

Research article

Published  
2024-09-05

Cite as

Jules Dezeure, Julie Dagorrette, Lugdiwine Burtschell, Shahrina Chowdhury, Dieter Lukas, Larissa Swedell and Elise Huchard (2024) *Flexible reproductive seasonality in Africa-dwelling papionins is associated with low environmental productivity and high climatic unpredictability*, Peer Community Journal, 4: e87.

Correspondence

dezeurejules@gmail.com

Peer-review

Peer reviewed and  
recommended by

PCI Ecology,

<https://doi.org/10.24072/pci.ecology.100698>



This article is licensed  
under the Creative Commons  
Attribution 4.0 License.

## Flexible reproductive seasonality in Africa-dwelling papionins is associated with low environmental productivity and high climatic unpredictability

Jules Dezeure<sup>1,2</sup>, Julie Dagorrette<sup>2</sup>, Lugdiwine Burtschell<sup>1,2,3</sup>, Shahrina Chowdhury<sup>1,4,5,6</sup>, Dieter Lukas<sup>1,7</sup>, Larissa Swedell<sup>1,8,5,6,9,10</sup>, and Elise Huchard<sup>1,2,11</sup>

Volume 4 (2024), article e87

<https://doi.org/10.24072/pcjournal.464>

### Abstract

At a time when seasonal cycles are increasingly disrupted, the ecology and evolution of reproductive seasonality in tropical vertebrates remains poorly understood. In order to predict how changes in seasonality might affect these animals, it is important to understand which aspects of their diverse patterns of reproductive phenology are linked to either the equally diverse patterns of rainfall seasonality (within-year variations) or instead the marked climatic unpredictability (year-to-year variations) occurring across the intertropical belt. Here, we gather birth and climatic seasonality data from 21 populations of 11 Africa-dwelling primate species from the papionin tribe, occupying a wide range of environments, including equatorial, tropical, temperate and arid climates. We investigate (1) the environmental variations that influence the intensity of reproductive seasonality, and (2) the reproductive stage that is synchronized with increased resource availability. Our results demonstrate wide variation in the intensity of birth seasonality between and within species. Across multiple measures of climatic variation, we found rainfall unpredictability to be the only clear predictor of the intensity of reproductive seasonality across populations, i.e., greater year-to-year variation in the amount of rainfall was associated with lower to no reproductive seasonality. Finally, we identified diverse patterns of reproductive phenology, with the most seasonal breeders generally aligning lactation with the peak in resource availability while other populations show more diverse patterns, where conception, lactation or weaning can all be synchronized with maximal food availability. This study sheds new light on the extent and ecological drivers of flexible reproductive phenology in long-lived tropical mammals, and may even contribute to our understanding of why humans give birth year-round.

<sup>1</sup>Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive (CEFE), Université de Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, EPHE, Montpellier, France,

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Evolutionary Sciences of Montpellier (ISEM), Université de Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, EPHE, Montpellier, France,

<sup>3</sup>AgroParisTech, Paris, France, <sup>4</sup>Department of Anthropology, Brooklyn College, CUNY, 2900 Bedford Ave, Brooklyn, NY

112, USA, <sup>5</sup>New York Consortium in Evolutionary Primatology, New York, NY, USA, <sup>6</sup>Anthropology Program, CUNY Graduate

Center, 365 Fifth Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA, <sup>7</sup>Department of Human Behavior, Ecology and Culture, Max

Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig, Germany, <sup>8</sup>Department of Anthropology, Queens College, City Uni-

versity of New York, Flushing, NY 11367-1597, USA, <sup>9</sup>Biology and Psychology Programs, CUNY Graduate Center, 365 Fifth

Avenue, New York, NY 10016, USA, <sup>10</sup>Department of Archaeology, University of Cape Town, Rondebosch 7701, Cape Town,

South Africa, <sup>11</sup>Gobabeb Namib Research Institute, Walvis Bay, Namibia

## Introduction

Most animals face variation in their environment across the year (Boyce, 1979) in the form of seasonal fluctuations in rainfall, temperature and resource availability that affect their energy balance. Reproductive seasonality, the temporal clustering of reproductive events in the annual cycle, is thought to be beneficial because it synchronizes the most energetically costly reproductive stage with the seasonal food peak, thereby enhancing the condition and survival probability of mothers and offspring (Bronson & Heideman, 1994; Bronson, 2009). Variation in birth frequencies across the annual cycle is a continuous trait, ranging from a complete absence of reproductive seasonality (i.e., random distribution of births throughout the year), as in mountain gorillas (Campos et al., 2017), to cases in which all births occur within a few weeks each year, as in many lemurs (Wright, 1999).

Comparative studies investigating determinants of variation in reproductive seasonality across mammals have often been conducted at the level of the order (Rodents: Heldstab, 2021a, Lagomorphs: Heldstab, 2021b, ruminants: Rutberg, 1987; Zerbe et al., 2012, Carnivora: Heldstab et al., 2018, Primates: Di Bitetti & Janson, 2000; Heldstab et al., 2020; Janson & Verdolin, 2005) and thus focus on broad-scale macro-evolutionary patterns. These studies have typically detected a relationship between geographic latitude and birth seasonality, suggesting that at higher latitudes, birth seasonality is more pronounced, with a more intense birth peak (a birth peak being the temporal period in the annual cycle during which most birth occur). However, important gaps remain in our understanding of the determinants of reproductive seasonality. Few studies have attempted to quantify the extent of variation in reproductive seasonality across multiple populations of the same species (but see in African wild dogs (*Lycaon pictus*): McNutt et al., 2019, and in red-tailed monkeys (*Cercopithecus ascanius*): Struhsaker, 1997), or across closely related species sharing relatively similar diets, body sizes and life histories (but see in several ungulate species: Pereira et al., 2010; Spinage, 1973; Brogi et al., 2022; macaque species: Trébouet et al., 2021). Thus, studies that control for major sources of variation in life history or broad dietary categories should be particularly useful for identifying the climatic drivers of variation in reproductive phenology.

The well-known association between latitude and reproductive seasonality fails to explain the diversity of reproductive seasonality patterns observed within restricted latitudinal ranges, such as in the tropics (Janson & Verdolin, 2005; Heldstab et al., 2020). In addition, latitude encapsulates multiple components of climatic variation, which need to be disentangled in order to identify the main climatic factors at play (Burtschell et al., 2023). First, latitude correlates positively with the degree of environmental seasonality, measured as the magnitude of within-year variation (such as the difference between maximal and minimal monthly rainfall in the annual cycle) (Botero et al., 2014). Further, latitude covaries negatively with environmental productivity, i.e., overall food availability in a given environment. Variation in productivity may alter the benefits of seasonal breeding, as populations living in more productive habitats may face less pressure to breed seasonally (Burtschell et al., 2023).

Finally, environmental predictability, independently of latitude and seasonality (Tonkin et al., 2017), could also influence breeding schedules. In locations with intense year-to-year environmental variation, a flexible reproductive phenology (i.e., individual ability to start a reproductive cycle at different timings of the year, in response to internal or external factors) may be more advantageous than a strictly seasonal reproduction (van Schaik & van Noordwijk, 1985; Brockman & van Schaik, 2005a). Indeed, regular delays or decreases in the food peak may lead to reproductive failures in strict seasonal breeders, thus reducing the fitness benefits of breeding seasonally. However, few studies have investigated the effects of environmental unpredictability on the intensity of reproductive seasonality, with mixed results so far. While English et al. (2012) found that higher inter-annual variation in food availability decreased the intensity of birth synchrony across 38 ungulate species, two studies of red deer, *Cervus elaphus* L. (Loe et al., 2005) and chacma baboons, *Papio ursinus* (Dezeure et al., 2023) found no effect of environmental unpredictability on reproductive seasonality. A recent modelling study similarly detected limited

effects of environmental unpredictability on evolutionary transitions to nonseasonal breeding (Burtschell et al., 2023).

Aside from the selective pressures favouring a flexible reproductive phenology, relatively little is known about how birth timing varies in relation to the annual resource peak in long-lived species. In short-lived species, the full reproductive cycle, from conception to offspring nutritional independence (such as weaning in mammals or fledging in birds), can take place within a single productive season (Bronson, 2009). However, this is not the case for long-lived species, in which multiple stages of a female's reproductive cycle can be aligned with the annual food peak, with varying fitness consequences (Dezeure et al., 2021). For example, females of some species may have to reach a certain threshold of body condition for the onset of reproduction and conception to take place (Brockman & van Schaik, 2005a), meaning that most conceptions are expected to follow a peak of food availability (Brockman & van Schaik, 2005a). In some other species, females may instead synchronize the costliest part of their reproductive cycle with the most productive season so as to enhance maternal condition and survival (Bronson & Heideman, 1994; Bronson, 2009), such that early- or mid-lactation occurs during the annual food peak, as in many primates (Altmann, 1980; Brockman & van Schaik, 2005a; Janson & Verdolin, 2005). Lastly, weaning is a critically vulnerable life stage, where juveniles must begin to forage for themselves (Altmann, 1980; Lee, 1996). Accordingly, several species have been shown to time their births so as to align weaning with the seasonal food peak (Brockman & van Schaik, 2005a; Janson & Verdolin, 2005), as occurs in most lemurs (Wright, 1999). Overall, the reasons underlying the observed variation in alignment of reproductive stages with the food peak across species and populations remain largely unknown.

