Table S1. Cont.

Region/taxa	Exploitation before domestication		Management and predomestication cultivation		Domestication change		Sources
	Start	Finish	Start	Finish	Start	Finish	
Meso-America							
Squash (pepo)	x	x	x	x	10,000	9,500	(3, 86, 88)
Maize	10,000	9,000	x	x	9,000		(89, 90)
Foxtail millet-grass	x	x	x	x	6,000	4,000	(91)
Common bean	x	x	x	x	3,000		(92)
Avocado	x	x	x	x	3,000		(93)
Chile pepper	x	x	x	x	3,000		(93, 94)
Turkey	x	x	x	x	2,000	x	(95)
South America							
Chili pepper	x	x	x	x	6,000		(96)
Peanut	x	x	8,500	6,500	5,000		(97)
Cotton	x	x	x	x	6,000		(97)
Coca	x	x	x	x	8,000		(98)
Now-minor root crops (arrowroot, leren)	x	x	x	x	9,000		(99, 100)
Squash (moschata)	x	x	x	x	10,000		(97)
Common bean	x	x	x	x	5,000		(92)
Lima bean	x	x	8,250	x	6,000		(92, 101)
Manioc	x	x	x	x	7,000		(3, 102, 103)
Sweet potato	x	x	x	x	5,000		(104)
White potato	7,000	4,500	x	x	4,500		(105)
Quinoa	5,000	x	x	x	3,500		(106)
Yam	x	x	x	x	5,500		(107)
Llama	10,000	6,000	x	x	6,000	4,000	(108, 109)
Alpaca	10,000	5,000	x	x	5,000	3,000	(108, 109)
Guinea pig	x	x	x	x	5,000	4,000	(110, 111)
Muscovy duck	x	x	x	x	4,000	2,000	(112, 113)

Dates (in calibrated years before present) listed in each of the three categories: exploitation before domestication, management and predomestic cultivation, and phenotypic change associated with domestication have been gleaned from the literature and rounded to the nearest 250 y. Cells with an "x" indicate there is no evidence as yet available for that specific category of management or change. Where there is a date for the start time for domestication change but the finish time has been left blank, this means that the date in the start time column represents a conservative time by which the organism had been domesticated, although there is yet no evidence for size or other morphological change following domestication. In addition, the missing end dates for quinoa and lima bean reflect gaps in the archaeobotanical records of these species. Because the domestication process operates over a continuum, defining categories and break points during the process is never clear-cut. The precision of numbers provided here should therefore be interpreted as estimates based upon the best available information, and many may shift as additional archaeological and genetic evidence is collected. Finally, there remain significant uncertainties and debates regarding whether many of the plants and animals (e.g., African cattle) listed here were domesticated independently in more than one region (114). In these cases, the listed dates represent those for the earliest domestication episodes in each region, although the processes may not have been truly independent.

1. Asouti E, Fuller DQ (2013) A contextual approach to the emergence of agriculture in Southwest Asia. *Curr Anthropol* 54(3):299–345.
2. Tanno K-I, Willcox G (2012) Distinguishing wild and domestic wheat and barley spikelets from early Holocene sites in the Near East. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 21(2):107–115.
3. Fuller DQ, et al. (2014) Convergent evolution and parallelism in plant domestication revealed by an expanding archaeological record. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, 10.1073/pnas.1308937110.
4. Tanno K-I, Willcox G (2006) The origins of cultivation of *Cicer arietinum* L. and *Vicia faba* L.: Early finds from Tell el-Kerkh, north-west Syria, late 10th millennium BP. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 15(3):197–204.
5. Karg S (2011) New research on the cultural history of the useful plant *Linum usitatissimum* L. (flax), a resource for food and textiles for 8,000 years. *Vegetation History and Archaeobotany* 20(6):507–508.
6. Kaniewski D, et al. (2012) Primary domestication and early uses of the emblematic olive tree: Palaeobotanical, historical and molecular evidence from the Middle East. *Biol Rev Camb Philos Soc* 87(4):885–899.
7. Legge AJ (1996) The beginning of caprine domestication in Southwest Asia. *The Origins and Spread of Agriculture and Pastoralism in Eurasia*, ed Harris DR (UCL Press, London), pp 238–262.
8. Arbuckle BS, Öztan A, Gülçur S (2009) The evolution of sheep and goat husbandry in central Anatolia. *Anthropozoologica* 44(1):129–157.
9. Conolly J, et al. (2011) Meta-analysis of zooarchaeological data from SW Asia and SE Europe provides insight into the origins and spread of animal husbandry. *J Archaeol Sci* 38(3):538–545.
10. Helmer D, Gourichon L (2008) Premières données sur les modalités de subsistance à Tell Aswad (Syrie, PPNB moyen et récent, néolithique céramique ancien) - Fouilles 2001-2005. *Archaeozoology of the Near East VIII: Actes des Huitièmes Rencontres Internationales d'Archéozoologie de l'Asie du Sud-Ouest et des Régions Adjacentes*, eds Vila E, Gourichon L, Choyke AM, Buitenhuis H (Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée, Lyon, France), pp 119–151.
11. Hongo H, Meadow RH, Oksuz B, Ilgezdi G (2005) Sheep and goat remains from Cayonu Tepesi, Southeastern Anatolia. *Archaeozoology of the Near East VI: Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium on the Archaeozoology of Southwestern Asia and Adjacent Areas*, eds Buitenhuis H, Choyke A, Martin L, Bartosiewicz L, Mashkour M (ARC, Groningen), pp 113–124.
12. Vigne JD, Carrère I, Briois F, Guilaine J (2011) The early process of mammal domestication in the Near East. *Curr Anthropol* 52(S4):255–271.
13. Zeder MA (2005) New perspectives on livestock domestication in the Fertile Crescent as viewed from the Zagros Mountains. *The First Steps of Animal Domestication: New Archaeozoological Approaches*, eds Vigne J-D, Peters J, Helmer D (Oxbow Books, Oxford).
14. Arbuckle BS (2013) The late adoption of cattle and pig husbandry in Neolithic Central Turkey. *J Archaeol Sci* 40(4):1805–1815.
15. Helmer DL, Gourichon L, Monchot H, Peters J, Segui MS (2005) Identifying early domestic cattle from Pre-Pottery Neolithic sites on the Middle Euphrates using sexual dimorphism. *The First Steps of Animal Domestication*, eds Vigne J-D, Peters J, Helmer D (Oxbow Books, Oxford), pp 86–95.