

Salivary response of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) to consumption of plant secondary metabolites (#110850)

1

First submission

Guidance from your Editor

Please submit by **3 Jan 2025** for the benefit of the authors (and your token reward) .



Structure and Criteria

Please read the 'Structure and Criteria' page for guidance.



Custom checks

Make sure you include the custom checks shown below, in your review.



Raw data check

Review the raw data.



Image check

Check that figures and images have not been inappropriately manipulated.

If this article is published your review will be made public. You can choose whether to sign your review. If uploading a PDF please remove any identifiable information (if you want to remain anonymous).

Files

Download and review all files from the [materials page](#).

2 Figure file(s)

3 Table file(s)

1 Other file(s)

! Custom checks

Vertebrate animal usage checks



Have you checked the authors [ethical approval statement](#)?



Were the experiments necessary and ethical?



Have you checked our [animal research policies](#)?



Structure and Criteria

Structure your review

The review form is divided into 5 sections. Please consider these when composing your review:

1. **BASIC REPORTING**
2. **EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN**
3. **VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS**
4. General comments
5. Confidential notes to the editor

 You can also annotate this PDF and upload it as part of your review

When ready [submit online](#).

Editorial Criteria

Use these criteria points to structure your review. The full detailed editorial criteria is on your [guidance page](#).

BASIC REPORTING

-  Clear, unambiguous, professional English language used throughout.
-  Intro & background to show context. Literature well referenced & relevant.
-  Structure conforms to [Peerj standards](#), discipline norm, or improved for clarity.
-  Figures are relevant, high quality, well labelled & described.
-  Raw data supplied (see [Peerj policy](#)).

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

-  Original primary research within [Scope of the journal](#).
-  Research question well defined, relevant & meaningful. It is stated how the research fills an identified knowledge gap.
-  Rigorous investigation performed to a high technical & ethical standard.
-  Methods described with sufficient detail & information to replicate.

VALIDITY OF THE FINDINGS

-  **Impact and novelty is not assessed.** Meaningful replication encouraged where rationale & benefit to literature is clearly stated.
-  All underlying data have been provided; they are robust, statistically sound, & controlled.
-  Conclusions are well stated, linked to original research question & limited to supporting results.



The best reviewers use these techniques

Tip

Example

Support criticisms with evidence from the text or from other sources

Smith et al (J of Methodology, 2005, V3, pp 123) have shown that the analysis you use in Lines 241-250 is not the most appropriate for this situation. Please explain why you used this method.

Give specific suggestions on how to improve the manuscript

Your introduction needs more detail. I suggest that you improve the description at lines 57- 86 to provide more justification for your study (specifically, you should expand upon the knowledge gap being filled).

Comment on language and grammar issues

The English language should be improved to ensure that an international audience can clearly understand your text. Some examples where the language could be improved include lines 23, 77, 121, 128 – the current phrasing makes comprehension difficult. I suggest you have a colleague who is proficient in English and familiar with the subject matter review your manuscript, or contact a professional editing service.

Organize by importance of the issues, and number your points

1. Your most important issue
2. The next most important item
3. ...
4. The least important points

Please provide constructive criticism, and avoid personal opinions

I thank you for providing the raw data, however your supplemental files need more descriptive metadata identifiers to be useful to future readers. Although your results are compelling, the data analysis should be improved in the following ways: AA, BB, CC

Comment on strengths (as well as weaknesses) of the manuscript

I commend the authors for their extensive data set, compiled over many years of detailed fieldwork. In addition, the manuscript is clearly written in professional, unambiguous language. If there is a weakness, it is in the statistical analysis (as I have noted above) which should be improved upon before Acceptance.

Salivary response of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) to consumption of plant secondary metabolites

Carlos Eduardo Ramírez Torres ^{Corresp., Equal first author, 1}, **Fabiola Carolina Espinosa Gómez** ², **Jorge E Morales-Mávil** ³, **Ma Remedios Mendoza** ⁴, **Matthias Laska** ⁵, **Laura Teresa Hernandez Salazar** ^{Corresp., Equal first author, 1}

¹ Instituto de Neuro-Etología, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico

² Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia, Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla, Puebla, Mexico

³ Instituto de Neuro-Etología, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico

⁴ Instituto de Química Aplicada, Universidad Veracruzana, Xalapa, Veracruz, Mexico

⁵ Department of Physics, Chemistry and Biology, IFM, Biology, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

Corresponding Authors: Carlos Eduardo Ramírez Torres, Laura Teresa Hernandez Salazar

Email address: ramirezcarlose@gmail.com, herlatss@gmail.com

Plants produce a wide variety of secondary metabolites which elicit a bitter taste. Black-handed spider monkeys feed on various plant species and consume different concentrations of secondary metabolites. Monkeys can modulate the acidity-alkalinity (pH) and salivary expression of total proteins (TP) and proline-rich proteins (PRP) dependent on the concentration of tannins, helping to counteract negative post-ingestive effects. However, it is unclear whether there is modulation of pH, TP, and PRP to other secondary metabolites than tannins and whether this effect also occurs towards bitter substances not associated with secondary metabolites. Our objective was to determine if there are adjustments in salivary pH, TP, and PRPs expression towards bitter substances or if spider monkeys display a specific response to secondary metabolites present in their diet and substances not associated with secondary metabolites. We presented six adult spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) with different concentrations of tannic acid, caffeine, and rutin (0.1, 0.3, 0.6 and 1 mM) and denatonium benzoate (0.001, 0.003, 0.006 and 0.01 mM) dissolved in 30 mM sucrose. We administered each concentration and collected saliva using swabs (SalivaBio). We used test paper strips to measure the pH and determined the TP concentration using the Bradford method at 595 nm. We also determined the percentage of PRPs using SDS-PAGE electrophoresis. The results showed an increase in salivary pH in response to consumption of secondary metabolites, no variations in TP concentration, variations in the percentage of PRPs associated with tannic acid concentrations, and no significant changes when the animals consumed denatonium benzoate. Our results showed that spider monkeys specifically modulate acidity-alkalinity towards secondary metabolites and salivary PRPs expression towards tannic acid in their diet, and that they do not have a generalized salivary response to bitter compounds that

are typically considered as toxic substances.

Salivary response of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) to consumption of plant secondary metabolites

Carlos E. Ramírez-Torres¹, Fabiola Carolina Espinosa-Gómez², Jorge E. Morales-Mávila¹, María Remedios Mendoza-López³, Matthias Laska⁴ y Laura T. Hernández-Salazar¹.

1. Instituto de Neuroetología, Universidad Veracruzana, México.

2. Facultad de Medicina Veterinaria y Zootecnia, (UPAEP Universidad), México.

3. Instituto de Química Aplicada, Universidad Veracruzana.

4. Department of Physics, Chemistry and Biology, IFM Biology, Linköping University, Linköping, Sweden

Corresponding Authors:

Laura T. Hernández-Salazar, Xalapa, Veracruz, 91190, México.

Email address: herlatss@gmail.com

Carlos E. Ramírez-Torres, Xalapa, Veracruz, 91190, México.

Email address: ramireztcartlose@gmail.com

ORCID:

Carlos E. Ramírez-Torres 0000-0002-8902-7677

Fabiola Carolina Espinosa-Gómez 0000-0003-3099-554X

Jorge E. Morales-Mávila 0000-0001-9577-0777

María Remedios Mendoza-López 0000-0002-6441-4558

20 Matthias Laska 0000-0001-5583-2697

21 Laura T. Hernández-Salazar 0000-0001-7567-8068

22 Abstract

23 Plants produce a wide variety of secondary metabolites which elicit a bitter taste. Black-handed
 24 spider monkeys feed on various plant species and consume different concentrations of secondary
 25 metabolites. Monkeys can modulate the acidity-alkalinity (pH) and salivary expression of total
 26 proteins (TP) and proline-rich proteins (PRP) dependent on the concentration of tannins, helping
 27 to counteract negative post-ingestive effects. However, it is unclear whether there is modulation
 28 of pH, TP, and PRP to other secondary metabolites than tannins and whether this effect also
 29 occurs towards bitter substances not associated with secondary metabolites. Our objective was to
 30 determine if there are adjustments in salivary pH, TP, and PRPs expression towards bitter
 31 substances or if spider monkeys display a specific response to secondary metabolites present in
 32 their diet and substances not associated with secondary metabolites. We presented six adult
 33 spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) with different concentrations of tannic acid, caffeine, and rutin
 34 (0.1, 0.3, 0.6 and 1 mM) and denatonium benzoate (0.001, 0.003, 0.006 and 0.01 mM) dissolved
 35 in 30 mM sucrose. We administrated each concentration and collected saliva using swabs
 36 (SalivaBio). We used test paper strips to measure the pH and determined the TP concentration
 37 using the Bradford method at 595 nm. We also determined the percentage of PRPs using SDS-
 38 PAGE electrophoresis. The results showed an increase in salivary pH in response to consumption
 39 of secondary metabolites, no variations in TP concentration, variations in the percentage of PRPs
 40 associated with tannic acid concentrations, and no significant changes when the animals
 41 consumed denatonium benzoate. Our results showed that spider monkeys specifically modulate
 42 acidity-alkalinity towards secondary metabolites and salivary PRPs expression towards tannic

acid in their diet, and that they do not have a generalized salivary response to bitter compounds that are typically considered as toxic substances.

