Running title: Scavenging in vertebrates
Number of words: ~9999

Date of submission: March 4, 2016

The natural history of scavenging in vertebrates

Adam Kane, Kevin Healy, Thomas Guillerme Graeme Ruxton, & Andrew Jackson.

1. *A. Kane (adam.kane@ucc.ie), University College Cork, Cooperage Building School of Biological Earth and Environmental Sciences Cork, Ireland.*

2. *K. Healy and A. Jackson, Trinity College Dublin, Department of Zoology; School of Natural Sciences, Dublin Ireland.*

3. *T. Guillerme, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, Department of Life Sciences, Buckhurst Road, Ascot SL5 7PY, UK.*

4. *G. Ruxton, School of Biology, Sir Harold Mitchell Building, Greenside Place, St Andrews, KY16 9TH, United Kingdom*

Abstract

Scavengers existed in the past and they exist now. Often under appreciated. Three main habitat types considered: land, air and sea. Different drivers in these areas. Review looks at these

Introduction

Historically, scavengers have not been viewed as the most charismatic animals. This may go some way to explaining the gap in our knowledge of the prevalence of this behaviour. Prof Sanborn Tenney writing in 1877 for The American Naturalist had this to say about one well known group, "Prominent among the mammalian scavengers are the hyenas, the ugliest in their general appearance of all the flesh eaters." He contrasts these with "nobler kinds" of carnivores such as lions and tigers. However, aside from our own subjective biases, scavenging is a difficult behaviour to detect after the fact. Without catching a carnivore in the act of killing we are left to infer how the prey was killed. Some simple heuristics can inform us, for instance, in cases where the prey item was simply too large to have been killed by the ostensible predator. But clearly, a scavenger doesn't only feed on animals too big for it to have hunted. This is significant, because as we are now beginning to realise, the extent of this behaviour is enormous among the carnivores such that, "in some ecosystems, vertebrates have been documented to assimilate as much as 90% of the available carrion" (Benbow et al. 2015). Even Tenney's noble big cats are now known to take in a significant portion of carrion in their diet where some lion populations get over 50% of their meat from carcasses. The obvious lack of direct behavioural data compounds the difficulty of discerning scavenging among extinct forms. Indeed, a single species of dinosaur notwithstanding, a synthesis describing the natural history of scavengers is absent from the literature.

Most if not all carnivorous vertebrates are facultative scavenging behaviour to some extant. It is recognised that scavengers have an important role in keeping energy flows at a higher trophic level in food webs than decomposers because they consume relatively more carrion (DeVault et al. 2003). Scavengers also provide useful ecosystem services by acting as barriers to the spread of disease by quickly consuming rotting carcasses which have often died from illness (Ogada et al. 2012). Despite this, scavengers are a seriously understudied group (Sekercioglu 2006, Selva and Fortuna 2007, Wilson and Wolkovich 2011). DeVault et al. (2003) propose that this is due to both human disgust at carrion itself and the difficulty in determining if an ingested prey item was killed or scavenged. The latter point means that studying the natural history of this behaviour is particularly problematic. Indeed, even data on the proportion of carrion in the diet of extant species are sorely lacking (Benbow et al. 2015).

"Indeed, in some ecosystems, vertebrates have been documented to assimilate as much as 90% of the available carrion"(Benbow et al. 2015).

The limitations in studying scavenging in extant species are even bigger in extinct species and past systems since the obvious lack of available direct behavioural data (CITE) This means indirect observations in the fossil record and other approaches such as energetics must be used to infer these behaviours. One avenue to infer scavenging from palaeontological data can be achieved by determining if a prey item was simply too big for the carnivore to have tackled in cases where tooth marks are found (Pobiner 2008). Comparative analysis can also allow us to ascertain which morphologies and physiologies are likely to have been found in scavenging species in the past (Ruxton and Houston 2004b). The development of indirect measures of scavenging in palaeontology can in turn be applied to current scavenging systems that also suffer from a lack of observational data.

In this review we collate methods (could this be another way of structuring it, just an idea) and research form palaeontology relating to scavenging behaviour and show that ignore this literature would be a missed opportunity for understanding extant scavenging.

