

1 **Running title:** Scavenging in vertebrates

2 **Number of words:** ~9999

3 **Date of submission:** April 26, 2016

4 **A Recipe for Scavenging - the natural history of a**
5 **behaviour**

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

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

9 2. K. Healy and A.L. Jackson, Trinity College Dublin, Department of Zoology, School of
10 Natural Sciences, Dublin 2, Ireland; Trinity Centre for Biodiversity Research, Trinity
11 College Dublin, Dublin 2, Ireland.

12 3. T. Guillerme, Imperial College London, Silwood Park Campus, Department of Life
13 Sciences, Buckhurst Road, Ascot SL5 7PY, United Kingdom.

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

Abstract

Despite its prevalence, scavenging is a difficult behaviour to observe in modern day carnivores and impossible to study directly in extinct species. Yet, there are certain intrinsic and environmental features of a species that push it towards a scavenging lifestyle. These can be thought of as some of the principal parameters in optimal foraging theory namely, encounter rate, handling time and prey availability. We use these components to highlight the morphologies and environments that would have been conducive to scavenging over geological time by focusing on the dominant vertebrate groups of the land, sea and air. The result is a document on the natural history of scavenging, the first to our knowledge. Our idea of a scale of scavenging can be applied to any species at any time to judge the importance of this behaviour in its diet.

1 Introduction

2 Historically, scavengers have not been viewed as the most charismatic of animals. This may
3 go some way to explaining the gap in our knowledge of the prevalence of this behaviour
4 (DeVault et al. 2003). Professor Sanborn Tenney writing in 1877 for *The American Naturalist*
5 had this to say about one well known group, "prominent among the mammalian scavengers
6 are the hyenas, the ugliest in their general appearance of all the flesh eaters." He contrasts
7 these with "nobler kinds" of carnivores such as lions and tigers (Tenney 1877). Even aside
8 from our own subjective biases, scavenging is a difficult behaviour to detect after the fact.
9 Without catching a carnivore in the act of killing we are left to infer how the prey was killed.
10 Some simple heuristics can inform us, for instance, in cases where the prey item was simply
11 too large to have been killed by the ostensible predator (Pobiner 2008). But clearly, a
12 scavenger does not only feed on animals too big for it to have hunted. The obvious lack of
13 direct behavioural data compounds the difficulty of discerning scavenging from predation
14 among extinct forms. Indeed, a single species of dinosaur notwithstanding (Carbone et al.
15 2011), a synthesis describing the natural history of scavengers is absent from the literature.
16 With research on scavenging on the rise (Koenig 2006) we are now beginning to realise the
17 extent of this behaviour such that, "in some ecosystems, vertebrates have been documented
18 to assimilate as much as 90% of the available carrion" (Beasley et al. 2015). This has
19 profound implications for the trophic ecology of these systems and particularly our models of
20 them. Even Tenney's noble big cats are now known to take in a significant portion of carrion
21 in their diet where some lion populations acquire over 50% of their meat from carcasses
22 (Jones et al. 2015). While recognising the difficulty in directly observing scavenging, it is
23 possible to turn to other methods in order to discern the most suitable morphologies,
24 physiologies and environments for a scavenging lifestyle to prosper. Here we chart the natural
25 history of scavenging by assessing the potential for the behaviour in dominant vertebrate

groups given their ecology and functional traits.

The Challenges of Scavenging

The chief hurdle to scavenging is finding a resource that is often difficult to predict in space and time. Through chance alone many species will avail of some opportunistic scavenging. However, species that rely on scavenging to sustain substantial portions of their diets must encounter a sufficient amount of carrion in order to meet their energetic demands. Once found, the scavenger must be able to out-compete any potential competitors and process the, typically decaying, carcass replete with micro-organism derived toxins (Ruxton et al. 2014). These characteristics can be assumed to be under evolutionary selection pressures for traits that increase carrion discovery and monopoly. Finally, the potential for scavenging will also depend on the density, size, and quality of carcasses produced, all of which are affected by complex ecosystem dynamics but are outside the selection pressures on the scavenger. Each of these facets are essentially the backbone of fundamental ecological theory and are the key parameters defined in functional response curves, namely encounter rate, handling time and prey availability (Jeschke et al. 2002). By considering scavenging in this context of optimal foraging we can identify the prerequisite attributes and processes required for the behaviour. This has enabled us to propose a scale of scavenging whereupon we can place any vertebrate species, past or present, and assess the likely importance of carrion in its diet.

Encounter Rate

All foraging processes depend on the encounter rate between consumer and resource. Locomotory speed, foraging time and detection radius all increase the encounter rate between a scavenger and the carcasses it is searching for. Alternatively, a species can reduce its metabolic requirements so that it can survive long periods between meals. We would thus




Figure 1: Factors influencing the proportion of scavenging in a vertebrates' diet. Blue lines indicate a reduction in the factor and red lines indicate an increase.

1 expect selection pressures to act on the various traits that govern these parameters.

2 However, as we noted above, encounter rate is also determined by the productivity of the
3 environment, something which the selective forces acting on the scavenging have no control
4 over.

5 **Metabolism**

6 Because of the sporadic nature of carrion we would expect adaptations that reduce energetic
7 costs of maintenance to be selected for in scavengers as it would allow for longer
8 inter-feeding periods. Extant reptiles possess an advantage here, in that over the course of a
9 year their food requirements can be 30 times lower than an endotherm of equal size (Nagy
10 2005). DeVault and Krochmal (2002) suggest this is an avenue for scavenging in snakes
11 because they “exhibit exceedingly low maintenance metabolisms, and most can survive on a
12 few scant feedings per year. It is, therefore, possible for snakes to rely largely on infrequent,
13 less energy-rich meals.” In the same review the authors found occurrences of scavenging
14 spread across five families of snakes and stated that this behaviour is “far more common than
15 currently acknowledged.”(DeVault and Krochmal 2002). The same reasoning can be applied
16 to crocodiles and their allies because a sit and wait strategy is viable for an ectotherm
17 (Forrest 2003, Moleón et al. 2015). Carey et al. (1982) found ectothermic sharks have the
18 ability to exist weeks between meals because they focus on the energy-rich sections of
19 carcasses (see Handling Time). Endotherms have also evolved physiological mechanisms that
20 allow them to depress their otherwise high metabolic rates at certain times e.g. vultures who
21 do so while resting at their roost and during periods of food deprivation (Bahat et al. 1998).

1 **Locomotion**

2 The inherent unpredictability of carrion also means scavenging depends more on the ability to
3 efficiently move over large areas than does predation. This generally requires an efficient
4 transfer of metabolic energy into movement which relies on the animal's anatomy and
5 physiology as well as the medium of the environment in which the animal is moving (i.e.
6 aerial, aquatic or terrestrial). Perhaps the most efficient form of locomotion in vertebrates is,
7 paradoxically, found in flying species. Despite the energetic costs of flight, the only known
8 vertebrate obligate scavengers are the old and the new world vultures. While powered flight is
9 energetically expensive, species like vultures have evolved behavioural and anatomical features
10 to exploit air currents using their large wingspans, allowing them to soar at a cost of only
11 twice their metabolic rate (Hedenstrom 1993, Spivey et al. 2014). By depending on thermal
12 air flows these species can forage over vast ranges (Spiegel et al. 2013). An analogous mode
13 of locomotion is also exploited by seabirds, who use strong ocean winds to search large areas
14 of the oceans (Norberg 2012, Thaxter et al. 2012). While many species of seabird are likely
15 primarily predators, it seems that albatrosses, who can range many hundreds of kilometres,
16 take a substantial amount of carrion in their diet (Croxall and Prince 1994). This is typically
17 in the form of squid carcasses, which float on the surface, allowing the birds to readily pluck
18 their remains out of the water (Croxall and Prince 1994).