In this study, we attempt to address the above gap in our understanding by investigating the evolutionary determinants of the intensity and timing of reproductive seasonality in Africa-dwelling papionin monkeys. We focus on papionins for several reasons. First, they exhibit relatively similar body sizes (large-bodied), life history traits (slow) and diet (mostly omnivorous) (Swedell, 2011; Kingdon et al., 2012), allowing us to investigate environmental effects on reproductive seasonality while controlling for these – potentially confounding – factors. Second, this taxonomic group displays a wide diversity of patterns of reproductive seasonality. Indeed, most baboon (*Papio* spp.) species are non-seasonal breeders (Bercovitch & Harding, 1993; Swedell, 2011) despite exhibiting variation in monthly birth frequencies (Lycett et al., 1999; Cheney et al., 2004), while mandrills (*Mandrillus sphinx*) (Setchell et al., 2002), Kinda baboons (*Papio kindae*) (Petersdorf et al., 2019) and most mangabey species (i.e., *Cercocebus* and *Lophocebus* spp.) (Swedell, 2011) are seasonal breeders. Third, this species constellation exhibits great ecological flexibility, inhabiting arid areas, woodland savannahs, equatorial forests, and high altitude grasslands (Swedell, 2011; Kingdon et al., 2012; Fischer et al., 2019) (see also Figure 1). Fourth, within the African members of this tribe, baboons are one of the most well studied primate taxon, with data available from multiple populations of some species within the genus *Papio* (Fischer et al., 2019). Lastly, species from this taxonomic group, and in particular from the genus *Papio*, possess a variety of features shared with early hominins (Jolly, 2001; Alberts et al., 2005; Brockman, 2005): they are large, terrestrial and eclectic omnivorous primates (Rhine et al., 1989; Alberts et al., 2005) that, unlike the great apes, have colonized African savannahs (Bobe et al., 2020) and give birth to a single offspring every one to three years (Altmann & Alberts, 2005; Swedell, 2011). Investigating the environmental determinants of their reproductive seasonality may thus shed new light on the evolution and maintenance of non-seasonal breeding in early hominins (King, 2022).

Here we ask three main questions regarding reproductive seasonality in the papionins in our sample:

- (i) What is the extent of inter- and intra-specific variation in patterns of reproductive seasonality, specifically regarding the height and width of the birth peak, as well as its timing in the annual cycle?

**Table 1 - Hypotheses and predictions proposed on the effects of various environmental components on the intensity of reproductive seasonality**

Predictor	Description	Hypothesis	Prediction	Results
Latitude	Latitude, in degrees	H1.1	When latitude increases, $r_{\text{birth}}$ increases	No
Environmental productivity	Mean annual rainfall ( $12 \times K_{\text{rain}}^1$ )	H1.2	When environmental productivity increases, $r_{\text{birth}}$ decreases	No (opposite effect)
Environmental seasonality	Magnitude of rainfall peak	H1.3	When the amount of within-year rainfall variation increases, $r_{\text{birth}}$ increases	No
	Modality of annual rainfall distribution	H1.4	When there is more than one rainy season, $r_{\text{birth}}$ decreases	No
	Breadth of the annual rainy season (breadth)	H1.5	When RPB increases, $r_{\text{birth}}$ decreases	No
Environmental unpredictability	Magnitude	H1.6	When the amount of rainfall unpredictability (between-year variation) increases, $r_{\text{birth}}$ decreases	Yes
	Timing	H1.7	When the level of rainfall unpredictability in terms of timing increases, $r_{\text{birth}}$ decreases	No
Habitat	Type of habitat: tropical forest, open savannah, or mosaic forest-savannah	H1.8	Populations living in open savannahs have lower $r_{\text{birth}}$ than those living in tropical forests	No

$r_{\text{birth}}$  refers here to the r-vector length, i.e. to the intensity of reproductive seasonality

<sup>1</sup> $K_{\text{rain}}$  is a constant and refers to the mean monthly rainfall

(ii) What are the main environmental factors responsible for variation in the intensity of reproductive seasonality? We isolated eight components of environmental variation: latitude, environmental productivity, magnitude of seasonal variation in rainfall, number of rainy seasons, breadth of the rainy season, amount of between-year (unpredictable) variation in rainfall, between-year variation in the timing of the rainfall season, and the type of habitat. We tested the eight corresponding hypotheses (H1.1-1.8) and their associated predictions, which are listed in Table 1.

(iii) In seasonally breeding populations, which stage of the reproductive cycle is synchronized with the food peak? We tested whether females match the seasonal food peak with conceptions (H2.1 - the 'conception hypothesis'), lactation (H2.2 - the 'lactation hypothesis'), or weaning (H2.3 - the 'weaning hypothesis').


## METHODS

### Sample and data selection

Our data set includes published reports on reproductive seasonality in natural populations of Africa-dwelling papionins from the genera *Cercocebus*, *Lophocebus*, *Macaca*, *Mandrillus*, *Papio*, *Rungwecebus* and *Theropithecus* (Figure 1). We selected papers that reported the number of births per month (except for yellow baboons, *Papio cynocephalus*, from Mikumi National Park, where births were provided in three month-periods). We obtained birth seasonality data from 21 wild populations representing 11 species: see Table S1 for references associated with each population, and Figure 1 for their locations. We did not find any monthly birth data for nine species of interest for which only data from captivity were available (Swedell, 2011; Kingdon et al., 2012): five species of *Cercocebus* (*agilis*, *chrysogaster*, *galeritus*, *lunulatus*, *torquatus*), as well as *Lophocebus aterrimus*, *Mandrillus leucophaeus*, *Papio papio* and *Rungwecebus kipunji* (Figure 1).

### Birth seasonality data

We were interested in quantifying two components of reproductive seasonality in each population: (1) the mean population birth date, i.e. describing when most births mainly occur during the year, and (2) the intensity of population birth seasonality, i.e. describing how seasonal the births are. For our analysis, given the heterogeneity of the data (in some datasets, precise birth dates were available, but in most datasets, we could only obtain a count of births per month), we considered each birth to have occurred in the middle of the month (i.e., the 15<sup>th</sup> of each month, except for February where births were considered to occur on the 14<sup>th</sup>). For the Mikumi population, we considered that births occurred in the middle of each 3 month-period. We then used a circular statistic and represented each birth event on the annual circle by a vector of length 1 and of angle  $\theta$  representing its date ( $15 \times 2 \times \pi / 365.25$  for January,  $(14+31) \times 2 \times \pi / 365.25$  for February, etc.). We computed the mean vector (r-vector) per population, whose angle (converted in a date:  $\mu_{\text{birth}}$ ) indicates the mean day of the year in which births occur (see Table S1) and is thus a measure of birth seasonality. We computed  $\mu_{\text{birth}}$  using the function 'circ.summary' from the 'CircStats' package (Agostinelli & Lund, 2018). For populations with a significant birth peak,  $\mu_{\text{birth}}$  represents the date of the population birth peak, i.e. when births are the most likely to occur in the annual cycle. The length ( $r_{\text{birth}}$ ) of the r-vector measures the intensity of birth seasonality, i.e., the degree of uniformity of the birth distribution across the annual cycle, varying from 0 to 1 (Di Bitetti & Janson, 2000; Janson & Verdolin, 2005; Thompson & McCabe, 2013). When  $r_{\text{birth}}=0$ , births are evenly spread across months (i.e., non-seasonal), while when  $r_{\text{birth}}=1$ , births all occur during the same month of the year (extremely seasonal). After comparing several classical measures of reproductive seasonality (Supplementary Materials, Appendix S1), we used only  $r_{\text{birth}}$  to measure the intensity of reproductive seasonality, as this measure is more robust to differences in sample size than other metrics, facilitating the comparison of seasonality measures between populations (Janson & Verdolin, 2005; Thel et al., 2022).



**Figure 1** - Distribution of the sampled species in Africa, and locations of the populations considered in this study. The species sampled in this study are depicted with relatively larger icons and species names, as well as full coloured circles. Species for which we could not find birth seasonality data are represented with smaller icons and names, as well as empty circles. The coloured areas on the map, corresponding to each species as indicated by the coloured circles, show the geographical distribution of each species. Within each range, small circled numbers show the location of the populations included in this study. 1: Taï, 2: Udzungwa Mountains, 3: Kibale, 4: Akfadou, 5: Tigounatine, 6: Lékédi. 7: Moukalaba-Doudou. 8: Gashaka-Gumti. 9: Gilgil. 10: Queen Elizabeth. 11: Amboseli. 12: Mikumi. 13: Tana River. 14: Filoha. 15: Kasanka. 16: De Hoop. 17: Drakensberg. 18: Moremi. 19: Tokai. 20: Tsaobis. 21: Simien. The species distribution ranges and icons come from Julia Fischer et al., 2017; Kingdon et al., 2012.

