

Direct evidence of megamammal-carnivore interaction decoded from bone marks in historical fossil collections from the Pampean region

Karina Vanesa Chichkoyan^{1,2}, Borja Figueirido³, Margarita Belinchón⁴, José Luis Lanata⁵, Anne-Marie Moigne⁶ and Bienvenido Martínez-Navarro^{1,2,7}

¹ IPHES, Institut Català de Paleocologia Humana i Evolució Social, Tarragona, Spain

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

³ Departamento de Ecología y Geología, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Málaga, Málaga, Spain

⁴ Museo de Ciencias Naturales de Valencia, Valencia, Spain

⁵ IIDyPCa, CONICET, UNRN, San Carlos de Bariloche, Argentina

⁶ Prehistory Dpt-UMR 7194 HnHp, Musée de l'Homme, Paris, France

⁷ ICREA, Barcelona, Spain

ABSTRACT

Pleistocene South American megafauna has traditionally attracted the interest of scientists and the popular media alike. However, ecological interactions between the species that inhabited these ecosystems, such as predator-prey relationships or interspecific competition, are poorly known. To this regard, carnivore marks imprinted on the fossil bones of megamammal remains are very useful for deciphering biological activity and, hence, potential interspecific relationships among taxa. In this article, we study historical fossil collections housed in different European and Argentinean museums that were excavated during the 19th and early 20th centuries in the Pampean region, Argentina, in order to detect carnivore marks on bones of megamammals and provide crucial information on the ecological relationships between South American taxa during the Pleistocene. Our results indicate that the long bones of megafauna from the Pampean region (e.g., the Mylodontidae and Toxodontidae families) exhibit carnivore marks. Furthermore, long bones of medium-sized species and indeterminate bones also present punctures, pits, scores and fractures. Members of the large-carnivore guild, such as ursids, canids and even felids, are recognised as the main agents that inflicted the marks. We hypothesize that the analysed carnivore marks represent the last stages of megaherbivore carcass exploitation, suggesting full consumption of these animals by the same or multiple taxa in a hunting and/or scavenging scenario. Moreover, our observations provide novel insights that help further our understanding of the palaeoecological relationships of these unique communities of megamammals.

Submitted 11 November 2016

Accepted 23 February 2017

Published 9 May 2017

Corresponding author
Borja Figueirido,
Borja.figueirido@uma.es

Academic editor
Fabien Knoll

Additional Information and
Declarations can be found on
page 22

DOI 10.7717/peerj.3117

© Copyright
2017 Chichkoyan et al.

Distributed under
Creative Commons CC-BY 4.0

OPEN ACCESS

Subjects Paleontology

Keywords Quaternary, Pleistocene, Pampean region, Bone marks, Carnivore, Megamammal, Interaction

INTRODUCTION

Reconstructing the biotic interactions between extinct organisms, including competition or predator–prey relationships, is an extremely difficult task, especially when the information available from living analogues is limited (Figueirido, Martín-Serra & Janis, 2016). This is particularly true in the case of ancient South American ecosystems, as members of the megafauna became 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).

Megamammals from the southern portion of South America, or the Pampean (Argentinean) region, have fascinated scientists since the 18th century. Nevertheless, different studies performed to understand their palaeoecology 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, carnivore marks preserved on fossil bones of megaherbivores constitute an important source of information, as they represent direct evidence of predator–prey relationships, or alternatively, of scavenging activity by top predators such as strictly flesh-eating or bone-cracking hypercarnivores, respectively (e.g., Haynes, 1982; Marean & Ehrhardt, 1995; Pobiner & Blumenschine, 2003; Pickering, Egeland & Brain, 2004; Palmqvist et al., 2011; Espigares et al., 2013). Consequently, detecting the marks of biological activity preserved on the bone surfaces of Pampean megamammals, using detailed taphonomic investigations and next-generation techniques, is crucial for deciphering the ecological relationships between Pleistocene South American palaeocommunities.

Previous studies of bone surfaces performed on fossil collections housed in various museums in the Americas have revealed carnivore activity, and hence animal interaction (Haynes, 1980; Martin, 2008; Martin, 2016; De Araújo Júnior, De Oliveira Porpino & Paglarelli Bergqvist, 2011; Dominato et al., 2011; Labarca et al., 2014). Indeed, in South America, carnivore marks have been reported from different locations (Fig. 1). Specifically in the Pampean region, there is a neural apophysis of a glyptodont cf. *Eosclerocalyptus lineatus* (Glyptodontidae, Hoplophorini) from the Pliocene (Olavarría) with a clear carnivore tooth imprint, attributed to a giant *Chapalmalania* (Carnivora, Procyonidae) procyonid (De Los Reyes et al., 2013). Recently, a taphocoenosis from the margins of the Salado River, comprising remains of the equid *Hippidion principale* (Perissodactyla, Equidae) and some indeterminate bones with carnivore marks was associated with the dirk-toothed sabre cat *Smilodon* sp. (Carnivora, Felidae, Machairodontinae) (Scanferla et al., 2013). At the archaeological site Arroyo Seco 2, bones of extinct horses such as *Equus* sp. (Perissodactyla, Equidae) show carnivore marks (Politis et al., 2016). In Patagonia, the jaguar *Panthera onca mesembrina* (Carnivora, Felidae, Pantherinae) was reportedly responsible for interventions involving the ground sloth Mylodontidae (Xenarthra, Tardigrada) and *Hippidion* groups (Martin, 2008; Martin, 2016), and a member of Felidae produced marks on mastodont (Proboscidea, Gomphotheriidae) bones (Labarca et al., 2014) during the late Pleistocene. In Brazil, two sites have been described where the small



Figure 1 South American map showing the three sites mentioned in the text. In Brazil: Tanque do Jirau, Águas de Araxá. In the Pampean region, Salado River and material found in different collections of this study, Olavarria and Arroyo Seco 2. In the Patagonian region: Pilauco, Cueva Lago Sofia, Cueva del Milodón, Alero Dos Herraduras, Cueva de Los Chingues, Cueva del Puma, Cueva Fell, Alero Tres Arroyos. Image modified from Wikipedia (<https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:BlankMap-Americas.svg>; public domain).

canid *Procyon troglodytes* (Carnivora, Canidae) presumably scavenged the carcasses of two mastodons, *Notiomastodon platensis* (Proboscidea, Gomphotheriidae), the giant ground sloths *Eremotherium laurillardi* (Tardigrada, Megatheriidae) and *Glossotherium* (Tardigrada, Mylodontidae) (De Araújo Júnior, De Oliveira Porpino & Paglarelli Bergqvist, 2011), and *Haplomastodon waringi* (Proboscidea, Gomphotheriidae) in the Pleistocene (Dominato et al., 2011).