Keywords: Frugivorous primates, bitter compounds, salivary proteins, salivary pH, proline-rich proteins.

Introduction

Primates use plants as an essential food source because they contain nutrients such as carbohydrates, lipids, and proteins (Mattes, 2011; Lambert & Rothman, 2015). However, the risk of consuming plant parts is that some compounds can be nutritionally limiting or even toxic, such as secondary metabolites whose function is to protect plants from herbivory (Akula & Ravishankar, 2011; War et al., 2012; Villalba et al., 2017; Kariñho-Betancourt, 2018; Yang et al., 2018). The type of secondary metabolites varies depending on the plant species (Wink, 2003; 2008), and their concentration depends on the plant part and stage of maturity. For example, they are found in higher concentration in young leaves and unripe fruits compared to ripe fruits, and during the ripening process of fruits, the concentration of organic acids varies (Sun et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2012; Da Silva et al., 2014).

The secondary metabolites classification considers terpenes, alkaloids, and phenolic compounds, the latter in turn divided into two groups: tannins and flavonoids (Bourgaud et al., 2001; Wink, 2008; Kariñho-Betancourt, 2018). Secondary metabolites generally produce a bitter taste and an astringent sensation and can generate negative post-ingestive effects such as nausea, abdominal pain and liver and kidney damage (Frutos et al., 2004; War et al., 2012; Stevenson et al., 2017). However, at low concentrations, some secondary metabolites can also act as antioxidants and immunostimulants (Crozier et al., 2009).

The presence of secondary metabolites has been documented in the diet of all major primate taxa, including great apes (Rogers et al., 1990; Takemoto, 2003; Beaune et al., 2017), strepsirrhines (Carrai et al., 2003; Norscia et al., 2006; 2012), catarrhines (Chapman & Chapman, 2002; Fashing et al., 2007; Ta et al., 2017) and platyrrhines (Felton et al., 2009; Espinosa-Gómez et al., 2018). In addition, most primate studies have focused on identifying the presence and concentration of tannins and alkaloids (Rogers et al., 1990; Hamilton & Galdikas, 1994; Wakibara et al., 2001; Chapman & Chapman, 2002; Norscia et al., 2012; Ta et al., 2017; Thureau et al., 2021), without considering other compounds such as flavonoids and terpenes. Considering the role that secondary metabolites play in the diet of primates (Glander, 1978; Rogers et al., 1990; Leighton, 1993; Kar-Gupta & Kumar, 1994; Fashing et al., 2007; Windley et al., 2022), it is relevant to conduct work that delves into the relationship between specific secondary metabolites present in their diet and their physiological response (Windley et al., 2022).

Some primate species appear not to be physiologically affected by the secondary metabolites in the plants they consume (Oates et al., 1980; Rothman et al., 2009). This suggests that they have defense mechanisms that counteract the negative effect of these compounds, for example, modulation of salivary pH (Ramírez-Torres et al., 2022) and the expression of proline-rich proteins and histatins, which capture and precipitate tannins and alkaloids, preventing them from interacting with proteins necessary for digestion (Oates et al., 1980; Shimada, 2006; Fashing et al., 2007; Morzel et al., 2022; Windley et al., 2022).

PRPs have been identified in the saliva of different primate species such as macaques (*Macaca fascicularis* and *Macaca arctoides*), baboons (*Papio hamadryas*), howler monkeys (*Alouatta palliata mexicana* and *Alouatta pigra*) and spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) (Oppenheim et al.,

1979; Schlesinger et al., 1989; Mau et al., 2011; Espinosa-Gómez et al., 2015; 2018; 2020; Ramírez-Torres et al., 2022). Similarly, histatins have been identified in the saliva of crab macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*), gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla*), gibbons (*Nomascus leucogenys*), vervet monkeys (*Cercopithecus aethiops*) and langurs (*Presbytis cristata*) (Xu et al., 1990; Padovan et al., 2010).

Spider monkeys are primates that feed on more than 250 plant species, of which they mainly consume ripe fruits, although they may also feed on unripe fruits as well as on other plant parts such as leaves, flowers, and seeds (González-Zamora et al., 2009; Schaffner et al., 2012; Pablo-Rodríguez et al., 2015; Hartwell et al., 2021). This dietary diversity exposes them to different types and concentrations of secondary metabolites and to variations in the acidity of the nutrients that make up their diet. Black-handed spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) can perceive the bitter taste elicited by different secondary metabolites and synthetic substances such as denatonium benzoate (Laska et al., 2009), and they have been shown to modulate their salivary pH, TP concentration, and PRPs percentage when consuming tannic acid (Ramírez-Torres et al., 2022). However, it is unclear if this salivary response is specific to tannins or is a general response towards other secondary metabolites, such as flavonoids, alkaloids or synthetic bitter compounds. Therefore, we addressed the following questions: Which secondary metabolites are present in the plants consumed by black-handed spider monkeys? What are the secondary metabolites concentrations of plant parts according to their stage of maturity? What are the salivary responses of spider monkeys to ingestion of alkaloids and flavonoids? Is there a general salivary response of spider monkeys to bitter stimuli?

Materials and Methods

Ethics statement

The experiments reported here comply with the Guidelines for the care and use of mammals in neuroscience and behavioral research (National Research Council, 2011), the American Society of Primatologists' Principles for the Ethical Treatment of Primates, and Mexican laws (NOM-062-ZOO-1999 and NOM-051-ZOO-1995). The protocol was approved by the Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (SEMARNAT; official permit numbers SGPA/DGVS/000041/22 and SPARN/DGVS/01767/22).

Collection of plant parts

We collected unripe fruits, ripe fruit, young leaves, and mature leaves from 64 trees of nine species reported as part of the diet of black-handed spider monkeys in the region of Los Tuxtlas, Veracruz, Mexico. The species collected were: (4) *Ficus americana*, (3) *F. colubrinae*, (3) *F. rzedowskiana*, (5) *F. insipida*, (8) *F. yoponensis*, (11) *Spondias mombin*, (7) *S. radlkoferi*, (12) *Brosimum alicastrum* and (11) *Poulsenia armata*. These species represent more than 40% of the spider monkey's diet (González-Zamora et al., 2009).

Secondary metabolite analysis

Once the plant parts were collected, they were dehydrated until they reached a constant weight. We used a dehydrator (SANGKEE®) for the fruits at 35 °C and the leaves were dehydrated in a cardboard box (50 cm x 50 cm) under a 70-watt incandescent bulb. The dehydrated samples were ground to a fine powder. One pool was formed for each plant part (UF, RF, YL, and ML) per plant species. We took 5 g of each pool and added 5 ml of HPLC-grade methanol (1:1). Each mixture was vortexed for one minute and allowed to stand for 5 min. We took the supernatant with a 5 ml syringe and a 0.045 µm pore nylon filter placed at the bottom of the syringe to recover the supernatant after passing through the filter.

Once the sample was filtered, we determined the presence and concentration of tannic acid (tannin), caffeine (alkaloid), and rutin (flavonoid) using high-performance liquid chromatography (HPLC) Agilent Technologies HPLC System (model: 1200 infinity). HPLC grade methanol was used as a solvent at a temperature of 20 °C with a mobile phase of acetonitrile, methanol, and water (15:15:70) with a flow rate of 1 ml/min. The concentration of the secondary metabolites was quantified using the HPLC equipment's LC-UV-100 UV/VIS detectors. We performed the secondary metabolites analyses at the Institute of Applied Chemistry, Universidad Veracruzana.