19 The groups from which these modern soaring birds arose, appear during the Palaeocene
20 (66 - 56 Million years ago (Mya); Jetz et al. 2012, Jarvis et al. 2014) and Cretaceous
21 (Chiappe and Dyke 2006) respectively. However, soaring flight is likely to be far older than
22 this with avian flight originating in the Late Jurassic (163.5-145 Mya) and vertebrate flight in
23 the Late Triassic (235-201.3 Mya) coincident with the pterosaurs. Indeed, scavenging among
24 pterosaurs has been hypothesised many times before (Witton and Naish 2008). Certain
25 groups of these animals could reach enormous sizes (e.g. Azhdarchids with wingspans of 11
26 metres; Witton and Habib 2010) and, notably, appear to have engaged in soaring flight

1 (Witton and Habib 2010). It seems probable that at least some of these extinct species used
2 soaring as a means for scavenging (Witton 2013). While soaring is perhaps the only viable
3 means of locomotion that allows for an obligate, scavenging life-style (Ruxton and Houston
4 2004b), powered flight is still an efficient means of locomotion. Certainly, avian flight is
5 cheaper than either walking or running (Tucker 1975).

6 We know that many extant birds exist as facultative scavengers because storks, raptors
7 and corvids all take substantial quantities of carrion in their diet (Kendall 2013). Similarly we
8 would expect that extinct species would also scavenge in a similar fashion depending on the
9 efficiency of their flight. For example, early birds such as *Archaeopteryx* are predicted to have
10 been poor, relatively inefficient fliers (Nudds and Dyke 2010) and so ill-suited to finding
11 carrion. The importance of efficient flying over large areas may explain the lack of scavenging
12 behaviour in bats as they are generally nocturnal, a time when they would receive no aid from
13 convective air currents (Norberg 2012).

14 Similar to aerial species, aquatic scavengers have a locomotory benefit because water is a
15 medium that is conducive to low-cost movement (Tucker 1975, Williams 1999). This has led
16 some researchers to argue for the likelihood of an obligate scavenging fish (Ruxton and
17 Houston 2004a, Ruxton and Bailey 2005).

18 Sharks are one likely candidate for general scavenging behaviors as their locomotion,
19 which depends on large pectoral fins to generate lift as they swim, resembles that of the large
20 soaring fliers. Many shark species have large foraging ranges (e.g. the great white sharks
21 *Carcharodon carcharias*; Bruce et al. 2006) and it seems reasonable that they would use
22 oceanographic currents to further reduce movement costs (Ruxton and Houston 2004a). In
23 fact, facultative scavenging is seen in many selachian groups, including species of extant
24 sharks like white sharks (known to feed on whale carcasses; Fallows et al. 2013), Greenland
25 sharks (feeding on seals; Watanabe et al. 2012), and sixgill sharks (Anderson and Bell 2016).
26 There is evidence too of scavenging in extinct species, where shark teeth have been found in

1 the remains of dinosaurs, mosasaurs and Pliocene mysticete whales (5.3-3.6 Mya;
2 Schwimmer et al. 1997, Ehret et al. 2009).

3 Interestingly, style of swimming in fish does not significantly affect the cost of movement
4 (Williams 1999), hence it is likely that many aquatic species with large ranges will encounter
5 scavenging opportunities. It is perhaps jaw morphology that is more likely to define which
6 species can avail of carcasses.

7 We might expect then that by combining an aquatic environment and an endothermic
8 metabolism marine mammals would especially prosper as scavengers. Fossil pinnipeds and
9 cetaceans from 60 Mya have transitional features indicative of their evolutionary trajectory to
10 fully aquatic species (Williams 1999). But despite their movement away from land their
11 energetic savings were negligible because the *total* cost incurred by a swimming marine
12 mammal is high (Williams 1999). Indeed, the total energetic cost is similar to an equivalent
13 terrestrial or aerial mammal (Williams 1999). This underscores the trade offs between the
14 benefits of endothermy in terms of activity periods and the costs of maintaining such an
15 energetically expensive system. That said, aquatic endotherms have and do scavenge. For
16 instance, early whales such as *Basilosaurus* (38-36.5 Mya) seem to have fit into the same
17 niche as killer whales (*Orcinus orca*) and we have some evidence for scavenging in both
18 (Fahlke 2012, Whitehead and Reeves 2005).

19 Terrestrial environments are the most energetically costly in which to move (Tucker
20 1975). Unlike aerial and aquatic environments support must be provided through the animal's
21 posture. The early transition from a sprawling gait, seen in early tetrapods, to the more erect
22 posture of synapsids and later dinosaurs and mammals, has often been supposed as
23 conferring a huge advantage to the latter groups (Sullivan 2015). The purported advantages
24 include benefits in terms of speed, efficiency, muscle effort and manoeuvrability (Sullivan
25 2015). Clearly, for a scavenger, an ability to efficiently cover an area at a high speed would
26 increase the encounter rate with carrion. Despite being intuitive, Sullivan (2015) states most

1 of the hypotheses in favour of this idea remain to be tested in the context of archosaur
2 evolution. One noted consequence of a sprawling gait is the phenomenon known as Carrier's
3 constraint such that the animal can't move and undergo costal ventilation at the same time
4 because the lateral movements impedes its lungs (Carrier 1987). The evolution of an upright
5 posture has been offered as one of the primary mechanisms that allowed early archosaurs to
6 overcome this constraint (Urona and Farmer 2008).

