall, space engineering was paralleled with the emergence of routine behaviours, which increased  
348 with spatiotemporal knowledge rate to saturate around 0.8 (Figure 3A). This held when no dispersal  
349 occurred (Figure A6).


350 These results were robust to the speed at which the agent moved, but were somewhat hampered  
351 by the inability of the agents to learn the new seedling locations when an old tree died (instead the  
352 agent learned the location and phenology of the last fruiting plant visited; Figure A8).

### 353 **III.2● Engineered patterns affects the benefits of spatiotemporal cognition**

354 On average, an "omniscient" forager (knowing all plants' locations and phenology patterns) was around  
355 1.316 times more efficient than an "intermediate" forager (knowing only 50% of them) or 3.666 times  
356 than a "naive" forager (knowing none of them) (Figure 4). While the benefits of omniscience relatively  
357 to a naive forager were rather constant (min-max = 3.582-3.737 times larger), the relative benefits of  
358 intermediate memory varied a little with the resource distribution emerging from previous engineering  
359 (Figure 4). Compared to when the foragers foraged in an environment previously shaped by a naive  
360 forager (left boxplots in Figure 4), the relative foraging efficiency of intermediate foragers compared to  
361 naive foragers increased of 5.7% and 7.91% when the foragers foraged in an environment previously  
362 shaped by an intermediate or omniscient forager, respectively (middle and right boxplots in Figure 4).  
363 Similarly, the relative foraging efficiency of intermediate foragers compared to omniscient foragers  
364 increased of 10.31% and 9.62% when the forager foraged in an environment previously shaped by  
365 an intermediate or omniscient forager, respectively, compared to when the foragers foraged in an  
366 environment previously shaped by a naive forager. This means that space engineering has affected  
367 the foraging benefits of spatiotemporal memory, but not necessarily in a way that promotes the level  
368 of cognition that shaped it.

### 369 **III.3● Route formation is reinforced because of opportunistic stops and by low 370 plant space competition**

371 How a forager moved to the target affected the emerging resource pattern (Figure 3B). In particular,  
372 moving to all plants encountered *en route* to the target ("All plants" moving rule, Figure 3B) induced  
373 a 1.117 times lower patchiness than only stopping to fruit plants ("Only fruiting plants" moving rule,  
374 Figure 3B) and 1.128 times lower than moving only to the target ("Only target plants" moving rule, Fig-  
375 ure 3B). Resource alignment was 1.081 and 1.172 times higher when the forager stopped at all plants



**Figure 4** – Relative foraging benefits of cognition are sensitive to the emerging resource distribution | The ‘initial condition’ of resource distribution was taken from the simulations in which a naive, intermediate or omniscient forager was first let foraging. Then, those three forager types were let foraging (separately) without dispersal and foraging efficiency was measured (cumulated food eaten over cumulated travelled distance).

376 rather than only stopped fruiting plants or moved directly to the target (Figure 3B). Both patchiness  
377 and alignment were considerably reduced by competition for space between plants, with patchiness  
378 1.643 and 2.134 times larger when competition for space between plants was low compared to when  
379 it was intermediate or high, and alignment being 2.04 and 7.814 times larger, respectively (Figure 3C).

380 Spatial autocorrelation in fruiting date remained mostly unaffected by the forager movement rule  
381 but decreased with competition for space between plants with the same magnitude as the changes  
382 induced by the forager's spatiotemporal knowledge (Figure 3B and C).

383 Variations in movement rules were paralleled by variations in routine behaviour, with foragers moving  
384 to all plants being 1.122 and 1.194 times more routine than foragers stopping only to fruit plants or  
385 their target, respectively. Competition for space between plants similarly affected the tendency of  
386 the forager to engage in routine behaviour, with a larger routine when competition for space between  
387 plants was low (Figure 3B).

## 388 **IV Discussion**

389 **T**he environment is shaped by the species that inhabit it. The destructive behaviour of some  
390 animals when moving, such as forest elephants (Pringle, 2008; Vanleeuwe & Gautier-Hion,  
391 1998), can lead to blatant changes, but more elusive - yet no less ecologically relevant - engineering  
392 can also occur over longer time scales. Using an agent-based model, I have illustrated the role of  
393 vagile animals in shaping the distribution of plants through zochory. Based on a minimal set of  
394 realistic assumptions, I showed how this slow process could affect resource distribution provided that  
395 the seed-dispersing animal was endowed with cognitive abilities, which in turn shaped selection on  
396 these abilities. Therefore, this study illustrates how foraging cognition could be both a cause and  
397 a consequence of resource heterogeneity. By its inherent simplicity, the models may nonetheless  
398 suffer from limitations which may weaken the conclusions in nature (see Box 1). As such, this model  
399 represents a proof of concept for an eco-evolutionary feedback loop between cognition and resource  
400 distribution, but does not confirm its existence in the wild.

401 As the breadth of knowledge increased, routine behaviour, the ability to repeatedly follow a fixed  
402 sequence of movements, developed (Riotte-Lambert et al., 2015). The model evidenced that the  
403 emergence of such behaviour was associated with changes in the distribution of resources, which  
404 tended to become more patchy, eventually forming linear features paralleling the routes used. The  
405 agglomeration of seeds for cognitive foragers has been proposed theoretically (John et al., 2016) and  
406 empirically (Fragoso et al., 2003), ultimately impacting the genetic structure and flow of plant popu-  
407 lations (Gelmi-Candusso et al., 2017). Here, the model highlighted how engineering can go further  
408 by contributing to a more organised distribution of resources, with the emergence of linear features  
409 likely to be associated with the foraging routes used due to cognition, as suggested by forest ele-  
410 phant routes matching with fruit gradients in the forest (Blake et al., 2009). Indeed, the non-linearity  
411 of the changes in patchiness and alignment with the cognition of the forager likely corresponds to the  
412 formation of the routes themselves, with the "materialisation" first of the route intersections (hence  
413 higher patchiness, lower alignment for low cognition), where most of the recursions occur (Presotto  
414 et al., 2018), before more routes are used and formed when cognition increases. Long-distance travels  
415 through these routes may explain why animal-dispersed plant species are less aggregated than when  
416 other dispersal mechanisms are involved, such as barochory, where dispersed seeds do not travel far  
417 from the parent plant (Seidler & Plotkin, 2006). This engineering remained yet limited because the re-  
418 source patterns did not fully match the simulated route-based patterns (see Appendix). Furthermore,  
419 given vertical inheritance of the parent plant phenology, seed dispersal induced a substantial shift in

420 spatial autocorrelation in fruiting dates. This was not because the plants all ended up fruiting at the  
421 same time (i.e., due to global synchrony of plants), as there was still ample variation in fruiting timing  
422 at the end of the simulations (see Appendix). Plant synchrony is an important tool that can be used by  
423 foragers to plan their movements efficiently (Janmaat et al., 2012). Given the climatic drivers of large-  
424 scale synchrony, the latter can be tracked by animals (Janmaat et al., 2006). A fine-scale synchrony is  
425 also observed in nature (Lamontagne & Boutin, 2007) and might as likely affect animal foraging suc-  
426 cess. While large-scale population trends in phenology might stem from genetic constraints (Chuine  
427 et al., 2000; Lyngdoh et al., 2012), the emergence of spatial autocorrelation in fruiting date in this  
428 model (which considers vertical inheritance) reinforces this idea, and evidences how gene flow may  
429 affect, in addition to local abiotic factors (e.g., lightening, local temperature, etc.), the spatial con-  
430 tingency of phenological traits. However, these conclusions may be challenged by more accurate  
431 modelling of movement behaviour, which may lead to different results (see below). Despite these  
432 limits, the observed spatial engineering could still be sufficient for the emergence of eco-evolutionary  
433 feedback loops between animal resources and animal movement (and cognition) (Riotte-Lambert &  
434 Matthiopoulos, 2020) due to the evidenced repercussions on foragers' foraging efficiency.