In this article, we study for the first time, carnivore marks on megamammal (>1,000 kg; Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009) remains from different fossil collections recovered from the Pampean region and now housed in various institutions in Europe and Argentina. Our goal is to identify potential biological activity using taphonomic methods in order to understand predator-megaherbivore interaction within Pleistocene South American mammalian communities from the Pampean region.

Table 1 Megamammal bones with museums assignment and current biostratigraphical determination.

Museum	Museum abbreviation	Taxon	Museum asignation	Biostatigraphical determination
<i>Museo de Ciencias Naturales de Valencia</i>	MCNV	cf. Scelidotheriinae gen.	–	Ensenadan to Lujanian stage/age
<i>Muséum National d' Histoire Naturelle</i>	MNHN	<i>Glossotherium robustum</i>	Pampean	Bonarian and Lujanian stage/age
<i>Naturhistorisches Museum Wien</i>	NMW	<i>Glossotherium robustum</i>	Diluvium-Upper Pampean	Bonarian stage/age
<i>Museo de La Plata</i>	MLP	Toxodontidae	Ensenadan	Ensenadan stage/age

MATERIALS & METHODS

In order to identify those bones showing evidence of carnivore intervention, we examined 1,976 bones belonging to the following four collections (Table 1): (i) 1,478 bones from the Rodrigo Botet collection, housed at the *Museo de Ciencias Naturales de Valencia* (MCNV; Spain), result of the excavations undertaken by Enrique de Carles in the northeast of the Buenos Aires province (Belinchón *et al.*, 2009); (ii) 30 bones from the Dupotet collection, housed at the *Muséum National d' Histoire Naturelle* (MNHN; Paris, France) of Pampean age from Luján City; (iii) 330 bones from the Krncsek collection, housed at the *Naturhistorisches Museum Wien* (NMW; Austria) that proceed from the Luján River in Mercedes City, and are identified as “Diluvium-Upper Pampean”; and (iv) 138 bones from the Ameghino collection, housed at the *Museo de La Plata* (MLP; Argentina), and which were extracted from a 20 m stretch along both sides of a water channel in the Canal de Conjunción (La Plata) (Ameghino, [1889] 1916 :128–129).

These collections were gathered during various non-systematic excavations carried out in the eastern region of what is currently Buenos Aires province, in the Pampean 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.* 0.5 Ma (Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009). The late Pleistocene-early Holocene corresponds to the Lujanian Stage/Age. Significant palaeoenvironmental oscillations, aeolian pulses, fluvial process and various pedogenetic events influenced this period (Tonni *et al.*, 2003; Fucks & Deschamps, 2008; Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009). When the collections analysed in this study were originally collected, these units were included in the “Pampean Formation” (Tonni, 2011). Current biostratigraphical information (Tonni, 2009) allows the material from MCNV to be assigned to the Ensenadan to Lujanian Stage/Age and the material from MNHN and NMW to the Bonaerian and Lujanian Stages/Ages. Furthermore, in the NMW collection, the old reference to Upper Pampean is currently equivalent to the Bonarian Stage/Age (Tonni, 2011). The last record of these mammal groups comes from the Guerrero Member of the Luján Formation, deposited between 21,000 and 10,000 ¹⁴C years BP (Tonni, 2009).




Figure 2 Pleistocene formations, Stage/Age and the locations of the collections over time. Abbreviations: Ma, million years of ago. Not scaled.

In the case of the MLP assemblage, the presence of the notoungulate *Mesotherium cristatum* (Notoungulata, Mesotheriidae) among the identified species means this material can be dated as Ensenadan (*Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009*) (Fig. 2 and Table 1).

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; Fernández-Jalvo & Andrews, 2016*). These allowed us to discard any type of intervention that could simulate carnivore activity or, if superimposed onto carnivore marks, could have indicated a previous carnivore intervention.

We follow the literature to identify whether bone marks were the result of carnivore activity (e.g., *Haynes, 1980; Haynes, 1982; Haynes, 1983; Binford, 1981; Capaldo & Blumenschine, 1994; Lyman, 1994; Domínguez-Rodrigo & Piqueras, 2003; Pickering, Egeland & Brain, 2004; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2012; Delaney-Rivera et al., 2009; Sala, Arsuaga & Haynes, 2014; Sala & Arsuaga, in press*). As large mammal bones are too large to be ingested (*Fernández-Jalvo & Andrews, 2016*), we did not consider this effect as a possible agent of the marks. Furthermore, small bones tend to be splintered by the teeth of predators, making them impossible to classify either anatomically or taxonomically (*Fernández-Jalvo & Andrews, 2016*). Therefore, this type of fragmented material was not included in our review. The only exception was the case of the indeterminate and medium-sized bones from the MLP collection where part of the original association was conserved. Coprolites were absent in the reviewed collections.

We classified the bone marks potentially produced by carnivores into four categories (Table S1): (i) pitting and/or punctures, (ii) u-shaped elongated scratches or scores, (iii) furrowing; and (iv) spiral fractures. To investigate the body size of the potential carnivores

that inflicted the marks, we used a box-plot diagram (*Hammer, Harper & Ryan, 2001*) to compare the size of the pitting and/or punctures from the MCNV, MNHN and MLP specimens with those published by *Pickering, Egeland & Brain (2004)* (various bones), *De Los Reyes et al. (2013)* (bone specimen Xen 30-12), and *Martin (2016)* (various bones); the material from NMW was excluded for the small sample size (Tables S2–S5). We follow the studies mentioned above as they allowed us to compare palaeontological and archaeological cases from the Pampean region, Patagonia, and one African case, and appreciate any similarities and/or differences with African ecosystems. Even though this information was still statistically poor, it allowed us to make some preliminary assumptions. Additionally, assigning a pit or puncture to a specific taxa is always problematic given the different factors involved (e.g., the part of the bone marked and the bite force of an animal) (*Delaney-Rivera et al., 2009*). Nevertheless, the overlapping of our data with the comparative cases allowed us to ascribe the marked bones to general carnivore size categories. Even though some authors have also included scores in their studies of body size (*Delaney-Rivera et al., 2009; Labarca et al., 2014; De Araújo Júnior, De Oliveira Porpino & Paglarelli Bergqvist, 2011*), we agree with *Domínguez-Rodrigo & Piqueras (2003)* that score marks relate not only with teeth size, but also the effect of the teeth being dragged over the bone surface; variability can therefore be expected from this type of marks.