7 Whatever the case, it is with the evolution of endothermy in the therapsid-mammal
8 lineage (Clarke and Pörtner 2010) that terrestrial vertebrates would have gained the ability to
9 range more widely, a vital component in seeking out carrion. Modern endothermic mammals
10 can sustain longer periods of energetically expensive activity (Bennett and Ruben 1979)
11 resulting in larger foraging ranges. Today, terrestrial scavenging in the mammals is probably
12 best known in an African context where hyenas, jackals and lions all take sizeable proportions
13 of carrion in their diet. In the spotted hyena (*Crocuta crocuta*), striped hyena (*Hyaena*
14 *hyaena*) and brown hyena (*Hyaena brunnea*) it can be over 90% (Jones et al. 2015). And
15 although no contemporary terrestrial vertebrate exists as an obligate scavenger, most, if not
16 all, are facultative to some extent (Beasley et al. 2015). The particular reliance of hyenas on
17 carrion means we can use them as examples of efficient terrestrial scavengers to compare
18 with other forms. In terms of locomotion, they employ a characteristic "rocking horse gait"
19 which allows them to cover great distances efficiently, loping at 10 km/hr (Mills 1989, Jones
20 et al. 2015). Such long-distance travel is apparent in African wild dogs (*Lycaon pictus*) and
21 many other canids (Pennycuick 1995, Janis and Figueirido 2014). In contrast, big cats like
22 leopards (*Panthera pardus*) rely on ambush (Pennycuick 1995). This allows us to make a
23 broad distinction between the ambush strategies of cat-like forms and the pursuit/ pounce
24 strategies of more dog-like forms, the latter being more suited to scavenging (Janis and
25 Figueirido 2014). These insights allow us to compare extant terrestrial species to their
26 prehistoric forebears given the dominance of mammalian carnivores since the Eocene (56-33.9

1 Mya) where the order split into the Caniforma and Feliforma (Van Valkenburgh 1987). To
2 take one example, Anyonge (1996) found that *Nimravides*, a genus of sabretooth cat from
3 the Miocene (10.3 to 5.3 Mya), were likely to have been ambush predators which would
4 argue against them taking a lot of carrion.

5 Of course, terrestrial animals can also move bipedally. Although the evolution of bipedal
6 movement was significant in that it freed up the forelimbs for other purposes (e.g. climbing,
7 tool-use, wing development etc.) it does not differ radically in cost from quadrupedal
8 locomotion (Williams (1999), and references therein). For instance, Alexander (2004) shows
9 that, in the case of humans, we are more economical than predicted while walking and less so
10 while running according to predicted costs of terrestrial movement. Our locomotory efficiency
11 has fed into the question of where our ancestors placed on the hunter-scavenger axis during
12 the Plio-Pleistocene, which has been a matter of debate for years (Domínguez-Rodrigo 2002).
13 Ruxton and Wilkinson (2013) added to this debate with their argument that long distance
14 endurance running, often used by humans for hunting, was not an important feature of
15 hominin scavenging. They arrive at this conclusion on the basis of the high cost of running
16 coupled with the fact that dangerous competitors will tend to arrive beforehand.

17 Aside from humans and our allies, the best-known terrestrial bipeds are the dinosaurs and
18 unsurprisingly, given their enduring appeal, the prevalence of scavenging has been extensively
19 explored in the carnivorous theropods. These were the dominant terrestrial carnivores for
20 most of the Mesozoic Era (252.17 - 66 Mya) and ranged from the chicken-sized to the
21 whale-sized, all of which were bipedal. While the locomotory ability of theropods has been
22 debated since their first inception, more recent studies have reconstructed them as relatively
23 mobile animals (Pontzer et al. 2009). Despite some suggestions that larger species may have
24 had some advantage in scavenging, partially due to the ability to search large areas (Ruxton
25 and Houston 2003), more recent studies have shown that the energetic demands of such
26 large forms meant scavenging was likely more prevalent in mid-sized theropods of

1 approximately half a tonne (Carbone et al. 2011, Kane et al. 2016).

2 **Detection**

3 As predicted by the importance of an increased encounter rate, known scavengers have
4 evolved well-developed senses, with the visual and olfactory sensory systems most often
5 associated with scavenging behavior. This is perhaps no surprise because sensory systems
6 that rely on detecting signals associated with living animals, such as audioception,
7 electroreception, thermoreception and echolocation will be limited in their ability to detect an
8 already dead animal.

9 Apart from the basic capacity of these senses to detect carrion, how they function in
10 different environments is also important. In the simplest case, the search space is a two
11 dimensional plane (Pawar et al. 2012). If the scavenger itself is searching on the plane, as is
12 so for terrestrial species, the detection range is simply defined by the radius of their sensory
13 organs. Consequently, the ability to detect carrion can be seriously restricted for visually
14 reliant, terrestrial species. They may overcome this restriction however, by using olfaction,
15 which is less affected by the relief of the land. For example, hyenas have the ability to smell a
16 rotting carcass 4 km away (Mills 1989), which exceeds the 500 m range deemed necessary by
17 Ruxton and Houston (2004b) to be able to survive as a scavenger.

18 Indeed, the olfactory senses of many extant (and in all probability extinct) carnivores meet
19 this required distance, making scavenging feasible for most terrestrial carnivores (Farlow
20 1994, Mech and Boitani 2010). Among extinct species in particular, we can use the ratio of
21 olfactory bulb to brain size to infer a preference for olfactory foraging (Zelenitsky et al.
22 2011). This approach was used by Zelenitsky et al. (2011) to hypothesise such a mode for
23 the theropod dinosaur *Bambiraptor* and by Witmer and Ridgely (2009) for tyrannosaurs. The
24 flying pterosaurs however, had tiny olfactory bulbs indicating this sense was not relied on
25 (Witton 2013).

Species capable of flight have effectively added an extra spatial dimension (i.e. the vertical component) to their sensory environment over land animals. This allows them to look down on a landscape where they are unencumbered by obstacles that would obstruct the view of a terrestrial scavenger. Such an ability has obvious benefits in detecting carrion. Certainly, vultures are known to have impressive visual acuity, with one estimate indicating lappet-faced vultures (*Torgos tracheliotus*) are capable of detecting a 2 metre carcass over 10 km away (Spiegel et al. 2013). Eagles too are known to have highly developed vision (Reymond 1985). The flying pterosaurs also convergently evolved large orbits and optic lobes (Witton 2013). It follows that the evolution of flight allowed aerial animals to detect far more carrion than their terrestrial counterparts through vision (Lisney et al. 2013).

Existing in this '3D' environment also means being able to gather a wealth of information from other foragers, be they conspecifics or otherwise (Jackson et al. 2008). Again, returning to vultures, the genus *Gyps* consists of highly social and colonially nesting species (Fernández-Bellon et al. 2015). These behaviours allow them to forage far more efficiently because one bird can scrounge information on the location of food from another successful forager (Kane et al. 2014). Information transfer of this kind is typically inadvertent and as a consequence no complex social interactions are required, simply the ability to recognise a successful forager. Thus, it seems probable that scrounging behaviours were seen in the flying pterosaurs as well.

The terrestrial-olfaction, aerial-visual divide is not total though. Terrestrial species like hyenas and hominins exploit the efficiency of birds by looking to the skies for groups of vultures to follow to carrion (Jones et al. 2015, Ruxton and Wilkinson 2013). And many birds, e.g. turkey vultures (*Cathartes aura*), have well-developed olfactory systems (Lisney et al. 2013) which they use to forage in heavily forested areas where vision is limited (Houston 1986).

Although aquatic species also have a vertical component to their environment, they must

1 contend with low-light levels where visual detection distances are far lower (< 100 m) than
2 they would be for air. As such, aquatic animals detect resources through chemo- and
3 mechanoreception more so than through vision (Ruxton and Houston 2004a). This is
4 particularly relevant to sharks and aquatic snakes who are deemed as having the most
5 suitable physiology for scavenging. A hypothesis put forth by Sazima and Strüssmann (1990)
6 argued that chemical gradients in water would allow for a relatively easier detection of carrion
7 by snakes. This gained some support from DeVault and Krochmal (2002), who found a
8 preponderance of aquatic snake species in their review of this behaviour. Smell seems to be
9 the primary means of carcass detection in sharks as well. Fallows et al. (2013) found that
10 wind speed determined the number of sharks feeding at whale carcasses, indicating they were
11 dependent on detecting the odours from the decaying whales.