## Environmental data

### *Two indicators of environmental variation: rainfall and NDVI*

In order to test our set of hypotheses, we considered environmental variation through two components: rainfall and the Normalized Difference Vegetation Index (NDVI). NDVI produces a quantitative index of vegetation productivity, where higher values indicate a higher degree of vegetation cover (Didan et al., 2015). Climatic seasonality in Africa (and in most tropical habitats) is mainly characterized by within-year variation in rainfall (van Schaik et al., 1993; Alberts et al., 2005; Feng et al., 2013), which has been successfully used as an indicator of food availability for several of our studied populations (Hill et al., 2000; Alberts et al., 2005; Johnson et al., 2018; Petersdorf et al., 2019). Yet, NDVI values have to be used with caution when comparing productivity across environments (Pettorelli et al., 2005), which is why we opted to use rainfall to test hypotheses H1.1-H1-8. For example, the mean annual NDVI value at De Hoop, one of our

driest habitats, was almost equal to that of Gashaka, one of our wettest habitats. We thus used variation in rainfall, rather than in NDVI, to disentangle the various components of climatic variation that may affect the intensity of reproductive seasonality (such as environmental productivity, predictability and seasonality) when testing hypotheses H1.1-H1.8.

However, we opted to use NDVI as an index of food availability to calculate the timing of the food peak when testing hypotheses H2.1-H2-3, as Africa-dwelling papionins rely mainly on plants for their diet (Swedell, 2011). Specifically, the annual peak in NDVI – and presumably in food availability - is likely to lag behind that of rainfall by a few weeks, and this lag duration may vary depending on local climatic or environmental conditions (Bercovitch & Harding, 1993; Jarvey et al., 2018; Dezeure et al., 2021). Consequently, we thought that using NDVI would be preferable than rainfall to assess the timing of the annual food peak, and test hypotheses regarding its match to the birth peak in each population. Nevertheless, the use of NDVI as an index of food productivity in papionins, which are not herbivorous (except for *Theropithecus gelada*), could be arguable, and results of this analysis would be discussed accordingly.

#### *Data extraction*

Daily rainfall was extracted from satellite data sensors with the Giovanni NASA website (product TRMM 3B42) (Huffman et al., 2016) using a 0.25x0.25 degree resolution (corresponding to between 28x28km at the equator and 23x23km at 35° latitude). The GPS coordinates used for this extraction are indicated per population in Table S2, and were assessed either from indications about the home ranges of the habituated groups per population when available in the literature, or alternatively from the geographical location (Park, Reserve or nearby city) of the population (see also Figure 1). Monthly cumulative rainfall (summed across daily values) was subsequently computed between January 1998 and December 2019. We therefore gathered 22 years of rainfall data per population over the same period of time.

We then extracted the mean NDVI per 16 day-period on a 500m x 500m resolution within the same geographical areas used for rainfall extraction (see GPS coordinates in Table S2) between March 2000 and March 2017 (data before and after these dates were not available at the time of data extraction) using MODIS data (MODIS13A1 product) provided by NASA (Didan et al., 2015). Daily NDVI was computed by linear interpolation and then averaged to obtain a monthly value across 18 years.

#### *Components of environmental variation*

In order to test our hypotheses, we identified multiple components of rainfall variation within and across years. First, we decomposed for a given site the observed rainfall value into three components as follows:  $\text{Rainfall}_{m,i} = K_{\text{rain}} + \text{Rainfall } S_m + \text{Rainfall NS}_{m,i}$ , where  $m$  is the month of the year (going from January to December) and  $i$  is the year (from 1998 to 2019).  $K_{\text{rain}}$  is a constant, equalling the mean monthly rainfall across 22 years of records (Figure S1).  $\text{Rainfall } S_m$  is the seasonal component of rainfall, i.e., the rainfall value, averaged across 22 years, for each month of the year, minus  $K_{\text{rain}}$  (Figure S1). For example, for a given site,  $\text{Rainfall } S_1$  ( $m=1$ ) is the mean of all January rainfall values. The term  $\text{Rainfall } S$  thus captures the seasonal component of rainfall variation in the annual cycle, i.e., its within-year variation. Finally,  $\text{Rainfall NS}_{m,i}$  is the non-seasonal component of rainfall, i.e., the difference between the observed rainfall value in any month at a given site ( $\text{Rainfall}_{m,i}$ ) and the predictable component of rainfall variation for that particular site in that particular month ( $K_{\text{rain}} + \text{Rainfall } S_m$ ) (Figure S1). This captures the unpredictable, i.e., between-year, rainfall variation. Using these measures, we assessed the following for each population (see Table S2 for the values associated with each population):

Environmental productivity, or mean annual rainfall, equal to  $12 \times K_{\text{rain}}$ .

Magnitude of environmental seasonality. We computed the magnitude of within-year rainfall variation, as the relative standard deviation (SD) of  $\text{Rainfall } S$  standardized for environmental productivity, given by the formula:  $\frac{100 \times \text{SD}(\text{Rainfall } S)}{12 \times K_{\text{rain}}}$ . The higher the value, the more seasonal is rainfall variation.

The number of rainy seasons per year. Using predictable rainfall variation ( $K_{\text{rain}} + \text{Rainfall S}$ ), we assessed graphically, for each population, the number of rainy seasons per year.

The length of the rainy season. For environments with only one rainy season, we further calculated the rainfall peak breadth (RPB), which is the minimum number of consecutive months of the year during which 80% of the annual rainfall ( $12 \times K_{\text{rain}}$ ) occurs. This measure is meaningless for environments with more than one rainy season, and we thus excluded the populations living in such environments from this analysis.

Magnitude of environmental unpredictability. We computed the magnitude of between-year rainfall variation, as the relative standard deviation of Rainfall NS, standardized by environmental productivity, given by the formula:  $\frac{100 \times SD(\text{Rainfall NS})}{12 \times K_{\text{rain}}}$ . The higher the value, the more unpredictable rainfall variation is.

Using the literature, we categorized the habitat of each population into three types: tropical forest, open savannah, and mosaic forest-grassland (Table S2).

In addition to the magnitude of environmental unpredictability, we were interested in quantifying unpredictability in the timing of the annual rainfall peak, i.e., quantifying how much the timing of rainfall varied between years. Details on the procedure can be found in Appendix S2, but briefly, using circular statistics, we computed standard deviations of the mean dates of the annual rainfall peak over the 20 years sampled. Values close to zero mean that rainfall peak occurs the same month every year, and the higher the value, the more variation in rainfall peak's timing between years.

Lastly, we computed the mean monthly NDVI across 18 years (i.e.,  $K_{\text{NDVI}}$ ) and the seasonal component of NDVI variation for each month of the year (i.e., NDVI S), following the same notation used to disentangle the components of rainfall variation. To characterise the timing of the seasonal food peak, we used circular statistics to compute the mean annual NDVI date,  $\mu_{\text{NDVI}}$  (see Appendix S2 for methodology and Table S2 for values of  $\mu_{\text{NDVI}}$ ).

#### *Phylogenetic tree*

We used the branch length of Version 3 of the 10kTreesPrimates consensus tree (Arnold et al., 2010). Two species of interest were absent from this tree: *Cercocebus sanjei* and *Papio kindae*. For the former, we substituted *Cercocebus galeritus*, its closest relative. For the latter, following recent genetic studies (Jordan et al., 2018; Rogers et al., 2019), we added *Papio kindae* in the same branch as *Papio ursinus*, using the function 'bind.tip' from the package 'phytools' (Revell, 2012).

#### **Statistical analysis**

All statistical analyses were conducted in R version 3.5.0 (R Core Team, 2019).

#### *Factors affecting the intensity of reproductive seasonality*

We considered eight potential environmental parameters associated with reproductive seasonality, which are listed along each corresponding prediction in Table 1.

For each hypothesis, we plotted  $r_{\text{birth}}$  (the r-vector length measuring the intensity of reproductive seasonality in a given population) versus the tested predictor. We then checked the significance of the relationship between each predictor and  $r_{\text{birth}}$  while controlling for phylogeny using Bayesian phylogenetic generalized linear mixed models, with a Beta regression and a logit link function, with the package 'brms' (Bürkner, 2017). We included the phylogenetic relationship between species as a covariance matrix, which was derived from the phylogenetic tree.

Given the low number of populations in this study, and the collinearity between some of our environmental parameters (multivariate models had variance inflated factors >3), we were not able to run stable multivariate models. For example, the magnitude of environmental seasonality was negatively associated with the duration of the rainy season ( $\text{cor}=-0.94$ ,  $t=-9.15$ ,  $p<10^{-4}$ ), and environmental productivity was negatively associated with both latitude ( $\text{cor}=-0.55$ ,  $t=-2.69$ ,  $p=0.016$ ) and the magnitude of environmental unpredictability ( $\text{cor}=-0.80$ ,  $t=-5.48$ ,  $p<10^{-4}$ ).



Therefore, our Beta regressions included as a response variable  $r_{\text{birth}}$  values, one fixed effect (each environmental predictor in turn listed in Table 1, standardised if continuous) and the phylogenetic matrix as a random effect. Given the high variation in sample size (i.e., number of births recorded) between populations, we used a weighed regression, where the weight given to each data point equals to  $\log(N) / \text{minimum}(\log(N))$  so that the population with the lowest sample size counts for 1 observation, and the other populations count for more observations depending on their sample size, following a logarithmic scale ; the logarithmic scale was chosen to account for the diminishing return of increasing the sample size of samples that are already large. Beyond a given sample size, further increases in sample size do not affect much  $r_{\text{birth}}$  estimates, which are already stable and precise. For each model, we set an informative prior and used 3 000 iterations, a burn-in of 1 000 and 3 chains. We visually inspected for convergence and checked the absence of autocorrelations for the posterior distributions of fixed and random effects. The predictors were considered statistically significant when their associated 95% confidence intervals did not cross 0.

