DIRECT EVIDENCE OF MEGAMAMMAL-CARNIVORE INTERACTION DECODED FROM BONE MARKS IN HISTORICAL FOSSIL COLLECTIONS FROM THE PAMPAS REGION

Karina Vanesa Chichkoyan[1,2,3], Borja Figueirido[4*], Margarita Belinchón[5], José Luis Lanata[6], Anne-Marie Moigne[7], Bienvenido Martínez-Navarro[1,2,8]

[1] IPHES, Institut Català de Paleoecologia Humana i Evolució Social, Tarragona, Spain

[2]Area de Prehistoria, Universitat Rovira i Virgili (URV), Tarragona, Spain

[3] Erasmus Mundus PhD. Quaternary and Prehistory.

[4] Departamento de Ecología y Geología, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Málaga, Málaga, Spain.

[5] Museo de Ciencias Naturales de Valencia, Valencia, Spain

[6] IIDyPCa, CONICET, UNRN, San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina.

[7]Prehistory Dpt- UMR 7194 HnHp, Musée de l'Homme, Paris, France

[8] ICREA, Barcelona, Spain.

Corresponding author:
Borja Figueirido
Departamento de Ecología y Geología, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Málaga, 29071-Málaga, Spain.
E-mail: Borja.figueirido@uma.es
Tlf: +34655791501

Abstract

The Pleistocene megafauna from South America has traditionally attracted the interest of scientist and the popular media alike. However, ecological interactions among species that inhabited these ecosystems, such as predator-prey relationships or interspecific competition, are poorly understood. To this regard, carnivore marks imprinted over fossil bones of megamammal remains are highly useful to decipher biological activity, including potential interspecific relationships among taxa. In this article, we study historical fossil collections, housed at different European and Argentinean museums that were excavated during 19th and early 20th centuries in the Pampean region, in order to detect carnivore marks over bones of megamammals. Our main goal is to provide crucial information on the ecological relationships of South American taxa during the Pleistocene. Our results indicate that four megamammal long bones of the megafauna from the Pampas region (i.e., families Mylodontidae and Toxodontidae) exhibit carnivore marks. Furthermore, 22 long bones of smaller species and two indeterminate bones present punctures, pits, scores, furrowing and fractures. Members of the large-carnivore guild, such as ursids, canids or even felids, are recognized as the main agents of inflicting the marks. We hypothesize that they represent the last stages of megaherbivores carcasses exploitation, suggesting that multiple taxa were involved in the 'consumption system' of the Pleistocene from the Pampas. Moreover, our observations provide novel insights to further understand past paleoecological relationships of these unique communities of megamammals.

.

Key Words

Museum's collections – Pleistocene - Taphonomy - Pampean Region - Carnivores

Introduction

Reconstructing biological interactions of extinct animals including competition or predator-prey relationships is extremely difficult particularly, when the information available from living analogues is limited (Figueirido, Martin-Serra & Janis, 2016). This is especially the case of

Deleted: , and more

Deleted: on

ancient South American ecosystems, as members of the megafauna were extinct during the latest Pleistocene-early Holocene, and these groups of mammals have no living counterparts (Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009; Fariña, Vizcaíno & de Iuliis, 2013). Although Pampean (Argentina) megamammals have fascinated scientists since 18th century, attempts to understand their paleoecology are much more recent (e.g., Fariña, 1996; Bargo, 2003; Prevosti, Zurita & Carlini, 2005; Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006; Figueirido & Soibelzon, 2010; de los Reyes et al., 2013; Fariña, Vizcaíno & de Iuliis, 2013; Scanferla et al., 2013; Soibelzon et al., 2014; Bocherens et al., 2016). To this respect, information about biological activity preserved in fossil remains of megamammals from the Pampean region is always valuable to understand paleoecological relationships among Pleistocene South American communities. As a consequence, carnivore marks preserved on fossil bones of megaherbivores constitute a relevant source of information as they represent direct evidence of predator-prey relationships, or alternatively, of scavenging activity by top predators such as strict flesh-eating and/or bone-cracking hypercarnivores (e.g., Palmqvist et al., 2011; Espigares et al., 2013). Therefore, detecting different marks of biological activity on bone surfaces by means of detailed taphonomic investigations using next-generation techniques could provide additional data to understand the paleoecology of Pleistocene communities from the Pampas (Binford, 1981).

Previous studies of bone surfaces made on fossil collections housed in different museums in the Americas have been extremely important, as they have shown carnivore activity, and hence animal interaction (Haynes, 1980; Martín, 2008; Dominato et al., 2011). In South America, evidence of carnivore marks has been reported from different places. Specifically, in the Pampean region, there is a neural apophysis cf. *Eosclerocalyptus lineatus* (Hoplophorini) from the Pliocene (Olavarría) with a clear a carnivore tooth imprint, attributed to *Chapalmalania* (Carnivora; Procyonidae) (de los Reyes et al., 2013). Recently, in the margins of the Salado River a taphocenosis comprising *Hippidion principale* and some indeterminate bones with carnivore marks were associated with *Smilodon* sp. (Scanferla et al., 2013). In the archaeological site Arroyo Seco 2 different bones, among them, extinct species such as *Equus* sp., present carnivore marks (Gutiérrez & Johnson, 2014). In Patagonia *Panthera onca mesembrina* was responsible for interventions involving Mylodontidae and *Hippidion* groups (Martín, 2008), and a member of Felidae produced marks on Gomphotheriidae bones (Labarca et al., 2014) during the late Pleistocene. In Brazil, two sites have been described where *Protocyon troglodytes*

Deleted: t

Deleted: d

Deleted: traditionally

Deleted: of

Deleted: i

Deleted: ,

Deleted: realized

Deleted: are

Deleted: of biological activity

Deleted: revision

Deleted: last

Deleted: n

scavenged *Notiomastodon platensis*, *Eremotherium laurillardi* and *Glossotherium* in the late Pleistocene (de Araújo Júnior, de Oliveira Porpino & Paglarelli Bergqvist, 2011), and *Haplomastodon waringi* in the Pleistocene (Dominato et al., 2011).

In this article, we study for the first time different fossil collections recovered from the Pampas region housed in different institutions of Europe and Argentina, and characterized by having megamammal (those mammals > 1000 kg; Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009) remains. Our main goal is to identify any type of biological activity using taphonomic methods in order to understand potential relationships between mammalian predators and megaherbivores within South American mammalian communities from the Pleistocene of the Pampas.

Materials & Methods

We studied the following collections: (i) The Rodrigo Botet collection from the *Museo de Ciencias Naturales de Valencia* (MCNV; Spain). This collection is the result of excavations made by Enrique de Carles in the Northeastern Buenos Aires province (Belinchón et al., 2009); (ii) The Dupotet collection, housed in the *Muséum National d' Histoire Naturelle* (MNHN; Paris, France). It belongs to the Pampean age and proceeds from Luján City (Fig. 1); (iii) The Krncsek collection, housed in the *Naturhistorisches Museum of Wien* (NMW; Austria). The collection proceeds from the Luján River in Mercedes City and identified as to "Diluvium - Upper Pampean" (Fig. 1); (iv) The collection from the *Canal de Conjunción* (La Plata), also housed in the *Museo de La Plata* (MLP). This fossil material was extracted from a 20 m space in the form of a pit near to an old water current (Ameghino in Torcelli, [1889] 1916:128- 129).