12 **Prey Availability**

13 The environmental influence on prey availability is an aspect that greatly affects encounter
14 rate but is invisible to the selective forces acting on the scavenger. Aspects including, primary
15 productivity, relief, and temperature will all greatly affect scavenging tendency. Ruxton and
16 Houston (2004b) suggest an historic ecosystem with a productivity similar to the Serengeti
17 could have supported an *obligate* mammalian or reptilian terrestrial scavenger. Indeed, in
18 systems that were dominated by large ectothermic or mesothermic herbivore vertebrates, the
19 same primary productivity would have supported a greater biomass, due to the scaling of
20 mass with metabolic rate (McNab 2009). The upshot of this may have been a higher
21 biomass of herbivores dying and offering scavenging opportunities (although these larger
22 species may have also lived longer).

23 In fact, scavenging behaviour may have evolved on land as soon as the first terrestrial
24 tetrapods emerged. Some of the earlier tetrapods tracks dating back to the early Middle
25 Devonian (393.3 - 387.7 Mya) were found in intertidal environments (Niedzwiedzki et al.

2010). These environments are isolated from marine systems twice a day leaving potential carrion unexploited by marine vertebrates. Niedzwiedzki et al. (2010) suggest that these environments “would thus have allowed marine ancestors of tetrapods gradually to acquire terrestrial competence while accessing a new and essentially untouched resource.”

Staying in the aquatic setting, the phenomenon of occasional bounties of carrion in the form of whale falls has led some researchers to investigate if an obligate scavenger could survive by seeking out these remains exclusively. Ruxton and Bailey (2005) argued that although this is energetically feasible it's ecologically unlikely. Any animal that could find such whale carcasses is unlikely to have ignored other types of carrion. Although no aquatic species have ever exceeded the size of whales, some enormous animals have evolved in this environment before the evolution of cetaceans, including *Leedsichthys*, a bony fish from the Middle Jurassic (174.1-163.5 Mya) and the aquatic Mesozoic reptiles, the plesiosaurs, pliosaurs and ichthyosaurs, that could all exceed 15 metres in length (Ruxton 2011, Danise et al. 2014).

So, despite being unlikely, the energetic feasibility of a marine scavenger that specialises on large carcasses has a long history. One point of interest is that of the whaling industry, which provided a bonanza of floating carcasses especially during the 20th century (Whitehead and Reeves 2005). This meant killer whales could switch from hunting to scavenging, a switch made that much easier by the noise of the whaling vessels that would effectively ring the “dinner-bells” (Whitehead and Reeves 2005).

Perhaps the greatest environmental driver of scavenging tendency is that of temperature. The geological record shows the Earth has undergone radical fluctuations in temperature over time. This will have had a significant bearing on the availability and persistence of carrion. To illustrate the point, a 10°C increase in ambient temperature can double carcass decomposition rates (Parmenter and MacMahon 2009) and geological evidence indicates that the Mesozoic Earth was on average at least 6 °C warmer than now (Sellwood and Valdes

1 2006). In terms of specific habitats, it has been shown that decomposition is greater in warm
2 and moist areas versus more xeric ones (Beasley et al. 2015). Moreover, oceanic productivity
3 and habitat structure are all impacted by climactic conditions. The impacts these can have
4 on scavengers have been empirically supported e.g. Beasley et al. (2015) who point to a
5 series of studies showing how microbes and invertebrates benefit at higher temperatures to
6 the detriment of vertebrate scavengers such that "above 20°C vertebrates were able to detect
7 and consume only 19% of small-mammal carcasses, whereas at temperatures below 18°C,
8 vertebrates consumed 49% of carcasses". This is a sobering thought given the impact we
9 humans are having on the Earth's climate.

10 **Handling Time**

11 Since the food a scavenger depends upon is not dispatched directly, often the most easily
12 accessible and choicest components of the carcass will be missing or, if present, will be
13 subject to decay as well as competition. So being able to overcome competitors and
14 maximise the nutrient gain from the remnants are all essential parts of carcass handling time.

15 **Competition**

16 Large body size has substantial advantages in agonistic interactions (Ruxton and Houston
17 2004b). For instance, lions can acquire much of their carrion through kleptoparasitism of
18 hyena kills (Trinkel and Kastberger 2005). This line of reasoning suggests that some
19 theropod dinosaurs, who could get up to 15 tonnes, would have had easily monopolised a
20 carcass (Weishampel et al. 2004) provided they could find them efficiently (Kane et al. 2016).

21 We would expect this trait to be selected for even in the case of weight-constrained,
22 scavenging fliers. This is true for wandering albatrosses (*Diomedea exulans*), cinereous
23 vultures (*Aegypius monachus*) and condors (*Vultur gryphus*, *Gymnogyps californianus*) who

all have body masses that can exceed 10 kg and represent some of the heaviest bird species capable of flight (Weimerskirch 1992, Ferguson-Lees and Christie 2001, Donazar et al. 2002). Indeed, such is the competitive advantage held by vultures over other facultative scavenging birds that temporal niche partitioning at the carcass has evolved (Kendall 2013, Kane et al. 2014). Additionally, many pterosaurs were far bigger again, with estimated body masses of over 200 kg in the Azhdarchids (Witton and Habib 2010). Although Witton and Naish (2008) argued that neck inflexibility and straight, rather than hooked jaw morphology points against Azhdarchids existing as *obligate* scavengers, their terrestrial proficiency indicates they would have been comfortable foraging on the ground. Extant Marabou Storks (*Leptoptilos crumenifer*) have a comparable morphology and are noted facultative scavengers (Monadjem et al. 2012) so it is reasonable to believe that these pterosaurs behaved similarly.

By contrast, extant bats seem poorly equipped to deal with competitors. Their poor terrestrial ability, small size and cost of movement on the ground would count against them while attempting to fend off other species at a carcass (Riskin et al. 2006, Voigt et al. 2012).

Smaller species can compensate for a lack of individual body size by weight of numbers in competitive interactions. This is true for a host of notable scavengers, such as vultures, early hominins and hyenas, who can dominate larger competitors provided they substantially outnumber them (Kane et al. 2014, Trinkel and Kastberger 2005, Ruxton and Wilkinson 2013).

Direct confrontation can be circumvented by certain behavioural adaptations. The evolution of nocturnal behaviour in some mammals, for instance, has been put forth as an adaptation to reduce competition with the exclusively diurnal vultures (Gittleman 2013). In areas absent of vultures such as the Arctic, terrestrial carnivores like bears and wolves take more carrion (DeVault et al. 2003). Thus, in the Palaeozoic, the absence of flying vertebrate competitors may have permitted terrestrial forms to take in a higher proportion of carrion in their diet.