Finally, we extracted the phylogenetic signal in our dataset with the metric of Blomberg's K, allowing us to compare it with other signals from other traits. To do so, we computed the mean  $r_{\text{birth}}$  per species, and use the 'phylosig' function with 1000 simulations from the 'phytools' package (Revell, 2024).

#### *Timings of conceptions, births and weaning in relation with NDVI seasonality*

We tested H2 only for those populations for which a significant birth peak can be detected, as it does not make sense to test which period of the reproductive cycle is matched with the annual food peak if there is not a clear seasonal pattern of births in one population. We therefore assessed whether each population had a significant birth peak using the Rayleigh test for circular statistics, more precisely the 'r.test' function from 'CircStats' package (Agostinelli & Lund, 2018). For each population, when the P-value associated with the Rayleigh test was  $<0.05$ , meaning that the null hypothesis of a uniform birth distribution could be rejected, the birth peak was considered significant. With this approach, some populations with relatively low reproductive seasonality (low  $r_{\text{birth}}$ ) but with a large number of births are included, which should be taken into account when interpreting the results. Among these populations with a significant birth peak (see Table S1), we investigated which reproductive stage (H2.1, 'conception'; H2.2, 'lactation'; or H2.3, 'weaning') was synchronized with the annual NDVI peak, i.e.  $\mu_{\text{NDVI}}$ . Additional details are given in Supplementary Materials, Appendix 3 & Table S3. We employed exact two-sample Fisher-Pitman permutation tests, using the 'oneway\_test' function from the 'coin' package (Hothorn et al., 2006). This function tests if the observed monthly value of NDVI during a target period, which depends on the hypothesis tested, is significantly higher than monthly values of NDVI randomized across the entire year. For example, using mean gestation length to infer the annual distribution of conception dates, we tested H2.1 by asking if females tended to conceive during, soon before, or soon after the annual food peak, looking at seasonal NDVI values respectively in (i) the six months surrounding  $\mu_{\text{conc}}$ , (ii) the three months before  $\mu_{\text{conc}}$  and (iii) the three months after  $\mu_{\text{conc}}$ .

## RESULTS

### 1) How variable are patterns of reproductive seasonality?


The annual distribution of births for each population is shown in Figure 2, alongside seasonal variation in rainfall and NDVI. The intensity of reproductive seasonality varies widely across species: *Papio hamadryas* (Filoha population:  $r_{\text{birth}}=0.02$ ) and most *Papio anubis* populations ( $r_{\text{birth}} < 0.22$ ) show non-seasonal births while *Mandrillus sphinx* (Lékédi:  $r_{\text{birth}}=0.67$  and Moukalaba-Doudou:  $r_{\text{birth}}=0.80$  resp.) and *Papio kindae* (Kasanka:  $r_{\text{birth}}=0.50$ ) exhibit pronounced birth seasonality (Figure 3). The phylogenetic signal associated with the intensity of reproductive seasonality is substantial (Blomberg's  $K=1.83$ ,  $p\text{value}<0.01$ ), indicating that more closely related species have more similar patterns of reproductive seasonality. Among papionins, the genera *Mandrillus*, *Cercocebus* and *Macaca* show strong reproductive seasonality, whereas the genera *Lophocebus*, *Papio* and *Theropithecus* show an overall lower intensity of birth seasonality, which

may be associated with greater flexibility within species (Figure 3). Such flexibility is particularly pronounced in *Papio ursinus* populations, extending from low (de Hoop:  $r_{\text{birth}} = 0.10$ ; Tokai:  $r_{\text{birth}} = 0.22$ , and Tsaobis:  $r_{\text{birth}} = 0.10$ ) to moderate birth seasonality (Drakensberg:  $r_{\text{birth}} = 0.42$ ; Moremi:  $r_{\text{birth}} = 0.37$ ) (Figure 3), while intra-specific variation seems less marked for the other species represented by multiple populations in our sample.

The timing of birth seasonality can also be surprisingly variable, even between species that live in adjacent geographical ranges: for instance, *Papio kindae* from Kasanka give birth mainly around July, whereas *Papio ursinus* from Moremi give birth primarily between July and November (Figure 2).



**Figure 2** - Monthly distribution of births in relation to rainfall and NDVI seasonality. The proportion of births per month (left side of the y-axis) is represented with red bars. In addition, the darker red bar indicates the month of the mean birth date ( $\mu_{\text{birth}}$ ) for seasonal breeding populations. We indicate in darker red the value of the r-vector length ( $r_{\text{birth}}$ ) for each population (top-right corner of each panel). We represent the mean monthly rainfall (equalled to  $K_{\text{rain}} + \text{Rainfall S}$ , in mm) in blue (right side of the y-axis), and the mean monthly NDVI (equal to  $K_{\text{NDVI}} + \text{NDVI S}$  and divided by 2 for graphical purposes) in green (left-side of the y-axis). The species and population names are indicated on top of each panel, along with the number of births observed (N).




**Figure 3** - Phylogenetic tree of the studied species including the variation in the intensity of reproductive seasonality for each species. The intensity of birth seasonality is here quantified using the  $r_{\text{birth}}$  value. For those species represented by more than one population, the length of the black segment displays the variation in the intensity of birth seasonality among populations.

## 2) What are the ecological parameters correlated with the intensity of reproductive seasonality?

We detected a significant correlation between the magnitude of environmental unpredictability and the intensity of reproductive seasonality, while controlling for species relatedness, which supported our prediction H1.6 (Table 2): the higher the magnitude of between-year variation in rainfall, the lower the intensity of reproductive seasonality (Figure 4F). We also found an effect of habitat productivity that contradicted our prediction H1.2 (Table 2): the lower the mean annual rainfall, the lower the intensity of reproductive seasonality (Figure 4B). Lastly, we did not find any support for the other six hypotheses: there was no effect of latitude, magnitude of rainfall seasonality, number of rainy seasons, breadth of the rainfall peak, unpredictability in the timing of the annual peak of rainfall, or habitat on the intensity of reproductive seasonality (Table 2, Figure 4).

## 3) Which stage of the reproductive cycle is timed with the annual food peak?

When considering all taxa in our sample as a whole, none of our three hypotheses were clearly supported (H2.1, H2.2, H2.3). However, in five of the six populations with the strongest reproductive seasonality ( $r_{\text{birth}} > 0.5$ ), females appeared to synchronize lactation with the annual NDVI peak, and overall lactation was generally aligned with the NDVI peak in 8 of the 14 populations with a significant birth peak (P-value of the Rayleigh test  $< 0.05$ ) (Table 3, Table S4). In less seasonally breeding populations ( $r_{\text{birth}} < 0.5$ ), females were more variable in the reproductive stages that were timed with the annual NDVI peak, ranging from conception (6 of 14 populations, and mainly before than after conception: e.g. Amboseli or Kibale) to weaning (3 of 8 populations: e.g., Moremi or Gilgil) to none (e.g., Simien) or all of these stages (e.g., Udzungwa) (Table 3, Table S4). Moreover, the timing of the annual NDVI peak compared to the mean conception, birth or weaning dates was highly variable between populations (Table S4).



**Figure 4 - Effect of multiple environmental factors on the intensity of reproductive seasonality.** We plotted the intensity of reproductive seasonality ( $r_{\text{birth}}$ ) depending on latitude (Panel A), environmental productivity (indexed by mean annual rainfall in mm, Panel B), the magnitude of environmental seasonality (i.e. of the rainfall peak, Panel C), the number of rainy seasons (Panel D), the rainfall peak breadth (RPB, Panel E), the magnitude of environmental unpredictability (i.e. of variation in the non-seasonal component of rainfall, Panel F), the timing of environmental unpredictability (i.e. between-year variation in rainfall timings, Panel G), and habitat type (Panel H). For each panel, each dot represents a population (with the population name annotated), and the colour indicates the species (see legend at the bottom). The dashed black line represents the linear regression, and the shaded area displays 95% confidence intervals. On top of each panel, we indicated in italic and between parentheses the significance of each predictor (NS for non-significant, S for significant).

**Table 2 - Influence of several components of rainfall variation on the reproductive seasonality of Africa-dwelling papionin populations**  
 The table shows the posterior mean, the estimate error and the 95% (marginal) confidence intervals (CI) associated for each posterior distribution of the predictors of the Beta regression brms models including species' relatedness as random effect,  $r_{birth}$  as response variable, weighted by the log-transformed number of observations, and each predictor as the only fixed effect of a univariate model. Significant effects are indicated in bold. For categorical predictor, the tested category is indicated between parentheses.

Predictor	posterior mean	estimate error	CI	
			lower	upper
Latitude	0.11	0.34	-0.56	0.77
<b>Habitat productivity</b>	<b>0.38</b>	<b>0.18</b>	<b>0.01</b>	<b>0.73</b>
Magnitude of environmental seasonality	0.03	0.13	-0.23	0.28
Number or rainy seasons (2) <sup>†</sup>	-0.22	0.40	-0.98	0.58
Rainfall peak breadth	-0.06	0.17	-0.40	0.27
<b>Magnitude of environmental unpredictability</b>	<b>-0.44</b>	<b>0.13</b>	<b>-0.70</b>	<b>-0.20</b>
Timing of environmental unpredictability	-0.21	0.14	-0.52	0.05
Habitat type	-0.21	0.41	-1.05	0.59
	0.56	1.45	-2.3	3.45

<sup>†</sup> The reference category is 1 rainy season

<sup>§</sup> The reference category is open savannah habitat

**Table 3** - Reproductive stage matched with the food peak in sampled populations. Cells are filled with NAs when the alignment of the food peak with this reproductive stage was not tested (either because the data on weaning age in this population was missing, or because the birth peak of the population is non-significant, i.e., with P-value of the Rayleigh test >0.05). Cells are filled with X when there is no alignment, and shaded when there is an alignment of the given reproductive stage with the food peak.