Deleted: Finally, t

These collections were formed during various non-systematic excavations carried out in the eastern region of what is currently Buenos Aires Province, in the Pampas region (Argentina), during the 19th and early 20th centuries. This is an extensive, flat geomorphological unit located in the central area of Argentina. The Quaternary was characterised by loess deposition, with different regressive and transgressive events (Fucks & Deschamps, 2008; Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009). The early and middle Pleistocene corresponds to the Ensenadan and Bonaerian Stages/Ages that were characterised by a cold and arid environment (Fucks & Deschamps, 2008; Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009). An important faunal turnover marks the boundary between the two stages, at *ca.* 0.5Ma (Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009). The late Pleistocene-early Holocene

corresponds to the Lujanian Stage/Age. Significant palaeoenvironmental oscillations, eolic pulses, fluvial process and different pedogenetic events influenced this period (Tonni et al., 2003; Fucks & Deschamps, 2008; Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009). When the collections analysed here were collected, these units were included in the "Pampean Formation" (Tonni, 2011). Current biostratigraphical information (Tonni, 2009) allows assigning the material from MCNV to the Ensenadan to Lujanian Stage/Age and the material from MNHN and NMW to the Bonaerian and Lujanian Stages/Ages. Furthermore, in the last museum the old reference to Upper Pampean is currently equivalent to the Bonarian Stage/Age (Tonni, 2011) (Fig. 1). The last records of these mammal groups is situated in the Guerrero Member of the Luján Formation deposited between 21,000 and 10,000 BP. (Tonni, 2009). In the case of the MLP assemblage, the presence of *Mesotherium cristatum* among the identified species assigns this material to the Ensenadan (Fig. 1) (Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009).

To understand the natural burial conditions of the remains, we considered different types of bone surface modifications such as post-depositional fractures, the presence of original sediment or concretions, fluvial erosion, trampling, weathering, root growth, manganese spots, and burning traces (e.g., Behrensmeyer, 1978; Binford, 1981; Shipman, 1981; Olsen & Shipman, 1988; Lyman, 1994; Fernández-Jalvo & Andrews, 2003).

We followed the literature to identify as carnivore activity a given bone mark (e.g., Haynes, 1980, 1982, 1983; Binford, 1981; Capaldo & Blumenschine, 1994; Lyman, 1994; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2012; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016). As a result, we classified those bone marks that were potentially realized by carnivores in the next categories: (i) *pitting and/or punctures that are produced by the pressure of teeth on bone*: this action can leave a superficial imprint (pitting) or deeper mark (puncture), depending on the level of the pressure exerted and whether this occurs on the softer cancellous bone of the epiphysis or on the harder part of the shaft; (ii) *u-shaped elongated scratches or scores realised when teeth dragged over the surface*: these can be superficial or present as gouges; (iii) *furrowing* is the product of cancellous bone extraction from the epiphyses. Alternatively, this action also can leave a crenulated edge, caused by the border of collapsed bone produced by the bite presenting an irregular edge; and (iv) *spiral fractures* produced by the bone being broken due to pressure from the teeth. Sometimes this action leaves notches in the wall of the bone.

Deleted: locating

Deleted: .

Deleted: to

Deleted: .

We also made an extensive systematic review of available actualistic studies describing carnivore marks that different taxa can leave when feeding, and more particularly, recent research on marks made by the members of the large carnivore guild such as ursids (Mammalia, Carnivora, Ursidae), felids (Mammalia, Carnivora, Felidae) and canids (Mammlia, Carnivora, Canidae). Of course, specialised bone-breaking hyenas were not considered because they were not present in South America. According to different studies, (i) ursids leave scarce to abundant teeth marks (Haynes, 1980, 1983; Burke, 2013; Saladié et al., 2013; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016). They can crush, furrow, grind and leave crenulated edges (Haynes, 1983; Burke, 2013; Saladié et al., 2013; Arilla et al., 2014); scratches are characterised by short, wide, parallel groups or disordered and superimposed clusters of scratches (Haynes, 1983; Saladié et al., 2013) with U shape or in some cases quadrangular (Saladié et al., 2013). They can also leave elongated gouges (Haynes, 1983; Burke, 2013). Pitting will be planar, flat-bottomed, superficial and circular and they can also fracture bones (Haynes, 1983, 1982). The impression of the teeth will tend to be square or rectangular (Haynes, 1983). In contrast, (ii) felids make fewer marks on the bones since they feed exclusively on meat (Arribas & Palmqvist, 1999; Christiansen & Wroe, 2007; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016). Nevertheless, they can leave important signs of predation (Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2012). They can inflict important teeth marks that have an "axe-edge" or elongated V-shape (Haynes, 1983). Their capacity for breaking bones is reduced (Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2012; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016), although some groups, such as jaguars, can furrow the epiphyses (Haynes, 1980, 1983; Martín, 2008; Burke, 2013; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015). Scratches tend to be perpendicular to the long axis of the bone (Haynes, 1983). Finally, (iii) canids can produce a great number of interventions but they not only leave the marks described for the other groups (pitting, punctures, scores, and furrowing) (Haynes, 1983; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2012; Burke, 2013). In contrast, they can also crush and break epiphyses and diaphyses (Haynes, 1982; Yravedra, Lagos & Bárcena, 2011; Sala, Arsuaga & Haynes, 2014; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016). Teeth impressions tend to have a cone or truncated-cone shape (Haynes, 1983). Furthermore, while felids (including *Smilodon*) and ursids have more straight incisive arcades, canids have curved arcades (Biknevicius, Van Valkenburgh & Walker, 1996).

We explore the fossil remains belonging to megaherbivores present in the collections with magnifying glasses of 3.5 X and 12 X. We also used a Dinolite Microscope 4113 model and the

Commented [A1]: Delaney-Rivera et al should also be cited in this section: http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305440309002726

Deleted: those

Deleted: discarded

198 software Dinolite 2.0, and we took high-resolution digital images using a Panasonic Lumix
199 DMC-TZ35 camera.

200 For the MLP assemblage we also used the well-established archaeozoological variables such as
201 MNI (Minimum number of individuals) and NISP (Number of Identified Specimens) as they
202 proceed from the same bone assemblage (Lyman, 1994). While the first was used to account for
203 the minimum number of mammals with carnivore marks represented in the sample, we used the
204 second to inform the counting per taxonomic or skeletal part categories.