1 In addition to fending off other vertebrates, scavengers also have to contend with
2 competition from micro-organisms, which requires a specialised physiology. Although the
3 findings of Shivik (2006) that “evolutionary pressures favor detection maximizers relative to
4 toxification minimizers in competitive interactions for carcasses.” appear sound, the fact
5 remains that overcoming micro-organism toxins is still a beneficial adaptation to any
6 scavenger. Avian scavengers have evolved incredibly acidic stomachs that allow them to
7 consume and process putrefied flesh with no ill effects (Houston and Cooper 1975,
8 Roggenbuck et al. 2014). This adaptation is not restricted to vultures though, Grémillet
9 et al. (2012) showed wandering albatrosses (*Diomedea exulans*; so-called “vultures of the
10 seas”) had an average pH of 1.5, which enables them to consume fisheries discards and squid
11 carcasses. There is also evidence of selection for “toxification minimizers” beyond birds
12 among the ectotherms. From our earlier arguments we know that ectotherms are limited in
13 their ability to find carrion as quickly as endotherms. These later arrivers would thus benefit
14 especially from well-developed detoxifying apparatus. Shivik (2006) suggests that “specialized
15 oral structures in snakes may have evolved under pressures associated with scavenging.”
16 Moreover, some researchers have charted an evolutionary course from basal fossorial snakes
17 to modern terrestrial species by way of an obligate scavenger intermediate (Bauchot 2006).

18 **Food Processing**

19 Aside from coping with competitors, another vital component of carrion handling time is the
20 ability to maximise the energy gain from the remains. At whale carcasses, white and blue
21 sharks are known to preferentially feed on the blubber layer (Long and Jones 1996). Blubber
22 is an energy rich portion of the carcass that can allow a shark to survive for 1.5 months on
23 30 kg of the material (Carey et al. 1982). On land many scavengers utilize late-stage carcass
24 material that is less subject to decomposition and may be unavailable to other competitors,
25 for example bone. Osteophagy is known across a range of terrestrial carnivores and given that

1 some fat-rich mammalian bones have an energy density (6.7 kJ/g) comparable with that of
2 muscle tissue, it makes skeletal remains an enticing resource (Brown 1989). This ability
3 reached its zenith among hyenas with the evolution of the estimated 110 kg *Pachycrocuta*
4 *brevirostris* during the Pliocene (3.6 - 2.58 Mya; Palmqvist et al. 2011). Indeed, their
5 extinction has been blamed on the decline of sabretooth cats (Machairodontinae), the unique
6 skull morphology of the latter meant they would leave a large amount of food on a carcass
7 for would-be scavengers (Palmqvist et al. 2011). Earlier in the evolution of mammals, the
8 bone-crushing dogs that evolved during the Oligocene (Borophaginae; 33.9 - 23.03 Mya)
9 have also been compared to hyenas in terms of their feeding ecology (Van Valkenburgh et al.
10 2003, Martín-Serra et al. 2016).

11 In Mesozoic systems some large theropod dinosaurs had a morphology indicative of an
12 ability to process bone (e.g. the robust skull and dentition of *Tyrannosaurus rex*; Hone and
13 Rauhut 2010). There is direct evidence that *T. rex* did this in the form of distinctive wear
14 marks on its tooth apices (Farlow and Brinkman 1994, Schubert and Ungar 2005) and the
15 presence of bone fragments in its coprolites (Chin et al. 1998). The animal also had an
16 enormous bite force, with one estimate putting it at 57000 Newtons (Bates and Falkingham
17 2012) which would have been powerful enough to break open skeletons (Rayfield et al. 2001).
18 Osteophagy may have been even more viable during the Mesozoic era as well because of this
19 skewed body mass distribution of herbivores towards larger sizes (O’Gorman and Hone 2012).
20 When we couple this with the fact that skeletal mass scales greater than linearly with body
21 mass (Prange et al. 1979) there would have been a lot of bone material to consume in the
22 environment provided an animal had the biology to process it (Chure and Fiorillo 1997).

23 Despite not having the anatomical ability to break open bone, the bearded vulture
24 (*Gypaetus barbatus*) has evolved a technique whereby it drops long bones from a height,
25 splintering them on the rocks below which allows them to feed (Margalida 2008). Similarly,
26 early hominins developed the ability to craft tools for breaking open bones (Blasco et al.

2014). A recent study investigating potential scavenging opportunities for hominins in Kenya found that, in addition to skeletal material, there is a substantial amount of scavengeable meat left on predated remains; sufficient to sustain the requirements of an adult male *Homo erectus* (Pobiner 2015). In some historical hominin-inhabited areas there were a greater number of felids than hyenids. Again, this is significant because hyenas are likely to have left far less flesh on a carcass than a felid such as a sabretooth, enabling contemporaneous hominins to benefit (Pobiner 2015). The use of tools and the cooperative nature of hominins meant they could likely get a substantial part of their energetic requirements through scavenging depending on their environment (Moleón et al. 2014).

On the ground, and despite the advantages of social resource defence, the competitive ability of even the largest flying bird is radically diminished in their interactions with mammalian competitors, and as such they tend to consume carrion rapidly. Houston (1974) observed a group of *Gyps* vultures consuming all of the soft tissue from a 50 kg Grant's gazelle (*Nanger granti*) in eight minutes. Their serrated tongues and hooked bills enabling them to achieve this feat (Houston and Cooper 1975). Aside from raptors, the specialised beaks of many modern bird lineages tends to hinder their ability to eat meat which is in contrast to the first lineages that did not have this feature (Martyniuk 2012). As Martyniuk (2012) notes these early birds would thus have been predominantly carnivorous, implying scavenging was a live opportunity cf. their descendants. Among the pterosaurs, Witton (2013) makes the case that the istiodactyl pterosaurs were the most likely scavengers of this group based on their potential handling time. The mix of strong and weak features in their skull morphology is indicative of animals that were suited to removing large amounts of flesh from an immobile foodstuff (Witton 2013).

Again, we can draw a comparison with clades that are lacking in these features. As we mentioned earlier the skull morphology of extinct sabretooths meant they would have left a large amount of flesh on a carcass and were unable to feed on bones (Palmqvist et al. 2011).

1 Extant bats are also poorly equipped when it comes to feeding on carrion; the larger forms
2 are typically frugivores and therefore lack the adaptations for digesting meat, while the
3 smaller carnivorous bats are mainly found in the microbats, which are insectivorous (Aguirre
4 et al. 2003). That said, *Necromantis* (“death-eater”), a large bat from the middle to late
5 Eocene (56-33.9 Mya) had a robust cranio-mandibular morphology, and is a likely candidate
6 for an extinct scavenging bat (Weithofer 1887, Hand et al. 2012).




Figure 2: The diversity of scavengers through time. Each species has either direct evidence for it being a scavenger or would be positioned high up on our scavenging scale.

Conclusion

As is often the case in science, the present provides the key to the past. The animals of today, while often different (sometimes radically so) to their ancestors, can be used to make informed comparisons to extinct species. We have used this technique to give insight into the drivers of scavenging across vertebrates through time. In common with any other forager be they grazer, browser or predator, scavengers past and present have had to balance their energetic costs with the gains of food. The main factors we considered namely, encounter rate, handling time and prey availability can be used to create a scale of scavenging whereupon any species can be placed in order to establish the importance of carrion in it diet. We hope this approach will be useful in the effort to explore this most understudied of feeding ecologies.