Site and study subjects

We performed the behavioral tests at the Environmental Management Unit "Hilda Ávila de O'Farrill" of the Universidad Veracruzana, located near Catemaco in Los Tuxtlas, Veracruz, Mexico. We worked with three female and three adult male spider monkeys (n=6). During the tests, we kept the animals in individual enclosures (4 x 4 x 4 m). When individuals completed the test, the sliding doors between the enclosures were opened, allowing them to interact with each other. The enclosures were enriched with trunks and vines to stimulate animal welfare. All individuals were exposed to natural conditions of temperature, relative humidity, and light-dark cycle. The monkeys were feed on cultivated fruits and vegetables one time a day, and all tests were conducted two hours before their feeding time to ensure they were motivated to participate.

Study design

Each individual was presented with one bottle with a metal drinking spout, containing 100 ml of sucrose at a concentration of 30 mM (control solution) or an experimental solution containing the secondary metabolites tannic acid, rutin, or caffeine at concentrations 0.1, 0.3, 0.6, and 1 mM,

mixed with sucrose (30 mM). We used solutions of denatonium benzoate, a bitter-tasting synthetic compound at concentrations 0.001, 0.003, 0.006 and 0.01 mM mixed with sucrose (30 mM) (Fig. 1). All monkeys had access to one bottle for one minute (control or experimental). The sucrose concentration used is above the taste preference threshold of spider monkeys, which makes it attractive to induce their consumption, however, this concentration is low enough to avoid masking effects to other taste substances (Laska et al., 1996; 2000). The concentrations of the secondary metabolites and of the artificial bitter tastant were above the spider monkeys' taste threshold (Laska et al., 2000; 2009), which ensured that the individuals could reliably perceive them. The different solutions and saliva collection were administered between 09:00 and 11:00 h. Sucrose (CAS# 57-50-1) was obtained from Merck, tannic acid (CAS# 1401-55-4) from Meyer, rutin (CAS# 207671-50-9), caffeine (CAS# 58-08-2) and denatonium benzoate (CAS# 3734-33-6) from Sigma-Aldrich.

Figure 1. Approximately here.

Saliva collection

We collected saliva samples using a swab (SalivaBio Children's Swab, Salimetrics 5001.08, SalivaBio, State College, PA, USA) 13 cm adjusted to a size of 4.3 cm to allow the complete introduction of the swab into the monkey's oral cavity. To encourage the monkeys to chew the swab, they were soaked with 0.5 ml of corn syrup for 60 s following the method reported by Ramírez-Torres et al., (2022).

Determination of salivary acidity/alkalinity (pH)

We determined salival pH using colorimetric paper strips and compared the colour of the test strips (OF®) with the standards (Ramírez-Torres et al., 2022).

Saliva sample processing

A pool was formed from the saliva obtained from each individual on days 6 to 8 by offering them each of the different concentrations of the secondary metabolites and denatonium benzoate. We processed the samples following the method used by Espinosa-Gómez et al., (2018). We performed the saliva analysis at the Veterinary School of the Universidad Popular Autónoma del Estado de Puebla (UPAEP, University).

Determination of the total protein concentration (TP)

The Bradford method was using a spectrophotometer measuring the absorbance of total proteins at 595 nm (Bradford, 1976).

Determination of the presence of proline-rich proteins (PRPs)

We determined the presence of PRP by identifying protein bands in one-dimensional SDS-PAGE gel electrophoresis (Beeley et al., 1996), with modifications by Espinosa-Gómez et al., (2018). Once the proteins were fixed on the gels, they were stained in a Coomassie-R250 bath for four hours and washed out with 10% acetic acid baths. We used 3 µl of the molecular weight marker Flash Protein Ladder (Gel Company), which was loaded into the first lane.

Densitometric analysis of protein bands identified as proline-rich proteins (PRP) on 1D-SDS-PAGE gels.

The electrophoresis gels were scanned at 1,200 dpi quality by HP Digital Sender Flow 8500 fn2 scanner to calculated the percentage of PRPs (% PRPs). Densitometry analysis of the gel images was performed using IMAGEJ software (Tiago & Wayne, 2012) following the method reported by Ramirez-Torres et al., (2022).

Statistical analysis

A factorial analysis was performed to determine if there were significant differences in each of the salivary physicochemical characteristics recorded for the different concentrations of the substances. Post hoc Tukey tests were performed using the R program version 4.1.1 to determine where these differences were found.

Results

Secondary metabolite analysis

The presence of tannic acid, caffeine, and rutin was identified in the plant species reported as part of the diet of spider monkeys, except caffeine in *Ficus americana*. Variations in the concentration of these secondary metabolites were found depending on the plant part and its maturity stage (Table 1). The highest concentration of tannic acid (252.43 µg/g) was recorded in the young leaves of *F. insipida*, ripe fruit of *P. armata* had the highest concentration of caffeine (5.26 µg/g), and mature leaves of *F. americana* presented the highest concentration of rutin (247.24 µg/g).

Table 1. Approximately here.

Salivary pH

Factor analysis indicated that there were statistically significant differences in the salivary pH of spider monkeys by compound ($F = 21.72$, $p < 0.05$), by concentration ($F = 57.38$, $p < 0.05$) and in the interaction of concentration and compounds ($F = 18.05$, $p < 0.05$). Tukey's test identified the differences in salivary pH when the spider monkeys consumed the different concentrations of the secondary metabolites solutions (Table 2). There was a significant increase in salivary pH

with increasing concentrations of tannic acid and caffeine. We did not find significant differences in salivary pH with increasing the concentration of rutin and denatonium benzoate. The most alkaline salivary pH was 8.1 ± 0.25 , recorded when the monkeys consumed the 1 mM concentration of tannic acid.

Table 2. Approximately here.

Total protein concentration

Factor analysis indicated significant differences in salivary TP of spider monkeys by compound ($F = 6.35$, $p < 0.05$). No significant differences were found by concentration nor by the interaction of the compounds and their concentration. Tukey's test identified significant differences between the TP concentration when monkeys consumed the 0.3 mM caffeine solution, and the control solution offered during the rutin administration period. There were significant differences in TP expression between the 0.3 mM concentration of caffeine and the 0.1 and 0.3 mM rutin concentrations.

Percentage of protein-rich proline

Factor analysis indicated statistically significant differences in the percentage of PRPs by compound ($F = 71.24$, $p < 0.05$), by concentration ($F = 11.65$, $p < 0.05$), and in the interaction of concentration and compounds ($F = 6.43$, $p < 0.05$). Tukey's test identified the differences in the percentage of PRPs when offered the concentrations of the different solutions (Table 3). There was a significant increase in the percentage of PRPs with increasing concentrations of tannic acid. At the same time, there was no significant increase in the percentage of PRPs with increasing concentrations of caffeine and rutin and denatonium benzoate. The highest percentage

of PRPs recorded was 27.63 ± 4.64 , obtained when the monkeys consumed the 1 mM concentration of tannic acid.

Table 3. Approximately here.

Discussion

Our results demonstrated the presence of tannic acid, caffeine and rutin in the fruits (unripe and ripe) and leaves (young and mature) of the nine plant species which have been reported to represent a large proportion in the diet of black-handed spider monkeys in Los Tuxtlas region (González-Zamora et al., 2009). Thus, our results confirmed that spider monkeys are naturally exposed to these secondary metabolites in their diet. We found tannic acid, caffeine, and rutin in some plant parts (young leaf, mature leaf, unripe fruit, and ripe fruit) in all plant species considered here, except for caffeine in *F. americana*.

The rutin was found in the highest concentration in the plant parts, followed by tannic acid and caffeine. We found that the highest concentration of rutin was in mature leaves of *F. americana*, tannic acid in young leaves of *F. insipida*, and caffeine in ripe fruits of *P. armata*. Although there were variations in the concentrations of the three secondary metabolites between fruits and leaves, unlike what has been reported in the literature (Sun et al., 2010; Huang et al., 2012; Da Silva et al., 2014), ripe fruits did not always present lower secondary metabolites concentration. For example, in *S. radlkoferi*, *F. colubrinae*, *F. insipida*, *F. yoponensis*, and *P. armata* tannic acid had higher concentration in ripe fruits compared to unripe fruits, and in most plant species higher concentration of caffeine was found in fruits compared to leaves, except for *F. americana* where no caffeine was found. Research has shown that plant stress can be caused by herbivory

261 and various environmental factors, such as light incidence (Akula & Ravishankar, 2011;
262 Kariñho-Betancourt, 2018; Yang et al., 2018).