205

206 **Results**

207 In total, we studied 1976 bone elements (1478 from the MCNV, 30 from the MNHN, 330 from
208 the MNW, and 138 from MLP). Of them, we only found four bones of megaherbivores with
209 potential carnivore intervention, which represent around 0.2% of the total remains: (i) A right
210 tibia from the MCNV (nº 64-492) that corresponds to cf. Scelidotheriinae gen.; (ii) A left
211 humerus of *Glossotherium robustum* labelled MNHN.F. PAM 119 from the Dupotet Collection
212 housed at the MNHN, (iii) A left distal humerus of *Mylodon robustum* (nº 1908.XI.110) housed
213 at MNW. This species is currently reclassified as *Glossotherium robustum* (McAfee, 2009); and
214 (iv) At the MLP, one distal femur of Toxodontidae (MLP 15-I-20-32). Moreover, in this
215 collection 22 long bones of smaller species and two indeterminate bones have fresh fractures,
216 scratches or punctures. Below, we describe in detail each of the marks identified in the
217 aforementioned remains:

218 (i) In the right tibia of cf. Scelidotheriinae gen. found at the MCNV, the marks are concentrated
219 on the distal epiphysis and medial face, and to a lesser degree, on the proximal epiphysis (Fig. 2).
220 The distal epiphysis has different groups of marks (Fig. 2A). Near the medial edge of the
221 articular face is where most damage is observed. Here, four pits are positioned linearly and
222 surrounded by scores. Posteriorly-anteriorly oriented, the first two pits are smaller with a cuspid-
223 rounded shape (0.3x0.1cm and 0.5x0.2cm) while the other two are bigger and one is semi-
224 rectangular (0.9x0.6cm and 0.5x0.6 cm). On the lateral side of the articular face, a larger
225 transverse score of 2x1 cm was detected. It is next to another pit of 1x0.5cm. Parallel U-shaped
226 scores are located over the metadiaphysis that continue beyond the rim with the four pits (Fig.
227 2B). They run parallel to the long axis of the bone and surround significant furrowing. The

Deleted: important

results of this action imply that the grooves where muscles such as the *tibia caudalis* and *flexor digitorium longus* were extracted (Fig. 2C). Another significant furrow is present on the medial face of the proximal epiphysis (Fig. 2E) that has extracted part of the inner condyle. A crenulated rim surrounds this furrowing, and there are parallel V-shaped tooth marks over the posterior face (Fig. 2C and Fig. 2E). There is one group of five marks in the distal part (1.5x0.4x0.1cm) and two in the proximal part (1.5x0.5x0.1cm), oriented posteriorly-medially. Three thick quadrangular shape grooves were detected over the medial face of the diaphysis (Fig. 2D). One runs along the entire face and is 4.5x1x0.4 cm; the other two are smaller and more superficial, and measure 1.3x1cm and 2x1.3cm. They start at the border of the anterior face and run up to the medial face.

(ii) We detected some marks attributable to carnivores in the distal epiphysis of the left humerus of *Glossotherium robustum* housed at the MNHN (Fig. 3). They are distributed on the articular face, over the condyle and trochlear regions (Fig. 3A). Near the medial side of the trochlear region, there are several punctures of around 0.5 cm in diameter, surrounded by scratches (Fig. 3B). Part of the trochlea has disappeared and there are crenulated edges as a consequence of the furrowing. Over the condyle, at least seven elongated pits of around 1.5x0.7cm were detected (Fig. 3C). Four of these are wide and positioned in parallel. Superficial scratches were also observed. In the border of this region, over the lateral side, are two wide grooves of around 4.5x1cm (Fig. 3D).

(iii) On the left humerus of *Glossotherium robustum* housed at the MNW, over the lateral face of the condyle, is a corrugated fracture that encompasses both anterior and posterior faces (Fig. 4A and Fig.4B). The epicondyle was destroyed and the border presents a crenulated edge. The collapsed bone is covered with sediment and the rim of the fracture has the same colour as the rest of the bone; thus the fracture would have occurred before burial. Although the furrowing and crenulated edge is weak evidence of carnivore intervention (Pickering, Clarke & Moggi-Cecchi, 2004; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015), the deltoid crest of the posterior face also has a possible 1cm puncture with sediment inside (Fig. 4B). Also in the posterior view, the fractured border is scaled resulting from a pressure exerted on it (Fig.4C and Fig.4D). The regularity of the fracture both on the anterior and posterior faces supports the proposal that the marks on this bone could have resulted from the action of carnivores.

Deleted: important

Deleted: ee

Deleted: Regarding

Deleted: extracted

Deleted: .

Deleted: T

Deleted: feeble

Commented [A2]: Is this supposed to be scalloped?

(iv) In the bones of megamammals of the MLP assemblage, a condyle of a distal femur of Toxodontidae with eight elongated and U-shaped scratches was identified (Fig. 5). Five of these are approximately 1.5x0.5cm and the others are 4x0.5cm. In addition, 22 bone shafts from smaller unidentified mammals display spiral fractures. Some of these also present scratches, crenulated edges or light pitting (Fig. 6). Semi-circular notches were also identified. Two indeterminate bones have punctures with a radius of 0.2 and 0.3cm, respectively (Fig. 7). Spiral fractures can be confused with human intervention or can occur naturally (Binford, 1981; Lyman, 1994). Nevertheless, the presence of other typical carnivore damage, such as scratches and perforations, enables us to consider them as being produced by carnivore activity. The presence of the Toxodontidae femur and other smaller bones with carnivore marks indicates that a MNI of 2 animals were consumed in the location the bones were collected from.

Deleted: detected

Deleted: Moreover, s

Deleted: detected

Deleted: interventions of

Deleted: s

Deleted: predated

Discussion

Commented [A3]: There needs to be a stronger introduction to the discussion.

The marks are predominant on the diaphyses and epiphyses of long bones. Carnivores generally start to chew the cancellous bone of the epiphyses, since these are easy to penetrate and long bones contain the highest nutritional resrouces (Binford, 1981; Blumenschine, 1987; Pickering, Clarke & Moggi-Cecchi, 2004). Two elements correspond to the forelimbs (humeri) and two to the hindlimb (femur and tibia). Both the tibia from MCNV and humerus from the MNHN are elements with combinations of different marks, which reinforces the possibility of carnivore damage. The femur from the MLP can be incorporated into an assemblage where bones of other mammals have fractures or perforations.

Deleted: predate

Deleted: richest feeding content

Commented [A4]: I don't understand the purpose of this sentence – is it necessary?

Deleted: a

Deleted: intervention

Deleted: integrated

Deleted: . This helps the interpretation of this bone and also provides a wider perspective of what could have happened in this case

The agents: Pleistocene mammalian predators from the Pampas region

Several species of carnivores have been recorded from the Pampas region during the Quaternary. Among ursids, *Arctotherium angustidens* evolved during the Ensenadan Stage/Age. This large 'short-faced' bear was a member of the megafauna as recent estimations of its body mass indicate that the animal exceeded a tonne (Soibelzon et al., 2014). Recent morphometric studies also indicate that this bear probably had an omnivorous diet supplemented by meat or carrion, as dental pathologies detected in some individuals of *Arctotherium* were probably the result of chewing on bones (Figueirido & Soibelzon, 2010). Moreover, Soibelzon et al. (2014) have found biomechanical and isotopic evidence of an omnivorous diet for *A. angustidens* but with

scavenging abilities. Other smaller bears that appeared later in South America, including *Arctotherium vetustum*, *Arctotherium bonariense* and *Arctotherium tarijense*, had a more plant-based diet (Figueirido & Soibelzon, 2010).

