Folia Primatol 1993;61:35-37

Fiona Maisels

CNRS URA 373 et Université de Rennes-I, Station Biologique de Paimpont, France

Gut Passage Rate in Guenons and Mangabeys: Another Indicator of a Flexible Feeding Niche?

Key Words

Gut passage rate
Diet
Digestibility
Frugivory
Folivory
Cercopithecus
Lophocebus
Mangabeys
Guenons

Introduction

Recent work on the feeding ecology of arboreal guenons and mangabeys in Central Zaire showed that these normally frugivorous species [1, 2] fed largely on leaves, arils and seeds and ate only 5-12% fleshy fruit [3; unpubl. data]. Two main factors affect the level of available nutrients in a plant: firstly its digestibility, which depends largely on cell wall content and secondly the gut passage rate (GPR) of the consumer [4]. Leaves, which have a higher proportion of cell wall material than succulent fruit, require a longer time in the gut for efficient digestion [4, 5].

Studies of GPR conducted on primates [5–8], including both frugivorous and omnivorous species, show that (1) when monkeys are

fed fresh plant material, a slower GPR is in general linked to larger body size; (2) among animals of similar size, more frugivorous species have a faster GPR than more folivorous species [4, 8].

GPR has never been studied in arboreal guenons and mangabeys. An experiment was thus conducted to see whether these species, which display high dietary flexibility, have a GPR within the range of 'typical' frugivores.

Methods

Trials were conducted with 2 male Cercopithecus (mona) pogonias, 1 male C. (cephus) ascanius, 1 male C. (cephus) erythrotis and 2 female Lophocebus albigena, all adults living at the breeding colony at the Station Biologique of Paimpont, France. These species are

taxonomically very close to those of the Zaire Basin /C. (mona) wolfi, C. (cephus) ascanius, L. aterrimus]. The food types comprising their normal diet were individually weighed.

Known numbers of circles $(5 \times 0.09 \text{ mm})$ of coloured plastic ribbon were concealed in a banana and fed to the monkeys just before their daily meals. They were highly visible in faeces, easily quantified, and such flexible markers are known to have a GPR independent of their size [9]. Two trials were run: monkeys were given markers on day I at 11 h a.m. and (after all of the first batch of markers had been passed) on day 3, at 5 h p.m., as GPR can vary with meal times [8]. All faeces passed after feeding with markers were washed over a 1.5-mm screen. The time of each defecation and the number of markers in each batch of faeces were recorded until they had all been passed [10].

The following data were obtained: (1) mean retention time (MRT), calculated as follows: $MRT = \sum m_i t_i / t_i$ Σm_i ; where $m_i = numbers$ of markers excreted at the ith defecation at time ti after the marked food had been ingested [11]; MRT is considered to be the best measure of GPR [10]; (2) transit time (TT) = time between ingestion and appearance of the first marker.

Results

The food given to the captive monkeys consisted of 36% fresh fruit, 29% raw vegetables, 15% cooked potatoes and 20% commercial monkey chow (expressed as the percentage of total weight).

MRT and TT for mangabeys were 38 ± 6.5 and 22.7 \pm 4.5 h, respectively (\pm standard error). The guenons had somewhat shorter GPRs; MRT was 26.7 ± 3.7 h for C. (cephus) ascanius and erythrotis and 26.9 \pm 6.7 h for C. pogonias. TT was 20.6 \pm 0.5 h for C. (cephus) spp. and $16.6 \pm 2.6 \,\mathrm{h}$ for C. pogonias.

Discussion

36

The GPRs of the guenon and mangabey species were much slower than those observed for 'frugivores' of similar size such as Lagothrix (TT of 6.7 h), Ateles (MRT of 8 h; TT of 4-5 h) or Cebus (TT of 3.5 h) [5]. They are closer to those found in more omnivorous species which are known to feed on over 40% leaves, such as Alouatta palliata and A. seniculus (MRT of 18–30 h; TT of 20.4 h) [5, 6] or Nasalis larvatus (MRT of 49 h; TT of 14 h) [7]. One cannot exclude the possibility that captivity modifies GPR, which is positively related to the proportion of dietary fibre in primates and other mammals [10, 12, 13]. However, it has been shown that captive monkeys fed on diets very similar to those of this study [5] had very different transit times depending on the species.