Our review is divided up into three sections, namely the land, air and sea. These are then subdivided into three geological eras the Cenozoic, Mesozoic and Palaeozoic. Each of these environments has a distinct phyiscal character that affects how a species forages for food which has obvious relevance for an animal searching for carrion. However, there is some commonality to a scavenger's environment and the problems in finding food that one would encounter. Notably, the resource environment of a scavenger is a patchily distributed one, because it is difficult to predict both when and where a carcass is produced. As a result of this, any animal existing as a scavenger must maximise its detection capabilities and minimise its locomotory costs (Ruxton and Houston 2004b). Exploring which groups are likely to have moved towards these traits and thus existed as sccavengers over palaentological time forms the basis of this work. "Interkingdom Competition among Vertebrates, Invertebrates, and Microbes"(Benbow et al. 2015) "For example, vertebrate scavengers appear to be disadvantaged when humidity and temperature favor microbial and invertebrate reproduction" (Benbow et al. 2015)

1 Terrestrial Scavengers

As noted above the ease with which natural selection pushes an animal towards the optima of cheap locomotion and large detection capabilities is dependent on the environment the species is in. Land-based scavengers can be thought of as existing in a 2-dimensional plane while foraging for carrion directly. The range at which they can detect carcasses is thus defined by the radius of their sensory organs, usually the visual and olfactory senses.

Large body size confers many advantages to a scavenger. It grants an animal competitive benefits against other species at a carcass, it allows for some resistance to starvation because of greater fat stores and it often means the sensory organs are elevated giving a higher likelihood of discovering food (Farlow 1994).

Cenozoic

Among terrestrial African carnivores, hyenas, jackals, lions and leopards all take sizable proportions of carrion in their diet. In the case of the spotted hyena (*Crocuta crocuta*) it can be as high as 99% (Benbow et al. 2015). Yet, no contemporary terrestrial vertebrate exists as an obligate scavenger. The selective pressures that push mammals and reptiles towards scavenging do not seem to undermine their ability to hunt, perhaps explaining the absence of obligate scavengers in these groups (Ruxton and Houston 2004b).

There is a long running debate on the tendency of human ancestors to scavenge. Some recent studies have found "that passive scavenging from abandoned larger felid kills could have been a high-yield, though potentially dangerous, foraging strategy for early hominins even without considering within-bone nutrients" (Pobiner 2015).

Osteophagy is known across a range of terrestrial carnivores. Some fat-rich mammalian bones have an energy density (6.7 kJ/g) comparable with that of muscle tissue, making skeletal remains an enticing resource (Brown 1989). Hyenas have a bite force capable of breaking open bones and early hominins had the ability to craft tools for this purpose (Hone and Rauhut 2010, Blasco et al. 2014). In light of this, the skeletal remains of carrion may act as trove of food to carnivores who can access it.

Ruxton and Houston (2004b) in a theoretical study suggested that "a 1 tonne mammal or reptile, in an ecosystem yielding carrion at densities similar to the current Serengeti, could have met its energy requirements if it could detect carrion over a distance of the order of 400–500 m."

A review by DeVault and Krochmal (2002) found occurrences of scavenging spread across five families of snakes and states that this behaviour is "far more common than currently acknowledged."

"SAZIMA and Strüssmann (1990) predicted that several components of snake be-havior contribute to scavenging propensity. They postulated that snakes that rely on chemosensory information to acquire prey might forage for carrion more frequently than those whose modes of prey acquisition are driven by visual cues. Additionally, SAZIMA and Strüssmann (1990) suggested that habitat and diet preferences might be indicators of scavenging propensity be-cause they influence the likelihood of a particular species encountering carrion naturally. Based on these criteria, they pre-dicted that aquatic or semi-aquatic pisciv-orous snakes would scavenge more fre-quently than other species. Moreover, SAZIMA and Strüssmann (1990) suggested that water currents that induce aggrega-tions of carrion heighten the probability of carrion detection by these snakes (see also Savitzky (1992)). Also, chemical gradients may be more uniform and give more de-pendable directional information in water (SAZIMA and Strüssmann 1990)." (DeVault and Krochmal 2002)