We also reviewed actualistic studies describing the marks that different carnivore taxa leave when feeding and, more specifically, recent research into marks made by the members of the large carnivore guild, such as ursids (Carnivora, Ursidae), felids (Carnivora, Felidae) and canids (Carnivora, Canidae) (Table S1). Specialised bone-breaking hyenas were not considered because they were not present in South America at that time. Various studies report that ursids leave scarce to abundant teeth marks (*Haynes, 1980; Haynes, 1983; Burke, 2013; Saladié et al., 2013; Arilla et al., 2014; Sala & Arsuaga, in press*). In contrast, felids tend to make fewer marks on the bones since they feed exclusively on meat (*Christiansen & Wroe, 2007; Sala & Arsuaga, in press*), although they can leave important signs of predation (*Haynes, 1983; Marean & Ehrhardt, 1995; Martin, 2008; Martin, 2016; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2012; Kaufmann et al., in press; Sala & Arsuaga, in press*). Finally, canids can make a great number of intervention marks (*Haynes, 1982; Haynes, 1983; Yravedra, Lagos & Bárcena, 2011; Burke, 2013; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2012; Sala, Arsuaga & Haynes, 2014; Sala & Arsuaga, in press*). Furthermore, while felids (including *Smilodon*) and ursids have straighter incisive arcades, canids have curved arcades (*Biknevicius, Van Valkenburgh & Walker, 1996*). This shape is useful when analysing pitting and/or puncture arrangements on bone surfaces (e.g., linear or curved rows of tooth impressions).

We examined the fossil remains of the megaherbivores present in the collections with 3.5× and 12× magnifying glasses. We also used a Dino-Lite Microscope AD4113T (at magnifications of 20×–45×) and the software Dino-Lite 2.0. Both the length and breadth (major and minor axes) of the scores, pits and punctures were measured. Larger marks were measured using a caliper, and smaller ones were recorded with the measurement tool installed in the Dino-Lite. For each collection, high-resolution digital images were taken, in each museum, using a Panasonic Lumix DMC-TZ35 camera.

Table 2 Measurements of pits, punctures and scores. Presence of furrowing or crenulated edges was also indicated.

Museum/specimen	Species	Element	Pitting/punctures	Scratches/scores	Crenulated	Furrowing
MCNV (64–492)	cf. Scelidotheriinae gen.	Right tibia	4 × 3 mm/5 × 3 mm/9 × 6 mm/5 × 4 mm. Pittings on distal articular face, medial edge	(i) 20 × 10 mm. Score on distal articular face, lateral edge. (ii) 45 × 10 × 4 mm/13 × 10 mm/ 20 × 13 mm. Grooves medial face of the diaphysis (iii) 15 × 4 mm (Five marks of distal posterior face) and 15 × 5 mm (Two marks proximal posterior face).	×	×
MNHN (MNHN.F. PAM 119)	<i>Glossotherium robustum</i>	Left humerus	8 × 6 mm/ 7 × 7 mm/ 6 × 5 mm/3 × 3 mm. Punctures in trochlear region	(i) 45 × 10 cm groove in the condyle (ii) 10 × 7 mm/ 15 × 6 mm/ 15 × 10 mm scores in condyle	–	×
MN (1908.XI.110)	<i>Glossotherium robustum</i>	Left distal humerus	8.5 × 6 mm	–	×	×
MLP (MLP 15-I-20-32)	Toxodontidae	Femur condyle	–	Three scratches of 40 × 5 mm/ Five scratches of 15 × 5 mm	–	–
MLP (MLP 15-I-20-36)	Indeterminate	Indeterminate	8 × 8 mm	–	–	–
MLP (MLP 15-I-20-39)	Indeterminate	Indeterminate	4.5 × 4 mm	–	–	–
MLP (MLP 15-I-20-40)	Indeterminate	Diaphysis	3.5 × 2 mm/ 6.5 × 4 mm	–	–	–
MLP (MLP 15-I-20-41)	Indeterminate	Diaphysis	2 × 2 mm	–	–	–

For the MLP assemblage we also applied the well-established archaeozoological variables MNI (Minimum Number of Individuals) and NISP (Number of Identified Specimens), as all the specimens are part of the same taphocoenosis (Lyman, 1994). While MNI was used to account for the minimum number of mammals with carnivore marks represented in the sample, the second informed the counting per taxa or skeletal part categories.

RESULTS

We found four bones (0.2% of the total) of megaherbivores and 24 bones (1.24% of the total) of medium-sized and indeterminate species with potential carnivore intervention. In addition, a detailed description of the marks is given in the supplementary information (Data S1). Below, we give a general overview of the most important damage found in each collection (Table 2 and Table S5) and provide general observations from the box-plot diagram (Fig. 3):




Figure 3 Box plot diagram showing the Log-transformed area of the pits/punctures. Bones from MCNV 64-492, MNHNF.PAM 119, MLP, Xen 30-12 (*De Los Reyes et al., 2013, Table 1*), Cueva del Milodón (*Martin, 2016*) and Swartkrans Member 3 (*Pickering, Egeland & Brain, 2004, Appendix A, column of large mammals*) (Generated using the PAST program, Version 3.14; *Hammer, Harper & Ryan, 2001*).

- (i) A right tibia from the MCNV (no 64-492) that corresponds to the ground sloth cf. *Scelidotheriinae* gen (Tardigrada, Mylodontidae). This bone presents important furrowing on both epiphyses and pits and scores on the distal epiphysis, as well as on the posterior and medial faces of the diaphysis (Fig. 4). In the box plot diagram it can be observed that the measurements of these pits slightly overlaps with the maximum sizes of large carnivores (and outliers) from *Pickering, Egeland & Brain (2004)* and falls within the measurements presented by *De Los Reyes et al. (2013)*, but are slightly bigger than the Pampean case (*De Los Reyes et al., 2013*). Nevertheless, this discrepancy could be due the bigger pit from MCNV that seems to be enlarged by post-depositional process (*Data S1* and *Fig. S1*). They also coincide with the smaller sizes from Cueva del Milodón (*Martin, 2016*);
- (ii) A left humerus of *Glossotherium robustum* labelled MNHN.F. PAM 119 from MNHN, with pits, scores and furrowing (Fig. 5). Comparing this with the other samples reveals the same trend as for MCNV. It matches with the log area of the tibia from MCNV, but also overlaps more with the specimens in *Pickering, Egeland & Brain (2004)* because of the presence of smaller pits on the MNHN bone. It also coincides with the range of Xen 30-12, but has bigger and smaller log area extremes than the Pampean case (*De Los Reyes et al., 2013*). In addition, it compares well with the smaller marks from Cueva del Milodón (*Martin, 2016*);
- (iii) A left distal humerus of *Myodon robustum* (no. 1908.XI.110) housed at MNW with furrowing and a possible puncture (Fig. 6). The furrowed border is scalloped and part of it is flaked. This species is considered to represent *Glossotherium robustum* (*McAfee,*




Figure 4 Right tibia of cf. *Scelidotheriinae* gen., 64-492 from MCNV, posterior-medial view, indicating the different marks described in the text. (A) distal epiphysis, the rectangle and zoom indicate the four linearly-positioned pits; (B) metadiaphysis with the U-shaped parallel scores circled; (C) furrowing of the distal metadiaphysis, with a circle indicating the parallel, V-shaped teeth marks on the posterior face; (D) medial face of the diaphysis with a magnified image of one of the three thick grooves; (E) furrowing of the proximal metadiaphysis.