435 While the same individual might experience little change in resource distribution over its lifetime,  
436 the progressive engineering of resource distribution could overturn selection over generations. This  
437 model showed that changes in environmental conditions were likely to affect the benefits of memory,  
438 but not enough to completely overturn selection. Indeed, in all environment, memory was advan-  
439 tageous. The relative advantage of omniscience compared to no memory was nearly constant whatever  
440 the environment. Interestingly in contrast, the relative advantage of intermediate memory compare  
441 to no memory, was increased in engineered environments. The performance of these naive agents is  
442 clearly dependent on their sensory abilities (Grove, 2013). Although always superior to the randomly  
443 expected nearest neighbour distance, the sensory range modelled here may have been insufficient  
444 for simple movement strategies such as taxis/kinesis to perform well. As much as memory could be  
445 favoured, the environment could also shape sensory abilities (LaScala-Gruenewald et al., 2019). Still,  
446 the changes in the relative efficiency of cognitive agents open the door to the possible emergence of  
447 evolutionary feedback loops if the costs of memory are no longer compensated, which should lead  
448 to a dynamic equilibrium (Beisner et al., 2003) due to the simultaneous changes in memory benefits  
449 (hence selection) with space engineering.

450 Space engineering was reinforced by the conjunction of two forces: the forager movement rules and  
451 competition for space between plants. Maximum resource engineering was achieved when the indi-  
452 vidual moved to all the plants it encountered along the way and was able to learn the new seedling  
453 locations (see Sensitivity to the learning pathways following old plant mortality). At the other ex-  
454 treme, when the animal moved directly to the best target, and only learned previously visited trees  
455 in case an old tree died, engineering was reduced, following routine trends. Although more effi-  
456 cient, moving straight to the target is rarely observed in nature. Instead, animals tend to move along  
457 routes, sometimes bypassing or otherwise opportunistically inspecting plants without resources, fit-  
458 ting with a beacon-based navigation, where individuals move from beacon to beacon to reach a goal  
459 (Fagan et al., 2013; Warren, 2019). Such a movement strategy gives them the possibility to mon-  
460 itor the environment (de Guinea et al., 2019), allowing them to update personal information. As  
461 such, despite short-term costs due to detours, moving to all trees might provide long-term advan-  
462 tages. However, the simulated movement patterns remain extremely simplistic. Animal movement,  
463 learning, and memory, is in reality much more nuanced than in this modelling work (see Box 1). This  
464 could be important for seed acquisition and deposition (Morales & Morán López, 2022). For example,  
465 this model considered directed movement supported by memory, which could alternate with ran-  
466 dom steps when memory was limited but independent of local cue feedback, as it would rather be  
467 expected for efficient foraging (Benhamou & Collet, 2015). Animal movement may indeed alternate

468 between 'large-scale' directed relocation events and 'area-restricted' wandering searches of the plant  
469 in a non-random manner (Bartumeus et al., 2016). When and where area-restricted searches occur  
470 may further contribute to the emergent distribution of seed deposition (Russo et al., 2006b; Westcott  
471 et al., 2005), provided that both seed deposition and foraging can occur simultaneously. Animals may  
472 yet be selective about where and when they defecate. The presence of latrines may contribute to  
473 shaping the distribution of resources too (Fragoso, 1997; Fuzessy et al., 2022b; Irwin et al., 2004;  
474 Pouvelle et al., 2009; Sakamoto & Takatsuki, 2015). Overall, as movement and/or dispersal scales  
475 with behaviour and personality (Brehm & Mortelliti, 2022; Zwolak, 2018; Zwolak & Sih, 2020), but  
476 also species and individual size (Jordano et al., 2007), a multi-individual and multi-species system  
477 could lead to a more complex multi-scale scaffolding than illustrated here (discussed in Box 1). This  
478 could explain why the evolution of the cognitive machinery underpinning foraging might depend on  
479 the frugivore community composition (Robira & Perez-Lamarque, 2023).

480 In this scaffolding, the plant itself may also play a role. Not only are seed characteristics important in  
481 the dispersal process (Albert et al., 2015; Fuzessy et al., 2018), but the success of seedling germination  
482 is highly dependent on the conditions in which the seed is deposited, due to direct or indirect actions  
483 of conspecifics. This model took into account negative interactions between plants (e.g., competition  
484 for resource, Craine & Dybzinski, 2013, inducing an exclusive space use) and illustrated how this could  
485 act as a barrier to spatial engineering. Indeed, as competition for space between plants increased,  
486 both patchiness and alignment logically decreased, cancelling out the engineering effect of cognition.  
487 While the model effect was interpreted as a competition for space, this may also encompass other  
488 processes such as greater exposure of seeds to predation risk in the vicinity of adult plant conspecifics  
489 (Janzen, 1970). Conversely, facilitation could also occur, with the adult plants acting as a shelter for  
490 new seedlings [Callaway (1995); but see Connell (1971) and Janzen (1970) for a contrasting rationale].  
491 This facilitation should increase clustering. While directly unmodelled here, in the quasi absence of  
492 competition for space, plant range was coherently drastically reduced (i.e., shrunk; Figure A5), with  
493 a tendency to agglomerate towards the centre of the map, where individual recurrences are likely  
494 to be most important. Therefore, the engineered patterns (e.g., from increased patchiness to route  
495 formation) may also depend on plant interactions, adding to the complexity of the system depicted.

496 The sessile lifestyle of plants may have created the illusion of residual fixity in the environmental con-  
497 ditions that shape the lives of frugivorous animals. While, in the absence of depletion, the resource  
498 spatial distribution is likely to remain the same in the short term, conferring the benefits of informa-  
499 tion retention in frugivores, resource spatial distribution can also change over longer periods of time.  
500 Selection could thus operate in two ways : frugivores could play a key role in plant traits by actively se-  
501 lecting and dispersing their food, while their traits could have been shaped by foraging on that primary  
502 food. Considering the feedback loops between these different entities could be an important facet  
503 to make sense of still poorly understood patterns of co-evolution, such as the primates/angiosperms  
504 dyad (Fuzessy et al., 2023; Fuzessy et al., 2022a; Gómez & Verdú, 2012; Sussman, 1991).

### **Box 1 | Taking a step back: a critical discussion of the model limitations (to be continued)**

This model is a proof of concept (i.e., answers the "what if" question, Morales & Moran Lopez, 2022): it shows that an eco-evolutionary feedback loop between animal cognition and resource distribution is possible, but it does not confirm its existence in nature. This is because, paradoxically, this model represents both a field of possibilities much larger than its realisation in nature, and at the same time a drastic simplification of reality, which is actually the essence of the model's interest (Morales & Moran Lopez, 2022, as is often said, "all models are wrong, but some are more useful than others", Georges E.P. Box). After some abstraction, this simplification makes it possible to find analogies with various natural systems and make predictions about what might happen in the wild. This is partly due to the arbitrary choice of spatial and temporal units, which allows the model to be transferred to different ecological systems. If the temporal unit is a day and the spatial unit is a metre, and spatial competition is low, a tropical rainforest with asynchronous plants can be considered (e.g., many of the fig tree species used by animals as a staple food, Shanahan et al., 2001). If you change the time unit to half a day (and thus reduce the speed by two to keep the absolute speed the same), plants can be considered synchronous, and thus you might consider focusing on the fruiting season only of a seasonal rainforest, that classically characterises some rainforests of Central Africa and can influence animals' feeding habits and movement (Masi et al., 2009; Terborgh, 1986). However, the mechanistic simplification of a real system also imposes limits on the generalisability of the model, calling into question the accuracy of the predictions. This box highlights and discusses some of the model limitations, and can serve as a compass for future research.

#### **The environment: a shared place**

The simulations presented here focused on a single forager occupying a square area filled with plants. While this postulate may be valid for a territorial species (Burt, 1943), or because of cognitively induced passive spatial segregation (Riotte-Lambert et al., 2015), some species may still have overlap with conspecifics (e.g., in primates: Pearce et al., 2013). Moreover, space is shared not only with individuals of the same species, but also with other species, some of which may be targeting similar resources. Because individuals compete or learn from other individuals, they may thus alter their movement based on conspecific (Sassi et al., *in press*) or heterospecific (Havmøller et al., 2021) movements. Furthermore, the direct or indirect interaction between individuals is likely to shape the selection on their cognition too (Ashton et al., 2020; Robira & Perez-Lamarque, 2023). As individuals with different levels of cognitive types can coexist, they can influence how animals move and deposit seeds (Borah & Beckman, 2022; Zwolak & Sih, 2020). By allowing different individuals to forage, and thus for the possible coexistence of "opposite" movement patterns, the conclusions presented here may well be overturned. Therefore, multi-individual models should be a future focus to understand the role of the community (rather than the individual) in eco-evolutionary feedback loops between cognition and resource distribution.