Three felids were also present in these ecosystems. The saber-toothed cat *Smilodon populator* was the top predator in this region; its estimated body mass has been calculated as being between 220-360 kg but it could have reached up to 400 kg (Christiansen & Harris, 2006). This sabre-toothed cat could even have been capable of hunting on juvenile *Megatherium americanum* (Megatheriidae) with a body mass of adult individuals ranging between 4 and 6 tonnes (Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006; Bocherens et al., 2016). However, its large saber-like canines that were used to attack to the throat of their prey (Antón et al., 2004) precluded *Smilodon* for breaking or consuming bones regularly, although they could have inflicted some damage during soft-tissues consumption (Arribas & Palmqvist, 1999; Van Valkeburgh & Hertel, 1993; Binder & Van Valkenburgh, 2010). The other two hypercarnivorous felids were *Puma concolor* with an estimated body mass of 47-50 kg (Christiansen & Harris, 2006; Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006) and *Panthera onca* weighing *ca.* 120 kg (Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006). Although these species would have fed on prey of *ca*. 600 kg, occasionally they could prey upon juvenile megamammals (Prevosti &Vizcaíno, 2006). Pumas usually do not consume bone, but *Panthera onca* is potentially able to break and consume it (Martín, 2008; Muñoz et al., 2008; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015).

The hypercarnivorous canids were also present in these ecosystems at that time. They could have cooperated in order to hunt large mammals and juvenile megamammals, and they also had scavenging capabilities. This may have been the case of *Theriodictis platensis*, weighing *ca*. 37 kg, which evolved during the Ensenadan Stage/Age. It could have preyed upon animals of around 600 kg or even upon animals of extreme age classes (i.e., very old and juvenile individuals) or upon pathological members of the megafauna (Prevosti & Palmqvist, 2001). During the Pleistocene, there were different species of *Protocyon*, weighing between 20 and 25 kg. These could have scavenged carcasses of megamammals, and even may have competed with *Smilodon populator* (Prevosti, Zurita & Carlini, 2005; Prevosti & Schubert, 2013; Bocherens et al., 2016).

Deleted: :

Deleted: t

Deleted: .

Deleted: I

Commented [A5]: Convert to kg for consistency

Deleted: /

Deleted: o

Deleted: e

Therefore, carnivores with an important capacity for bone modification would have produced the different interventions described. Accordingly, felids such as *Smilodon* or *Puma* must be dismissed, due to their reduced bone-damaging capacity. In order to get an idea of which of the remaining carnivores could have participated in inflicting the marks we briefly describe each bone:

The MCNV's cf. Scelidotherinae gen. tibia is the bone that presents the most important carnivore interventions. A combination of pitting, scratches and important furrowing, both on epiphyses and medial faces, was observed. Even though the three groups of carnivores can leave these types of marks, some characteristic allows relating the damage described to ursids. The group of aligned pits imprinted on the medial rim (Fig. 2A) of the distal epiphysis are planar, flat-bottomed and have a semi-rectangular shape that could have been made by premolars or molars as mentioned for this group (Haynes, 1983). While the V-shaped parallel tooth marks observed on the posterior face (Fig. 2C and Fig. 2E) could be related to a series of incisors and canines and would coincide with the dragging action of a straight incisor arcade (Biknevicius, Van Valkenburgh & Walker, 1996). On the other side the parallel scores as the ones seen in the distal metadiaphysis (Fig. 2B) are generally a type of damage characteristic of this type of animal (Haynes, 1983; Saladié et al., 2013). Also, the intensive furrowing coincides with the bone-breaking capacity of this animal (Soibelzon et al., 2014). Other damage indicated for ursids and observed in the tibia is the elongated gouge as seen in the lateral side of the articular face (Fig. 2A) or the quadrangular shape grooves of the medial face of the diaphysis (Fig. 2D) (Burke, 2013; Saladié et al., 2013). These ones and the gouges observed in the distal metadiaphysis do not have regular walls and bottoms, as indicated for ursids (Saladié et al., 2013). Nevertheless, according to current research, they must be superficial, a feature not observed for these marks (Haynes, 1983; Saladié et al., 2013). Consequently, more than one animal may have participated in imprinting the complex and variable types of marks observed on this tibia. To this respect, some authors suggest that damage produced by ursids is less intense in comparison with other groups (Haynes, 1983; Arilla et al., 2014; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016) a pattern not observed here. If that is the case, *Panthera onca* could have also been involved. They also possessed straight incisive arcades (Biknevicius, Van Valkenburgh & Walker, 1996) that could have produced the elongated V-shape marks (Haynes, 1983) of the posterior face. The important furrowing noticed

Commented [A6]: I disagree. See these papers for examples of bone modification by Homotherium (relative of Smilodon) http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0047248485710743 and Puma http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1040618215302536.

Deleted: ee

Commented [A7]: What type of animal?

Deleted: adjudicated

Deleted: to

Deleted: it cannot be discarded that

Deleted: registered in

Deleted: slight

Deleted: In this sense, it cannot be discarded that

in both ends of the bone also matches with their capacity of realizing this type of damage (Martín, 2008; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015).

The humerus of *Glossotherium robustum* housed in the MNHN has less bone loss than the tibia. This mark on this element has several characteristics that may indicate it was damaged by *Arctotherium*. As noticed on the tibia, the short and wide scratches present on the condyle and the wide and elongated and superficial pitting accords with actualistic studies of ursid marks (Haynes, 1983; Burke, 2013; Saladié et al., 2013). Nevertheless, the presence of punctures in the trochlea, also characteristic of felids, means that other options, such as *Panthera onca*, cannot be disregarded (Haynes, 1983). Both groups also can furrow the epiphysis (Martín, 2008; Arilla et al., 2014; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015) as observed for the trocheal part of the bone.

The furrowing on the MNW's *Glossotherium robustum* humerus is less clear than for the other two cases, since different animals could have inflicted this type of damage on cancellous bone. The cusp that made the associated puncture could be related to secodont teeth, such as felids or canids. Both have the capacity to damage and destroy cancellous tissue, although canids leave fewer marks in mammals larger than 400 kg (Yravedra, Lagos & Bárcena, 2011). Patagonian sites with important furrowing in Mylodontidae bones attributed to *Panthera onca mesembrina* (Martín, 2008) could be an antecedent when considering the types of marks that jaguars can make on the limbs, as observed in this case.

The marked femur of Toxodontidae from the MLP has to be integrated with the other evidence in order to interpret which carnivore was involved. Of the taxonomic groups represented by the 138 bones studied from MLP, 62.32% (NISP: 86) belong to indeterminate species, while the remaining 37.68% (NISP: 52) were identified at a general level. Among them, equids form the most important group, accounting for 36.53% (NISP: 19) of the identified elements. Megamammal bones are the second most widely represented group, at 30.76% (NISP: 16). Appendicular skeletal elements (73.92% or NISP: 102) composed predominantly the assemblage. Axial and planar bones contribute only 13.77% (NISP: 19) of the assemblage and indeterminate fragments account for 12.31% (NISP: 17). Of these carnivore-marked bones, 81.48% (NISP: 22) are indeterminate diaphyses of the long bones mentioned above, coinciding with the general abundance of appendicular skeletal elements. The dominance of long bone elements and paucity of axial parts could have resulted, in part, from carnivore activities that transported some limbs to this area or from density mediated destruction of the axial bones. The

Deleted: also presents
Deleted: can be related to
Deleted: for
Deleted: i
Deleted: , coincides
Deleted: n
Deleted: extraction
Deleted: extract
Deleted: reviewed
Deleted: the null or scarce importance

carnivore/s involved in the formation of this assemblage must have had the capacity to break long bones and/or the ability to predate megamammals. In this sense, given the absence of specialised bone-crushers in the Americas, some type of canid could have been responsible for this type of assemblage. Therefore, either *Theriodictis platensis* or *Protocyon scagliorum* from the Ensenadan Stage/Age could have been responsible for these marks, as seen in the Brazilian cases (de Araújo Júnior, de Oliveira Porpino & Paglarelli Bergqvist, 2011; Dominato et al., 2011).