263 To our knowledge, this is one of the first studies that delve into the identification of particular
264 secondary metabolites in species that are part of the diet of spider monkeys and even in non-
265 human primates since most studies only focus on determining the presence and concentration of
266 groups of substances such as tannins and alkaloids (Rogers et al., 1990; Hamilton & Galdikas,
267 1994; Wakibara et al., 2001; Chapman & Chapman, 2002; Norscia et al., 2012; Ta et al., 2017;
268 Thureau et al., 2021; Li et al., 2022). However, tannic acid and caffeine have repeatedly been used
269 to determine the behavioral and physiological response to bitter or astringent substances in
270 western gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla gorilla*), pigtailed macaques (*Macaca nemestrina*),
271 squirrel monkeys (*Saimiri sciureus*) and spider monkeys (*A. geoffroyi*) (Critchley & Rolls, 1996;
272 Remis & Kerr, 2002; Laska et al., 2009; Ramírez-Torres et al., 2022). However, this is the first
273 report of rutin in plants consumed by non-human primates. Rutin, a flavonoid that has been
274 studied in functional foods, provides an astringent/sour sensation (Kim et al., 2023) and, like
275 other flavonoids, has been shown to have effects as a glycemic level controller, anti-
276 inflammatory, antioxidant and neuroprotective agent (Crozier et al., 2009; Hosseinzadeh &
277 Nassiri-Asl, 2014; Ghorbani et al., 2017; El-Beltagi et al., 2019) and its consumption in primates
278 could have a potentially beneficial effect, as has been described in female primates that consume
279 them to solve stressful situations such as the postpartum period (Colombage et al., 2024).

280 The salivary pH value of spider monkeys, when offered the control solution (30 mM sucrose) at
281 the beginning of each experimental period, shown that saliva maintains a neutral pH. However,
282 an increase in salivary pH (which became more alkaline) was generally recorded as the
283 concentration of the three secondary metabolites consumed by the spider monkeys increased,

with the highest value obtained when the animals consumed the highest concentration of tannic acid (1 mM).

Changes in salivary pH in spider monkeys when consuming different secondary metabolites act as a defense mechanism to avoid acid-associated damage from food (Lavy et al., 2012; Ramírez-Torres et al., 2022). The differential response in the salivary pH levels to the tested compounds could be due to the fact that they present different degrees of acidity (tannic acid - pH 3.5, caffeine - pH 4.4 to 5.5, rutin - pH 6.5 to 7 and denatonium benzoate - pH 6.8 to 7.8), whereby the body releases only the necessary amount of salivary alkalinity-promoting buffers such as bicarbonate ions, thus avoiding damage to the oral cavity associated with the organic acids in the food (Foley et al., 1995; Pedersen & Belstrøm, 2019). Changes in pH levels could be related to their food selection, as spider monkeys accept acidic tastes as may occur in other primate species such as squirrel monkeys (*Saimiri sciureus*) and rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*) (Pritchard et al., 1995; Laska, 1996; 1999; Laska et al., 2000). It has been proposed that this ability allows them the detection of acids and essential amino acids in fruits and thus to assess their nutritional value (Larsson et al., 2014). In addition, these changes could contribute to the ability of spider monkeys to consume unripe fruits when ripe fruits are unavailable (Pablo-Rodríguez et al., 2015; Batista-Silva et al., 2018).

On the other hand, we found statistically significant differences in TP concentration between caffeine and rutin. However, although there was an increase in TP with increasing concentrations of tannic acid consumed by the monkeys, this was not as significant as with the caffeine and rutin solutions. We did not find a significant increase in TP when the monkeys consumed different concentrations of denatonium benzoate.

Diet type and taste sensations can influence salivary protein expression (Dawes & Shaw, 1965; Neyraud et al., 2006; Quintana et al., 2009; Morzel et al., 2012; Torregrossa et al., 2014). Furthermore, in some primates, it has been shown that in addition to secondary metabolites, fiber also influences TP expression and concentration (Neyraud et al., 2006; Quintana et al., 2009; Canon et al., 2010; Ramirez-Torres et al., 2022). Although we did not estimate the amount of fiber in the plant parts, our study demonstrates that the content of secondary metabolites present confers a bitter taste, which is not sufficient to cause significant changes in the concentration of salivary TP in spider monkeys, which could be because the type of proteins related to this taste does not represent a high percentage of salivary TP. Spider monkeys feed on a predominantly frugivorous diet (with a high proportion of ripe fruits) and therefore may not need to express significant changes in TP concentration as could be the case in folivorous or granivorous species, when exposed to higher amounts of fiber and secondary metabolites (Klein & Klein, 1977; Milton, 1978; Dias & Rangel-Negrín, 2015; Masi et al., 2015).

Statistically significant differences were found in the percentage of PRPs by compound, concentration, and interaction of concentration with compounds. The percentage of PRPs in the saliva of spider monkeys when offered the control solution ranged from 10.04 ± 2.21 % to 12.32 ± 1.61 %. There was a significant increase in PRPs when the monkeys consumed tannic acid from its lowest concentration (0.1 mM), with the salivary expression of PRPs increasing at higher concentrations of this solution (1 mM), reaching 27.63 ± 4.64 %. However, no statistically significant changes were recorded in the PRPs for caffeine and rutin, and they remained at 14.1 ± 2.57 % and 13.53 ± 4.59 %, respectively, when offering the 1 mM concentrations. Similarly, no significant differences were recorded in the PRPs percentage with

the different concentrations of denatonium benzoate, which remained in a range of 11.03 ± 1.62 % when offering the highest concentration (0.01 mM).

Our results agree with the literature that PRPs act as a defense mechanism against the consumption of tannins (Shimada, 2006; Mau et al., 2011; Espinosa-Gómez et al., 2015; 2018; 2020; Morzel et al., 2022; Windley et al., 2022). However, the production of this type of protein does not increase with the consumption of other secondary metabolites, such as alkaloids and flavonoids. The salivary response of the monkeys may be linked to the diverse taste receptors that detect bitter flavors which are sensitive to various molecules responsible for this taste quality (Matsunami et al., 2000; DuBois et al., 2008; Kuhn et al., 2010). The differences in the chemical structures of tannins, alkaloids, and flavonoids lead to their perception by specific receptors, resulting in varied responses in protein production. Additionally, tannins can create astringency, which has been shown to stimulate the production of PRPs (Kauffman & Keller, 1979; Wróblewski et al., 2001). This may explain why an increase in PRPs levels was observed only when the monkeys consumed tannic acid, but not with caffeine or rutin. Accordingly, we propose that the expression of salivary PRPs may be a specific mechanism for tannins. This does not rule out the existence of other defense responses against other secondary metabolites that prevent the damage associated with them, for example, histatin-rich proteins which are effective in capturing secondary metabolites (Naurato et al., 1999; Shimada, 2006) and the intestinal microbiota which produces a wide variety of enzymes with the ability to form a protective biofilm and detoxify potentially toxic compounds such as secondary metabolites (McKey et al., 1981; Zhang et al., 2020; Xia et al., 2023). Furthermore, it is essential to highlight that no significant changes were found in the percentage of PRPs when presenting the spider monkeys with denatonium benzoate which is a synthetic bitter-tasting substance. Accordingly, we

conclude that the expression of this type of protein does not occur in response to the perception of bitter taste as such (Frutos et al., 2004; War et al., 2012; Stevenson et al., 2017). Thus, spider monkeys, despite perceiving bitter taste as something negative, possess physiological mechanisms that allow them to react differentially and specifically to the wide variety of compounds that cause an avoidance response (Fig. 2). In this context, it is important to consider that the vegetative parts consumed by spider monkey do not have the same concentration of secondary metabolites. This physiological discrimination associated with the type of secondary metabolites is an essential mechanism for these primates that allows them to be selective in obtaining quick energy, but with the ability to include a wide variety of food species and plant parts, and to respond physiologically to compounds that do not represent the same adverse effects on their health, and whose consumption could even benefit them (Schaffner et al., 2012; War et al., 2012; Pablo-Rodríguez et al., 2015; Kariñho-Betancourt, 2018; Yang et al., 2018; Hartwell et al., 2021).

Figure 2. Approximately here.

Conclusion

This study demonstrates the presence of different secondary metabolites in plants consumed by spider monkeys and provides the first evidence of the flavonoid rutin in the diet of primates. The results support the hypothesis that spider monkeys have specific salivary mechanisms for some secondary metabolites, such as tannins, while for other compounds, such as caffeine or rutin, salivary protein expression is not affected. Data obtained with denatonium benzoate showed no significant trigger for bitter taste in protein expression or changes in salivary acidity.

Acknowledgements

Gildardo Castañeda and Alejandro Coyohua for their help during field work and Dr. Eduardo Reynoso and Dr. Serio Silva for the comments. Many thanks to all the monkeys that participated in our experiments.

References

Akula, R., & Ravishankar, G. A. (2011). Influence of abiotic stress signals on secondary metabolites in plants. *Plant Signaling & Behavior*, 6(11), 1720-1731. DOI:10.4161/psb.6.11.17613.