## Box 1 | Taking a step back: a critical discussion of the model limitations (to be continued)

### The coexistence of dispersal syndromes

The only way for the modelled plants to disperse was by zochory. The amalgamation of a diasporae and a dispersal mode (i.e., the existence of a dispersal syndrome) is common, but incorrect (Green et al., 2022). Many of the fleshy fruits, for example, are dispersed by both barochory (local dispersal) and zochory (potentially “global” dispersal). The multi-channel possibilities for dispersal are likely to affect the resulting patterns of seed deposition (Clark et al., 1999; Rogers et al., 2019). By considering zochory only, this model implicitly assumes that it is the dominating channel of dispersal and therefore, that space engineering may only be substantial, and affect selection on cognition, in that case. To which extent barochory (or other dispersal means) may cancel out the engineering highlighted here, and thus, the consequence on animals' foraging cognition, remains to be explored.

### Movement as a multifaceted behavioural trait

Animals may not move at random: their movement might be planned and result in a succession of decisions inducing different movement modes (Fryxell et al., 2008). For example, an animal may move from a locally exploited patch to another patch (relocation) and then search for the resource within that patch (exploitation phase, Bartumeus et al., 2016; Benhamou & Collet, 2015). Animal decisions, and thus, the multiplicity of movement modes, may result from changes in both animal condition and environmental conditions (Nathan et al., 2008). For example, during periods of food scarcity, hungry animals can drastically reduce their movement, for example by entering torpor (Vuarin & Henry, 2014), as it has been modelled here. In contrast, satiated individuals may engage less in foraging movement (Hansen et al., 2015). Such short-term changes, following food distribution and animal physiology, may even persist over longer periods of time. For example, western gorillas prefer fruit to leaves. However, the abundance of fruit varies throughout the year, as does their diet, which changes from high to low frugivory (Remis, 1997). These variations are mimicked by oscillations in their activity, the distance they travel, and the area they cover per day (Doran-Sheehy et al., 2004; Masi et al., 2009; Robira et al., 2023b). None of these possibilities occurred in this model. Agent movement was restricted to the simplest case: ballistic movement from target plant to target plant, if known and of interest, throughout the season. Only variations of opportunism were implemented: stopping at all or only fruiting plants encountered *en route*, or none. This was shown to reinforce, or buffer, the spatial engineering following the seed dispersal by the agents. It is therefore likely that the neglect of movement pattern diversity, and in particular concentrated movement such as area restricted search, may have minimised long-term resource aggregation. Overall, coupling agent-based models such as this with more explicit behaviourally-dependent habitat use and movement patterns (Bialozyt et al., 2014; Russo et al., 2006a) would increase the predictive power of these modelling works.

## Box 1 | Taking a step back: a critical discussion of the model limitations

### Evolutionary and ecological change speeds

For eco-evolutionary feedback loops to occur, ecological changes (resulting from agents' actions) should be substantial, and these ecological changes should in turn induce changes in agents' traits (Post & Palkovacs, 2009). This model formally illustrates the first condition (Q1; see the third next bullet point) and suggests that the second condition is true, as the benefits of spatiotemporal memory vary with the resulting engineering of resource distribution (Q2). It only suggests this because agents' fitness is only proxied by foraging efficiency (see the second next bullet point). Furthermore, this model excludes the evolution of the agents (spatio-temporal memory width does not change during the simulation). This is particularly important in explaining why the model was designed to accelerate ecological change (e.g., plants reaching maturity quickly after dispersal) in order to limit the computational time needed to test the first condition (for substantial ecological change), but these choices should be inconsequential on the model conclusion given the current model design (i.e., absence of evolution). However, in eco-evolutionary feedbacks, the rate at which the environment changes and the species traits of interest evolve (here spatio-temporal memory) are key. Indeed, for eco-evolutionary feedbacks to arise and be maintained, the ecological and evolutionary time scales must be congruent (Post & Palkovacs, 2009). Here, only ecological changes occurred, evolution did not occur in parallel. To unambiguously confirm the existence of eco-evo feedbacks, explicit modelling of spatio-temporal evolution should be performed. This would require careful consideration of the ecological processes underlying seed dispersal success and plant growth patterns. It would also mean considering a mortal forager. Indeed, in the present simulations, the forager could be considered immortal or simply replaced by a clone with perfect vertical inheritance of knowledge, a rather unrealistic assumption. Moreover, an individual may also show plasticity in the known information (see the next bullet point below). Considering learning and inheritance of knowledge is an essential next step to explicitly model the evolution of spatiotemporal memory and thus to challenge the conclusions of this model.

### Learning and forgetting: the dual aspect of memory

In this model, the agent was rarely able to learn new profitable locations. Only when a known plant died was the location of an unknown plant (either the dispersed seed in most simulations, or the most recently visited fruiting plant, see Appendix, Sensitivity to the learning pathways following old plant mortality) learned. Such a simplified learning mechanism, which is clearly unrealistic (especially for instantaneous learning of instantaneously growing new seeds), was a convenient way to keep plant density (hence instantaneous growth) and memory size (hence instantaneous learning) constant, as these two aspects are crucial in determining the benefits of memory (Boyer & Walsh, 2010; Bracis et al., 2015; Grove, 2013, this paper). However, the consequence of memory may arise from the nexus of learning, knowing, and forgetting (Kraemer & Golding, 1997; Tello-Ramos et al., 2019). In particular, in the case of foragers' recursions, the speed with which a fruitful site can be memorised or erased, and the cognitive abilities and dynamics in general, may have a significant impact on foragers' patterns of revisits and routine (Berger-Tal & Bar-David, 2015), both of which were prerequisites for the emergence of resource aggregation and local correlation in phenology. This would explain why the two learning pathways produced qualitatively identical (i.e., ranging similarly compared to the benchmarks), yet quantitatively unidentical results, with memorisation of the seedling accentuating the environmental engineering effect. Relaxing assumptions on memory stability and learning speed would necessarily affect further the speed at which ecological change may occur, as well as the

### **Box 1 | Taking a step back: a critical discussion of the model limitations**

likelihood for memory to evolve. Further work should therefore consider a more dynamic memory to see how this may affect the existence and nature of eco-evolutionary feedback loops involved in memory evolution.

#### **The memory burden: memory benefits does not necessarily imply selection**

For a trait to be advantageous, not only must it confer some benefits, but these benefits must outweigh the costs that the trait may impose. In the case of cognition, for example, it is known that it imposes additional metabolic costs, while less straightforward costs may arise from the need to learn, from memory impairment, or from the consequences of knowledge inaccuracy (Burns et al., 2011; Fagan et al., 2013). These costs are rarely studied and quantified empirically, highlighting the need for such research to make models such as this more realistic and less condemned to speculation about memory adaptiveness. In the meantime, in the absence of explicit costs, the shortcut taken here has been to assume that foraging benefits are synonymous with fitness benefits. In other words, the benefits of foraging compensate for the additional costs of cognition. However, this is not necessarily the case. For example, the benefits of spatiotemporal memory vary significantly with patterns of spatial distribution of resources (Grove, 2013) and phenology (Robira et al., 2021). Variation in benefits with environment conditions explains why cognition may vary between species (Van Woerden et al., 2010; van Woerden et al., 2012). A clear formulation of fitness, and hence of the benefit-cost trade-off associated with memory, is essential to further elaborate on the role of cognition in animal evolution, including through these (possible) eco-evolutionary feedback loops (Hoyle et al., 2008).

#### **Biological substantiality: what is a lot in ecology and evolution?**

As should be the case in modelling work, differences in resource patterns have been estimated by quantifying changes in some indices compared to expected changes estimated on the basis of simulated data, rather than on the basis of statistical tests which are meaningless in this case (White et al., 2014). However, while this characterises the ecological relevance of the change, it does not characterise the eco-evolutionary relevance of the consequence of the change. If that consequence (e.g., effects on foraging benefits or fitness) is a nonlinear function of the ecological variable of interest (e.g., patchiness, alignment, spatial autocorrelation, etc.), ridiculously small or large differences in this variable compared to the true range of possibilities, may perhaps have in the end very large, or on the contrary very low, evolutionary consequence. This was the reason behind directly measuring the changes in foraging efficiency of foragers following the changes in resource spatio-temporal distribution (Q2). However, foraging efficiency is only an indirect proxy for individual fitness: not only because it does not measure costs (see above), but also because the functional form linking foraging efficiency to fitness is unknown. While this approximation is common in most, if not all, empirical or theoretical studies on cognitive foraging, it drastically limits the predictive power of this work specifically: while results put forward that an eco-evolutionary feedback loop between cognition and resources may exist, there is no certainty that it does so in nature, and that this in itself has any consequences for the evolutionary trajectories of both foragers and plants. This is also why this model does not intend to portray a fully realistic situation. However, by demonstrating that an eco-evolutionary feedback loop between animal cognition and resource distribution can be relevant under a minimal set of assumptions, it now justifies the undertaking of empirical studies to test it *in vivo*.