Species	Population	$r_{\text{birth}}$	Reproductive stages match with food peak		
			Conception (H2.1)	Lactation (H2.2)	Weaning (H2.3)
<i>Cercocebus atys</i>	Tai	0.8312	X	Early	X
<i>Cercocebus sanjei</i>	Udzungwu Mountains	0.5588	Before	Mid	Before
<i>Lophocebus albigena</i>	Kibale	0.2762	Before	Mid	X
<i>Macaca sylvanus</i>	Akfadou	0.9350	X	Early	NA
	Tigounatine	0.9467	X	X	NA
<i>Mandrillus sphinx</i>	Lekedi	0.6766	Before	Mid	X
	Moukalaba-Doudou	0.7940	X	Whole	NA
<i>Papio anubis</i>	Gashaka-Gumti	0.2167	NA	NA	NA
	Gilgil	0.1873	X	X	After
	Queen Elizabeth	0.0971	NA	NA	NA
<i>Papio cynocephalus</i>	Amboseli	0.1344	Before	X	X
	Mikumi	0.1584	X	X	NA
	Tana River	0.1413	NA	NA	NA
<i>Papio hamadryas</i>	Filoha	0.0208	NA	NA	NA
<i>Papio kindae</i>	Kasanka	0.4971	After	X	NA
<i>Papio ursinus</i>	De Hoop	0.0969	NA	NA	NA
	Drakensberg	0.4143	X	Early	NA
	Moremi	0.3710	Before	Mid	After
	Tokai	0.2394	NA	NA	NA
	Tsaobis	0.1046	NA	NA	NA
<i>Theropithecus gelada</i>	Simien	0.1550	X	X	X

## DISCUSSION

We revealed strong inter- and intra-specific variation in the intensity of reproductive seasonality as well as in the annual timing of births in Africa-dwelling papionins. Our study further emphasizes the importance of environmental unpredictability for the evolution of flexible reproductive seasonality. Lastly, we found that females from different populations of Africa-dwelling papionins match different reproductive stages with the annual food peak.

### Papionins exhibit flexible reproductive seasonality

Of the sampled *Papio* populations, most showed very little seasonality and *Papio kindae* departed from the overall baboon pattern in being relatively highly seasonal breeders. Such diverse patterns of reproductive seasonality within a single genus have rarely been reported outside primates (see for example *Cervus*: English et al., 2012; Loe et al., 2005; Rutberg, 1987, *Damaliscus*: Rutberg, 1987, *Ovis*: Rutberg, 1987, *Ursus*: Spady et al., 2007, *Mustela*: Heldstab et al., 2018, *Vulpes*: Heldstab et al., 2018), but apparently occur in some other primate genera with

large distribution ranges, such as *Alouatta* (Di Bitetti & Janson, 2000; Janson & Verdolin, 2005), *Cercopithecus* (Janson & Verdolin, 2005; Heldstab et al., 2020), *Cebus* (Janson & Verdolin, 2005) and *Macaca* (Janson & Verdolin, 2005; Heldstab et al., 2020; Trébouet et al., 2021). Given the limited taxonomic scale of our study, it is impossible to establish whether seasonal breeding was the ancestral state in papionins, but it seems possible that the loss of seasonal reproduction is a derived state affecting the *Papio* genus (Fig 3). The estimated phylogenetic signal is significant and shows that among the 11 sampled papionin species, the intensity of birth seasonality is more similar among two closely related species. The value of this phylogenetic signal (Blomberg's  $K=1.83$ ) is relatively high, among the highest of many life history traits (such as age at maturity, adult mortality, clutch size in birds, sexual dimorphism, etc.), and higher than behavioural traits (such as daily movement distance, prey size, preferred body temperature, etc.), that are more labile (Blomberg et al., 2003). Despite this strong impact of phylogeny on the intensity of reproductive seasonality, our study emphasizes the importance of the variations in birth seasonality between two closely-related species, or even within a single species.

Importantly, the key adaptive trait that evolved in the *Papio* genus may not be simply the loss of breeding seasonality *per se*, but the evolution of a flexible reproductive phenology. A same papionin female can give birth at different timings for successive birth events, depending on her own individual traits or physiological constraints, or alternatively depending on the strategies of other females in the same social group, as shown in *Papio ursinus* (Dezeure et al., 2021; Dezeure et al., 2023). This reproductive flexibility at the individual level necessarily shapes population patterns of reproductive seasonality, leading to lower reproductive seasonality. Reproductive flexibility at the population level could be defined as the ability for different populations of a same species to exhibit diverse patterns of reproductive seasonality, depending on the environmental conditions. Such flexibility is observed at the population level in *Papio ursinus*, living in a large distributional range characterized by exceptional ecological diversity, which includes cold and temperate climates, oceanic and mountainous ecosystems, and tropical and arid savannahs. Indeed, populations of this species exhibit a wide range of intensity of reproductive seasonality ( $r_{\text{birth}}=[0.10-0.41]$ ), with significant (Moremi) or non-significant (Tsaobis) birth peaks, and to some extent, various timings in their birth peaks (Moremi: around November, versus Drakensberg: around September). However, such population-level flexibility is often difficult to assess in many species, given the datasets available (*Papio ursinus* is indeed the only species in our sample represented by more than three populations with a reasonable number of births).

Flexibility in reproductive phenology may be facilitated by several mechanisms. First, a slower life history may allow papionin species to spread the energetic costs of reproduction over a prolonged period, such that pregnant or lactating females face only a small daily extra energetic expenditure that can be afforded at any time, as suggested by a recent modelling study (Burtschell et al., 2023). In addition, unlike many other mammals, cercopithecids do not use strict photoperiodic cues to trigger their reproduction (Heldstab et al., 2020) but may instead exhibit condition-induced reproduction, whereby conceptions (and/or cycle resumption after lactation) are more likely to occur when females are in better condition (Alberts et al., 2005; Beehner et al., 2006). Such reproductive flexibility may have contributed to their historical ecological success via their ability to colonize diverse environments, and may become a critical asset to facilitate their resilience to climate change, associated with increasing environmental unpredictability (Feng et al., 2013).

### **Environmental unpredictability may drive flexible reproductive seasonality**

We examined several climatic correlates of the intensity of reproductive seasonality across our sample, and found that environmental unpredictability was a significant predictor, with higher between-year rainfall variation being associated with lower reproductive seasonality. So far, most studies investigating climatic effects on reproductive phenology have focused on environmental seasonality, i.e., the magnitude of within-year environmental variation. In primates, the effect of environmental unpredictability on reproductive seasonality, e.g., through climatic events such as el Niño or fruit mast years in South-East Asia, has been suggested (van Schaik & van Noordwijk, 1985; Brockman & van Schaik, 2005a; Wiederholt & Post, 2011) but had never been tested. In line

with our results, a previous study across 70 ungulate populations showed that the birth peak is more spread out in environments with more year-to-year environmental variation (English et al., 2012).

Unpredictable climates may considerably reduce the fitness benefits associated with seasonal breeding, such as enhancing maternal condition and offspring survival. In Africa, year-to-year climatic variation frequently takes the shape of an absence of rain during the rainy season (Alberts et al., 2005), which could cause severe reproductive costs in seasonal breeders who often synchronize lactation or weaning with the rainy season, subsequently forcing females to wait until the next breeding season to initiate a new reproductive event. In such conditions, other adaptive traits may be more advantageous than seasonal breeding to face the energetic costs of reproduction, such as the capacity to store energy (van Schaik & van Noordwijk, 1985; Brockman & van Schaik, 2005a), to expand the dietary repertoire via a generalist diet or foraging innovations (Grueter, 2017), to increase daily foraging time (Alberts et al., 2005; Grueter, 2017), to flexibly adjust lactation duration (van Noordwijk, 2012; Dezeure et al., 2021), or to reproduce cooperatively (Lukas & Clutton-Brock, 2017; Cornwallis et al., 2017). Papionin species show many such traits: they can store energy, they have an eclectic omnivorous diet, and they are flexible foragers that typically rely on fallback foods during the dry season (Altmann et al., 1993; Altmann, 2009; Swedell, 2011). As such, it is likely that rainfall unpredictability selected these traits in papionin species (energy storage, omnivorous diet, slow life histories, etc.), which in turn contributed to shape their flexible reproductive seasonality.

Two recent studies found no or little effect of climatic unpredictability on the intensity of reproductive seasonality at the population level, one in *Papio ursinus* (Dezeure et al., 2023) and one on *Papio cynocephalus* using a modelling approach (Burtschell et al., 2023), questioning the robustness of the effect found in this study. This discrepancy may come from the fact that unpredictable climates select for reproductive flexibility, rather than nonseasonal breeding. In fact, the study by Burtschell et al., 2023 revealed that increasing climatic unpredictability was associated with a lower variance, but not a lower mean, in the intensity of reproductive seasonality. In addition, the effect of climatic unpredictability may be better detected across space than time, i.e., by comparing different populations living in distinct climates and environments, as is the case here, than by comparing the same population across time, as was the case for Dezeure et al., 2023. Different study designs should be combined, across time, taxonomic or spatial scales, to reveal the full complexity of selective pressures at play.