Arcas, M. C., Botía, J. M., Ortuño, A. M., & Del Río, J. A. (2000). UV irradiation alters the levels of flavonoids involved in the defence mechanism of *Citrus aurantium* fruits against *Penicillium digitatum*. *European Journal of Plant Pathology*, 106, 617-622. DOI: 10.1023/a:1008704102446

Barbehenn, R. V., & Constabel, C. P. (2011). Tannins in plant–herbivore interactions. *Phytochemistry*, 72(13), 1551-1565. DOI:10.1016/j.phytochem.2011.01.040

Bashir, H. A., & Abu-Goukh, A. B. A. (2003). Compositional changes during guava fruit ripening. *Food Chemistry*, 80(4), 557-563. DOI: 10.1016/S0308-8146(02)00345-X

Batista-Silva, W., Nascimento, V. L., Medeiros, D. B., Nunes-Nesi, A., Ribeiro, D. M., Zsögön, A., & Araújo, W. L. (2018). Modifications in organic acid profiles during fruit development and ripening: correlation or causation?. *Frontiers in Plant Science*, 9, 416868. DOI:10.3389/fpls.2018.01689

392 Beaune, D., Hohmann, G., Serckx, A., Sakamaki, T., Narat, V., & Fruth, B. (2017). How bonobo
 393 communities deal with tannin rich fruits: Re-ingestion and other feeding processes. *Behavioural*
 394 *Processes*, 142, 131-137. DOI:10.1016/j.beproc.2017.06.007

395 Beeley, J. A., Newman, F., Wilson, P. H., & Shimmin, I. C. (1996). Sodium dodecyl
 396 sulphate-polyacrylamide gel electrophoresis of human parotid salivary proteins: Comparison of
 397 dansylation, Coomassie Blue R-250 and silver detection methods. *Electrophoresis*, 17(3), 505-
 398 506. DOI:10.1002/elps.1150170314

399 Bourgaud, F., Gravot, A., Milesi, S., & Gontier, E. (2001). Production of plant secondary
 400 metabolites: a historical perspective. *Plant Science*, 161(5), 839-851. DOI: 10.1016/S0168-
 401 9452(01)00490-3

402 Canon, F., Giuliani, A., Paté, F., & Sarni-Manchado, P. (2010). Ability of a salivary intrinsically
 403 unstructured protein to bind different tannin targets revealed by mass spectrometry. *Analytical*
 404 *and Bioanalytical Chemistry*, 398, 815-822. DOI:10.1007/s00216-010-3997-9

405 Carrai, V., Borgognini-Tarli, S. M., Huffman, M. A., & Bardi, M. (2003). Increase in tannin
 406 consumption by sifaka (*Propithecus verreauxi verreauxi*) females during the birth season: a case
 407 for self-medication in prosimians?. *Primates*, 44, 61-66. DOI:10.1007/s10329-002-0008-6

408 Chapman, C. A., & Chapman, L. J. (2002). Foraging challenges of red colobus monkeys:
 409 influence of nutrients and secondary compounds. *Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology*
 410 *Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology*, 133(3), 861-875. DOI: 10.1016/S1095-
 411 6433(02)00209-X

- 412 Colombage, R. L., Holden, S., Lamport, D. J., & Barfoot, K. L. (2024). The effects of flavonoid
413 supplementation on the mental health of postpartum parents. *Frontiers in Global Women's*
414 *Health*, 5, 1345353. DOI:10.3389/fgwh.2024.1345353
- 415 Critchley, H. D., & Rolls, E. T. (1996). Responses of primate taste cortex neurons to the
416 astringent tastant tannic acid. *Chemical Senses*, 21(2), 135-145. DOI:10.1093/chemse/21.2.135
- 417 Crozier, A., Jaganath, I. B., & Clifford, M. N. (2009). Dietary phenolics: chemistry,
418 bioavailability and effects on health. *Natural product Reports*, 26(8), 1001-1043.
419 DOI:10.1039/B802662A.
- 420 Da Silva, L. M. R., De Figueiredo, E. A. T., Ricardo, N. M. P. S., Vieira, I. G. P., De Figueiredo,
421 R. W., Brasil, I. M., & Gomes, C. L. (2014). Quantification of bioactive compounds in pulps and
422 by-products of tropical fruits from Brazil. *Food Chemistry*, 143, 398-404.
423 DOI:10.1016/j.foodchem.2013.08.001
- 424 Dawes, C., & Shaw, J. H. (1965). The effects of changes in the proportion and type of dietary
425 carbohydrate on the amylase and protein concentrations in rat saliva. *Archives of Oral*
426 *Biology*, 10(2), 261-267. DOI:10.1016/0003-9969(65)90028-2
- 427 Del Bubba, M., Giordani, E., Pippucci, L., Cincinelli, A., Checchini, L., & Galvan, P. (2009).
428 Changes in tannins, ascorbic acid and sugar content in astringent persimmons during on-tree
429 growth and ripening and in response to different postharvest treatments. *Journal of Food*
430 *Composition and Analysis*, 22(7-8), 668-677. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfca.2009.02.015
- 431 Dias PAD, Rangel-Negrín A. 2015. Diets of howler monkeys. In: Kowalewski MM, Garber PA,
432 Cortés-Ortiz L, Urbani B, Youlatos D, eds. *Howler Monkeys*. New York: Springer, 21–56.

433 Dixon, R. A., Xie, D. Y., & Sharma, S. B. (2005). Proanthocyanidins—a final frontier in
 434 flavonoid research?. *New Phytologist*, 165(1), 9-28. DOI: 10.1111/j.1469-8137.2004.01217.x

435 DuBois, G. E., DeSimone, J. A., & Lyall, V. (2008). Chemistry of gustatory stimuli. In *The*
 436 *Senses: A Comprehensive Reference*, Vol 4, Olfaction & Taste, Basbaum, A. I., Keneko, A.,
 437 Shepherd, G. M., and Westheimer, G. (Eds). San Diego: Academic Press pp. 27–74.

438 El-Beltagi, H. S., Mohamed, H. I., Abdelazeem, A. S., Youssef, R., & Safwat, G. (2019). GC-
 439 MS analysis, antioxidant, antimicrobial and anticancer activities of extracts from *Ficus*
 440 *sycomorus* fruits and leaves. *Notulae Botanicae Horti Agrobotanici Cluj-Napoca*, 47 (2), 493-
 441 505. DOI:10.15835/nbha47211405

442 Espinosa Gómez, F., Santiago García, J., Gómez Rosales, S., Wallis, I. R., Chapman, C. A.,
 443 Morales Mávil, J., ... & Hernández Salazar, L. (2015). Howler monkeys (*Alouatta palliata*
 444 *mexicana*) produce tannin-binding salivary proteins. *International Journal of Primatology*, 36,
 445 1086-1100. DOI:10.1007/s10764-015-9879-4

446 Espinosa-Gómez, F. C., Serio-Silva, J. C., Santiago-García, J. D., Sandoval-Castro, C. A.,
 447 Hernández-Salazar, L. T., Mejía-Varas, F., ... & Chapman, C. A. (2018). Salivary tannin-binding
 448 proteins are a pervasive strategy used by the folivorous/frugivorous black howler
 449 monkey. *American Journal of Primatology*, 80(2), e22737. DOI:10.1002/ajp.22737

450 Espinosa-Gómez, F. C., Ruíz-May, E., Serio-Silva, J. C., & Chapman, C. A. (2020). Salivary
 451 proteome of a neotropical primate: potential roles in host defense and oral food
 452 perception. *PeerJ*, 8, e9489. DOI:10.7717/peerj.9489