509

## V Acknowledgements

510 Simulations were run on the HPC cluster of the Edmund Mach Foundation. I thank Louise Riotte-  
511 Lambert and Kavel Ozturk for discussion on the model rationale and feedback on the manuscript, Eva  
512 Gril for discussion on botanical assumptions, as well as Alexandra Loveridge for English editing. I thank  
513 Fabien Laroche (PCI recommender), Julia Astegiano, Christophe Baltzinger and another anonymous  
514 reviewer for feedback on a previous version of the manuscript.

515

## VI Funding

516 No specific funding was obtained for this research.

517

## VII Declaration of conflict of interest

518 I declare having no conflict of interest.

519

## VIII Data and code availability

520 The code used to generate the data and perform the analyses is available at <https://github.com/benjaminrobira/ModelZoochoryCognition>. To fully reproduce the analyses, a singularity image (through  
521 which the model can be run and which was used to run the simulations on the HPC cluster) can be  
522 provided on request, as it is too large to store on git.  
523


525 **IX.1● Using patchiness and alignment to characterise spatial point patterns**

526 I provide below evidence that the two metrics, namely *patchiness* and *alignment*, allows for distinguishing  
 527 between homogeneous, heterogeneous and route point patterns. In both the low (100 plants) and  
 528 high (1000 plants) density, I considered 1/10 of the number of plants as the number of clusters for  
 529 the heterogeneous distribution (i.e., 10 clusters at low density, 100 at high density). Around these  
 530 clusters of strictly equivalent size, plants were distributed according to a Gaussian distribution (both  
 531 for the x and y axis) of variance 50 su. The distribution resembling a route network was obtained by  
 532 modelling one (low density) to ten (high density) correlated random walks of 100 steps ("simm.crw"  
 533 function of the *adehabitatLT* package, Calenge et al. (2023), with a scaling parameter, to determine  
 534 step length, of 20 su, and a concentration parameter, relative to the correlation in heading, of 0.9). I  
 535 calculated the two metrics on 200 distributions.


536 Homogeneous distributions are identified by a low patchiness and a low alignment. Heterogeneous  
 537 distributions are identified by an intermediate patchiness and a low alignment. Finally route point  
 538 distributions are evidenced by a high patchiness and a high alignment (Figure A2). This pattern is  
 539 robust to density variations, although absolute differences in the indices shrink with density increase  
 540 (Figure A2). The benchmark values at high plant density (1000 plants) are depicted in Figure 3 of  
 541 the main text.

542 **IX.2● Using Moran's Index to characterise plant synchrony**

543 Below I provide evidence that Moran's Index, adapted for circular variables (see main text), can correctly  
 544 identify environments with high or low local synchrony in fruiting dates. To do this, I simulated  
 545 square environments of length 1000 su and containing 1000 plants either homogeneously or heterogeneously  
 546 distributed (as above, Figure A3). I assigned each plant a start of fruiting date (in radians)  
 547 to mimic an environment with no, intermediate or local synchrony (Figure A3). To do this, I first initiated  
 548 the fruiting dates for 50 plants by randomly sampling in a wrapped Gaussian distribution with  
 549 a concentration parameter equal to 0.5 and centred on 0 ("rwrappednormal" function of the *circular*  
 550 package Agostinelli & Lund, 2023). Then, for the 950 remaining plants, I sampled their fruiting dates  
 551 in a wrapped Gaussian distribution with a concentration parameter equal to 0 (low local synchrony),  
 552 0.5 (medium local synchrony), or 1 (high local synchrony), centred on the fruiting date of the nearest  
 553 plant (with a fruiting date already associated). Then, to smooth the pattern in space, I corrected the  
 554 fruiting dates of all plants by taking the weighted (by the inverse of the Euclidean distance; the value  
 555 of the weight for the focal plant was set to 1) circular mean ("weighted.mean.circular" function of the  
 556 *circular* package Agostinelli & Lund, 2023), considering only the 50 closest plants (including the focal  
 557 plant itself). I simulated 200 environments for each spatial (homogeneous or heterogeneous) and  
 558 temporal (i.e., synchrony level) pattern. Overall, Moran's Index increased coherently with simulated  
 559 synchrony, regardless of spatial distribution (Figure A3). The spatial distribution affected the resulting  
 560 Moran's Index, with a spatial autocorrelation 1.38 times superior for a simulated same synchrony  
 561 when the environment was heterogeneous compared to homogeneous. The benchmark values are  
 562 depicted in Figure 3 of the main text.




**Figure A1** – Simulated spatial distributions to investigate metrics value | Distribution: Homo. = homogeneous, Hetero. = Heterogeneous, Route = Route network-like. plant population size: Low = 100 plants, High = 1000 plants, within a square map of side length 1000 su.




**Figure A2** – Patchiness and alignment allow for identifying spatial distributions at low (100 plants) or high (1000 plants) plant population size | Results are based from simulated data following a homogeneous (Homo.), heterogeneous (Hetero.) or route network-like (Route) distribution. The mean value is depicted by the black dot and the text. The shape of the distribution is depicted by the contour of the violins.

## Spatial distribution



**Figure A3** – Examples of simulated environments varying in their spatial and temporal distribution | The dots represent the plants. They are coloured along a white-to-black gradient according to the value of their fruiting date. The more synchronous two plants are, the more their colours match.



**Figure A4** – Moran's Index adapted for circular variables correctly identifies local synchrony among plants | Results are based from simulated data following a homogeneous (Homo.) or heterogeneous (Hetero.) spatial distribution. The synchrony intensity is related to the concentration parameter used when sampling in a wrapped Gaussian distribution (low = 0, intermediate = 0.5, high = 1). The mean value of Moran's Index is depicted by the black dot and the text. The shape of the distribution is depicted by the contour of the violins. Note the non-linearity on the y axis. This is used to highlight the differences between low and intermediate synchrony.

### 563 IX.3● Variations in resource range shrinkage intensity

564 Shrinkage was affected by the forager's cognition, peaking at low cognition (Figure A5a). Shrinkage  
565 was also driven by the forager limiting visits to plant encountered *en route*, with a maximum reached  
566 when the forager discarded all of these plants and moved directly to the target (Figure A5b). Finally,  
567 shrinkage was removed when the competition for space between plants was high (Figure A5c).





Figure A5 – Shrinkage of resource range is driven by cognition, the forager's movement rules and competition for space between plants.

### 568 IX.4● Variations in routine behaviour when no dispersal occurs


569 In the absence of seed dispersal (scenarios in Q2 were used), routine behaviour still increased (and  
570 saturated) with more advanced cognition, whatever the environment (i.e., the engineering level, Figure  
571 A6).

### 572 IX.5● Variations in fruiting dates

573 Considering the fruiting dates as circular variables (i.e., vectors with a length of one unit and a given  
574 direction), the distribution of fruiting dates can be summarised by a mean vector, the direction of  
575 which characterises the mean fruiting date and the length of which characterises the variance around  
576 this mean (with a length of 1 characterising low variance, Batschelet, 1981). I thus quantified the  
577 variation in fruiting dates as one minus the length of the mean vector of fruiting dates (Batschelet,  
578 1981) in either the initial or final conditions. It varies from 0 (no variation; all fruiting dates are the  
579 same) to 1 (extensive variation; fruiting dates are uniformly distributed). At the beginning or end of the  
580 simulations, the variation in fruiting dates was considerable, regardless of the scenario tested (Figure  
581 A7).



**Figure A6** – Routine emerges when cognition is high, independent of environment engineering | The ‘initial condition’ of resource distribution was taken from the simulations in which a naive, intermediate or omniscient forager was first let foraging. Then, those three forager types were let foraging (separately) without dispersal and routine behaviour was quantified (the tendency of the forager to target plants in a predictable way; values close to 0 indicate no predictable movement, values close to 1 indicate highly predictable movements).