2009). Although not plotted, Table S5 shows that the log area coincides with the range for the rest of the sampled material; and

- (iv) At the MLP, one femur condyle from the notoungulate *Toxodontidae* (MLP 15-I-20-32) (Notoungulata; *Toxodonta*) was found with scratches (Fig. 7). Moreover, in this collection 22 long bones of medium-sized species and two further indeterminate bones have fresh fractures, scratches, punctures/pits and crenulated edges (details of these marks are shown in Table S6) (Figs. 8–10). The box plot reveals the same trend for these pits and punctures as seen in the other cases. Nevertheless, the presence of smaller




Figure 5 Left humerus *Glossotherium robustum*, MNHN.F.PAM 119 from MNHN, anterior view, indicating the different marks described in the text. (A) front view of distal articular face; (B) amplification of trochlear region with punctures and scratches; (C) amplification of condyle with scoring; (D) wide grooves on the lateral face.

marks on this sample results in greater coincidence with the Swartkrans specimens (Pickering, Egeland & Brain, 2004), and there is partial overlap with Xen 30-12 (De Los Reyes et al., 2013). However, only the outliers from MLP coincide with the smaller sizes from Cueva del Milodón (Martin, 2016), and the plot partially overlaps with those of the material from MCNV and MNHN. The smaller pits on the MLP specimens were considered together with the bigger punctures on the two indeterminate bones. Large carnivores can generate both small and large pits and/or punctures (Delaney-Rivera et al., 2009), and this may explain the variability in the marks observed here.

DISCUSSION

The information presented above suggests that the different types of bone marks found on both megamammal and the other mammal remains were most likely inflicted by some large-sized carnivores that inhabited the Pampean region during the Pleistocene. Considering the limited evidence available from this region, the data presented here is crucial for exploring different predator–prey and/or scavenging scenarios, at a coarse scale.




Figure 6 Left distal humerus of *Glossotherium robustum*, 1908. XI.110 from MNW. (A) anterior face; (B) posterior face, indicating the puncture; (C) amplification of the posterior rim; and (D) indication of the flaked border.



Figure 7 Condyle of distal femur of Toxodontidae, 15-I-20-32 with elongated and U-shaped scratches. (A) lateral face; (B) anterior view with scores; (C) medial view.

The agents: pleistocene mammalian predators from the Pampean region

Several species of Quaternary carnivores have been recorded from the Pampean region. In the supplementary information, we offer a general description of these, along with some ecological characteristics (Data S2). These carnivores include ursids, felids and canids. The ursids comprise *Arctotherium angustidens* from the Ensenadan Stage/Age and *Arctotherium vetustum*, *Arctotherium bonariense* and *Arctotherium tarijense* from Bonarian and Early Lujanian times (Soibelzon et al., 2014; Figueirido & Soibelzon, 2010). In particular, the first species would have had an important capacity to feed on meat (Figueirido & Soibelzon, 2010). Felids are represented by three hypercarnivorous species: *Smilodon populator*, *Puma concolor* and *Panthera onca* (Christiansen & Harris, 2006; Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006; Bocherens et al., 2016). While the first two had some bone marking capacity, the third would have been capable of inflicting more damage (Van Valkenburgh & Hertel, 1993; Marean & Ehrhardt, 1995; Antón et al., 2004; Martin, 2008; Martin, 2016; Muñoz et al., 2008; Binder & Van Valkenburgh, 2010; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015; Kaufmann et al., in press). Finally, several pack-hunting and/or scavenging canids were present at the time, including *Theriodictis platensis* (and its sister taxon “C”. *gezi*) in the Ensenadan (Prevosti & Palmqvist, 2001; Prevosti, Tonni & Bidegain, 2009), various *Procyon* species throughout the Pleistocene (Prevosti, Zurita & Carlini, 2005; Prevosti & Schubert, 2013; Bocherens et al., 2016), *Canis nehringui* (currently recognised as a junior synonym of *C. dirus*, (Prevosti, Tonni & Bidegain, 2009), and *Dusicyon avus* in the late Pleistocene (Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006).

It is clear that carnivores with an important capacity for bone modification and/or consumption would have been responsible for the various marks observed. Even though felids such as *Smilodon* or *Puma* could have produced some bone-damage, as observed in some studies (Van Valkenburgh & Hertel, 1993; Marean & Ehrhardt, 1995; Muñoz et al., 2008; Kaufmann et al., in press), their reduced bone-breaking potential rules them out as the principal generator of the feeding traces recorded. Furthermore, it is worth mentioning that the highly specialised viscera-eating dentition of the dirk-toothed *Smilodon* would have




Figure 8 Bone shafts showing carnivore intervention from MLP. (A) MLP 15-I-20-35 with spiral fracture, amplifications of the internal notch and the cortical face with scoring; (B) MLP 15-I-20-34 with spiral fracture, notches can be observed on the medullar face, amplification of light pitting in the cortical face; (C) MLP 15-I-20-33 with spiral fracture




Figure 9 Bone shafts showing carnivore intervention from MLP with spiral fracture and magnification of crenulated edge. (A) MLP 15-I-20-37; (B) MLP 15-I-20-38.



Figure 10 Indeterminate fragment of bone with puncture and amplification of the puncture with Dino-Lite measurements. (A) MLP 15-I-20-36; (B) MLP 15-I-20-39.

prevented this animal from feeding on carrion unlike other scimitar-toothed predators (e.g., *Homotherium*) (Palmqvist et al., 2007).

Identifying potential agents of the megamammal tooth-marks

Based on the box plot comparisons (Fig. 3), the marks on the samples in this study best match those made by the giant Pampean *Chapalmalania* (De Los Reyes et al., 2013). This procyon had previously been compared with a bear, although according to De Los Reyes et al. (2013) the cranial configuration is more similar to that of hyenas. From the information presented by Pickering, Egeland & Brain (2004), it seems that the damage inflicted also coincides to some degree with that made by large African carnivores, such as large canids, spotted hyenas and lions, or the smaller marks realised by *Panthera onca mesembrina* (Martin, 2016). These African species correspond to sizes 2 or 3 in the Bunn ranking (1986). Cross-referencing these sizes with the Pampean carnivores, they coincide with several ursids, felids and canids, although some Pampean species were larger, such as *Smilodon populator*, size 4, and *Arctotherium angustidens*, size 5 (Table 3). Moreover, the reports from the various South American sites involving pitting and/or punctures show a similar range of values as seen in this study (Table 4). Most of this information could not be plotted, as the number of marks found at each site was too low to be able to input them into the calculation. Nevertheless, it can be observed that the majority range from 5 to 10 mm in size (those from Cueva del Milodón are larger, as shown in the box-plot). According to this data, different members of the Pampean large-carnivore guild would have produced the bone damage observed on the samples from the various museums. To determine which carnivores were involved, we must relate the marks to the types of bone damage generated by the potential ursid, felid and canid taxa.