"Investigations of ophidian metabolic re-quirements unveil additional advantages to carrion utilization. Snakes exhibit exceed-ingly low maintenance metabolisms, and most can survive on a few scant feedings per year. It is, therefore, possible for snakes to rely large-ly on infrequent, less energy-rich meals. Carrion, which is by nature ephemeral and unpredictable, may represent such a food source to snakes. Scavenging might allow snakes to meet their low metabolic needs more easily and without the costs associ-ated with subduing prey." (DeVault and Krochmal 2002)

Mesozoic

In a recent publication a modelling approach found that theropods between 27 kg and 1044 kg would have gained a significant energetic advantage over individuals at both the small and large extremes of theropod body mass through their scavenging efficiency. This humped pattern is the result of the disparity between the scaling of energetic cost which scales according to an exponent of 0.91 and energy input that scales according to a cubic polynomial that initially scales according to an exponent of 1.07 but plateaus after 1000kg. The polynomial behaviour of energy input is itself the result of the limitations imposed by gut capacity and the overall availability of carcasses after competition.

As we discussed for the case of Cenozoic carnivores, osteophagy could be extremely beneficial to a scavenger. In Mesozoic systems some extremely large theropod dinosaurs had a morphology which suggests an ability to process bone e.g. the robust skull and dentition of *Tyrannosaurus rex*. There is direct evidence that *T.rex* did this in the form of distinctive wear marks on its tooth apices (Farlow and Brinkman 1994, Schubert and Ungar 2005) and the presence of bone fragments in its coprolites (Chin et al. 1998). The animal also had an enormous bite force, with one estimate putting it at 57000 Newtons (Bates and Falkingham 2012). This is noted as being powerful enough to break open skeletal material (Rayfield et al. 2001). Osteophagy may have been even more viable during this era because the body mass distribution of herbviores tended to be skewed towards larger sizes (O'Gorman and Hone 2012). When we couple this with the fact that skeletal mass scales greater than linearly with body mass (Prange et al. 1979) there would have been a lot of bones to consume in the environment provided an animal had the biology to process it.

Allosaurus tooth marks on a hadrosaur in the Late Jurassic (Chure and Fiorillo 1997). Late Triassic scavenging on a prosauropod by basal carnivorous archosaurs (Hungerbühler 1998).

Palaeozoic

Synapsids Sprawling gait

2 Aerial Scavengers

Species capable of flight have effectively added an extra spatial dimension, i.e. the vertical component, to their sensory environment. This allows them to look down on a landscape where they are unencumbered by obstacles that would obstruct the view of a terrestrial scavenger. Moreover, flight is a cheaper means of locomotion than running (Tucker 1975). Thus, it appear that would-be scavengers have a distinct advantage by taking flight.

Cenozoic

Birds are the dominant vertebrate fliers today and include the best known scavengers on Earth, the vultures. These birds consist of two convergent groups, old world and new world vultures and represent the only example of obligate vertebrate scavengers. They have a suite of adaptations that allow them to flourish in this niche. Vultures extend the energetic advantage of flight further by engaging in soaring instead of flapping flight, which is even cheaper (Hedenstrom 1993). Their efficiency is illustrated by cases of predators like bears and wolves benefiting by taking more carrion in their diet in areas bereft of vultures through competitive release (DeVault et al. 2003). In flight, birds possess a huge advantage over any terrestrial obligate scavenger. Flight affords them the ability to range over a much larger area and detect carrion from an elevated vantage point. Pennycuick (1972) conservatively estimated that a Gyps vulture could identify activity at a carcass 4 km away.

Many other bird species take a significant amount of carrion in their diet notably the eagles, storks and corvids. Although, none of them are obligate scavengers. By contrast with terrestrial species, the traits that render a bird adept at scavenging do undermine its ability to function as an effective predator (DeVault et al. 2003).

The ability to lower BMR at night is reported in some *Gyps* vultures.

Mesozoic

In ancient ecosystems, the volant pterosaurs have also been postulated as existing in a vulture-like niche (Witton and Naish 2008). Certain clades of these animals could reach enormous sizes (e.g. Azhdarchids) and look to have engaged in soaring flight. However, the inflexibility of their necks and straight, rather than hooked jaw morphology argues against their existing as obligate scavengers (Witton and Naish 2008). As yet, no one has ever attempted an energetics approach for this group which is likely due to the many uncertainties over their biology (Witton and Habib 2010).