**Figure A7** – Variation in fruiting dates at the beginning of the simulation ('initial' condition) or at the end ('final' condition) | The plots show the results of 200 simulations when a seed-dispersing forager with varying level of cognition (i.e., proportion of plant locations and associated phenology known), moving choice rules or space competition intensities between plants (the two latter being simulated with an omniscient forager; left to right) was let foraging for a long time. The index of variation in fruiting dates (one minus the length of the mean vector of fruiting dates, Batschelet, 1981) ranges from 0 (no variation) to 1 (extensive variation).

582 **IX.6● Sensitivity to the agent's speed**

---

583 The emergence of spatial autocorrelation in fruiting dates depends on how far the seed is from the  
584 parent plant. Therefore, it may depend not only on the routine of the agent, but also on the speed  
585 at which it moves, and thus on the area that an agent can explore during the dispersal window. To  
586 investigate the robustness of the observation to the agent's speed of movement (and thus allow  
587 analogies with other biological systems, since it is this speed that establishes the link between the  
588 'arbitrary' spatial and temporal units), I ran additional simulations considering an omniscient forager  
589 moving at either half ('low speed') or twice ('high speed') the speed used for the standard simulations  
590 in the main text ('intermediate speed').


591 In comparison to other forager's traits and in the range tested, movement speed was not the main  
592 driver of the resource spatiotemporal distribution (Figure A8A).

593 **IX.7● Sensitivity to the learning pathways following old plant mortality**

---

594 In the model, when the deposited seed was able to grow, it caused the death of another random adult  
595 plant. Since memory size is an important feature that determines the benefits of memory in foraging  
596 (Figure 4), the new seed location and phenology was immediately known to the agent when a known  
597 plant died. To investigate whether this had undesirable consequences for the model's results, I simu-  
598 lated the behaviour of an agent endowed with cognitive but not perfect knowledge (spatiotemporal  
599 knowledge rate of 0.25, 0.5, 0.75) learning the location and phenology of the most recently seen  
600 fruiting plant when another adult plant died ('Recent fruiting plant learned') and compared the simu-  
601 lation results (patchiness, alignment, spatial autocorrelation and routine) with those presented in the  
602 main text when the seedling location was learned ('Seedling learned').

603 The inability of the agent to directly learn the seedling location and phenology when an old plant  
604 died, and only the location and phenology of the most recently visited fruiting plant, limited the level  
605 of engineering (lower patchiness, alignment and spatial autocorrelation in fruiting dates, Figure A8B).  
606 However, both learning pathways ranged similarly compared to the benchmarks, so the overall pattern  
607 of engineering remained largely the same (Figure A8B).



**Figure A8** – Seed-dispersing foragers can shape resource distribution | The notched box plots show the results of 200 simulations when a seed-dispersing forager with varying speed or learning abilities was let foraging for a long time. The resulting distribution pattern was assessed by its patchiness (the tendency of plans to be aggregated into patches; larger values indicate highly aggregated plans), its alignment (the tendency of plans to form linear geometries; larger values indicate the presence of linear geometries) and spatial {autocorrelation} in fruiting date (the tendency of plans to have fruiting dates closer/farther in time to their spatial neighbours; values close to -1 indicate negative spatial autocorrelation, values close to 0 indicate no spatial autocorrelation, values close to 1 indicate positive spatial autocorrelation). Indices' benchmarks obtained from simulated environments are represented by the horizontal lines (Homo. = Homogeneous, Hetero. = Heterogeneous, Synchro. = Synchrony) (see Appendix). Because of overlap, only alignment and intermediate synchrony in a homogeneous (and not heterogeneous) environment was plotted. The emerging movement behaviour of the forager was described in terms of routine behaviour (the tendency of the forager to target plans in a predictable way; values close to 0 indicate no predictable movement, values close to 1 indicate highly predictable movements).

608 **References**

- 609 Addis, C. R., et al. (2017). *Causes and consequences of movement: The interaction between foraging and*  
610 *landscape patterns* (Doctoral dissertation).
- 611 Agostinelli, C., & Lund, U. (2023). *R package circular: Circular statistics (version 0.5-0)*. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=circular>
- 612 Albert, A., Auffret, A. G., Cosyns, E., Cousins, S. A. O., D'hondt, B., Eichberg, C., Eycott, A. E., Heinken,  
613 T., Hoffmann, M., Jaroszewicz, B., Malo, J. E., Mårell, A., Mouissie, M., Pakeman, R. J., Picard,  
614 M., Plue, J., Poschlod, P., Provoost, S., Schulze, K. A., & Baltzinger, C. (2015). Seed dispersal  
615 by ungulates as an ecological filter: A trait-based meta-analysis. *Oikos*, 124(9), 1109–1120.  
616 <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.02512>
- 617 Ashton, B. J., Kennedy, P., & Radford, A. N. (2020). Interactions with conspecific outsiders as drivers  
618 of cognitive evolution. *Nature Communications*, 11(1), 4937.
- 619 Avgar, T., Deardon, R., & Fryxell, J. M. (2013). An empirically parameterized individual based model of  
620 animal movement, perception, and memory. *Ecological Modelling*, 251, 158–172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2012.12.002>
- 621 Bagchi, R., Henrys, P. A., Brown, P. E., Burslem, D. F., Diggle, P. J., Gunatilleke, C. V., Gunatilleke, I. A.,  
622 Kassim, A. R., Law, R., Noor, S., & Valencia, R. L. (2011). Spatial patterns reveal negative density  
623 dependence and habitat associations in tropical trees. *Ecology*, 92(9), 1723–1729. <https://doi.org/10.1890/11-0335.1>
- 624 Ban, S. D., Boesch, C., & Janmaat, K. R. (2014). Taï chimpanzees anticipate revisiting high-valued fruit  
625 trees from further distances. *Animal Cognition*, 17(6), 1353–1364. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-014-0771-y>
- 626 Ban, S. D., Boesch, C., N'Guessan, A., N'Goran, E. K., Tako, A., & Janmaat, K. R. (2016). Taï chimpanzees  
627 change their travel direction for rare feeding trees providing fatty fruits. *Animal Behaviour*, 118,  
628 135–147. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2016.05.014>
- 629 Bartumeus, F., Campos, D., Ryu, W. S., Lloret-Cabot, R., Méndez, V., & Catalan, J. (2016). Foraging  
630 success under uncertainty: search tradeoffs and optimal space use. *Ecology Letters*, 19(11),  
631 1299–1313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12660>
- 632 Batschelet, E. (1981). *Circular Statistics in Biology*. Academic Press.
- 633 Beisner, B. E., Haydon, D. T., & Cuddington, K. (2003). Alternative stable states in ecology. *Frontiers  
634 in Ecology and the Environment*, 1(7), 376–382.
- 635 Benhamou, S. (2014). Of scales and stationarity in animal movements. *Ecology Letters*, 17(3), 261–  
636 272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12225>
- 637 Benhamou, S., & Bovet, P. (1992). Distinguishing between elementary orientation mechanisms by  
638 means of path analysis. *Animal Behaviour*, 43(3), 371–377.
- 639 Benhamou, S., & Collet, J. (2015). Ultimate failure of the lévy foraging hypothesis: Two-scale search-  
640 ing strategies outperform scale-free ones even when prey are scarce and cryptic. *Journal of  
641 theoretical biology*, 387, 221–227.
- 642 Benhamou, S., & Poucet, B. (1995). A comparative analysis of spatial memory processes. *Behavioural  
643 Processes*, 35(1-3), 113–126.
- 644 Berger-Tal, O., & Bar-David, S. (2015). Recursive movement patterns: Review and synthesis across  
645 species. *Ecosphere*, 6(9), 1–12.
- 646 Bialozyt, R., Flinkerbusch, S., Niggemann, M., & Heymann, E. W. (2014). Predicting the seed shadows  
647 of a neotropical tree species dispersed by primates using an agent-based model with internal  
648 decision making for movements. *Ecological Modelling*, 278, 74–84.
- 649 Blake, S., Deem, S. L., Mossimbo, E., Maisels, F., & Walsh, P. (2009). Forest elephants: Tree planters of  
650 the congo. *Biotropica*, 41(4), 459–468. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2009.00512.x>