Appendix

Scaling relationships for sustainable travel speed are $1.15 \times \text{body mass (kg)}^{0.12}$ and $0.23 \times \text{body mass (kg)}^{0.12}$ for mammals and reptiles respectively (Ruxton and Houston 2004b). These are fed into the foraging model $\frac{\text{duration} \times \text{speed}}{2} / 1000$ (Enstipp et al. 2006).

Acknowledgments

A lot of people are to thank here.

References

- Aguirre, L. et al. 2003. The implications of food hardness for diet in bats. – *Functional Ecology* 17: 201–212.
- Alexander, R. 2004. Bipedal animals, and their differences from humans. – *Journal of anatomy* 204: 321–330.
- Anderson, G. S. and Bell, L. S. 2016. Impact of marine submergence and season on faunal colonization and decomposition of pig carcasses in the salish sea. – *PloS one* 11: e0149107.
- Anyonge, W. 1996. Locomotor behaviour in plio-pleistocene sabre-tooth cats: a biomechanical analysis. – *Journal of Zoology* 238: 395–413.
- Bahat, O. et al. 1998. Nocturnal variation in body temperature of griffon vultures. – *Condor* : 168–171.
- Bates, K. and Falkingham, P. 2012. Estimating maximum bite performance in *Tyrannosaurus rex* using multi-body dynamics. – *Biology Letters* 8: 660–664.
- Bauchot, R. 2006. Snakes: a natural history. – Sterling Publishing Company, Inc.
- Beasley, J. et al. 2015. Ecological role of vertebrate scavengers. – In: Benbow, M. E. et al. (eds.), *Introduction to Carrion Ecology, Evolution, and Their Applications*, chap. 6. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida, USA, pp. 107–128.
- Bennett, A. F. and Ruben, J. A. 1979. Endothermy and activity in vertebrates. – *Science* 206: 649–654.
- 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.
- Brown, C. J. 1989. A study of the Bearded Vulture *Gypaetus barbatus* in southern Africa. Ph.D. thesis, University of Natal (Pietermaritzburg).

- 1 Bruce, B. et al. 2006. Movements and swimming behaviour of white sharks (carcharodon
2 carcharias) in australian waters. – Marine Biology 150: 161–172.
- 3 Carbone, C. et al. 2011. Intra-guild competition and its implications for one of the biggest
4 terrestrial predators, *Tyrannosaurus rex*. – Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological
5 Sciences 278: 2682–2690.
- 6 Carey, F. G. et al. 1982. Temperature and activities of a white shark, carcharodon carcharias. –
7 Copeia : 254–260.
- 8 Carrier, D. R. 1987. The evolution of locomotor stamina in tetrapods: circumventing a mechanical
9 constraint. – Paleobiology : 326–341.
- 10 Chiappe, L. M. and Dyke, G. J. 2006. The early evolutionary history of birds. – Journal of the
11 Palaeontological Society OF Korea 22: 133–151.
- 12 Chin, K. et al. 1998. A king-sized theropod coprolite. – Nature 393: 680–682.
- 13 Chure, D. and Fiorillo, A. 1997. One big al to go and hold the mayo: evidence of scavenging of a
14 specimen of allosaurus from the morrison formation (late jurassic) of wyoming. – Journal of
15 Vertebrate Paleontology 17: 38A.
- 16 Clarke, A. and Pörtner, H.-O. 2010. Temperature, metabolic power and the evolution of
17 endothermy. – Biological Reviews 85: 703–727.
- 18 Croxall, J. P. and Prince, P. A. 1994. Dead or alive, night or day: how do albatrosses catch squid?
19 – Antarctic Science 6: 155–162.
- 20 Danise, S. et al. 2014. Ecological succession of a jurassic shallow-water ichthyosaur fall. – Nature
21 communications 5.
- 22 DeVault, T. L. and Krochmal, A. R. 2002. Scavenging by snakes: an examination of the literature.
23 – Herpetologica 58: 429–436.

- 1 DeVault, T. L. et al. 2003. Scavenging by vertebrates: behavioral, ecological, and evolutionary
2 perspectives on an important energy transfer pathway in terrestrial ecosystems. – *Oikos* 102:
3 225–234.
- 4 Domínguez-Rodrigo, M. 2002. Hunting and scavenging by early humans: the state of the debate. –
5 *Journal of World Prehistory* 16: 1–54.
- 6 Donázar, J. A. et al. 2002. Effects of forestry and other land-use practices on the conservation of
7 cinereous vultures. – *Ecological Applications* 12: 1445–1456.
- 8 Ehret, D. J. et al. 2009. Caught in the act: trophic interactions between a 4-million-year-old white
9 shark (*carcharodon*) and mysticete whale from peru. – *Palaaios* 24: 329–333.
- 10 Enstipp, M. et al. 2006. Foraging energetics of north sea birds confronted with fluctuating prey
11 availability. – In: Boyd, I. et al. (eds.), *Top Predators in Marine Ecosystems*, chap. 13.
12 Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, pp. 191–210.
- 13 Fahlke, J. M. 2012. Bite marks revisited—evidence for middle-to-late eocene *basilosaurus isis*
14 predation on *dorudon atrox* (both cetacea, *basilosauridae*). – *Palaeontologia Electronica* 15: 32A.
- 15 Fallows, C. et al. 2013. White sharks (*carcharodon carcharias*) scavenging on whales and its
16 potential role in further shaping the ecology of an apex predator. – *PloS one* 8: e60797.
- 17 Farlow, J. and Brinkman, D. 1994. Wear surfaces on the teeth of tyrannosaurs. In: *Dino Fest;*
18 *Proceedings of a Conference for the General Public*. Palaeontological Society Special
19 Publications, vol. 7. pp. 165–175.
- 20 Farlow, J. O. 1994. Speculations about the carrion-locating ability of tyrannosaurs. – *Historical*
21 *Biology* 7: 159–165.
- 22 Ferguson-Lees, J. and Christie, D. A. 2001. *Raptors of the world*. – Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- 23 Fernández-Bellón, D. et al. 2015. Density-dependent productivity in a colonial vulture at two spatial
24 scales. – *Ecology* .