Palaeozoic

The absence of flying vertebrates in the Palaeozoic may have permitted terrestrial forms to take in a higher proportion of carrion in their diet.

3 Aquatic Scavengers

The existence of an obligate scavenger in a marine setting also remains hypothetical (Britton and Morton 1994, Smith and Baco 2003, Ruxton and Houston 2004a, Ruxton and Bailey 2005). Carrion in this environment is produced by dead flesh and other marine organisms when their carcasses descend to the sea floor. This low-light environment means animals detect resources through chemo- and mechanoreception (Ruxton and Houston 2004a). Detection distances are far lower than they would be in the air (< 100 m) as a result. However, water is a medium that is conducive to low-cost movement (Tucker 1975) and so may be able to support a small obligate scavenging fish

(Ruxton and Houston 2004a, Ruxton and Bailey 2005). Although, for the time being this remains conjectural.

"although some benthic scavengers (e.g., hagfish: family Myxinidae) rely on necrophagy for a large portion of their diet and may indeed be obligate scavengers" (Benbow et al. 2015)

Cenozoic

A likely instance of scavenging between a 4-million-year-old white shark (*Carcharodon*) and mysticete whale from Peru (Ehret et al. 2009). Bite marks on early Holocene Tursiops truncatus fossils from the North Sea indicate scavenging by rays (Chondrichthyes, Rajidae) (van Netten and Reumer 2009). Possible scavenging on a juvenile fur seal from the Late Neogene (Boessenecker and Perry 2011).

Mesozoic

Evidence of scavenging in a Cretaceous shark species *Squalicorax* whereby remains of a mosasaur and a hadrosaur were discovered with embedded shark teeth (Schwimmer et al. 1997).

Palaeozoic

Evolution of sharks, known scavengers. Evidence of vertebrate scavenging dates back to the early Permian approximately 300 MYA (Reisz and Tsuji 2006).

Results

Discussion

Acknowledgments

A lot of people are to thank here.

References

Bates, K. and Falkingham, P. 2012. Estimating maximum bite performance in *Tyrannosaurus rex* using multi-body dynamics. – Biology Letters 8: 660–664.

Benbow, M. E. et al. 2015. Introduction to carrion ecology, evolution, and their applications. – Carrion Ecology, Evolution, and Their Applications : 1.

Blasco, R. et al. 2014. Breaking bones to obtain marrow: A comparative study between percussion by batting bone on an anvil and hammerstone percussion. – Archaeometry 56: 1085–1104.

Boessenecker, R. W. and Perry, F. A. 2011. Mammalian bite marks on juvenile fur seal bones from the late neogene purisima formation of central california. – Palaios 26: 115–120.

Britton, J. C. and Morton, B. 1994. Marine carrion and scavengers. – Oceanography and Marine Biology: an annual review 32: 369–434.

Brown, C. J. 1989. A study of the Bearded Vulture *Gypaetus barbatus* in southern Africa. Ph.D. thesis, University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg).

Chin, K. et al. 1998. A king-sized theropod coprolite. – Nature 393: 680–682.

Chure, D. and Fiorillo, A. 1997. One big al to go and hold the mayo: evidence of scavenging of a specimen of allosaurus from the morrison formation (late jurassic) of wyoming. – Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 17: 38A.

DeVault, T. L. and Krochmal, A. R. 2002. Scavenging by snakes: an examination of the literature. – Herpetologica 58: 429–436.

DeVault, T. L. et al. 2003. Scavenging by vertebrates: behavioral, ecological, and evolutionary perspectives on an important energy transfer pathway in terrestrial ecosystems. – Oikos 102: 225–234.

Ehret, D. J. et al. 2009. Caught in the act: trophic interactions between a 4-million-year-old white shark (carcharodon) and mysticete whale from peru. – Palaios 24: 329–333.

Farlow, J. and Brinkman, D. 1994. Wear surfaces on the teeth of tyrannosaurs. In: Dino Fest; Proceedings of a Conference for the General Public. Palaeontological Society Special Publications, vol. 7. pp. 165–175.

Farlow, J. O. 1994. Speculations about the carrion-locating ability of tyrannosaurs. – Historical Biology 7: 159–165.