- 655 Blake, S., & Inkamba-Nkulu, C. (2004). Fruit, minerals, and forest elephant trails: Do all roads lead to  
656 Rome? *Biotropica*, 36(3), 392–401. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-7429.2004.tb00332.x>
- 657 Borah, B., & Beckman, N. G. (2022). Studying seed dispersal through the lens of movement ecology.  
658 *Oikos*, 2022(2).
- 659 Boyer, D., & Walsh, P. D. (2010). Modelling the mobility of living organisms in heterogeneous land-  
660 scapes: Does memory improve foraging success? *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*  
661 A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences, 368(1933), 5645–5659. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2010.0275>
- 663 Bracis, C., Gurarie, E., Van Moorter, B., & Goodwin, R. A. (2015). Memory effects on movement be-  
664 havior in animal foraging. *PLoS ONE*, 10(8), e0136057. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0136057>
- 666 Brehm, A. M., & Mortelliti, A. (2022). Small mammal personalities generate context dependence  
667 in the seed dispersal mutualism. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 119(15),  
668 e2113870119. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2113870119>
- 669 Burns, J. G., Foucaud, J., & Mery, F. (2011). Costs of memory: Lessons from 'mini' brains. *Proceedings*  
670 of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 278(1707), 923–929.
- 671 Burt, W. H. (1943). Territoriality and home range concepts as applied to mammals. *Journal of mam-  
672 malogy*, 24(3), 346–352.
- 673 Calenge, C. (2006). The package adehabitat for the r software: Tool for the analysis of space and  
674 habitat use by animals. *Ecological Modelling*, 197, 1035.
- 675 Calenge, C., contributions from Stephane Dray, & Royer, M. (2023). Adehabitatlt: Analysis of animal  
676 movements [R package version 0.3.27]. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=adehabitatLT>
- 677 Callaway, R. M. (1995). Positive interactions among plants. *The Botanical Review*, 61, 306–349.
- 678 Campos-Arceiz, A., & Blake, S. (2011). Megagardeners of the forest - the role of elephants in seed  
679 dispersal. *Acta Oecologica*, 37(6), 542–553. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actao.2011.01.014>
- 680 Chapman, C. A., Bonnell, T. R., Gogarten, J. F., Lambert, J. E., Omeja, P. A., Twinomugisha, D., Wasser-  
681 man, M. D., & Rothman, J. M. (2013). Are primates ecosystem engineers? *International Journal*  
682 of *Primateology*, 34(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-012-9645-9>
- 683 Chuine, I., Belmonte, J., & Mignot, A. (2000). A modelling analysis of the genetic variation of phenology  
684 between tree populations. *Journal of Ecology*, 88(4), 561–570. Retrieved June 21, 2023, from  
685 <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2648589>
- 686 Clark, J. S., Silman, M., Kern, R., Macklin, E., & HilleRisLambers, J. (1999). Seed dispersal near and far:  
687 Patterns across temperate and tropical forests. *Ecology*, 80(5), 1475–1494.
- 688 Connell, J. H. (1971). On the role of natural enemies in preventing competitive exclusion in some  
689 marine animals and in rain forest trees. *Dynamics of populations*, 298(312).
- 690 Córtes, M. C., & Uriarte, M. (2013). Integrating frugivory and animal movement: A review of the  
691 evidence and implications for scaling seed dispersal. *Biological Reviews*, 88(2), 255–272.
- 692 Craine, J. M., & Dybzinski, R. (2013). Mechanisms of plant competition for nutrients, water and light.  
693 *Functional Ecology*, 27(4), 833–840. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.12081>
- 695 de Guinea, M., Estrada, A., Nekaris, K. A.-I., & Van Belle, S. (2019). Arboreal route navigation in a  
696 Neotropical mammal: Energetic implications associated with tree monitoring and landscape  
697 attributes. *Movement Ecology*, 7(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40462-019-0187-z>
- 698 Di Fiore, A., & Suarez, S. A. (2007). Route-based travel and shared routes in sympatric spider and  
699 woolly monkeys: Cognitive and evolutionary implications. *Animal cognition*, 10, 317–329.
- 700 Doran-Sheehy, D. M., Greer, D., Mongo, P., & Schwindt, D. (2004). Impact of ecological and social  
701 factors on ranging in western gorillas. *American Journal of Primatology: Official Journal of the*  
702 *American Society of Primatologists*, 64(2), 207–222.

- 703 Eddelbuettel, D. (2013). *Seamless R and C++ integration with Rcpp* [ISBN 978-1-4614-6867-7].  
704 Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-6868-4>
- 705 Eddelbuettel, D., Francois, R., Allaire, J., Ushey, K., Kou, Q., Russell, N., Ucar, I., Bates, D., & Chambers,  
706 J. (2023). *Rcpp: Seamless r and c++ integration* [R package version 1.0.11]. <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Rcpp>
- 707 Eddelbuettel, D., & François, R. (2011). Rcpp: Seamless R and C++ integration. *Journal of Statistical  
708 Software*, 40(8), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v040.i08>
- 709 Fagan, W. F., Lewis, M. A., Auger-Méthé, M., Avgar, T., Benhamou, S., Breed, G., Ladage, L., Schlägel,  
710 U. E., Tang, W. W., Papastamatiou, Y. P., Forester, J., & Mueller, T. (2013). Spatial memory and  
711 animal movement. *Ecology Letters*, 16(10), 1316–1329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.12165>
- 712 Flörchinger, M., Braun, J., Böhning-Gaese, K., & Schaefer, H. M. (2010). Fruit size, crop mass, and  
713 plant height explain differential fruit choice of primates and birds. *Oecologia*, 164(1), 151–  
714 161. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00442-010-1655-8>
- 715 Fragoso, J. M. V. (1997). Tapir-generated seed shadows: Scale-dependent patchiness in the amazon  
716 rain forest. *Journal of Ecology*, 85(4), 519–529.
- 717 Fragoso, J. M. V., Silvius, K. M., & Correa, J. A. (2003). Long-distance seed dispersal by tapirs increases  
718 seed survival and aggregates tropical trees. *Ecology*, 84(8), 1998–2006. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1890/01-0621>
- 719 Fryxell, J. M., Hazell, M., Börger, L., Dalziel, B. D., Haydon, D. T., Morales, J. M., McIntosh, T., & Rosatte,  
720 R. C. (2008). Multiple movement modes by large herbivores at multiple spatiotemporal scales.  
721 *Proceedings of the National academy of Sciences*, 105(49), 19114–19119.
- 722 Fuzessy, L., Balbuena, J. A., Nevo, O., Tonos, J., Papinot, B., Park, D., Sol, D., Valenta, K., Razafindratisima,  
723 O., & Verdú, M. (2023). Friends or foes? plant-animal coevolutionary history is driven by  
724 both mutualistic and antagonistic interactions. *BioRxiv*.
- 725 Fuzessy, L., Silveira, F. A., Culot, L., Jordano, P., & Verdú, M. (2022a). Phylogenetic congruence between  
726 Neotropical primates and plants is driven by frugivory. *Ecology Letters*, 25(2), 320–329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ele.13918>
- 727 Fuzessy, L., Sobral, G., & Culot, L. (2022b). Linking howler monkey ranging and defecation patterns  
728 to primary and secondary seed dispersal. *American Journal of Primatology*, 84(2), e23354. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.23354>
- 729 Fuzessy, L. F., Janson, C., & Silveira, F. A. (2018). Effects of seed size and frugivory degree on dispersal  
730 by neotropical frugivores. *Acta Oecologica*, 93, 41–47.
- 731 Gelmi-Candusso, T. A., Heymann, E. W., & Heer, K. (2017). Effects of zochory on the spatial genetic  
732 structure of plant populations. *Molecular Ecology*, 26(21), 5896–5910. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.14351>
- 733 Gómez, J. M., & Verdú, M. (2012). Mutualism with plants drives primate diversification. *Systematic  
734 Biology*, 61(4), 567–577. <https://doi.org/10.1093/sysbio/syr127>
- 735 Gottsberger, G., & Silberbauer-Gottberger, I. L. S. E. (1983). Dispersal and distribution in the cerrado  
736 vegetation of Brazil. *Sonderbd natuwiss. ver. Hamburg*, 7, 315–352.
- 737 Green, A. J., Baltzinger, C., & Lovas-Kiss, Á. (2022). Plant dispersal syndromes are unreliable, especially  
738 for predicting zochory and long-distance dispersal. *Oikos*, 2022(2).
- 739 Grove, M. (2013). The evolution of spatial memory. *Mathematical Biosciences*, 242(1), 25–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mbs.2012.11.011>
- 740 Hansen, M. J., Schaerf, T. M., & Ward, A. J. (2015). The effect of hunger on the exploratory behaviour  
741 of shoals of mosquitofish *gambusia holbrooki*. *Behaviour*, 152(12–13), 1659–1677.
- 742 Havmøller, L. W., Loftus, J. C., Havmøller, R. W., Alavi, S. E., Caillaud, D., Grote, M. N., Hirsch, B. T.,  
743 Tórrez-Herrera, L. L., Kays, R., & Crofoot, M. C. (2021). Arboreal monkeys facilitate foraging  
744 of terrestrial frugivores. *Biotropica*, 53(6), 1685–1697.