The MCNV cf. Scelidotheriinae gen. tibia is the bone that presents the most significant carnivore interventions. A combination of pitting, scratches and important furrowing was observed, on both the epiphyses and medial faces. Even though all three groups of

Table 3 Body size categories for Pampean carnivores (based on [Bunn, 1986](#)).

Pleistocene Pampean carnivores	Body size (in kg)	Body size categories
<i>Dusicyon avus</i>	14	Size 1
<i>Protocyon</i>	20–25	Size 2
<i>Canis nehringui</i>	32	Size 2
<i>Theriodictis platensis</i>	37	Size 2
<i>Puma concolor</i>	47–50	Size 2
<i>A. vetustum/ A. bonariense/ A. tarijense</i>	110 a 140	Size 3a
<i>Panthera onca</i>	120	Size 3a
<i>Smilodon populator</i>	220–360 up to 400	Size 3b/ Size 4
<i>Arctotherium angustidens</i>	>1,000	Size 5

carnivores were capable of leaving these types of marks, certain characteristics allow us to relate this damage to ursids. In particular, the group of aligned pits imprinted on the medial rim ([Fig. 4A](#)) of the distal epiphysis is planar that could indeed have been made by the premolars or molars of ursids ([Haynes, 1983](#)). In contrast, the parallel, V-shaped tooth marks on the posterior face ([Figs. 4C and 4E](#)) 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, like those seen on the distal metadiaphysis ([Fig. 4B](#)), are also generally characteristic of ursids ([Haynes, 1983](#); [Saladié et al., 2013](#)). In addition, the intensive furrowing coincides with the bone-breaking capacity of this animal ([Soibelzon et al., 2014](#)). Other damage typical of ursids observed on the tibia includes the elongated gouge on the lateral side of the articular face ([Fig. 4A](#)) and the quadrangular-shaped grooves on the medial face of the diaphysis ([Fig. 4D](#)) ([Burke, 2013](#); [Saladié et al., 2013](#)). That being said, these grooves, and the gouges observed on the distal metadiaphysis, do not have the regular walls and bottoms characteristic of ursid marks ([Saladié et al., 2013](#)). Also, according to current research, this damage should be superficial, a feature not observed on this bone ([Haynes, 1983](#); [Saladié et al., 2013](#)). To this respect, some authors suggest that the damage produced by ursids is less intense than that inflicted by other groups ([Haynes, 1983](#); [Arilla et al., 2014](#); [Sala & Arsuaga, in press](#)), a pattern not observed here. Consequently, more than one animal may have participated in imprinting the complex and producing the marks observed on this tibia. If that is the case, *Panthera onca* could have been involved, too. This species also possessed straight incisive arcades ([Biknevicius, Van Valkenburgh & Walker, 1996](#)) that could have produced the elongated V-shape marks ([Haynes, 1983](#)) on the posterior face. The important furrowing noticed at both ends of the bone is also consistent with this felid's damage-producing capacity ([Martin, 2008](#); [Martin, 2016](#); [Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015](#)).

The humerus of *Glossotherium robustum* housed in the MNHN has suffered less bone loss than the tibia. Feeding marks on this element have several characteristics that could indicate its consumption by *Arctotherium*. As observed on the tibia, the short, wide scratches present on the condyle and the wide, elongated, superficial pitting, agree with actualistic studies of ursid marks ([Figs. 5A–5C](#)) ([Haynes, 1983](#); [Burke, 2013](#); [Saladié et al., 2013](#)). Nevertheless, the presence of V-shape punctures in the trochlea ([Fig. 5B](#)), characteristic of

Table 4 South American sites with reported dimensions of pitting and/or punctures (as cited in the original publication).

Site	Species	Carnivore	Puncture/pitting size (in mm)	References
Olavarría	cf. <i>Eosclerocalyptus lineatus</i> (Hoplophorini)	<i>Chapalmalania</i>	ML 8.67/MW 4.38/Area mm ² 33.93*	<i>De Los Reyes et al. (2013)</i>
			ML 11.07/ MW 4.32/Area mm ² 45.56*	<i>De Los Reyes et al. (2013)</i>
			ML 7.98/ MW 1.95/Area mm ² 10.92*	<i>De Los Reyes et al. (2013)</i>
			ML 6.97/ MW 4.63/ Area mm ² 30.98*	<i>De Los Reyes et al. (2013)</i>
			ML 8.83/ MW 1.93/Area mm ² 13.02*	<i>De Los Reyes et al. (2013)</i>
			ML 7.82/ MW 2.80/Area mm ² 17.12*	<i>De Los Reyes et al. (2013)</i>
Arroyo Seco	Equidae	–	Average: MA A (long) 7.383/ MI A (wide) 5.727	<i>Politis et al. (2016)</i>
Cueva del Milodón	<i>Myiodon darwini</i>	<i>Panthera onca mesembrina</i>	12.27 diameter	<i>Martin (2008), Martin (2016)</i>
			4.34–9.05	<i>Martin (2008)</i>
			41.63 × 30.36*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			23.37 × 21.86*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			7.10 × 5.01*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			55.30 × 40.29*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			10.61 × 7.46*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			6.13 × 5.14*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			15.09 × 4.40*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			17.56 × 13.43*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			7.99 × 8.64*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
Cueva de Los Chingues	<i>Hippidion saldiasi</i>	<i>Panthera onca mesembrina</i>	5.17 × 4.99*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			6.84 × 8.30*	<i>Martin (2016)</i>
			9 × 7.60	<i>Martin (2008)</i>
Pilauco	Gomphotheriidae	Felidae	8.13 × 4.79	<i>Martin (2008)</i>
			4.9 × 4.2	<i>Martin (2008)</i>
			10.24 × 11.71	<i>Labarca et al. (2014)</i>
Águas de Araxá	<i>Haplomastodon waringi</i>	<i>Procyon troglodytes</i>	8.84 × 9.71	<i>Labarca et al. (2014)</i>
			Average diameter 5	<i>Dominato et al. (2011)</i>
			Average diameter 6	<i>Dominato et al. (2011)</i>

Notes.

ML, Maximum length; MW, Maximum width; MA A, Major axis; MI A, Minor axis.
Measurements marked with * were used for comparative purposes.

felids rather than ursids, means that other taxa, such as *Panthera onca*, cannot be ruled out (*Haynes, 1983*). Both groups were capable of furrowing the epiphysis (*Martin, 2008; Arilla et al., 2014; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015*) as observed on the trocheal part of the bone (*Fig. 5D*).