- 453 Fashing, P. J., Dierenfeld, E. S., & Mowry, C. B. (2007). Influence of plant and soil chemistry on
454 food selection, ranging patterns, and biomass of *Colobus guereza* in Kakamega Forest,
455 Kenya. *International Journal of Primatology*, 28, 673-703. DOI:10.1007/s10764-006-9096-2
- 456 Felton, A. M., Felton, A., Lindenmayer, D. B., & Foley, W. J. (2009). Nutritional goals of wild
457 primates. *Functional Ecology*, 70-78. DOI:10.1111/j.1365-2435.2008.01526.x.
- 458 Foley, W. J., McLEAN, S. T. U. A. R. T., & Cork, S. J. (1995). Consequences of
459 biotransformation of plant secondary metabolites on acid-base metabolism in mammals—a final
460 common pathway?. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 21, 721-743. DOI:10.1007/BF02033457
- 461 Frutos, P., Hervás, G., Giráldez, F. J., & Mantecón, A. R. (2004). Tannins and ruminant
462 nutrition. *Spanish Journal of Agricultural Research*, 2(2), 191-202. DOI:10.5424/sjar/2004022-
463 73
- 464 Ghorbani, A. (2017). Mechanisms of antidiabetic effects of flavonoid rutin. *Biomedicine &*
465 *Pharmacotherapy*, 96, 305-312. DOI:10.1016/j.biopha.2017.10.001
- 466 Glander, K. E. (1978). Drinking from arboreal water sources by mantled howling monkeys
467 (*Alouatta palliata* Gray). *Folia Primatologica*, 29(3), 206-217. DOI:10.1159/000155840
- 468 González-Zamora, A., Arroyo-Rodríguez, V., Chaves, Ó. M., Sánchez-López, S., Stoner, K. E.,
469 & Riba-Hernández, P. (2009). Diet of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*) in Mesoamerica: current
470 knowledge and future directions. *American Journal of Primatology*: 71(1), 8-20.
471 Doi:10.1002/ajp.20625
- 472 Hamilton, R. A., & Galdikas, B. M. (1994). A preliminary study of food selection by the
473 orangutan in relation to plant quality. *Primates*, 35, 255-263. DOI: 10.1007/BF02382723

474 Hartwell, K. S., Notman, H., Kalbitzer, U., Chapman, C. A., & Pavelka, M. M. (2021). Fruit
475 availability has a complex relationship with fission–fusion dynamics in spider
476 monkeys. *Primates*, 62, 165-175. DOI: 10.1007/s10329-020-00862-x

477 Huang, X., Li, W., & Yang, X. W. (2012). New cytotoxic quinolone alkaloids from fruits of
478 *Evodia rutaecarpa*. *Fitoterapia*, 83(4), 709-714. DOI:10.1016/j.fitote.2012.02.009

479 Kar-Gupta, K., & Kumar, A. (1994). Leaf chemistry and food selection by common langurs
480 (*Presbytis entellus*) in Rajaji National Park, Uttar Pradesh, India. *International Journal of*
481 *Primatology*, 15, 75-93. DOI: 10.1007/BF02735235

482 Kariñho-Betancourt, E. (2018). Plant-herbivore interactions and secondary metabolites of plants:
483 Ecological and evolutionary perspectives. *Botanical Sciences*, 96(1), 35-51.
484 DOI:10.17129/botsci.1860.

485 Kauffman, D. L., & Keller, P. J. (1979). The basic proline-rich proteins in human parotid saliva
486 from a single subject. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 24(4), 249-256. DOI:10.1016/0003-
487 9969(79)90085-2

488 Kim, J., Kim, R. H., & Hwang, K. T. (2023). Flavonoids in different parts of common
489 buckwheat (*Fagopyrum esculentum*) and Tartary buckwheat (*F. tataricum*) during
490 growth. *Journal of Food Composition and Analysis*, 120, 105362.
491 DOI:10.1016/j.jfca.2023.105362

492 Klein LL, Klein DJ. 1977. Feeding behavior of the Colombian spider monkey, *Ateles belzebuth*.
493 In: Clutton-Brock TH., ed. *Primate Ecology: Studies of Feeding and Ranging Behaviour in*
494 *Lemurs, Monkeys, and Apes*. London: Academic Press, 153–181.

495 Kuhn, C., Bufe, B., Batram, C., & Meyerhof, W. (2010). Oligomerization of TAS2R bitter taste
496 receptors. *Chemical senses*, 35(5), 395-406. DOI:10.1093/chemse/bjq027

497 Lambert, J. E., & Rothman, J. M. (2015). Fallback foods, optimal diets, and nutritional targets:
498 primate responses to varying food availability and quality. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 44,
499 493-512. DOI:10.1146/annurev-anthro-102313-025928.

500 Larsson, J., Maitz, A., Salazar, L. T. H., & Laska, M. (2014). Gustatory responsiveness to the 20
501 proteinogenic amino acids in the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Physiology & Behavior*, 127,
502 20-26. DOI:10.1016/j.physbeh.2014.01.003

503 Laska, M. (1996). Taste preference thresholds for food-associated sugars in the squirrel monkey
504 (*Saimiri sciureus*). *Primates*, 37, 91-95. DOI:10.1007/BF02382925

505 Laska, M., Carrera Sanchez, E., & Rodriguez Luna, E. (1996). Gustatory thresholds for
506 food-associated sugars in the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *American Journal of Primatology*,
507 39: 189–193. DOI:10.1002/(SICI)1098-2345(1996)39:3<189::AID-AJP4>3.0.CO;2-V

508 Laska, M. (1999). Taste responsiveness to food-associated acids in the squirrel monkey (*Saimiri*
509 *sciureus*). *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 25, 1623-1632. DOI:10.1023/A:1020845001504

510 Laska, M., Hernandez Salazar, L. T., Luna, E. R., & Hudson, R. (2000). Gustatory
511 responsiveness to food-associated acids in the spider monkey (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Primates*, 41,
512 213-221. DOI:10.1007/BF02557803

513 Laska, M., Rivas Bautista, R. M., & Hernandez Salazar, L. T. (2009). Gustatory responsiveness
514 to six bitter tastants in three species of nonhuman primates. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 35,
515 560-571. DOI:10.1007/s10886-009-9630-8

516 Lavy, E., Goldberger, D., Friedman, M., & Steinberg, D. (2012). pH values and mineral content
517 of saliva in different breeds of dogs. *Israel Journal of Veterinary Medicine*, 67(4), 244-248.

518 Leighton, M. (1993). Modeling dietary selectivity by Bornean orangutans: evidence for
519 integration of multiple criteria in fruit selection. *International Journal of Primatology*, 14, 257-
520 313. DOI:10.1007/BF02192635

521 Li, B., Li, W., Liu, C., Yang, P., & Li, J. (2022). Diverse diets and low-fiber, low-tannin
522 foraging preferences: Foraging criteria of Tibetan macaques (*Macaca thibetana*) at low altitude
523 in Huangshan. *Ecology and Evolution*, 12(10), e9338. DOI:10.1002/ece3.9338

524 Matsunami, H., Montmayeur, J. P., & Buck, L. B. (2000). A family of candidate taste receptors
525 in human and mouse. *Nature*, 404(6778), 601-604. DOI:10.1038/35007072

526 Mattes, R. D. (2011). Accumulating evidence supports a taste component for free fatty acids in
527 humans. *Physiology & Behavior*, 104(4), 624-631. DOI:10.1016/j.physbeh.2011.05.002

528 Masi, S., Mundry, R., Ortmann, S., Cipolletta, C., Boitani, L., & Robbins, M. M. (2015). The
529 influence of seasonal frugivory on nutrient and energy intake in wild western gorillas. *PLoS*
530 *One*, 10(7), e0129254. DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0129254.

531 Mau, M., de Almeida, A. M., Coelho, A. V., & Südekum, K. H. (2011). First identification of
532 tannin-binding proteins in saliva of *Papio hamadryas* using MS/MS mass
533 spectrometry. *American Journal of Primatology*, 73(9), 896-902. DOI:10.1002/ajp.20958

534 McKEY, D. B., Gartlan, J. S., Waterman, P. G., & Choo, G. M. (1981). Food selection by black
535 colobus monkeys (*Colobus satanas*) in relation to plant chemistry. *Biological Journal of the*
536 *Linnean Society*, 16(2), 115-146. DOI:10.1111/j.1095-8312.1981.tb01646.x

Milton K. 1978. Behavioral adaptations to leaf-eating in the mantled howler monkey (*Alouatta palliata*). In: Montgomery GG, ed. *The Ecology of Arboreal Folivores*. Washington, D.C: Smithsonian Press, 535–550.

Morzel, M., Jeannin, A., Lucchi, G., Truntzer, C., Pecqueur, D., Nicklaus, S., ... & Ducoroy, P. (2012). Human infant saliva peptidome is modified with age and diet transition. *Journal of proteomics*, 75(12), 3665-3673. DOI:10.1016/j.jprot.2012.04.028.

Morzel, M., Canon, F., & Guyot, S. (2022). Interactions between salivary proteins and dietary polyphenols: potential consequences on gastrointestinal digestive events. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 70(21), 6317-6327. DOI: 10.1021/acs.jafc.2c01183

Naurato, N., Wong, P., Lu, Y., Wroblewski, K., & Bennick, A. (1999). Interaction of tannin with human salivary histatins. *Journal of Agricultural and Food Chemistry*, 47(6), 2229-2234. DOI:10.1021/jf981044i

Nelson, S. L., Miller, M. A., Heske, E. J., & Fahey Jr, G. C. (2000). Nutritional quality of leaves and unripe fruit consumed as famine foods by the flying foxes of Samoa. *Pacific Science*, 54 (4), 301-311.