- 751 Hoyle, A., Bowers, R. G., White, A., & Boots, M. (2008). The influence of trade-off shape on evolution-  
752       ary behaviour in classical ecological scenarios. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 250(3), 498–  
753       511.
- 754 Hubbell, S. P. (1979). Tree dispersion, abundance, and diversity in a tropical dry forest: That tropical  
755       trees are clumped, not spaced, alters conceptions of the organization and dynamics. *Science*,  
756       203(4387), 1299–1309.
- 757 Irwin, M. T., Samonds, K. E., Raharison, J.-L., & Wright, P. C. (2004). Lemur Latrines: Observations of  
758       Latrine Behavior in Wild Primates and Possible Ecological Significance. *Journal of Mammalogy*,  
759       85(3), 420–427. <https://doi.org/10.1644/1383937>
- 760 Janmaat, K. R., Ban, S. D., & Boesch, C. (2013). Taï chimpanzees use botanical skills to discover fruit:  
761       What we can learn from their mistakes. *Animal Cognition*, 16(6), 851–860. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-013-0617-z>
- 763 Janmaat, K. R., Byrne, R. W., & Zuberbühler, K. (2006). Primates take weather into account when  
764       searching for fruits. *Current Biology*, 16(12), 1232–1237. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2006.04.031>
- 766 Janmaat, K. R., Chapman, C. A., Meijer, R., & Zuberbühler, K. (2012). The use of fruiting synchrony  
767       by foraging mangabey monkeys: A 'simple tool' to find fruit. *Animal Cognition*, 15(1), 83–96.  
768       <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-011-0435-0>
- 769 Janson, C. H. (1998). Experimental evidence for spatial memory in foraging wild capuchin monkeys,  
770       Cebus apella. *Animal Behaviour*, 55(5), 1229–1243. <https://doi.org/10.1006/anbe.1997.0688>
- 771 Janson, C. H. (2016). Capuchins, space, time and memory: An experimental test of what-where-when  
772       memory in wild monkeys. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 283(1840),  
773       20161432. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2016.1432>
- 774 Janzen, D. H. (1970). Herbivores and the number of tree species in tropical forests. *The American  
775       Naturalist*, 104(940), 501–528.
- 776 John, E. A., Francesca, S., Burman, O. H. P., Anna, W., & Pike, T. W. (2016). Plant ecology meets animal  
777       cognition: impacts of animal memory on seed dispersal. *Plant Ecology*, 217, 1441–1456. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s11258-016-0652-3>
- 779 Jordano, P., García, C., Godoy, J. A., & García-Castaño, J. L. (2007). Differential contribution of fru-  
780       givores to complex seed dispersal patterns. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,  
781       104(9), 3278–3282. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0606793104>
- 782 Kraemer, P. J., & Golding, J. M. (1997). Adaptive forgetting in animals. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*,  
783       4, 480–491.
- 784 Lambert, J. E., & Garber, P. A. (1998). Evolutionary and ecological implications of primate seed disper-  
785       sal. *American Journal of primatology*, 45(1), 9–28.
- 786 Lamontagne, J. M., & Boutin, S. (2007). Local-scale synchrony and variability in mast seed production  
787       patterns of picea glauca. *Journal of Ecology*, 95(5), 991–1000.
- 788 LaScala-Gruenewald, D. E., Mehta, R. S., Liu, Y., & Denny, M. W. (2019). Sensory perception plays a  
789       larger role in foraging efficiency than heavy-tailed movement strategies. *Ecological Modelling*,  
790       404, 69–82. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolmodel.2019.02.015>
- 791 Lloyd, M. (1967). Mean crowding. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*, 1–30. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.2307/3012>
- 793 Lomáscolo, S. B., & Schaefer, H. M. (2010). Signal convergence in fruits: A result of selection by  
794       frugivores? *Journal of Evolutionary Biology*, 23(3), 614–624. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-9101.2010.01931.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1420-<br/>795       9101.2010.01931.x)
- 796 Lyngdoh, N., Gunaga, R., Joshi, G., Vasudeva, R., Ravikanth, G., & Shaanker, R. U. (2012). Influence of  
797       geographic distance and genetic dissimilarity among clones on flowering synchrony in a teak  
798       (*Tectona grandis* Linn. f) clonal seed orchard. *Silvae Genetica*, 61(1-6), 10–18.

- 799 Masi, S., Cipolletta, C., & Robbins, M. M. (2009). Western lowland gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla*) change  
800 their activity patterns in response to frugivory. *American Journal of Primatology: Official Journal  
801 of the American Society of Primatologists*, 71(2), 91–100.
- 802 Milton, K. (1981). Distribution Patterns of Tropical Plant Foods as an Evolutionary Stimulus to Primate  
803 Mental Development. *American Anthropologist*, 83(3), 534–548. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1981.83.3.02a00020>
- 805 Morales, J. M., & Moran Lopez, T. (2022). Mechanistic models of seed dispersal by animals. *Oikos*,  
806 2022(2).
- 807 Morales, J. M., & Morán López, T. (2022). Mechanistic models of seed dispersal by animals. *Oikos*,  
808 2022(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.08328>
- 809 Nathan, R., Getz, W. M., Revilla, E., Holyoak, M., Kadmon, R., Saltz, D., & Smouse, P. E. (2008). A  
810 movement ecology paradigm for unifying organismal movement research. *Proceedings of the  
811 National Academy of Sciences*, 105(49), 19052–19059.
- 812 Paradis, E., & Schliep, K. (2019). Ape 5.0: An environment for modern phylogenetics and evolutionary  
813 analyses in R. *Bioinformatics*, 35, 526–528. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/bty633>
- 814 Pearce, F., Carbone, C., Cowlishaw, G., & Isaac, N. J. (2013). Space-use scaling and home range overlap  
815 in primates. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 280(1751), 20122122.
- 816 Post, D. M., & Palkovacs, E. P. (2009). Eco-evolutionary feedbacks in community and ecosystem ecol-  
817 ogy: Interactions between the ecological theatre and the evolutionary play. *Philosophical Trans-  
818 actions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 364(1523), 1629–1640.
- 819 Pouvelle, S., Jouard, S., Feer, F., Tully, T., & Ponge, J.-F. (2009). The latrine effect: Impact of howler  
820 monkeys on the distribution of small seeds in a tropical rain-forest soil. *Journal of Tropical  
821 Ecology*, 25(3), 239–248. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266467409005987>
- 822 Presotto, A., Verderane, M. P., Biondi, L., Mendonça-Furtado, O., Spagnoletti, N., Madden, M., & Izar,  
823 P. (2018). Intersection as key locations for bearded capuchin monkeys (*Sapajus libidinosus*)  
824 traveling within a route network. *Animal Cognition*, 21(3), 393–405. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-018-1176-0>
- 826 Pringle, R. M. (2008). Elephants as agents of habitat creation for small vertebrates at the patch scale.  
827 *Ecology*, 89(1), 26–33. <https://doi.org/10.1890/07-0776.1>
- 828 R Core Team. (2022). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. R Foundation for Statistical  
829 Computing. Vienna, Austria. <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 830 Raichle, M. E. (2006). The brain's dark energy. *Science-New York Then Washington-*, 314(5803), 1249.
- 831 Remis, M. J. (1997). Western lowland gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla*) as seasonal frugivores: Use of  
832 variable resources. *American Journal of Primatology*, 43(2), 87–109.
- 833 Riotte-Lambert, L., Benhamou, S., & Chamaillé-Jammes, S. (2015). How memory-based movement  
834 leads to nonterritorial spatial segregation. *American Naturalist*, 185(4), E103–E116. <https://doi.org/10.1086/680009>
- 836 Riotte-Lambert, L., Benhamou, S., & Chamaillé-Jammes, S. (2017). From randomness to traplining: a  
837 framework for the study of routine movement behavior. *Behavioral Ecology*, 28(1), 280–287.  
838 <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arw154>
- 839 Riotte-Lambert, L., & Matthiopoulos, J. (2020). Environmental predictability as a cause and conse-  
840 quence of animal movement. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 35(2), 163–174. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2019.09.009>
- 842 Robira, B., Benhamou, S., Bayanga, E. O., Breuer, T., & Masi, S. (2023a). How do primates decide where  
843 to feed? insights from wild western gorillas. *Animal behaviour*.
- 844 Robira, B., Benhamou, S., Fuh, T. N., & Masi, S. (2023b). Do seasonal frugivory and cognition shape for-  
845 aging movements in wild western gorillas? In *Movement ecology of afrotropical forest mammals*  
846 (pp. 151–170). Springer.