Megamammals carcass exploitation during the Pleistocene

Although discussing how these animals were predated is difficult without more contextual information, taking into account the skeletal elements and location of marks, and the level of use of the bones, it seems most likely that these marks represents the last stages of consumption of megamammal carcasses.

(i) Marks on the tibia and the humeri are situated on the epiphysis, both the articular surface and metadiaphyses. In a hunting event, carnivores that have access to a large mammal usually begin to feed on the abdominal part, then moving to femoral muscle masses, leaving some marks on the distal epiphyses and diaphyses (Haynes & Klimowicz, 2015). Thus, the initial consumers feed on viscera and muscles, inflicting few damage to bones (Haynes, 1982; Blumenschine, 1986; Arribas & Palmqvist, 1999; White & Driedrich, 2012; Haynes & Klimowicz, 2015). Forelimbs are usually consumed later, since the skin is harder in these areas (Haynes, 1982; Haynes & Klimowicz, 2015). The same usually happens with lower limb bones, such as the tibia, due to the smaller quantity of the meat they have (Haynes, 1982, Blumenschine, 1986; Haynes & Klimowicz, 2015). The intense gnawing of the cf. Scelidotherinae gen. tibia, both on the distal epiphysis and medial face of the diaphysis, as well as to a lesser degree on the proximal epiphysis, implies that this element was fully exploited. This is not expected in the case of an early access event, where other more nutritious parts of the carcass are available. The presence of marks on the diaphysis indicates that even the hardest part of the shaft was utilised. The same is true for both *Glossotherium robustum* humeri. The damage to the distal epiphyses was inflicted in subsequent stages and not in a first access event (Haynes, 1982). The presence of furrowing on the three elements implies that the various carnivores involved were consuming a substantial amount of bone. In the case of the MLP assemblage, the dominance of broken diaphyses of long

Deleted:

Deleted: (i)

Deleted: (ii)

Commented [A8]: This is not supported by other authors' work, including my own, which shows that initial consumers can leave considerable damage on bones.

Commented [A9]: I disagree – I think variables such as carnivore species, group size, and prey size all factor into the expected level of damage.

bones indicates accessing the marrow. The use of the medullar cavity is related to secondary access to the carcass (Binford, 1981; Haynes, 1982; Blumenschine, 1987; Arribas & Palmqvist, 1999; Capaldo & Blumenschine, 1994; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016).

(ii) Intensity of use of a carcass is related to resource availability (Haynes, 1980, 1982), pack hunting size group (Van Valkenburgh et al., 2016) or the quantity of different carnivores that can access to a carcass. In general terms, large animals usually conserve tissues for longer after dead (Blumenschine, 1987) and have fewer marks than smaller ones (Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015). As the meat is depleted, carnivores will tend to consume the remaining carcass parts (Binford, 1981; Haynes, 1982; Blumenschine, 1986; White & Driedrich, 2012; Haynes & Klimowicz, 2015, Sala & Arsuaga, 2016) and more significant marks on bones are inflicted. Thus, marks on articulation surfaces could indicate that the bone held a small amount of meat when it was damaged. This would be the case of the cf. Scelidotherinae gen. tibia from the MCNV, the *Glossotherium robustum* left humerus from the MNHN and the Toxodontidae femur from the MLP (along with other broken bones). The same hypothesis can be proposed for the *Glossotherium robustum* humerus from the MNW, although in this case, a lack of marks on the articulation surface could indicate that the bone was still attached to the rest of the limb. In general, the intensity of the marks and fractures observed indicates advanced stages of modification (Haynes, 1982; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016). This contradicts the hypothesis that they could have been made in an early first access event.

According to the described bones, during the Pleistocene, different species of the large carnivore guild would have access and consume megamammals' bones and/or marrow of smaller animals thus representing the last stages of a consumption sequence. One possible scenario is that after their death, different carnivores would have consumed the primary edible tissues of the bony elements presented here. In a next stage, exploitation of the bones and marrow would have occurred. It is in this stage that much of the tooth marks, furrowing, and bone cracking would have been done. Such a situation in the Pampean region would imply that different carnivores could have fed on a single carcass as has been recorded in European and African sites (Binford, 1981; Blumenschine, 1987; Arribas & Palmqvist, 1999; Pickering, Clarke & Moggi-Cecchi, 2004; White & Driedrich, 2012; Haynes & Klimowicz, 2015; among others).

Deleted: the need to

Commented [A10]: Again, I disagree – it depends on the size of predator and prey.

Commented [A11]: YES!

Deleted: feed

Deleted: attack

Deleted: carrion

Deleted: by the scavenging time,

Deleted: olds

Deleted: , since this is consumed in a first access event

Deleted: made

Commented [A12]: I disagree – this contradicts your introductory sentence in this section!

Deleted: ,

Deleted: had

Deleted: w

In a broad carnivore-herbivore interaction level, in the Pampean region, other carnivores or even avifauna would have probable exploited this megaherbivore prey community. To this respect, *Canis nehringui* was present during the late Pleistocene-early Holocene and although it would have fed on medium size mammals, exploitation of bigger species could have been possible (Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006). Also a diversified Pampean avifauna existed during Pleistocene-Holocene times that included condor-like vultures, such as *Geronogyps reliquus*, *Sarcoramphus papa* and *Vultur gryphus*, as well as also vultures like *Coragyps atratus*, and at least two types of large falconids identified at generic level as *Caracara* sp. The rich megaherbivore community would have provided an important source of food for these species (Tonni & Noriega, 1998; Noriega & Areta, 2005; Cenizo, Angolin & Pomi, 2015; Jones et al., 2015), so their participation in the Pampean ecosystems from the past cannot be disregarded. At the end of the Pleistocene also *Homo sapiens* would have been added to this complex scavenging niche (Borrero & Martín, 2012). Nevertheless, humans also created new opportunities for predators through hunting these animals in a more successful way than existing carnivores (Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009). The inclusion of them suggest that megamammals' exploitation would have developed in a competitive interspecies context in the Pleistocene of this region (Prevosti, Zurita & Carlini, 2005; Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006; Bocherens et al., 2016). In this sense, it was recently pointed that Pleistocene communities had more hypercarnivore species than extant communities given the abundance of megaherbivores and consequently competition for the carcasses would have been intense (Van Valkenburgh et al., 2016).