The furrowing on the MNW *Glossotherium robustum* humerus is more ambiguous than the marks on the other two bones, since various taxa could have inflicted this type of damage on cancellous bone (*Figs. 6A–6D*). The cusp that made the puncture could have been on a secodont tooth from a felid or canid (*Fig. 6B*). Both these groups have the capacity to damage and destroy cancellous tissue, although canids leave fewer marks

on mammals larger than 400 kg (*Yravedra, Lagos & Bárcena, 2011*). Patagonian sites with important furrowing in Mylodontidae bones, attributed to *Panthera onca mesembrina*, could provide an important parallel (*Martin, 2008; Martin, 2016*) when considering the types of marks that jaguars can make on limb bones, as seen in this case.

The marked femur of Toxodontidae from the MLP must be integrated with the other evidence from the taphocoenosis in order to interpret which carnivore species was involved. Of the 138 bones studied from this site, 61.59% (NISP: 85) belong to indeterminate species, while the remaining 38.40% (NISP: 53) were identified to genus level. Among these, equids are the most common, accounting for 36.53% (NISP: 19) of the identified elements. Megamammal bones are the second most widely represented group, with 30.76% (NISP: 16). The assemblage predominantly comprises appendicular skeletal elements (73.92% or NISP: 102). Axial and planar bones contribute only 13.77% (NISP: 19) and indeterminate fragments account for 12.31% (NISP: 17). Of the carnivore-marked bones, 88% (NISP: 22) are indeterminate diaphysis of the long bones mentioned above ([Table S6](#)), coinciding with the general abundance of limb elements. Carnivore-marked bones represent only 18.11% (NISP: 25) of the total assemblage. The low proportion found at this site could have been influenced by its location in running water. As explained by *Ameghino, ([1889] 1916)* the material from this site was scattered along a 20 m stretch on both sides of a channel. Therefore, the current may not only have dispersed the primary association, but also mixed it with bony remains not originally consumed by the carnivore/s involved. This may also have influenced the skeletal assemblage, including the paucity of axial parts, resulting from density-mediated destruction or the winnowing of lighter axial bones. Nevertheless, the fact that carnivores mark 18.11% of the bones also indicates that a basic level of primary association remained when this material was collected. The presence of the Toxodontidae femur and other medium-sized bones with carnivore marks indicates that a MNI of 2 animals were consumed in the location itself. In addition, the dominance of fractured long bones could, partly, have been the result of carnivore activities that transported limbs to this area. Consequently, the carnivore/s involved in the formation of the collected assemblage must have had the capacity to break long bones and/or the ability to predate upon megamammals. In this sense, given the absence of specialised bone-crushers in the Americas, some type of canid may have been responsible for the described interventions. It is likely that either *Theriodictis platensis* or *Protocyon scagliorum* from the Ensenadan Stage/Age generated these marks, as also inferred for the Brazilian cases (*De Araújo Júnior, De Oliveira Porpino & Paglarelli Bergqvist, 2011; Dominato et al., 2011*).

In any event, although the proportion of carnivore marks that we have found on bones of megamammals is relatively low, this precludes the conclusion that the sites where the remains were originally collected represented the den of a hypercarnivore or bone-cracking species.

Other potential carnivores specialising in medium-sized and/or small taxa, such as *Canis nehringui* or *Dusicyon avus*, could have fed on the megaherbivore community during the late Pleistocene (*Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006; Prevosti, Tonni & Bidegain, 2009*). At ca. 14,000 cal yrs BP (*Politis et al., 2016*) *Homo sapiens* also became part of the carnivore guild. Humans not only scavenged megamammal carcasses (*Politis et al., 2016*), but were also

more successful hunters of these animals than the existing carnivores (*Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009*).

Megamammal carcass consumption during the Pleistocene

Considering the skeletal elements, bone mark locations, and the level of use of the bones, it seems most likely that these marks represent the final stages of megamammal carcass consumption.

- (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, later moving to femoral muscle masses, leaving some marks on the distal epiphyses and diaphyses (*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 their smaller quantities of meat (*Haynes, 1982; Blumenschine, 1986; Haynes & Klimowicz, 2015*). The intense gnawing of the cf. *Scelidotheriinae* 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. 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 at the beginning of the consumption sequence. 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 long bone diaphyses indicates access to within-bone nutrients, relating to the last stages in the consumption sequence (*Binford, 1981; Haynes, 1982; Blumenschine, 1987; Capaldo & Blumenschine, 1994*).
- (ii) Intensity of carcass use is related to resource availability (*Haynes, 1980; Haynes, 1982; Van Valkenburgh & Hertel, 1993; Delaney-Rivera et al., 2009*), the size of the hunting pack (*Van Valkenburgh et al., 2016*), or multiple carnivore taxa involvement (*Pobiner & Blumenschine, 2003; Delaney-Rivera et al., 2009*). In general terms, large animal tissue is usually conserved for longer once dead (*Blumenschine, 1987*) and their bones have fewer marks than seen on bones of smaller species (*Yravedra, Lagos & Bárcena, 2011; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015*). As the easy-to-access meat is consumed, carnivores tend to eat the remaining parts of the carcass and inflict more significant damage to the bones (*Binford, 1981; Haynes, 1982; Blumenschine, 1986; Pobiner & Blumenschine, 2003; White & Diedrich, 2012; Haynes & Klimowicz, 2015; Sala & Arsuaga, in press*). Thus, marks on articulation surfaces could indicate that the bone held only a small amount of meat when the intervention took place. This is the case of the cf. *Scelidotheriinae* 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, in press](#)).

The described feeding traces therefore appear to indicate that during the Pleistocene, different species within the large carnivore guild would have accessed and consumed megamammal bones and/or the marrow of medium-sized animals, in the final stages of a consumption sequence. Although discussion of how the animals were predated is difficult without more contextual information, given the multiple possibilities for carnivore exploitation of megamammal carcasses ([Pobiner & Blumenschine, 2003](#)), two possible extreme scenarios are considered here: the marks described resulted from a first access (hunting) event and/or secondary access (scavenging) activity. The first case would involve the same group of carnivores killing and consuming the edible muscle tissues and then exploiting bones and within-bone nutrients. Early access to the carcass of an animal that had died a natural death by the same carnivore group can be also included in this situation ([Blumenschine, 1986](#)). Alternatively, after the death of the animal (either from natural causes or hunting activities), various carnivore taxa could have fed on a single carcass. In this second situation, one group would have consumed the primary edible tissues of the bony elements, and, at a later stage, the bones and marrow would have been exploited by other carnivores.