- 847 Robira, B., Benhamou, S., Masi, S., Llaurens, V., & Riotte-Lambert, L. (2021). Foraging efficiency in  
848 temporally predictable environments: Is a long-term temporal memory really advantageous?  
849 *Royal Society Open Science*, 8(9), 210809. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.210809>
- 850 Robira, B., & Perez-Lamarque, B. (2023). Primate sympatry shapes the evolution of their brain archi-  
851 tecture. *Peer Community Journal*, 3.
- 852 Rogers, H. S., Beckman, N. G., Hartig, F., Johnson, J. S., Pufal, G., Shea, K., Zurell, D., Bullock, J. M.,  
853 Cantrell, R. S., Loiselle, B., et al. (2019). The total dispersal kernel: A review and future direc-  
854 tions. *AoB Plants*, 11(5), plz042.
- 855 Rojas, T. N., Bruzzone, O. A., Zampini, I. C., Isla, M. I., & Blendinger, P. G. (2021). A combination of  
856 rules govern fruit trait preference by frugivorous bat and bird species: Nutrients, defence and  
857 size. *Animal Behaviour*, 176, 111–123.
- 858 Rosati, A. G. (2017). Foraging cognition: Reviving the Ecological Intelligence Hypothesis. *Trends in  
859 Cognitive Sciences*, 21(9), 691–702. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2017.05.011>
- 860 Russo, S. E., Portnoy, S., & Augspurger, C. K. (2006a). Incorporating animal behavior into seed dispersal  
861 models: Implications for seed shadows. *Ecology*, 87(12), 3160–3174.
- 862 Russo, S. E., Portnoy, S., & Augspurger, C. K. (2006b). Incorporating animal behaviour into seed dis-  
863 persal models: Implications for seed shadows. *Ecology*, 87(12), 3160–3174. <https://doi.org/h>  
864 [https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658\(2006\)87\[3160:IABISD\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2006)87[3160:IABISD]2.0.CO;2)
- 865 Sakamoto, Y., & Takatsuki, S. (2015). Seeds Recovered from the Droppings at Latrines of the Raccoon  
866 Dog (*Nyctereutes procyonoides viverrinus*): The Possibility of Seed Dispersal. *Zoological Science*,  
867 32(2), 157–162. <https://doi.org/10.2108/zs140107>
- 868 Sassi, Y., Nouzieres, B., Scacco, M., Tremblay, Y., Duriez, O., & Robira, B. (in press). The use of social  
869 information in vulture flight decisions. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*.
- 870 Schmal, C., Myung, J., Herz, H., & Bordyugov, G. (2017). Moran's *i* quantifies spatio-temporal pattern  
871 formation in neural imaging data. *Bioinformatics*, 33(19), 3072–3079.
- 872 Seidler, T. G., & Plotkin, J. B. (2006). Seed dispersal and spatial pattern in tropical trees. *PLoS Biology*,  
873 4(11), 2132–2137. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0040344>
- 874 Shanahan, M., So, S., Compton, S. G., & Corlett, R. (2001). Fig-eating by vertebrate frugivores: A global  
875 review. *Biological reviews*, 76(4), 529–572.
- 876 Soldati, F., et al. (2015). *Animal cognition meets ecosystem ecology: The impact of cognition on seed  
877 dispersal* (Doctoral dissertation). University of Lincoln.
- 878 Sussman, R. W. (1991). Primate origins and the evolution of angiosperms. *American Journal of Prima-  
879 tology*, 23(4), 209–223. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.1350230402>
- 880 Teichroeb, J. A., & Vining, A. Q. (2019). Navigation strategies in three nocturnal lemur species: diet  
881 predicts heuristic use and degree of exploratory behavior. *Animal Cognition*, 22(3), 343–354.  
882 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-019-01247-4>
- 883 Tello-Ramos, M. C., Branch, C. L., Kozlovsky, D. Y., Pitera, A. M., & Pravosudov, V. V. (2019). Spatial  
884 memory and cognitive flexibility trade-offs: To be or not to be flexible, that is the question.  
885 *Animal Behaviour*, 147, 129–136.
- 886 Terborgh, J. (1986). Community aspects of frugivory in tropical forests. In *Frugivores and seed dispersal*  
887 (pp. 371–384). Springer.
- 888 Tiffney, B. H., & Mazer, S. J. (1995). Angiosperm growth habit, dispersal and diversification reconsidered.  
889 *Evolutionary Ecology*, 9, 93–117.
- 890 Trapanese, C., Meunier, H., & Masi, S. (2019a). What, where and when: spatial foraging decisions in  
891 primates. *Biological Reviews*, 94(2), 483–502. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12462>
- 892 Trapanese, C., Meunier, H., & Masi, S. (2022). Do primates flexibly use spatio-temporal cues when  
893 foraging? *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 75(2), 232–244. <https://doi.org/10.1111/77/1747021820970724>

- 895 Trapanese, C., Robira, B., Tonachella, G., Di Gristina, S., Meunier, H., & Masi, S. (2019b). Where and  
896 what? Frugivory is associated with more efficient foraging in three semi-free ranging primate  
897 species. *Royal Society Open Science*, 6(5), 181722. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.181722>
- 898 Van Woerden, J. T., Van Schaik, C. P., & Isler, K. (2010). Effects of seasonality on brain size evolution:  
899 Evidence from strepsirrhine primates. *The American Naturalist*, 176(6), 758–767.
- 900 Vanleeuwe, H., & Gautier-Hion, A. (1998). Forest elephant paths and movements at the Odzala Na-  
901 tional Park, Congo: The role of clearings and Marantaceae forests. *African Journal of Ecology*,  
902 36(2), 174–182. <https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2028.1998.00123.x>
- 903 van Woerden, J. T., Willems, E. P., van Schaik, C. P., & Isler, K. (2012). Large brains buffer energetic  
904 effects of seasonal habitats in catarrhine primates. *Evolution*, 66(1), 191–199.
- 905 Vittoz, P., & Engler, R. (2007). Seed dispersal distances: A typology based on dispersal modes and plant  
906 traits. *Botanica Helvetica*, 117(2), 109–124. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00035-007-0797-8>
- 907 Vuarin, P., & Henry, P.-Y. (2014). Field evidence for a proximate role of food shortage in the regulation  
908 of hibernation and daily torpor: A review. *Journal of Comparative Physiology B*, 184, 683–697.
- 909 Warren, W. H. (2019). Non-euclidean navigation. *Journal of Experimental Biology*, 222.
- 910 Westcott, D. A., Bentrupperbäumer, J., Bradford, M. G., & McKeown, A. (2005). Incorporating patterns  
911 of disperser behaviour into models of seed dispersal and its effects on estimated dispersal  
912 curves. *Oecologia*, 146, 57–67.
- 913 White, J. W., Rassweiler, A., Samhouri, J. F., Stier, A. C., & White, C. (2014). Ecologists should not use  
914 statistical significance tests to interpret simulation model results. *Oikos*, 123(4), 385–388.
- 915 Zuberbühler, K., & Janmaat, K. (2010). Foraging cognition in non-human primates. *Primate neuroethol-  
916 ogy*, 64–83.
- 917 Zwolak, R. (2018). How intraspecific variation in seed-dispersing animals matters for plants. *Biological  
918 Reviews*, 93(2), 897–913. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12377>
- 919 Zwolak, R., & Sih, A. (2020). Animal personalities and seed dispersal: A conceptual review. *Functional  
920 Ecology*, 34(7), 1294–1310. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2435.13583>