Although little can be said about the acquisition way of the bones described here, it seems likely that predator-prey relationships and/or scavenging activities would have been extensively developed given the richness of Pampean megamammal communities (Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009). Past megaherbivores, as it is true today of megaherbivores, have few natural predators (Owen-Smith & Mills, 2008; Fariña, Vizcaíno & de Iuliis, 2013), although Pleistocene hypercarnivorous species may have occasionally pack-hunted adult individuals and confronted juveniles ones (Van Valkenburgh et al., 2016). Natural diseases and paleoenvironmental stressors would have also influenced in mortality and would have acted as top-down pressures stimulating the interspecific competition for the carcasses.

Deleted: megamammal

Deleted: megafauna

Deleted: has to

Deleted: e

Deleted: predation

Deleted: ,

Deleted: s

Deleted: M

Deleted: amammals

Deleted: it cannot be discarded that

Deleted: i

Deleted: would

Deleted: ing

Conclusions

Four megaherbivore fossil bones, 22 bones of smaller species, and two indeterminate bones with carnivore marks were found in different Pleistocene paleontological collections from the Pampas region. Here, we conclude that megaherbivores were a considerable resource exploited by diverse carnivores through Pampean Pleistocene ecosystems. We identified marks predominately on bones of the appendicular skeleton that are the richest part with regard to both tissue and fat content, and particularly the epiphyses which are the easiest to penetrate (Binford, 1981; Pickering, Clarke & Moggi-Cecchi, 2004). We interpret the data presented here to indicate that ursids, canids, and possibly felids would have consumed the soft and hard tissues, inflicting different types of tooth marks including pits, punctures, and scratches, furrowing bone epiphyses, and even breaking the diaphyses of long bones in order to access the marrow. These represent the last stages of carcasses exploitation. This situation suggests the participation of a diverse array of carnivores that consumed all the edible tissues plus bony elements and consequently the development of competitive interspecific interactions for this resource.

Although the sample is small, it increases significantly our knowledge of the past paleoecological relationships in the region. At a broad level, considering the time span and the different species involved, megaherbivores would have been an important resource for different members of the large carnivore guild of this region. The exploitation of this resource has occurred at least since the Pliocene (de los Reyes et al., 2013) and continued throughout the Pleistocene according to the evidence presented here. This long term-span situation matches with recent proposals that the maintenance of Pleistocene large mammal's communities was part of a stable composition developed over the last 1 million years. The development of different trophic levels and multiple competitive species would have allowed them to persist across time and overcoming different paleoclimatic fluctuations. This situation lasted until late Pleistocene-early Holocene times when most of the megafaunal extinctions occurred (Van Valkenburgh et al., 2016).

Current taphonomic methods allows analyses of old collections to obtain new results and offers new insights to develop future field systematic fieldwork. The application of both collections and field-based research will provide crucial information regarding the evolution of past Pleistocene ecosystems of the South American Southern Cone.

Deleted: . These remains were collected from the Pleistocene of

Deleted: After a first access event, the remaining carrion would have been used by a diverse spectrum of carnivores.

Deleted: Especially the

Deleted: described

Deleted: s

Deleted: In the material

Deleted: ,

Deleted: residual

Deleted: ee

Deleted: ,

Deleted: y

Deleted: -

Deleted: implied

Deleted: al

Deleted: al

Deleted: knowledge

Deleted: i

Deleted: ng

Deleted: these

Deleted: lines of

Acknowlegments

This work was financed by the Erasmus Mundus grant inside the International Doctorate in Quaternary and Prehistory programme (KVCH), and by the the Generalitat de Catalunya research group MINECO- CGL2016-80975-P. This contribution is part of the PICT V 2014-1558 "Sociedades y Ambientes en Transformación" funded by FONCYT-MINCYT, Argentina and "El patrimonio arqueológico y paleontológico de la cuenca superior del río Luján: investigación y gestión", Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, UBA. We thank the different Museums, which have facilitated the collections to us, especially to Christine Argot and Guillaume Billet from MNHN, to Ursula Göhlich from NMW and to Marcelo Reguero and Martín de los Reyes from MLP.

REFERENCES

Ameghino F. [1889] 1916. Los mamíferos fósiles de la República Argentina, Parte 1 Planungulados y Ungulados. In: Torcelli AJ, ed. *Obras completas y correspondencia científica de Florentino Ameghino*. La Plata: Taller de Impresiones Oficiales, Vol VI.

Antón M, Salesa MJ, Pastor JF, Sánchez IM, Fraile S, Morales J. 2004. Implications of the mastoid anatomy of larger extant felids for the evolution and predatory behavior of sabre toothed cats (Mammalia, Carnivora, Felidae). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 140(2):207-221.DOI: 10.1111/j.1096-3642.2003.00093.x.

Arilla M, Rosell J, Blasco R, Domínguez-Rodrigo M, Pickering TR. 2014. The “Bear” essentials: actualistic research on *Ursus arctos arctos* in the Spanish Pyrenees and its implications for paleontology and archaeology. *PLoS One* 9(7):e102457. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0102457.

Arribas A, Palmqvist P. 1999. On the Ecological Connection between Sabre-tooths and Hominids: Faunal dispersal events in the Lower Pleistocene and a review of the evidence for the first human arrival in Europe. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 26:571–585.

Bargo MS. 2003. Biomechanics and Palaeobiology of the Xenarthra: state of the art. In: Fariña RA, Vizcaíno SF, Storch G, eds. *Morphological Studies in fossil and extant Xenarthra (Mammalia). Senckenbergiana biologica* 83(1): 41-50. Frankfurt am Main.

Behrensmeyer AK. 1978. Taphonomic and Ecologic Information from Bone Weathering. *Paleobiology* 4:150–162.

Belinchón M, Peñalver E, Montoya P, Gascó F. 2009. *Crónicas de fósiles. Las colecciones paleontológicas del Museo de Ciencias Naturales de Valencia*. Valencia: Ayuntamiento de Valencia. Regidoría de Cultura.

Biknevicius AR, Van Valkenburgh B, Walker J. 1996. Incisor size and shape: implications for feeding behaviors in saber-toothed "cats". *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 16(3):510-521.

Binder WJ, Van Valkenburgh B. 2010. A comparison of tooth wear and breakage in Rancho La Brea sabertooth cats and dire wolves across time. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* 30(1):255-261.DOI: 10.1080/02724630903413016.

Binford LR.1981. *Bones: Ancient Men and Modern Myths*. New York: Academic Press.

Blumenschine RJ. 1986. Carcass consumption sequences and the archaeological distinction of scavenging and hunting. *Journal of Human Evolution* 15(8):639-659.

646 Blumenschine RJ. 1987. Characteristics of an Early Hominid Scavenging Niche [and Comments
647 and Reply].*Current Anthropology* 28(4):383-407.

648

649 Bocherens H, Cotte M, Bonini R, Scian D, Straccia P, Soibelzon LH, Prevosti FJ. 2016.
650 Paleobiology of sabretooth cat *Smilodon populator* in the Pampean Region (Buenos Aires
651 Province, Argentina) around the Last Glacial Maximum: Insights from carbon and nitrogen
652 stable isotopes in bone collagen. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 449:
653 463–474. DOI: 10.1016/j.palaeo.2016.02.017.