These interventions resulting from hunting and/or scavenging events indicate that in both cases, megamammal carcasses were completely exploited by various members of the large-sized carnivore guild in the region. Our samples belong to different time periods within the Pleistocene ([Fig. 2](#) and [Table 1](#)). This provides weak but positive evidence suggesting that consumption of edible tissues as well as the bony elements and/or marrow by different carnivore groups was a pattern that occurred repeatedly throughout that period. Full exploitation of carcasses is expected, at least periodically when food is scarce and/or more carnivore species are present, as has been proposed for other American ecosystems such as Rancho La Brea ([Van Valkenburgh & Hertel, 1993](#); [Binder & Van Valkenburgh, 2010](#); [Van Valkenburgh et al., 2016](#)). Thus, it seems likely that temporal palaeoenvironmental stressors would have influenced the richness of Pampean megamammal communities ([Cione, Tonni & Soibelzon, 2009](#)), acting as cyclic, top-down pressures stimulating interspecific and intraspecific competition for the carcasses, resulting in the complete consumption of them.

CONCLUSIONS

Four megaherbivore fossil bones, 22 bones of medium-sized species, and two indeterminate bones with carnivore marks were studied from European and Argentinean collections of Pleistocene remains from the Pampean region, collected during the 19th and early 20th centuries. The marks were predominately identified on appendicular bones. After internal organs and muscles are consumed, limb bones are the richest parts with regard to within-bone nutrients, and in particular, the epiphyses are the easiest to penetrate by gnawing ([Binford, 1981](#); [Dominato et al., 2011](#); [Labarca et al., 2014](#)). Analysis of the punctures and pitting shows that these partially overlap with the range of bigger marks

made by large carnivores from African environments, the smaller markings of *Panthera onca mesembrina*, and they are comparable with the giant *Chapalmalania* from the Pliocene of the Pampean region (Pickering, Egeland & Brain, 2004; De Los Reyes et al., 2013; Martin, 2016). Moreover, our measurements generally agree with the information reported from other South American sites (Martin, 2008; Dominato et al., 2011; Labarca et al., 2014; Politis et al., 2016). Consequently, it is likely that different members of the Pampean large-carnivore guild produced the marks described in this study. We interpret the data presented here as indicating the fact that ursids, canids, and possibly felids would have consumed the soft and hard tissues, inflicting various 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 latter represent the final stages of carcass exploitation, given that the marks described on the epiphyses and diaphyses were not inflicted when bone still held large quantities of meat.

Considering that there is little information on carnivore marks from the region, as this type of evidence is still scarce, the few remains presented here significantly increase our knowledge of palaeoecological relationships in the Pampean region. The marked bones indicate that the megamammal carcasses were fully exploited. This type of evidence has been recorded in the Pliocene (De Los Reyes et al., 2013) and, according to the evidence presented here, continued periodically throughout the Pleistocene. Consequently, temporal shifts in prey availability would have influenced predator–prey and/or scavenging dynamics, increasing competition for carcasses and resulting in the consumption of bone and within-bone nutrients by the same or multiple taxa. Pleistocene large mammal communities would have developed different trophic levels with multiple competitive species, allowing them to persist through time and overcome different palaeoclimatic fluctuations. This situation lasted until the late Pleistocene-early Holocene when many megafaunal extinctions occurred (Van Valkenburgh et al., 2016).

Current taphonomic methods allow new results to be obtained from historical collections. In this study, different types of carnivore marks inflicted on megamammal and other mammal bones were measured and categorised. Interpreting these with the help of current ecological information sheds light onto the palaeoecological relationships of native Pampean mammal communities from the Pleistocene. This novel perspective offers new insights into the development of future systematic fieldwork. Both collection and field-based research will provide crucial information on the evolution of the Pleistocene ecosystems of the South American Southern Cone.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Christine Argot and Guillaume Billet (MNHN), Ursula Göhlich (NMW), and Marcelo Reguero and Martín De Los Reyes (MLP) for allowing access to the collections under their care. KVCH thanks Noel Amano from IPHES who helped with the PAST program and development of the graphics. We are especially grateful to Sam Arman, Briana Pobiner and an anonymous reviewer, whose comments, suggestions and critiques have improved this manuscript and given new insights into several ideas.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION AND DECLARATIONS

Funding

This work was financed by the Erasmus Mundus grant inside the International Doctorate in Quaternary and Prehistory programme (KVCH), and by the CGL2010-15326 project of the Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness, and by the Generalitat de Catalunya Research Group GENCAT 2014 SGR 901. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Grant Disclosures

The following grant information was disclosed by the authors:

Erasmus Mundus.

Spanish Ministry of Economy and Competitiveness: CGL2010-15326.

Generalitat de Catalunya Research Group GENCAT: 2014 SGR 901.

Competing Interests

The authors declare there are no competing interests.

Author Contributions

- Karina Vanesa Chichkoyan conceived and designed the experiments, performed the experiments, analyzed the data, wrote the paper, prepared figures and/or tables, reviewed drafts of the paper.
- Borja Figueirido wrote the paper, reviewed drafts of the paper.
- Margarita Belinchón and Anne Marie Moigne analyzed the data.
- José Luis Lanata conceived and designed the experiments, analyzed the data.
- Bienvenido Martínez-Navarro conceived and designed the experiments, analyzed the data, wrote the paper, prepared figures and/or tables, reviewed drafts of the paper.

Data Availability

The following information was supplied regarding data availability:

The raw data is included in the figures and tables in the manuscript and also in the [Supplemental Information](#).

Supplemental Information

Supplemental information for this article can be found online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.7717/peerj.3117#supplemental-information>.

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*. Vol VI. La Plata: Taller de Impresiones Oficiales.
- 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0102457).
- Bargo MS. 2003.** Biomechanics and Palaeobiology of the Xenarthra: state of the art. *Senckenbergiana Biologica* **83**(1):41–50.
- Behrensmeyer AK. 1978.** Taphonomic and ecologic information from bone weathering. *Paleobiology* **4**:150–162 DOI [10.1017/S0094837300005820](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0094837300005820).
- 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. Regiduría 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 DOI [10.1080/02724634.1996.10011336](https://doi.org/10.1080/02724634.1996.10011336).
- 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](https://doi.org/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 DOI [10.1016/S0047-2484\(86\)80002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2484(86)80002-1).
- Blumenschine RJ. 1987.** Characteristics of an early hominid scavenging niche (and comments and reply). *Current Anthropology* **28**(4):383–407 DOI [10.1086/203544](https://doi.org/10.1086/203544).
- Bocherens H, Cotte M, Bonini R, Scian D, Straccia P, Soibelzon LH, Prevosti FJ. 2016.** Paleobiology of sabretooth cat *Smilodon populator* in the Pampean Region (Buenos Aires Province, Argentina) around the Last Glacial Maximum: insights from carbon and nitrogen stable isotopes in bone collagen. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* **449**:463–474 DOI [10.1016/j.palaeo.2016.02.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.palaeo.2016.02.017).
- Bunn HT. 1986.** Patterns of skeletal representation and hominid subsistence activities at Olduvai Gorge, Tanzania, and Koobi Fora, Kenya. *Journal of Human Evolution* **15**(8):673–690 DOI [10.1016/S0047-2484](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0047-2484).
- Burke CC. 2013.** Neotaphonomic analysis of the feeding behaviors and modification marks produced by North American carnivores. *Journal of Taphonomy* **11**(1):1–20.
- Capaldo SD, Blumenschine RJ. 1994.** A quantitative diagnosis of notches made by hammerstone percussion and carnivore gnawing on bovid long bones. *American Antiquity* **59**(4):724–748 DOI [10.2307/282345](https://doi.org/10.2307/282345).
- Christiansen P, Harris JM. 2006.** Body size of *Smilodon* (Mammalia: Felidae). *Journal of Morphology* **266**:369–384 DOI [10.1002/jmor.10384](https://doi.org/10.1002/jmor.10384).