- 1 Forrest, R. 2003. Evidence for scavenging by the marine crocodile *metriorhynchus* on the carcass of
2 a plesiosaur. – *Proceedings of the Geologists' Association* 114: 363–366.
- 3 Gittleman, J. L. 2013. *Carnivore behavior, ecology, and evolution*. – Springer Science & Business
4 Media.
- 5 Grémillet, D. et al. 2012. Vultures of the seas: hyperacidic stomachs in wandering albatrosses as an
6 adaptation to dispersed food resources, including fishery wastes. – *PloS one* 7: e37834.
- 7 Hand, S. et al. 2012. *Necromantis weithofer*, 1887, large carnivorous middle and late eocene bats
8 from the french quercy phosphorites: new data and unresolved relationships. – In: Gunnell, G. F.
9 and Simmons, N. B. (eds.), *Evolutionary History of Bats*. Cambridge University Press, pp.
10 210–251.
- 11 Hedenstrom, A. 1993. Migration by soaring or flapping flight in birds: the relative importance of
12 energy cost and speed. – *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B:*
13 *Biological Sciences* 342: 353–361.
- 14 Hone, D. W. and Rauhut, O. W. 2010. Feeding behaviour and bone utilization by theropod
15 dinosaurs. – *Lethaia* 43: 232–244.
- 16 Houston, D. 1974. The role of griffon vultures *gyps africanus* and *gyps ruppellii* as scavengers. –
17 *Journal of Zoology* 172: 35–46.
- 18 Houston, D. C. 1986. Scavenging efficiency of turkey vultures in tropical forest. – *The Condor* 88:
19 318–323.
- 20 Houston, D. C. and Cooper, J. 1975. The digestive tract of the whiteback griffon vulture and its
21 role in disease transmission among wild ungulates. – *Journal of Wildlife Diseases* 11: 306–313.
- 22 Jackson, A. L. et al. 2008. The effect of social facilitation on foraging success in vultures: a
23 modelling study. – *Biology Letters* 4: 311–313.

- 1 Janis, C. M. and Figueirido, B. 2014. Forelimb anatomy and the discrimination of the predatory
2 behavior of carnivorous mammals: The thylacine as a case study. – *Journal of morphology* 275:
3 1321–1338.
- 4 Jarvis, E. D. et al. 2014. Whole-genome analyses resolve early branches in the tree of life of modern
5 birds. – *Science* 346: 1320–1331.
- 6 Jeschke, J. M. et al. 2002. Predator functional responses: discriminating between handling and
7 digesting prey. – *Ecological Monographs* 72: 95–112.
- 8 Jetz, W. et al. 2012. The global diversity of birds in space and time. – *Nature* 491: 444–448.
- 9 Jones, S. et al. 2015. Ecology of african carrion. – In: Benbow, M. E. et al. (eds.), *Introduction to*
10 *Carrion Ecology, Evolution, and Their Applications*, chap. 6. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida,
11 USA, pp. 461–494.
- 12 Kane, A. et al. 2014. Vultures acquire information on carcass location from scavenging eagles. –
13 *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* 281.
- 14 Kane, A. et al. 2016. Body size as a driver of scavenging in theropod dinosaurs. – *The American*
15 *Naturalist* 187.
- 16 Kendall, C. J. 2013. Alternative strategies in avian scavengers: how subordinate species foil the
17 despotic distribution. – *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 67: 383–393.
- 18 Koenig, R. 2006. Vulture research soars as the scavengers' numbers decline. – *Science* 312.
- 19 Lisney, T. J. et al. 2013. Comparison of eye morphology and retinal topography in two species of
20 new world vultures (aves: Cathartidae). – *The Anatomical Record* 296: 1954–1970.
- 21 Long, J. and Jones, E. 1996. White shark predation and scavenging on cetaceans in the eastern
22 north pacific ocean. – In: Klimley, P. and Jones, E. (eds.), *Great white sharks: the biology of*
23 *Carcharodon carcharias*, chap. 27. New York Academic Press, USA, pp. 293–307.

- 1 Margalida, A. 2008. Bearded vultures (*Gypaetus barbatus*) prefer fatty bones. – Behavioral Ecology
2 and Sociobiology 63: 187–193.
- 3 Martín-Serra, A. et al. 2016. In the pursuit of the predatory behavior of borophagines (mammalia,
4 carnivora, canidae): Inferences from forelimb morphology. – Journal of Mammalian Evolution :
5 1–13.
- 6 Martyniuk, M. P. 2012. A Field Guide to Mesozoic Birds and Other Winged Dinosaurs. – Pan Aves.
- 7 McNab, B. K. 2009. Resources and energetics determined dinosaur maximal size. – Proceedings of
8 the National Academy of Sciences 106: 12184–12188.
- 9 Mech, L. D. and Boitani, L. 2010. Wolves: behavior, ecology, and conservation. – University of
10 Chicago Press.
- 11 Mills, M. 1989. The comparative behavioral ecology of hyenas: the importance of diet and food
12 dispersion. – In: Carnivore behavior, ecology, and evolution. Springer, pp. 125–142.
- 13 Moleón, M. et al. 2014. Humans and scavengers: The evolution of interactions and ecosystem
14 services. – BioScience : biu034.
- 15 Moleón, M. et al. 2015. Carcass size shapes the structure and functioning of an african scavenging
16 assemblage. – Oikos 124: 1391–1403.
- 17 Monadjem, A. et al. 2012. Survival and population dynamics of the marabou stork in an isolated
18 population, swaziland. – PLOS ONE 7: e46434.
- 19 Nagy, K. A. 2005. Field metabolic rate and body size. – Journal of Experimental Biology 208:
20 1621–1625.
- 21 Niedzwiedzki, G. et al. 2010. Tetrapod trackways from the early middle devonian period of poland.
22 – Nature 463: 43–48.

- 1 Norberg, U. M. 2012. Vertebrate flight: mechanics, physiology, morphology, ecology and evolution,
2 vol. 27. – Springer Science & Business Media.
- 3 Nudds, R. L. and Dyke, G. J. 2010. Narrow primary feather rachises in *confuciusornis* and
4 *archaeopteryx* suggest poor flight ability. – *Science* 328: 887–889.
- 5 O’Gorman, E. J. and Hone, D. W. E. 2012. Body size distribution of the dinosaurs. – *PLoS ONE* 7:
6 e51925.
- 7 Palmqvist, P. et al. 2011. The giant hyena *Pachycrocuta brevirostris*: modelling the bone-cracking
8 behavior of an extinct carnivore. – *Quaternary International* 243: 61–79.
- 9 Parmenter, R. R. and MacMahon, J. A. 2009. Carrion decomposition and nutrient cycling in a
10 semiarid shrub-steppe ecosystem. – *Ecological Monographs* 79: 637–661.
- 11 Pawar, S. et al. 2012. Dimensionality of consumer search space drives trophic interaction strengths.
12 – *Nature* 486: 485–489.
- 13 Pennycuik, C. 1995. Energy costs of locomotion and the concept of "foraging radius". – In:
14 Sinclair, A. R. E. and Norton-Griffiths, M. (eds.), *Serengeti: dynamics of an ecosystem*, chap. 7.
15 University of Chicago Press, USA, pp. 164–18.
- 16 Pobiner, B. 2008. Paleoecological information in predator tooth marks. – *Journal of taphonomy* 6:
17 373–397.
- 18 Pobiner, B. L. 2015. New actualistic data on the ecology and energetics of hominin scavenging
19 opportunities. – *Journal of human evolution* 80: 1–16.
- 20 Pontzer, H. et al. 2009. Biomechanics of running indicates endothermy in bipedal dinosaurs. –
21 *PLOS ONE* 4: e7783.
- 22 Prange, H. D. et al. 1979. Scaling of skeletal mass to body mass in birds and mammals. –
23 *American Naturalist* 113: 103–122.