654

655 Borrero LA, Martín FM, 2012.Ground sloths and humans in southern Fuego-Patagonia:
656 taphonomy and archaeology. *World Archaeology* 44(1):102-117. DOI:
657 10.1080/00438243.2012.646145.

658

659 Burke CC. 2013. Neotaphonomic analysis of the feeding behaviors and modification marks
660 produced by North American carnivores. *Journal of Taphonomy* 11(1): 1-20.

661

662 Capaldo SD, Blumenschine RJ. 1994. A quantitative diagnosis of notches made by hammerstone
663 percussion and carnivore gnawing on bovid long bones. *American Antiquity* 59(4): 724-748.

664

665 Cenizo MM, Angolin FL, Pomi LH. 2015. A New Pleistocene bird assemblage from the
666 Southern Pampas (Buenos Aires, Argentina). *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
667 *Palaeoecology* 420:65-81. DOI: 10.1016/j.palaeo.2014.12.009.

668

669 Christiansen P, Harris JM. 2006. Body Size of *Smilodon* (Mammalia: Felidae). *Journal of*
670 *Morphology* 266:369–384. DOI: 10.1002/jmor.10384.

671

672 Christiansen P, Wroe S. 2007. Bite forces and evolutionary adaptations to feeding ecology in
673 carnivores. *Ecology* 88(2):347-358.DOI: 10.1890/0012-9658(2007)88[347:BFAEAT]2.0.CO;2.

674

675 Cione AL, Tonni EP, Soibelzon LH. 2009. Did humans cause large mammal Late Pleistocene-
676 Holocene extinction in South America in a context of shrinking open areas? In: Haynes G, ed.
677 *American Megafaunal Extinctions at the End of the Pleistocene*. Vertebrate Paleobiology and
678 Palaeontology Series. Springer Publishers, 125-144.

679

680 de Araújo Júnior HI, de Oliveira Porpino K, Paglarelli Bergqvist L. 2011. Marcas de dentes de
681 carnívoros/carniceiros em mamíferos pleistocênicos do Nordeste do Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de*
682 *Paleontologia* 14(3): 291-296.DOI: 10.4072/rbp.2011.3.08.

683

684 de los Reyes M, Poiré D, Soibelzon LH, Zurita AE, Arrouy MJ. 2013. First evidence of
685 scavenging of a glyptodont (Mammalia, Glyptodontidae) from the Pliocene of the Pampean
686 region (Argentina): taphonomic and paleoecological remarks. *Palaeontología Electrónica*
687 16(2):15A.

688

689 Dominato VH, Mothé D, Costa da Silva R, Dos Santos Avilla L. 2011. Evidence of scavenging
690 on remains of the gomphothere *Haplomastodon waringi* (Proboscidea: Mammalia) from the
691 Pleistocene of Brazil: Taphonomic and paleoecological remarks. *Journal of South American*
692 *Earth Sciences* 31:171-177. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsames.2011.01.002.

693

694 Domínguez-Rodrigo M, Gidna AO. Yravedra J, Musiba C. 2012. A comparative neo-taphonomic
695 study of felids, hyaenids and canids: an Analogical Framework Based on long bone Modification
696 Patterns. *Journal of taphonomy* 10(3-4):147-164.

697

698 Domínguez-Rodrigo M, Yravedra J, Organista E, Gidna A, Fourvel JB, Baquedano E. 2015. A
699 new methodological approach to the taphonomic study of paleontological and archaeological

faunal assemblages: a preliminary case study from Olduvai Gorge (Tanzania). *Journal of Archaeological Science* 59: 35-53. DOI: 10.1016/j.jas.2015.04.007.

Espigares MP, Martínez-Navarro B, Palmqvist P, Ros-Montoya S, Toro I, Agustí I, Sala R. 2013. Homo versus Pachycrocuta: Earliest evidence of competition for and Elephant carcass between scavengers at Fuente Nueva 3 (Orce, Spain). *Quaternary International* 295:113-125.DOI: 10.1016/j.quaint.2012.09.032

Fariña RA. 1996. Trophic relationships among Lujanian mammals. *Evolutionary Theory* 11: 125-134.

Fariña RA, Vizcaíno SF, de Iuliis G. 2013. *Megafauna. Giant Beasts of Pleistocene South America.* Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.

Fernández-Jalvo Y, Andrews P. 2003.Experimental effects of water abrasion on bone fragments. *Journal of Taphonomy* 1(3): 147-163.

Figueirido BF, Soibelzon LH. 2010. Inferring palaeoecology in extinct tremarctine bears (Carnivora, Ursidae) using geometric morphometrics. *Lethaia* 43(2): 209-222. DOI: 10.1111/j.1502-3931.2009.00184.x.

Figueirido B, Martín-Serra A, Janis CM. 2016. Ecomorphological determinations in the absence of living analogues: the predatory behaviour of the marsupial lion (Thylacoleocarnifex) as revealed by elbow joint morphology. *Paleobiology* 43:508-531. DOI: 10.1017/pab.2015.55.

Fucks E, Deschamps CM. 2008. Depósitos Continentales Cuaternarios en el Noreste de la Provincia de Buenos Aires. *Revista de la Asociación Geológica Argentina* 63(3): 326-343.

727

728 Gutiérrez MA, Johnson E. 2014 Análisis de los efectos tafonómicos del material óseo faunístico.
729 Interpretaciones sobre los procesos de formación del sitio. In: Politis GG, Gutiérrez MA,
730 Scabuzzo C, eds. *Estado actual de las investigaciones en el sitio arqueológico Arroyo Seco 2 (partido*
731 *de Tres Arroyos, provincia de Buenos Aires, Argentina).* Olavarría: Facultad de Ciencias Sociales,
732 Universidad Nacional del Centro de la Provincia de Buenos Aires. Serie Monográfica del
733 INCUAPA Nro. 5.97- 137.

734

735 Haynes G. 1980. Evidence of carnivore gnawing on Pleistocene and Recent mammalian bones.
736 *Paleobiology* 6(3): 341-351.DOI: 10.1017/S0094837300006849.

737

738 Haynes G. 1982. Utilization and skeletal disturbances North American prey. *Artic* 35(2):266-
739 281. DOI: 10.14430/arctic2325.

740

741 Haynes G. 1983. A guide for differentiating mammalian carnivore taxa responsible for gnaw
742 damage to herbivore limb bones. *Paleobiology* 9(2):164-172. DOI:
743 10.1017/S0094837300007545

744

745 Haynes G, Klimowicz J. 2015. Recent elephant-carcass utilization as a basis for interpreting
746 mammoth exploitation. *Quaternary International* 359-360:19-37. DOI:
747 10.1016/j.quaint.2013.12.040

748

749 Jones WW, Cenizo MM, Agnolin FL, Rinderknecht A, Blanco RE. 2015. The largest known
750 falconid. *Neues Jahrbuch Für Geologie Und Paläontologie – Abhandlungen* 277(3):361-372.
751 DOI: 10.1127/njgpa/2015/0514.

752

753 Labarca R, Recabarren OP, Canales-Brellenthin P, Pino M. 2014. The gomphotheres
754 (Proboscidea: Gomphotheriidae) from Pilauco site: Scavenging evidence in the Late Pleistocene

of the Chilean Patagonia. *Quaternary International* 352:75-84. DOI: 10.1016/j.quaint.2014.10.027.