Neyraud, E., Sayd, T., Morzel, M., & Dransfield, E. (2006). Proteomic analysis of human whole and parotid salivas following stimulation by different tastes. *Journal of Proteome Research*, 5(9), 2474-2480. DOI:10.1021/pr060189z

Norscia, I., Carrai, V., & Borgognini-Tarli, S. M. (2006). Influence of dry season and food quality and quantity on behavior and feeding strategy of *Propithecus verreauxi* in Kirindy, Madagascar. *International Journal of Primatology*, 27, 1001-1022. DOI:10.1007/s10764-006-9056-x

- 559 Norscia, I., Ramanamanjato, J. B., & Ganzhorn, J. U. (2012). Feeding patterns and dietary
560 profile of nocturnal southern woolly lemurs (*Avahi meridionalis*) in southeast
561 Madagascar. *International Journal of Primatology*, 33, 150-167. DOI:10.1007/s10764-011-
562 9562-3
- 563 Oates, J. F., Waterman, P. G., & Choo, G. M. (1980). Food selection by the south Indian leaf-
564 monkey, *Presbytis johnii*, in relation to leaf chemistry. *Oecologia*, 45, 45-56.
565 DOI:10.1007/BF00346706
- 566 Oppenheim, F. G., Kousvelari, E., & Troxler, R. F. (1979). Immunological cross-reactivity and
567 sequence homology between salivary proline-rich proteins in human and macaque monkey
568 (*Macaca fascicularis*) parotid saliva. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 24(8), 595-599.
569 DOI:10.1016/0003-9969(79)90019-0
- 570 Pablo-Rodríguez, M., Hernández-Salazar, L. T., Aureli, F., & Schaffner, C. M. (2015). The role
571 of sucrose and sensory systems in fruit selection and consumption of *Ateles geoffroyi* in Yucatan,
572 Mexico. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, 31(3), 213-219. DOI:10.1017/S0266467415000085
- 573 Padovan, L., Segat, L., Pontillo, A., Antcheva, N., Tossi, A., & Crovella, S. (2010). Histatins in
574 non-human primates: Gene variations and functional effects. *Protein and Peptide Letters*, 17(7),
575 909-918. DOI:10.1177/00220345900690110301
- 576 Paduch, R., Kandefer-Szerszeń, M., Trytek, M., & Fiedurek, J. (2007). Terpenes: substances
577 useful in human healthcare. *Archivum Immunologiae et Therapiae Experimentalis*, 55, 315-327.
578 DOI:10.1007/s00005-007-0039-1
- 579 Pedersen, A. M. L., & Belstrøm, D. (2019). The role of natural salivary defences in maintaining
580 a healthy oral microbiota. *Journal of Dentistry*, 80, S3-S12. DOI:10.1016/j.jdent.2018.08.010

581 Pritchard, T. C., Bowen, J. A., Reilly, S. (1995). Taste thresholds in non-human primates.
582 *Chemical Senses*, 20: 760.

583 Quintana, M., Palicki, O., Lucchi, G., Ducoroy, P., Chambon, C., Salles, C., & Morzel, M.
584 (2009). Short-term modification of human salivary proteome induced by two bitter tastants, urea
585 and quinine. *Chemosensory Perception*, 2(3), 133-142. DOI:10.1007/s12078-009-9048-2.

586 Ramírez-Torres, C. E., Espinosa-Gómez, F. C., Morales-Mávil, J. E., Reynoso-Cruz, J. E.,
587 Laska, M., & Hernández-Salazar, L. T. (2022). Influence of tannic acid concentration on the
588 physicochemical characteristics of saliva of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *PeerJ*, 10,
589 e14402. DOI:10.7717/peerj.14402

590 Remis, M. J., & Kerr, M. E. (2002). Taste responses to fructose and tannic acid among gorillas
591 (*Gorilla gorilla gorilla*). *International Journal of Primatology*, 23, 251-261.
592 DOI:10.1023/A:1013827310497

593 Rothman, J. M., Dusinger, K., & Pell, A. N. (2009). Condensed tannins in the diets of
594 primates: a matter of methods?. *American Journal of Primatology: Official Journal of the*
595 *American Society of Primatologists*, 71(1), 70-76. DOI:10.1002/ajp.20623

596 Rogers, M. E., Maisels, F., Williamson, E. A., Fernandez, M., & Tutin, C. E. (1990). Gorilla diet
597 in the Lope Reserve, Gabon: a nutritional analysis. *Oecologia*, 326-339.
598 DOI:10.1007/BF00329756

599 Schaffner, C. M., Rebecchini, L., Ramos-Fernandez, G., Vick, L. G., & Aureli, F. (2012). Spider
600 monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi yucatanensis*) cope with the negative consequences of hurricanes
601 through changes in diet, activity budget, and fission–fusion dynamics. *International Journal of*
602 *Primatology*, 33, 922-936. DOI:10.1007/s10764-012-9621-4

Schlesinger, D. H., Hay, D. I., & Levine, M. J. (1989). Complete primary structure of statherin, a potent inhibitor of calcium phosphate precipitation, from the saliva of the monkey, *Macaca arctoides*. *International Journal of Peptide and Protein Research*, 34(5), 374-380. DOI:10.1111/j.1399-3011.1989.tb00705.x

Shimada, T. (2006). Salivary proteins as a defense against dietary tannins. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 32, 1149-1163. DOI:10.1007/s10886-006-9077-0

Stevenson, P. C., Nicolson, S. W., & Wright, G. A. (2017). Plant secondary metabolites in nectar: impacts on pollinators and ecological functions. *Functional Ecology*, 31(1), 65-75. DOI:10.2174/092986610791306715

Sun, M., Gu, X., Fu, H., Zhang, L., Chen, R., Cui, L., ... & Tian, J. (2010). Change of secondary metabolites in leaves of *Ginkgo biloba* L. in response to UV-B induction. *Innovative Food Science & Emerging Technologies*, 11(4), 672-676. DOI:10.1016/j.ifset.2010.08.006

Ta, C. A. K., Pebsworth, P. A., Liu, R., Hillier, S., Gray, N., Arnason, J. T., & Young, S. L. (2018). Soil eaten by chacma baboons adsorbs polar plant secondary metabolites representative of those found in their diet. *Environmental Geochemistry and Health*, 40, 803-813. DOI:10.1007/s10653-017-0025-4

Takemoto, H. (2003). Phytochemical determination for leaf food choice by wild chimpanzees in Guinea, Bossou. *Journal of Chemical Ecology*, 29, 2551-2573. DOI:10.1023/a:1026366119705

Tiago F., Wayne, R. (2012). ImageJ user's guide. Bethesda: U. S. National Institutes of Health. Available at <https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/docs/guide/user-guide.pdf>.

623 Theis, N., & Lerdau, M. (2003). The evolution of function in plant secondary
 624 metabolites. *International Journal of Plant Sciences*, 164(S3), S93-S102. DOI:10.1086/374190

625 Thureau, E. G., Rahajanirina, A. N., & Irwin, M. T. (2021). Condensed tannins in the diet of
 626 folivorous diademed sifakas and the gap between crude and available protein. *American Journal*
 627 *of Primatology*, 83(3), e23239. DOI:10.1002/ajp.23239

628 Tiago F, Wayne R. 2012. ImageJ user's guide. Bethesda: U. S. National Institutes of Health.
 629 Available at [https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/docs/guide/user-](https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/docs/guide/user-guide.pdf)
 630 [guide.pdfhttps://imagej.nih.gov/ij/docs/guide/user-guide.pdf](https://imagej.nih.gov/ij/docs/guide/user-guide.pdf).