Although these results should be extended before using them to time digestibility assays, they provide a strong indication that free-living guenons and mangabeys are capable of coping with seasonally leaf-dominated diets; in Zaire they were observed to consume 31% leaves over a 3-month period [3, unpubl. datal.

The results of this experiment, combined with those from field studies in Zaire [3], confirm that both the classification of primates into ecological 'grades' and inferred relationships between gut morphology and diet [14] need to be treated with caution [3]. They also support Chapman and Chapman's opinion [15] that primate diets are not tightly constrained by phylogeny or even by body size into these grades.

Acknowledgments

I thank Jean Pierre Gautier for permission to work with the monkeys at Paimpont, and also Dominique Vallet and Philippe Bec for help with the animals. Thanks to Peter Waterman for initial inspiration and thanks to Annie Gautier-Hion for constructive criticism of the manuscript. The study was undertaken whilst in receipt of a Royal Society European Exchange Fellowship.

Mangabeys

Gut Passage Rates in Guenons and

References

- 1 Gautier-Hion A: The diet and dietary habits of forest guenons; in Gautier-Hion A, Bourlière F, Gautier JP, Kingdon J (eds): A Primate Radiation: Evolutionary Biology of the African Guenons. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp 257-283.
- 2 Waser P: Feeding, ranging and group size in the mangabey Cercocebus albigena; in Clutton-Brock TH (ed): Primate Ecology: Studies of Feeding and Ranging Behaviour in Lemurs, Monkeys and Apes. London, Academic Press, 1977, pp 183– 222.
- 3 Gautier-Hion A, Gautier JP, Maisels F: Seed dispersal vs. seed predation: An inter-site comparison of two related African monkeys. Vegetatio 1993;107/108:237-244.
- 4 Van Soest PJ: Nutritional Ecology of the Ruminant. Corvallis, O & A Books, 1982.

- 5 Milton K: The role of food-processing factors in primate food choice; in Rodman PS, Kant JGH (eds): Adaptions for Foraging in Nonhuman Primates. New York, Columbia University Press, 1984, pp 249– 279
- 6 Estrada A, Coates-Estrada R: Fruit eating and seed dispersal by howling monkeys (Alouatta palliata) in the tropical rainforest of Los Tuxtlas, Mexico. Am J Primatol 1984;6:77-91.
- 7 Direnfeld ES, Koontz FW, Goldstein RS: Feed intake, digestion and passage of the proboscis monkey (Nasalis larvatus) in captivity. Primates 1992;33:399-405.
- 8 Milton K: Food choice and digestive strategies of two sympatric primate species. Am Nat 1981;117:496– 505
- 9 Welch JG, Smith AM: Particle sizes passed from the rumen. J Anim Sci 1978;46:309-312.
- 10 Warner ACI: Rate of passage of digesta through the gut of mammals and birds. Commonwealth Bureau Nutr: Nutr Abstr Rev Ser B 1981; 51:789-820.

- 11 Blaxter KL, Graham N, Wainman FW: Some observations on the digestibility of food by sheep, and on related problems. Br J Nutr 1956; 10:69-91.
- 12 Milton K, Demment MW: Digestion and passage kinetics of chimpanzees fed high and low fibre diets and comparison with human data. J Nutr 1988;42:1082-1088.
- 13 Sakaguchi E, Suzuki K, Kotera S, Ehara A: Fibre digestion and digesta retention time in macaque and colobus monkeys; in Ehara A, Kimura T, Takenaka O, Iwamoto M (eds): Primatology Today: Proc 13th Congr Int Primatol Soc. Kyoto, Kyoto University Press, 1991, pp 671-674.
- 14 Chivers DJ, Hladik CM: Diet and gut morphology in primates; in Chivers DJ, Wood BA, Bilsborough A (eds): Food Acquisition and Processing in Primates. New York, Plenum Press, 1984, pp 213-230.
- 15 Chapman CA, Chapman LJ: Dietary variability in primate populations. Primates 1990;31:121-128.