- 1 Rayfield, E. J. et al. 2001. Cranial design and function in a large theropod dinosaur. – Nature 409:
2 1033–1037.
- 3 Reymond, L. 1985. Spatial visual acuity of the eagle aquila audax: a behavioural, optical and
4 anatomical investigation. – Vision research 25: 1477–1491.
- 5 Riskin, D. K. et al. 2006. Terrestrial locomotion of the new zealand short-tailed bat mystacina
6 tuberculata and the common vampire bat desmodus rotundus. – Journal of Experimental Biology
7 209: 1725–1736.
- 8 Roggenbuck, M. et al. 2014. The microbiome of new world vultures. – Nature communications 5.
- 9 Ruxton, G. D. 2011. Zoology: Why are whales big? – Nature 469: 481–481.
- 10 Ruxton, G. D. and Bailey, D. M. 2005. Searching speeds and the energetic feasibility of an obligate
11 whale-scavenging fish. – Deep Sea Research Part I: Oceanographic Research Papers 52:
12 1536–1541.
- 13 Ruxton, G. D. and Houston, D. C. 2003. Could *Tyrannosaurus rex* have been a scavenger rather
14 than a predator? an energetics approach. – Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series
15 B: Biological Sciences 270: 731–733.
- 16 Ruxton, G. D. and Houston, D. C. 2004a. Energetic feasibility of an obligate marine scavenger. –
17 Marine ecology. Progress series 266: 59–63.
- 18 Ruxton, G. D. and Houston, D. C. 2004b. Obligate vertebrate scavengers must be large soaring
19 fliers. – Journal of Theoretical Biology 228: 431–436.
- 20 Ruxton, G. D. and Wilkinson, D. M. 2013. Endurance running and its relevance to scavenging by
21 early hominins. – Evolution 67: 861–867.
- 22 Ruxton, G. D. et al. 2014. Why fruit rots: theoretical support for janzen's theory of
23 microbe–macrobe competition. – Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences 281:
24 20133320.

- 1 Sazima, I. and Strüssmann, C. 1990. Necrofagia em serpentes brasileiras: exemplos e previsões. –
2 Revista Brasileira de Biologia 50: 463–468.
- 3 Schubert, B. W. and Ungar, P. S. 2005. Wear facets and enamel spalling in tyrannosaurid
4 dinosaurs. – Acta Palaeontologica Polonica 50: 93–99.
- 5 Schwimmer, D. R. et al. 1997. Scavenging by sharks of the genus *squalicorax* in the late cretaceous
6 of north america. – Palaios : 71–83.
- 7 Sellwood, B. W. and Valdes, P. J. 2006. Mesozoic climates: General circulation models and the
8 rock record. – Sedimentary geology 190: 269–287.
- 9 Shivik, J. A. 2006. Are vultures birds, and do snakes have venom, because of macro-and
10 microscavenger conflict? – BioScience 56: 819–823.
- 11 Spiegel, O. et al. 2013. Factors influencing foraging search efficiency: why do scarce lappet-faced
12 vultures outperform ubiquitous white-backed vultures? – The American Naturalist 181:
13 E102–E115.
- 14 Spivey, R. et al. 2014. Analysing the intermittent flapping flight of a manx shearwater, *puffinus*
15 *puffinus*, and its sporadic use of a wave-meandering wing-sailing flight strategy. – Progress in
16 Oceanography 125: 62–73.
- 17 Sullivan, C. 2015. Evolution of hind limb posture in triassic archosauriforms. – In: Dial, K. et al.
18 (eds.), Great Transformations in Vertebrate Evolution, chap. 7. University of Chicago Press, USA,
19 pp. 107–124.
- 20 Tenney, S. 1877. A few words about scavengers. – The American Naturalist 11: 129–135.
- 21 Thaxter, C. B. et al. 2012. Seabird foraging ranges as a preliminary tool for identifying candidate
22 marine protected areas. – Biological Conservation 156: 53–61.
- 23 Trinkel, M. and Kastberger, G. 2005. Competitive interactions between spotted hyenas and lions in
24 the etosha national park, namibia. – african Journal of Ecology 43: 220–224.

- 1 Tucker, V. A. 1975. The energetic cost of moving about: Walking and running are extremely
2 inefficient forms of locomotion. much greater efficiency is achieved by birds, fish and bicyclists. –
3 American Scientist 63: 413–419.
- 4 Uriona, T. and Farmer, C. 2008. Recruitment of the diaphragmaticus, ischiopubis and other
5 respiratory muscles to control pitch and roll in the american alligator (*alligator mississippiensis*).
6 – Journal of Experimental Biology 211: 1141–1147.
- 7 Van Valkenburgh, B. 1987. Skeletal indicators of locomotor behavior in living and extinct
8 carnivores. – Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology 7: 162–182.
- 9 Van Valkenburgh, B. et al. 2003. Chapter 7: Pack hunting in miocene borophagine dogs: Evidence
10 from craniodental morphology and body size. – Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural
11 History : 147–162.
- 12 Voigt, C. C. et al. 2012. Terrestrial locomotion imposes high metabolic requirements on bats. –
13 The Journal of experimental biology 215: 4340–4344.
- 14 Watanabe, Y. Y. et al. 2012. The slowest fish: swim speed and tail-beat frequency of greenland
15 sharks. – Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology 426: 5–11.
- 16 Weimerskirch, H. 1992. Reproductive effort in long-lived birds: age-specific patterns of condition,
17 reproduction and survival in the wandering albatross. – Oikos : 464–473.
- 18 Weishampel, D. B. et al. 2004. The dinosauria. – University of California Press.
- 19 Weithofer, A. 1887. Zur kenntniss der fossilen cheiropteren der französischen phosphorite. –
20 Mathematisch-naturwissenschaftlich 96: 341—360.
- 21 Whitehead, H. and Reeves, R. 2005. Killer whales and whaling: the scavenging hypothesis. –
22 Biology Letters 1: 415–418.

- 1 Williams, T. M. 1999. The evolution of cost efficient swimming in marine mammals: limits to
2 energetic optimization. – Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London B: Biological
3 Sciences 354: 193–201.
- 4 Witmer, L. M. and Ridgely, R. C. 2009. New insights into the brain, braincase, and ear region of
5 tyrannosaurs (dinosauria, theropoda), with implications for sensory organization and behavior. –
6 The Anatomical Record 292: 1266–1296.
- 7 Witton, M. P. 2013. Pterosaurs: natural history, evolution, anatomy. – Princeton University Press,
8 USA.
- 9 Witton, M. P. and Habib, M. B. 2010. On the size and flight diversity of giant pterosaurs, the use
10 of birds as pterosaur analogues and comments on pterosaur flightlessness. – PLOS ONE 5:
11 e13982.
- 12 Witton, M. P. and Naish, D. 2008. A reappraisal of azhdarchid pterosaur functional morphology
13 and paleoecology. – PLOS ONE 3: e2271.
- 14 Zelenitsky, D. K. et al. 2011. Evolution of olfaction in non-avian theropod dinosaurs and birds. In:
15 Proc. R. Soc. B, vol. 278. The Royal Society, pp. 3625–3634.