631 Torregrossa, A. M., Nikonova, L., Bales, M. B., Villalobos Leal, M., Smith, J. C., Contreras, R.
 632 J., & Eckel, L. A. (2014). Induction of salivary proteins modifies measures of both orosensory
 633 and postingestive feedback during exposure to a tannic acid diet. *PloS one*, 9(8), e105232.
 634 DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0105232

635 Treutter, D. (2006). Significance of flavonoids in plant resistance: a review. *Environmental*
 636 *Chemistry Letters*, 4(3), 147-157. DOI: 10.1007/s10311-006-0068-8

637 Villalba, J. J., Costes-Thiré, M., & Ginane, C. (2017). Phytochemicals in animal health: diet
 638 selection and trade-offs between costs and benefits. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society*, 76(2),
 639 113-121. DOI: 10.1017/S0029665116000719

640 Wakibara, J. V., Huffman, M. A., Wink, M., Reich, S., Aufreiter, S., Hancock, R. G. V., ... &
 641 Russel, S. (2001). The adaptive significance of geophagy for Japanese macaques (*Macaca*
 642 *fuscata*) at Arashiyama, Japan. *International Journal of Primatology*, 22, 495-520.
 643 DOI:10.1023/A:1010763930475

644 War, A. R., Paulraj, M. G., Ahmad, T., Buhroo, A. A., Hussain, B., Ignacimuthu, S., & Sharma,
645 H. C. (2012). Mechanisms of plant defense against insect herbivores. *Plant Signaling &*
646 *Behavior*, 7(10), 1306-1320. DOI: 10.4161/psb.21663

647 Windley, H. R., Starrs, D., Stalenberg, E., Rothman, J. M., Ganzhorn, J. U., & Foley, W. J.
648 (2022). Plant secondary metabolites and primate food choices: A meta-analysis and future
649 directions. *American Journal of Primatology*, 84(8), e23397. DOI: 10.1002/ajp.23397

650 Wink, M. (2008). Plant secondary metabolism: diversity, function and its evolution. *Natural*
651 *Product Communications*, 3(8), 1934578X0800300801. DOI:10.1177/1934578X0800300801

652 Wróblewski, K., Muhandiram, R., Chakrabartty, A., & Bennick, A. (2001). The molecular
653 interaction of human salivary histatins with polyphenolic compounds. *European Journal of*
654 *Biochemistry*, 268(16), 4384-4397. DOI:10.1046/j.1432-1327.2001.02350.x

655 Xia, X., Wang, Q., Gurr, G. M., Vasseur, L., Han, S., & You, M. (2023). Gut bacteria mediated
656 adaptation of diamondback moth, *Plutella xylostella*, to secondary metabolites of host
657 plants. *Msystems*, 8(6), e00826-23. DOI:10.1128/msystems.00826-23

658 Xu, T., Telser, E., Troxler, R. F., & Oppenheim, F. G. (1990). Primary structure and anticandidal
659 activity of the major histatin from parotid secretion of the subhuman primate, *Macaca*
660 *fascicularis*. *Journal of Dental Research*, 69(11), 1717-1723. 10.1111/1365-2435.12761

661 Yang, L., Wen, K. S., Ruan, X., Zhao, Y. X., Wei, F., & Wang, Q. (2018). Response of plant
662 secondary metabolites to environmental factors. *Molecules*, 23(4), 762. DOI:
663 10.3390/molecules23040762

664 Zhang, S., Shu, J., Xue, H., Zhang, W., Zhang, Y., Liu, Y., ... & Wang, H. (2020). The gut
665 microbiota in camellia weevils are influenced by plant secondary metabolites and contribute to
666 saponin degradation. *Msystems*, 5(2), 10-1128. DOI:10.1128/msystems.00692-19

667

668

669

Figure 1

Experimental design

Each substance was administered to all individuals for a period of 49 days. In each period, the monkeys were initially offered the control solution containing 30 mM of sucrose and then, in ascending order, the four concentrations of tannic acid, rutin, caffeine (0.1, 0.3, 0.6 and 1 mM) or denatonium benzoate (0.001, 0.003, 0.006 and 0.01 mM) mixed with 30 mM of sucrose. Each concentration was offered for eight days, and on days six, seven and eight of each period salivary pH was recorded, and saliva samples were taken. After finishing the administration of a substance in its different concentrations, a three-day rest period was given, during which the control solution was offered, so that the analysis would reflect the result of the concentration of each solution and not be an accumulated response. At the end of each period of administration of the substances, a two-week break was implemented, after which a new experimental period began.




Figure 2

Response of salivary physicochemical characteristics.

Variations in salivary pH, TP concentration and PRPs percentage of spider monkeys when consuming different (A). secondary metabolites (tannic acid, caffeine and rutin) and (B) denatonium benzoate.




Table 1(on next page)

Secondary metabolites in plants reported as consumed by spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*).

Concentration of tannic acid, caffeine and rutin in plant parts of the nine species reported as consumed by spider monkeys in Los Tuxtlas, Veracruz, Mexico.

1

Table 1. Secondary metabolites in plants reported as consumed by spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*)

Species	Plant part	Concentration (µg/g)		
		Tannic acid	Caffeine	Rutin
<i>Spondias mombin</i>	young leaves	-	-	-
	mature leaves	-	-	-
	Unripe fruits	-	0.16	-
	Ripe fruits	3.85	1.8	0.38
<i>Spondias radlkoferi</i>	young leaves	-	-	22.5
	mature leaves	2.28	-	1.1
	Unripe fruits	5.86	-	1.51
	Ripe fruits	16.72	0.65	5.15
<i>Ficus americana</i>	young leaves	-	-	0.14
	mature leaves	1.1	-	247.24
	Unripe fruits	-	-	4
	Ripe fruits	-	-	-
<i>Ficus colubrinae</i>	young leaves	2.27	-	21.21
	mature leaves	3.81	-	10.47
	Unripe fruits	0.58	0.05	0.23
	Ripe fruits	2.09	-	3.2
<i>Ficus insípida</i>	young leaves	252.43	-	1.94
	mature leaves	8.81	-	0.84
	Unripe fruits	-	-	-
	Ripe fruits	5.19	5.15	0.17
<i>Ficus rzedowskiana</i>	young leaves	6.71	0.44	27.96
	mature leaves	0.3	0.49	26.97
	Unripe fruits	3.19	0.74	1.92
	Ripe fruits	0.38	1.7	1.31
<i>Ficus yoponensis</i>	young leaves	-	-	18.14
	mature leaves	-	-	19.22
	Unripe fruits	8.27	3.46	10.37
	Ripe fruits	14.47	0.41	0.95
<i>Brosimum alicastrum</i>	young leaves	-	-	-
	mature leaves	16.01	-	-
	Unripe fruits	13.28	0.63	18.22
	Ripe fruits	12.08	1.82	19.29
<i>Poulsenia armata</i>	young leaves	0.8	0.41	0.38
	mature leaves	3.54	0.79	-
	Unripe fruits	-	-	-
	Ripe fruits	4.15	5.26	1.72

Table 2 (on next page)

Comparison of salivary pH of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*).

Comparisons of salivary pH values of spider monkeys when offered different concentrations of secondary metabolites and denatonium benzoate. We put < when the pH of the X axis was significantly lower than that of the Y axis, while > when it was higher.

1

2

Table 2. Comparison of salivary pH of spider monkeys (<i>Ateles geoffroyi</i>)											
Substance		Tanic acid					Caffeine				
	Concentration [mM]	0	0.1	0.3	0.6	1	0	0.1	0.3	0.6	1
Tanic acid	0			<	<	<			<	<	<
	0.1				<	<				<	
	0.3	>				<	>	>			
	0.6	>	>			<	>	>			
	1	>	>	>	>		>	>	>	>	>
Caffeine	0			<	<	<			<	<	<
	0.1			<	<	<			<	<	<
	0.3	>				<	>	>			
	0.6	>	>			<	>	>			
	1	>				<	>	>			
Rutin	0				<	<				<	<
	0.1				<	<				<	
	0.3				<	<				<	<
	0.6	>				<	>	>			
	1	>				<	>	>			
Denatonium benzoate	0				<	<				<	
	0.001				<	<				<	
	0.003	>				<	>	>			
	0.006	>				<	>	>			
	0.01				<	<				<	

Table 3 (on next page)

Comparison of % PRPs of spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*).

Comparison of PRPs percentage values of spider monkeys when offered different concentrations of secondary metabolites and denatonium benzoate. We put < when the PRPs percentage of the X axis was significantly lower than that of the Y axis, while > when it was higher.

1

Table 3. Comparison of % PRPs of spider monkeys (<i>Ateles geoffroyi</i>)						
Substance		Tanic acid				
Concentration [mM]		0	0.1	0.3	0.6	1
2	Tanic acid	0	<	<	<	<
		0.1	>			
		0.3	>			
		0.6	>			
		1	>			
	Caffeine	0	<	<	<	<
		0.1	<	<	<	<
		0.3	<	<	<	<
		0.6		<	<	<
		1	<	<	<	<
	Rutin	0	<	<	<	<
		0.1	<	<	<	<
		0.3	<	<	<	<
		0.6	<	<	<	<
		1	<	<	<	<
	Denatonium benzoate	0	<	<	<	<
		0.001	<	<	<	<
		0.003	<	<	<	<
		0.006	<	<	<	<
		0.01	<	<	<	<