The numerous pressures affecting the intensity of reproductive seasonality are often hard to disentangle, meaning that the effects uncovered by correlational studies like ours may sometimes reflect other co-varying pressures, and should thus be interpreted cautiously. Specifically, environmental productivity, which is negatively correlated with climatic unpredictability at our study sites ( $\text{cor}=-0.80$ ,  $t=-5.48$ ,  $p<10^{-4}$ ), was also a significant predictor of the intensity of reproductive seasonality, but in a direction opposed to our prediction, as well as to previous results (Burtschell et al., 2023). In our sample, the least productive climates are also the most unpredictable, and environmental productivity may thus represent a confounding factor in the relationship between climatic unpredictability and seasonal breeding. In species with a flexible phenology, females can start a new reproductive event rapidly after a reproductive failure, without having to wait the next mating season. Such failures are likely to be particularly frequent where environmental productivity is low, contributing to spread reproductive events across the year cycle, and explaining how low environmental productivity may contribute to decrease reproductive seasonality. In addition, this study is based on datasets with heterogeneous resolutions, including diverse numbers of births and years of study (e.g. Amboseli:  $N=496$ ,  $N_{\text{years}}=33$ , versus Queen Elizabeth:  $N=35$ ,  $N_{\text{years}}=2$ ). Additional birth records in small datasets may change  $r_{\text{birth}}$ , and could thus alter some of the results in our study.

Lastly, our decomposition of rainfall components further calls for a more rigorous definition of the term seasonality, especially when it is used in a quantitative way. Indeed, a 'more seasonal' environment can either be an environment with higher within-year variation (i.e. the amplitude of variation between the 'best' and the 'worst' month of the year), with higher within-year over



between-year variation (i.e. the amplitude of within-year variation controlling for the intensity of unpredictable variations), with a shorter productive season (i.e. the rainfall peak breadth), or with only a unimodal season (i.e. one rainy, or one warm season per year). Similarly, climatic unpredictability can be broken into two components: (1) the amount/magnitude of year-to-year variation (i.e., if the rainy season brings more or less rainfall than usual), and (2) year-to-year variation in the timing of the rainy season (i.e., if the rainy season occurs earlier or later than usual) (Clauss et al., 2020). These various components have rarely been disentangled in empirical studies so far, and this study opens new methodological avenues to investigate various environmental components that are likely to affect reproductive seasonality.

### **Females can match different reproductive stages with the food peak**

The main pattern emerging from our investigations suggests that females from species with high breeding seasonality match lactation with the peak in vegetation productivity (Table 3). For species and populations with a more flexible reproductive phenology, females can match different reproductive stages with the annual vegetation peak, with a possible preference towards conception. This trend may reflect the condition-dependence of conception – a proximate mechanism – rather than an adaptive, optimal strategy aimed at synchronizing the vegetation peak with a particular reproductive stage. These results, obtained from (mostly) tropical primates, echo the broader mammalian literature showing that most mammals from temperate regions match lactation with the best season of the year (Bronson & Heideman, 1994; Bronson, 2009), while patterns are more variable in tropical and long-lived mammals, depending on body size, energy storage capacities and environmental predictability (van Schaik & van Noordwijk, 1985; Brockman & van Schaik, 2005a; Janson & Verdolin, 2005). In addition, even though weaning is a vulnerable life-history stage in young primates, which can be buffered when matched with the vegetation peak in a wild *Papio ursinus* population (Dezeure et al., 2021), few populations seemed to adopt this strategy.

Several caveats apply to the test of H2. First, although NDVI is a relatively good measure of plant productivity, highest values of NDVI do not necessarily coincide with the annual food peak, especially when focusing on omnivorous/frugivorous species. Precise phenological data from each population would be more accurate to quantify the annual food peak. Second, our estimations of lactation peak and weaning might lack accuracy, due to strong between-populations and between-individuals variation. Data quantifying maternal energy expenditure during lactation (Rosetta et al., 2011), or isotopic measures of trophic levels between mothers and infants (Reitsema, 2012; Carboni et al., 2022) would be necessary, for each population, to determine the dynamics of lactation and weaning. Finally, additional unexplored factors can potentially affect reproductive timing and further limit our ability to detect a clear pattern. For example, for populations living at high altitudes like *Theropithecus gelada* from Simien and the *Papio ursinus* from Drakensberg, seasonal variation in temperatures also constrain reproductive phenology (Lycett et al., 1999; Johnson et al., 2018).

### **The evolution of reproductive flexibility in Anthropoid primates may inform our understanding of the reproductive phenology in early humans**

Baboons and relatives represent an interesting model for understanding the evolution of behavioural and reproductive plasticity of early humans (Fischer et al., 2019; King, 2022). Although most great apes are nonseasonal breeders (Brockman & van Schaik, 2005b; Campos et al., 2017), suggesting that their common ancestor also bred year-round, humans are distinct from other apes by exhibiting much faster reproductive paces (which are similar to most Africa-dwelling papionins: Swedell, 2011), and by living in a wider variety of environments, rather than being restricted to tropical forests (Wells & Stock, 2007). The selective pressures that have shaped reproductive phenology in the human lineage versus in other apes may therefore differ, and the papionins, who have similarly left forested habitats to colonize savannahs may provide valuable insights to understand the adaptation of early humans to such diverse and unpredictable environments. Our results suggest that baboons have acquired a low and flexible reproductive seasonality, as well as

several other adaptive traits, when facing more arid and unpredictable environments, such as a generalist omnivorous diet and the frequent use of fallback foods, frequent foraging innovations, an increased ability to store fat and to switch home ranges to more suitable areas. Similar reproductive, physiological and behavioural adaptations to environmental unpredictability may have allowed early humans to thrive and maintain fast reproductive paces during their colonization of a wide variety of environments.

## Conclusion

Our work revealed substantial variation in patterns of reproductive seasonality within and across species of Africa-dwelling papionins, highlighting an exceptional flexibility in their reproductive phenology. Among multiple dimensions of climatic variation, rainfall unpredictability and productivity were the main predictors of the intensity of reproductive seasonality, with arid and unpredictable climates being associated with less seasonal reproduction. Among populations with a pronounced breeding seasonality, females often match lactation with the annual vegetation peak, while phenology patterns are very diverse in other populations. This study sheds new light on the selective pressures shaping reproductive seasonality in long-lived tropical mammals, as well as on potential adaptations to environmental unpredictability. It may further provide an original contribution to understand why humans breed year-round, given their phylogenetic ties and convergences in life-history and ecology with our taxonomic group.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Cassandra Raby for her kind help on extracting NDVI data, and Christophe Dezeure for making Figure 1 of this paper (and more generally for his paternal care). Preprint version 2 of this article has been peer-reviewed and recommended by Peer Community In Ecology (<https://doi.org/10.24072/pci.ecology.100698>; Sueur, 2024). This is an ISEM publication number: ISEM 2024-221 SUD.

## Funding

This project was funded by a grant from the Agence Nationale de la Recherche (ANR ERS-17-CE02-0008, 2018-2021) awarded to E. H.

## Conflict of interest disclosure

The authors declare that they comply with the PCI rule of having no financial conflicts of interest in relation to the content of the article.

## Data, scripts, code, and supplementary information availability

The raw data and scripts used for this paper are available in the following Zenodo repository: 10.5281/zenodo.13312416 (Dezeure, 2024a). Supplementary information is available online in the following Zenodo repository: 10.5281/zenodo.13608425 (Dezeure, 2024b).

## References

- Agostinelli C, Lund U (2018) Package “CircStats”: Circular Statistics, from “Topics in Circular Statistics.” <https://doi.org/10.32614/cran.package.circstats>
- Alberts SC, Hollister-smith JA, Mututua RS, Sayialel SN, Muruthi PM, Warutere KJ, Altmann J (2005) Seasonality and long-term change in a savanna environment. In: Seasonality in Primates: Studies of living and extinct human and non-human primates (eds Brockman DK, van Schaik CP), pp. 157–195. Cambridge Univ. Press., Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511542343.007>