Hedenstrom, A. 1993. Migration by soaring or flapping flight in birds: the relative importance of energy cost and speed. – Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B: Biological Sciences 342: 353–361.

Hone, D. W. and Rauhut, O. W. 2010. Feeding behaviour and bone utilization by theropod dinosaurs. – Lethaia 43: 232–244.

Hungerbühler, A. 1998. Taphonomy of the prosauropod dinosaur sellosaurus, and its implications for carnivore faunas and feeding habits in the late triassic. – Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology 143: 1–29.

Ogada, D. L. et al. 2012. Dropping dead: causes and consequences of vulture population declines worldwide. – Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences 1249: 57–71.

O'Gorman, E. J. and Hone, D. W. E. 2012. Body size distribution of the dinosaurs. – PLoS ONE 7: e51925.

Pennycuick, C. 1972. Soaring behaviour and performance of some east african birds, observed from a motor-glider. – Ibis 114: 178–218.

Pobiner, B. 2008. Paleoecological information in predator tooth marks. – Journal of taphonomy 6: 373–397.

Pobiner, B. L. 2015. New actualistic data on the ecology and energetics of hominin scavenging opportunities. – Journal of human evolution 80: 1–16.

Prange, H. D. et al. 1979. Scaling of skeletal mass to body mass in birds and mammals. – American Naturalist 113: 103–122.

Rayfield, E. J. et al. 2001. Cranial design and function in a large theropod dinosaur. – Nature 409: 1033–1037.

Reisz, R. R. and Tsuji, L. A. 2006. An articulated skeleton of *Varanops* with bite marks: the oldest known evidence of scavenging among terrestrial vertebrates. – Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 26: 1021–1023.

Ruxton, G. D. and Bailey, D. M. 2005. Searching speeds and the energetic feasibility of an obligate whale-scavenging fish. – Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers 52: 1536–1541.

Ruxton, G. D. and Houston, D. C. 2004a. Energetic feasibility of an obligate marine scavenger. – Marine ecology. Progress series 266: 59–63.

Ruxton, G. D. and Houston, D. C. 2004b. Obligate vertebrate scavengers must be large soaring fliers. – Journal of Theoretical Biology 228: 431–436.

Savitzky, B. A. 1992. Laboratory studies on piscivory in an opportunistic pitviper, the cottonmouth, agkistrodon piscivorus. – Biology of the Pitvipers : 347–368.

SAZIMA, I. and Strüssmann, C. 1990. Necrofagia em serpentes brasileiras: exemplos e previsões. – Revista Brasileira de Biologia 50: 463–468.

Schubert, B. W. and Ungar, P. S. 2005. Wear facets and enamel spalling in tyrannosaurid dinosaurs. – Acta Palaeontologica Polonica 50: 93–99.

Schwimmer, D. R. et al. 1997. Scavenging by sharks of the genus squalicorax in the late cretaceous of north america. – Palaios : 71–83.

Sekercioglu, C. H. 2006. Increasing awareness of avian ecological function. – Trends in Ecology & Evolution 21: 464–471.

Selva, N. and Fortuna, M. A. 2007. The nested structure of a scavenger community. – Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 274: 1101–1108.

Smith, C. R. and Baco, A. R. 2003. Ecology of whale falls at the deep-sea floor. – Oceanography and marine biology 41: 311–354.

Tucker, V. A. 1975. The energetic cost of moving about: Walking and running are extremely inefficient forms of locomotion. much greater efficiency is achieved by birds, fish and bicyclists. – American Scientist 63: 413–419.

van Netten, H. and Reumer, J. 2009. Bite marks on early holocene tursiops truncatus fossils from the north sea indicate scavenging by rays (chondrichthyes, rajidae). – Netherlands Journal of Geosciences 88: 169–175.

Wilson, E. E. and Wolkovich, E. M. 2011. Scavenging: how carnivores and carrion structure communities. – Trends in Ecology & Evolution 26: 129–135.

Witton, M. P. and Habib, M. B. 2010. On the size and flight diversity of giant pterosaurs, the use of birds as pterosaur analogues and comments on pterosaur flightlessness. – PLOS ONE 5: e13982.

Witton, M. P. and Naish, D. 2008. A reappraisal of azhdarchid pterosaur functional morphology and paleoecology. – PLOS ONE 3: e2271.