Lyman R.L. 1994. Vertebrate Taphonomy. Cambridge Manuals in Archaeology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martín FM. 2008. Bone crunching felids at the end of the Pleistocene in Fuego-Patagonia, Chile. *Journal of Taphonomy* 6 (3-4): 337- 372.

Mcafee R K. 2009. Reassessment of the cranial characters of Glossotherium and Paramylodon (Mammalia: Xenarthra: Mylodontidae). *Zoological Journal of the Linnean Society* 155(4): 885-903. DOI: 10.1111/j.1096-3642.2008.00468.x

Muñoz AS, Mondini M, Durán V, Gasco A. 2008. Los pumas (*Puma concolor)* como agentes tafonómicos. Análisis actualístico de un sitio de matanza en los Andes de Mendoza, Argentina. *Geobios* 41:123-131.DOI: 10.1016/j.geobios.2006.11.010.

Noriega JI, Areta JI. 2005. First record of *Sarcoramphus*Dumeril 1806 (Ciconiiformes: Vulturidae) from the Pleistocene of Buenos Aires province, Argentina. *Journal of South American Earth Science* 20:73–79. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsames.2005.05.004.

Olsen SL, Shipman P. 1988. Surface modification on bone: Trampling versus butchery. *Journal of Archaeological Science* 15: 535-553. DOI: 10.1016/0305-4403(88)90081-7.

Owen-Smith N, Mills MGL. 2008. Predator–prey size relationships in an African large-mammal food web. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 77:173–183.DOI: 10.1111/j.1365-2656.2007.01314.x.

782 Palmqvist P, Martínez-Navarro B, Pérez-Claros JA, Torregrosa V, Figueirido B, Jiménez-Arenas
783 JM, Patrocinio Espigares M, Ros-Montoya S, De Renzi M. 2011. The giant hyena *Pachycrocuta*
784 *brevirostris*: modelling the bone-cracking behavior of an extinct carnivore. *Quaternary*
785 *International 243*(1): 61-79. DOI: 10.1016/j.quaint.2010.12.035.

786

787 Pickering TR, Clarke RJ, Moggi-Cecchi J. 2004. Role of Carnivores in the Accumulation of the
788 Sterkfontein Member 4 Hominid Assemblage: A Taphonomic Reassessment of the Complete
789 Hominid Fossil Sample (1936–1999). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 125:1–15.
790 DOI: 10.1002/ajpa.10278.

791

792 Prevosti FJ, Palmqvist P. 2001. Análisis ecomorfológico del cánido hipercarnívoro *Theriodictis*
793 *platensis* Mercerat (Mammalia, Carnivora), basado en un nuevo ejemplar del Pleistoceno de
794 Argentina. *Ameghiniana* 38(4): 375-384.

795

796 Prevosti FJ, Zurita AE, Carlini AA. 2005. Biostratigraphy, systematics, and paleoecology of
797 Protocyon Giebel, 1855 (Carnivora, Canidae) in South America. *Journal of South American*
798 *Earth Sciences* 20:5–12. DOI: 10.1016/j.jsames.2005.05.005.

799

800 Prevosti FJ, Vizcaíno S. 2006. Paleoecology of the large carnivore guild from the Late
801 Pleistocene of Argentina. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* 51(3):407–422.

802

803 Prevosti FJ, Schubert BW. 2013. First taxon date and stable isotopes (δ13C, δ15N) for the large
804 hypercarnivorous South American canid *Protocyon troglodytes* (Canidae, Carnivora).
805 *Quaternary International* 305:67-73. DOI: 10.1016/j.quaint.2012.07.003.

806

807 Sala N, Arsuaga JL, Haynes G. 2014. Taphonomic comparison of bone modifications caused by
808 wild and captive wolves (*Canis lupus*). *Quaternary International* 330: 126-135. DOI:
809 10.1016/j.quaint.2013.08.017.

Sala N, Arsuaga JL. 2016. Regarding beasts and humans: A review of taphonomic works with living carnivores. *Quaternary International*, in press.DOI: 10.1016/j.quaint.2016.03.011

Saladié P, Huguet R, Díez C, Rodríguez-Hidalgo A, Carbonell E. 2013. Taphonomic modifications produced by modern brown bears (*Ursus arctos*). *International Journal of Osteoarchaeology* 23:13-33.DOI: 10.1002/oa.1237.

Scanferla A, Bonini R, Pomi L, Fucks E, Molinari A. 2013. New Late Pleistocene megafaunal assemblage with well-supported chronology from the Pampas of Southern South America. *Quaternary International* 305:97-103. DOI: 10.1016/j.quaint.2012.08.005.

Shipman P. 1981.*Life History of a Fossil: An Introduction to Taphonomy and Paleoecology*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Soibelzon LH, Grinspan GA, Bocherens H, Acosta WG, Jones W, Blanco ER, Prevosti F. 2014. South American giant short-faced bear (*Arctotherium angustidens*) diet: evidence from pathology, morphology, stable isotopes, and biomechanics. *Journal of Paleontology* 88(6):1240-1250. DOI: 10.1666/13-143.

Tonni EP. 2009. Los mamíferos del Cuaternario de la región pampeana de Buenos Aires, Argentina. In: Ribeiro AM, Girardi Bauermann S., Saldanha Scherer C., Eds. *Quaternario do Rio Grande do Sul. Integrando Conhecimentos*. Porto Alegre: Monografías da Sociedades Brasileira de Paleontologia, 193-205.

Tonni EP. 2011. Ameghino y la estratigrafía pampeana un siglo después. *Publicación Especial de la Asociación Paleontológica Argentina, Vida y Obra de Florentino Ameghino*, 69-79.

Tonni EP, Noriega JI. 1998. Los Cóndores (Ciconiiformes, Vulturidae) de la Región Pampeana de la Argentina durante el Cenozoico tardío: Distribución, interacciones y extinciones. *Ameghiniana* 35:141–150.

Tonni EP, Duarte RA, Carbonari JE, Figini AJ. 2003. New radiocarbon chronology for the Guerrero Member of the Luján Formation (Buenos Aires, Argentina): Palaeoclimatic significance. *Quaternary International* 109-110:45-48. DOI: 10.1016/S1040-6182(02)00201-X.

Van Valkenburgh, B, Hertel F. 1993. Tough times at La Brea: tooth breakage in large carnivores of the late Pleistocene. *Science* 261:456–459. DOI: 10.1126/science.261.5120.456.

Van Valkenburgh B, Hayward MW, Ripple WJ, Meloro C, Roth VL. 2016. The impact of large terrestrial carnivores on Pleistocene ecosystems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 113(4):862-867. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1502554112

White PA, Diedrich CG. 2012. Taphonomy story of a modern African elephant *Loxodonta africana* carcass on a lakeshore in Zambia (Africa). *Quaternary International* 276-277: 287-296. DOI: 10.1016/j.quaint.2012.07.025.

Yravedra J, Lagos L, Bárcena F. 2011. A Taphonomic study of wild wolf (*Canis lupus*) Modification of horse bones in Northwestern. Spain. *Journal of Taphonomy* 9(1): 37-65.