- Altmann J (1980) Baboon Mothers and Infants. The University of Chicago Press.
- Altmann SA (2009) Fallback foods, eclectic omnivores, and the packaging problem. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, **140**, 615–629. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.21097>
- Altmann J, Alberts SC (2005) Growth rates in a wild primate population: ecological influences and maternal effects. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, **57**, 490–501. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00265-004-0870-x>
- Altmann J, Schoeller D, Altmann SA, Muruthi P, Sapolsky RM (1993) Body size and fatness of free-living baboons reflect food availability and activity levels. *American Journal of Primatology*. 30: 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.1350300207>
- Arnold C, Matthews LJ, Nunn CL (2010) The 10kTrees website: A new online resource for primate phylogeny. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, **19**, 114–118. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.20251>
- Beehner JC, Onderdonk DA, Alberts SC, Altmann J (2006) The ecology of conception and pregnancy failure in wild baboons. *Behavioral Ecology*, **17**, 741–750. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/arl006>
- Bercovitch FB, Harding RSO (1993) Annual Birth Patterns of Savanna Baboons (*Papio cynocephalus anubis*) over a Ten-Year Period at Gilgil, Kenya. *Folia Primatologica*, **61**, 115–122. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000156738>
- Di Bitetti MS, Janson CH (2000) When will the stork arrive? Patterns of birth seasonality in neotropical primates. *American Journal of Primatology*, **50**, 109–130. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2345\(200002\)50:2<109::AID-AJP2>3.0.CO;2-W](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2345(200002)50:2<109::AID-AJP2>3.0.CO;2-W)
- Blomberg SP, Garland T, Ives AR (2003) Testing for phylogenetic signal in comparative data: Behavioral traits are more labile. *Evolution*, **57**, 717–745. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0014-3820.2003.tb00285.x>
- Bobe R, Martínez FI, Carvalho S (2020) Primate adaptations and evolution in the Southern African Rift Valley. *Evolutionary anthropology*, **29**, 94–101. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21826>
- Botero CA, Dor R, McCain CM, Safran RJ (2014) Environmental harshness is positively correlated with intraspecific divergence in mammals and birds. *Molecular Ecology*, **23**, 259–268. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mec.12572>
- Boyce MS (1979) Seasonality and Patterns of Natural Selection for Life Histories. *The American Naturalist*, **114**, 569–583. <https://doi.org/10.1086/283503>
- Brockman DK (2005) What do studies of seasonality in primates tell us about human evolution? In: *Seasonality in Primates: Studies of Living and Extinct Human and Non-Human Primates*, pp. 543–570. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511542343.020>
- Brockman DK, van Schaik C (2005a) Seasonality and reproductive function. In: *Seasonality in Primates: Studies of Living and Extinct Human and Non-Human Primates* (eds Brockman DK, van Schaik CP), pp. 269–305. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511542343.011>
- Brockman DK, van Schaik CP (2005b) *Seasonality in Primates: Studies of Living and Extinct Human and Non-Human Primates* (DK Brockman, CP van Schaik, Eds.). Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511542343.001>
- Brogi R, Merli E, Grignolio S, Chirichella R, Bottero E, Apollonio M (2022) It is time to mate: population-level plasticity of wild boar reproductive timing and synchrony in a changing environment. *Current Zoology*, **68**, 371–380. <https://doi.org/10.1093/cz/zoab077>
- Bronson FH (2009) Climate change and seasonal reproduction in mammals. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, **364**, 3331–3340. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2009.0140>
- Bronson FH, Heideman PD (1994) Seasonal regulation of reproduction in mammals. In: *The physiology of reproduction* (eds Knobil E, Neill JD), pp. 541–583. New York Raven Press, New York.
- Bürkner PC (2017) brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*, **80**. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01>

- Burtschell L, Dezeure J, Huchard E, Godelle B (2023) Evolutionary determinants of reproductive seasonality: A theoretical approach. *Peer Community Journal*, **3**. <https://doi.org/10.24072/10.24072/pcjournal.286/>
- Campos FA, Morris WF, Alberts SC, Altmann J, Brockman DK, Cords M, Pusey A, Stoinski TS, Strier KB, Fedigan LM (2017) Does climate variability influence the demography of wild primates? Evidence from long-term life-history data in seven species. *Global Change Biology*, **23**, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gcb.13754>
- Carboni S, Dezeure J, Cowlshaw G, Huchard E, Marshall HH (2022) Stable isotopes reveal the effects of maternal rank and infant age on weaning dynamics in wild chacma baboons. *Animal Behaviour*, **193**, 21–32. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2022.08.010>
- Cheney DL, Seyfarth RM, Fischer J, Beehner J, Bergman T, Johnson SE, Kitchen DM, Palombit RA, Rendall D, Silk JB (2004) Factors affecting reproduction and mortality among baboons in the Okavango Delta, Botswana. *International Journal of Primatology*, **25**, 401–428. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:IJOP.0000019159.75573.13>
- Clauss M, Zerbe P, Bingaman Lackey L, Codron D, Müller DWH (2020) Basic considerations on seasonal breeding in mammals including their testing by comparing natural habitats and zoos. *Mammalian Biology*, **101**, 373–386. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42991-020-00078-y>
- Cornwallis CK, Botero CA, Rubenstein DR, Downing PA, West SA, Griffin AS (2017) Cooperation facilitates the colonization of harsh environments. *Nature Ecology and Evolution*, **1**. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-016-0057>
- Dezeure J, Baniel A, Carter A, Cowlshaw G, Godelle B, Huchard E (2021) Birth timing generates reproductive trade-offs in a non-seasonal breeding primate. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, **288**, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.0286>
- Dezeure J, Burtschell L, Baniel A, Carter AJ, Godelle B, Cowlshaw G, Huchard E (2023) Evolutionary Determinants of Nonseasonal Breeding in Wild Chacma Baboons. *American Naturalist*, **201**, 106–124. <https://doi.org/10.1086/722082>
- Dezeure, J. (2024a). Datasets and scripts for: flexible reproductive seasonality in African-dwelling papionins [Data set]. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13312417>
- Dezeure, J. (2024b). Supplemental Information for: Flexible reproductive seasonality in Africa-dwelling papionins is associated with low environmental productivity and high climatic unpredictability. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13608426>
- Didan K, Barreto Munoz A, Solano R, Huete A (2015) MOD13A1 MODIS/Terra Vegetation Indices 16-Day L3 Global 500m SIN Grid V006 [Data set]. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.5067/MODIS/MOD13A1.006>
- English AK, Chauvenet L, Safi K, Pettorelli N (2012) Reassessing the Determinants of Breeding Synchrony in Ungulates. *PLoS ONE*, **7**, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0041444>
- Feng X, Porporato A, Rodriguez-Iturbe I (2013) Changes in rainfall seasonality in the tropics. *Nature Climate Change*, **3**, 811–815. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1907>
- Fischer J, Higham JP, Alberts SC, Barrett L, Beehner JC, Bergman TJ, Carter A, Collins A, Elton S, Fagot J, Ferreira da Silva M, Hammerschmidt K, Henzi P, Jolly C, Knauf S, Kopp G, Rogers J, Roos C, Ross C, Seyfarth RM, Silk J, Snyder-Mackler N, Städele V, Swedell L, Wilson ML, Zinner D (2019) The Natural History of Model Organisms: Insights into the evolution of social systems and species from baboon studies. *eLife*, **1960**, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.7554/elife.50989.009>
- Fischer J, Kopp GH, Dal Pesco F, Goffe A, Hammerschmidt K, Kalbitzer U, Klapproth M, Maciej P, Ndao I, Patzelt A, Zinner D (2017) Charting the neglected West: The social system of Guinea baboons. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, **162**, 15–31. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.23144>
- Grueter CC (2017) Environmental Seasonality. In: *The International Encyclopedia of Primatology*, pp. 1–2. John Wiley & Sons, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119179313.wbprim0048>
- Heldstab SA (2021a) Latitude, life history and sexual size dimorphism correlate with reproductive seasonality in rodents. *Mammal Review*, **51**, 256–271. <https://doi.org/10.1111/mam.12231>

- Heldstab SA (2021b) Habitat characteristics and life history explain reproductive seasonality in lagomorphs. *Mammalian Biology*, **101**, 739–757. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42991-021-00127-0>
- Heldstab SA, Müller DWH, Graber SM, Bingaman Lackey L, Rensch E, Hatt JM, Zerbe P, Clauss M (2018) Geographical Origin, Delayed Implantation, and Induced Ovulation Explain Reproductive Seasonality in the Carnivora. *Journal of Biological Rhythms*, **33**, 402–419. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0748730418773620>
- Heldstab SA, van Schaik CP, Müller DWH, Rensch E, Lackey LB, Zerbe P, Hatt JM, Clauss M, Matsuda I (2020) Reproductive seasonality in primates: patterns, concepts and unsolved questions. *Biological Reviews*, **96**, 66–88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12646>
- Hill RA, Lycett JE, Dunbar RIM (2000) Ecological and social determinants of birth intervals in baboons. *Behavioral Ecology*, **11**, 560–564. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/11.5.560>
- Hothorn T, Hornik K, Van De Wiel MA, Zeileis A (2006) A lego system for conditional inference. *American Statistician*, **60**, 257–263. <https://doi.org/10.1198/000313006X118430>
- Huffman GJ, Bolvin DT, Nelkin EJ, Adler RF (2016) TRMM (TMPA) Precipitation L3 1 day 0.25 degree x 0.25 degree V7.
- Janson C, Verdolin J (2005) Seasonality of primate births in relation to climate. In: *Seasonality in Primates: Studies of Living and Extinct Human and Non-Human Primates* (eds Brockman DK, van Schaik CP), pp. 307–350. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511542343.012>
- Jarvey JC, Low BS, Pappano DJ, Bergman TJ, Beehner JC (2018) Graminivory and Fallback Foods: Annual Diet Profile of Geladas (*Theropithecus gelada*) Living in the Simien Mountains National Park, Ethiopia. *International Journal of Primatology*, **39**, 105–126. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-018-0018-x>
- Jolly CJ (2001) A proper study for mankind: Analogies from the Papionin monkeys and their implications for human evolution. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology*, **44**, 177–204. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.10021>
- Jordan VE, Walker JA, Beckstrom TO, Steely CJ, McDaniel CL, St Romain CP, Worley KC, Phillips-Conroy J, Jolly CJ, Rogers J, Konkel MK, Batzer MA, Rogers J, Harris RA, Raveendran M, Liu Y, Murali S, Vilgalys TP, Walker JA, Konkel MK, Jordan VE, Steely CJ, Beckstrom TO, Thomas GWC, Pagel KA, Pejaver V, Catacchio CR, Archidiacono N, Ventura M, Marra-Campanale A, Palazzo A, Capozzi O, Raja A, Huddleston J, Quick VS, Karimpour-Fard A, Schrempf D, de Manuel Montero M, Billis K, Martin FJ, Muffato M, Athanasiadis G, Bergey C, Burrell A, Cheng J, Cox L, Else J, Han Y, Kopp GH, Kothe M, Leppälä K, Noll A, Pecotte J, Pipes L, Rice K, Mason CE, Disotell T, Phillips-Conroy J, Walter L, Munch K, Mailund T, Schierup M, Kosiol C, Vinar T, Sikela JM, Zinner D, Roos C, Jolly CJ, Radivojac P, Stanyon R, Rocchi M, Eichler EE, Aken B, Hahn MW, Batzer MA, Marques-Bonet T, Tung J, Muzny DM, Gibbs RA, Worley KC (2018) A computational reconstruction of *Papio* phylogeny using Alu insertion polymorphisms. *Mobile DNA*, **9**. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13100-018-0118-3>
- King GE (2022) Baboon perspectives on the ecology and behavior of early human ancestors. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **119**. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2116182119>
- Kingdon J, Happold D, Butynski TM, Hoffmann M, Happold M, Kalina J (2012) *Mammals of Africa*. A&C Black, London, UK.
- Lee PC (1996) The meanings of weaning: growth, lactation, and life history. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, **5**, 87–98. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6505\(1996\)5:3<87::AID-EVAN4>3.0.CO;2-T](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6505(1996)5:3<87::AID-EVAN4>3.0.CO;2-T)
- Loe LE, Bonenfant C, Mysterud A, Gaillard JM, Langvatn R, Klein F, Calenge C, Ergon T, Pettorelli N, Stenseth NC (2005) Climate predictability and breeding phenology in red deer: Timing and synchrony of rutting and calving in Norway and France. *Journal of Animal Ecology*, **74**, 579–588. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2656.2005.00987.x>
- Lukas D, Clutton-Brock T (2017) Climate and the distribution of cooperative breeding in mammals. *Royal Society Open Science*, **4**. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.160897>

- Lycett JE, Weingrill T, Henzi SP (1999) Birth patterns in the Drakensberg Mountain baboons (*Papio cynocephalus ursinus*). *South African Journal of Science*, **95**, 354–356.
- McNutt JW, Groom R, Woodroffe R (2019) Ambient temperature provides an adaptive explanation for seasonal reproduction in a tropical mammal. *Journal of Zoology*, **309**, 153–160. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jzo.12712>
- van Noordwijk MA (2012) From maternal investment to lifetime maternal care. In: *The evolution of primate societies*, pp. 321–342. The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, London.
- Pereira RJP, Dos Santos Zanetti E, Furlan Polegato B (2010) Female reproduction. In: *Neotropical Cervidology* (eds Barbanti Duarte JM, Gonzalez S), p. . FUNEP/IUCN.
- Petersdorf M, Weyher AH, Kamilar JM, Dubuc C, Higham JP (2019) Sexual selection in the Kinda baboon. *Journal of Human Evolution*, **135**. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2019.06.006>
- Pettorelli N, Vik JO, Mysterud A, Gaillard JM, Tucker CJ, Stenseth NC (2005) Using the satellite-derived NDVI to assess ecological responses to environmental change. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*. **20**, 503–510. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2005.05.011>
- R Core Team (2019) R: A language and environment for statistical computing.
- Reitsemá LJ (2012) Introducing Fecal Stable Isotope Analysis in Primate Weaning Studies. *American Journal of Primatology*, **74**, 926–939. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.22045>
- Revell LJ (2012) phytools: An R package for phylogenetic comparative biology (and other things). *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, **3**, 217–223. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2041-210X.2011.00169.x>
- Revell LJ (2024) phytools 2.0: an updated R ecosystem for phylogenetic comparative methods (and other things). *PeerJ*, **12**. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.16505>
- Rhine RJ, Norton GW, Wynn GM, Wynn RD (1989) Plant feeding of yellow baboons (*Papio cynocephalus*) in Mikumi national park, Tanzania, and the relationship between seasonal feeding and immature survival. *International Journal of Primatology*, **10**, 319–342. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02737420>
- Rogers J, Muthuswamy R, Harris RA, Mailund T, Leppälä K, Athanasiadis G, Schierup MH, Cheng J, Munch K, Walker JA, Konkel MK, Jordan V, Steely CJ, Beckstrom TO, Bergey C, Burrell A, Schrempf D, Noll A, Kothe M, Kopp GH, Liu Y, Murali S, Billis K, Martin FJ, Muffato M, Cox L, Else J, Disotell T, Muzny DM, Phillips-Conroy J, Aken B, Eichler EE, Marques-Bonet T, Kosiol C, Batzer MA, Hahn MW, Tung J, Zinner D, Roos C, Jolly CJ, Gibbs RA, Worley KC (2019) The comparative genomics and complex population history of *Papio* baboons. *Science Advances*, **5**, 1–14.
- Rosetta L, Lee PC, Garcia C (2011) Energetics during reproduction: A doubly labeled water study of lactating baboons. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, **144**, 661–668. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.21475>
- Rutberg AT (1987) Adaptive Hypotheses of Birth Synchrony in Ruminants: An Interspecific Test. *The American Naturalist*, **130**, 692–710. <https://doi.org/10.1086/284739>
- van Schaik CP, van Noordwijk MA (1985) Interannual variability in fruit abundance and the reproductive seasonality in Sumatran Long-tailed macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*). *J. Zool., Lond. (A)*, **206**, 533–549. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-7998.1985.tb03557.x>
- van Schaik CP, Terborgh JW, Wright SJ (1993) The phenology of tropical forests: Adaptive significance and consequences for primary consumers. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, **24**, 353–377. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.es.24.110193.002033>
- Setchell JM, Lee PC, Wickings EJ, Dixson AF (2002) Reproductive Parameters and Maternal Investment in Mandrills (*Mandrillus sphinx*). *International Journal of Primatology*, **23**, 51–68. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1013245707228>
- Spady TJ, Lindburg DG, Durrant BS (2007) Evolution of reproductive seasonality in bears. *Mammal Review*, **37**, 21–53. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.2007.00096.x>
- Spinage CA (1973) The role of photoperiodism in the seasonal breeding of tropical African ungulates. *Mammal Review*, **3**, 71–85. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2907.1973.tb00174.x>

- Struhsaker TT (1997) Ecology of an African rain forest: logging in Kibale and the conflict between conservation and exploitation. *Journal of Tropical Ecology*, **14**, 561–561. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266467498240399>
- Sueur, C. (2024) Reproductive flexibility shapes primate survival in a changing climate driven by environmental unpredictability. *Peer Community in Ecology*, 100698. <https://doi.org/10.24072/pci.ecology.100698>
- Swedell L (2011) African papionins: diversity of social organization and ecological flexibility. In: *Primates in perspective* (eds Campbell CJ, Fuentes A, MacKinnon KC, Bearder S, Stumpf R), pp. 241–277. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Thel L, Chamailé-Jammes S, Bonenfant C (2022) How to describe and measure phenology? An investigation on the diversity of metrics using phenology of births in large herbivores. *Oikos*, **2022**. <https://doi.org/10.1111/oik.08917>
- Thompson ME, McCabe GM (2013) Reproductive seasonality in wild Sanje mangabeys (*Cercocebus sanjei*), Tanzania: Relationship between the capital breeding strategy and infant survival. *Behaviour*, **150**, 1399–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1163/1568539X-00003102>
- Johnson ET, Snyder-Mackler N, Lu A, Bergman TJ, Beehner JC (2018) Social and ecological drivers of reproductive seasonality in geladas. *Behavioral Ecology*, **29**, 574–588. <https://doi.org/10.1093/beheco/ary008>
- Tonkin JD, Bogan MT, Bonada N, Rios-Touma B, Lytle DA (2017) Seasonality and predictability shape temporal species diversity. *Ecology*, **98**, 1201–1216. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ecy.1761>
- Trébouet F, Malaivijitnond S, Reichard UH (2021) Reproductive seasonality in wild northern pig-tailed macaques (*Macaca leonina*). *Primates*, 62 491–505. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-021-00901-1>
- Wells JCK, Stock JT (2007) The biology of the colonizing ape. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology*, **50**, 191–222. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.20735>
- Wiederholt R, Post E (2011) Birth seasonality and offspring production in threatened neotropical primates related to climate. *Global Change Biology*, **17**, 3035–3045. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2486.2011.02427.x>
- Wright PC (1999) Lemur Traits and Madagascar Ecology: Coping With an Island Environment. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology*, **42**, 31–72. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(sici\)1096-8644\(1999\)110:29+<31::aid-ajpa3>3.0.co;2-0](https://doi.org/10.1002/(sici)1096-8644(1999)110:29+<31::aid-ajpa3>3.0.co;2-0)
- Zerbe P, Clauss M, Codron D, Bingaman Lackey L, Rensch E, Streich JW, Hatt JM, Müller DWH (2012) Reproductive seasonality in captive wild ruminants: Implications for biogeographical adaptation, photoperiodic control, and life history. *Biological Reviews*, **87**, 965–990. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-185X.2012.00238.x>