- Christiansen P, Wroe S. 2007.** Bite forces and evolutionary adaptations to feeding ecology in carnivores. *Ecology* **88**(2):347–358
[DOI 10.1890/0012-9658\(2007\)88\[347:BFAEAT\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1890/0012-9658(2007)88[347:BFAEAT]2.0.CO;2).
- Cione AL, Tonni EP, Soibelzon LH. 2009.** Did humans cause large mammal Late Pleistocene-Holocene extinction in South America in a context of shrinking open areas? In: Haynes G, ed. *American megafaunal extinctions at the end of the pleistocene. Vertebrate paleobiology and palaeontology series*. Dordrecht: Springer Publishers, 125–144.
- De Araújo Júnior HI, De Oliveira Porpino K, Paglarelli Bergqvist L. 2011.** Marcas de dentes de carnívoros/carniceiros em mamíferos pleistocênicos do Nordeste do Brasil. *Revista Brasileira de Paleontologia* **14**(3):291–296 [DOI 10.4072/rbp.2011.3.08](https://doi.org/10.4072/rbp.2011.3.08).
- De Los Reyes M, Poiré D, Soibelzon LH, Zurita AE, Arrouy MJ. 2013.** First evidence of scavenging of a glyptodont (Mammalia, Glyptodontidae) from the Pliocene of the Pampean region (Argentina): taphonomic and paleoecological remarks. *Palaeontología Electrónica* **16**.2.15A.
- Delaney-Rivera C, Plummer TW, Hodgson JA, Forrest F, Hertel F, Oliver JS. 2009.** Pits and pitfalls: taxonomic variability and patterning in tooth mark dimensions. *Journal of Archaeological Science* **36**(11):2597–2608 [DOI 10.1016/j.jas.2009.08.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jas.2009.08.001).
- Dominato VH, Mothé D, Costa da Silva R, Dos Santos Avilla L. 2011.** Evidence of scavenging on remains of the gomphothere *Haplomastodon waringi* (Proboscidea: Mammalia) from the Pleistocene of Brazil: Taphonomic and paleoecological remarks. *Journal of South American Earth Sciences* **31**:171–177
[DOI 10.1016/j.jsames.2011.01.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsames.2011.01.002).
- Domínguez-Rodrigo M, Gidna AO, Yravedra J, Musiba C. 2012.** A comparative neotaphonomic study of felids, hyaenids and canids: an analogical framework based on long bone modification patterns. *Journal of Taphonomy* **10**(3–4):147–164.
- Domínguez-Rodrigo M, Piqueras A. 2003.** The use of tooth pits to identify carnivore taxa in tooth-marked archaeofaunas and their relevance to reconstruct hominid carcass processing behaviours. *Journal of Archaeological Science* **30**(11):1385–1391
[DOI 10.1016/S0305-4403\(03\)00027-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-4403(03)00027-X).
- Domínguez-Rodrigo M, Yravedra J, Organista E, Gidna A, Fourvel JB, Baquedano E. 2015.** A 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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 University Press.
- Fernández-Jalvo Y, Andrews P. 2016. Atlas of taphonomic identifications. In: *1001+ Images of fossil and recent mammal bone modification*. Dordrecht: Springer Publishers.
- Fernández-Jalvo Y, Andrews P. 2003. Experimental effects of water abrasion on bone fragments. *Journal of Taphonomy* 1(3):147–163.
- Figueirido B, Martín-Serra A, Janis CM. 2016. Ecomorphological determinations in the absence of living analogues: the predatory behaviour of the marsupial lion (*Thylacoleo carnifex*) as revealed by elbow joint morphology. *Paleobiology* 43:508–531 DOI 10.1017/pab.2015.55.
- 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.
- 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.
- Hammer Ø, Harper DAT, Ryan PD. 2001. PAST: paleontological statistics software package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica* 4(1):1–9.
- Haynes G. 1980. Evidence of carnivore gnawing on Pleistocene and Recent mammalian bones. *Paleobiology* 6(3):341–351 DOI 10.1017/S0094837300006849.
- Haynes G. 1982. Utilization and skeletal disturbances North American prey. *Arctic* 35(2):266–281 DOI 10.14430/arctic2325.
- Haynes G. 1983. A guide for differentiating mammalian carnivore taxa responsible for gnaw damage to herbivore limb bones. *Paleobiology* 9(2):164–172 DOI 10.1017/S0094837300007545.
- Haynes G, Klimowicz J. 2015. Recent elephant-carcass utilization as a basis for interpreting mammoth exploitation. *Quaternary International* 359–360:19–37 DOI 10.1016/j.quaint.2013.12.040.
- Kaufmann CA, Rafuse DJ, González ME, Álvarez MC, Massigoge A, Scheifler NA, Gutiérrez MA. 2016. Carcass utilization and bone modifications on guanaco killed by puma in northern Patagonia, Argentina. *Quaternary International* In press DOI 10.1016/j.quaint.2016.03.003.
- Labarca R, Recabarren OP, Canales-Brellenthin P, Pino M. 2014. The gomphotheres (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 RL. 1994. Vertebrate taphonomy. In: *Cambridge manuals in archaeology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marean CW, Ehrhardt CL. 1995. Paleoanthropological and paleoecological implications of the taphonomy of a sabertooth's den. *Journal of Human Evolution* 29(6):515–547 DOI 10.1006/jhev.1995.1074.

- Martin FM. 2008.** Bone crunching felids at the end of the Pleistocene in Fuego-Patagonia, Chile. *Journal of Taphonomy* **6(3-4)**:337–372.
- Martin FM. 2016.** Cueva del Milodón. The hunting grounds of the patagonian panther. *Quaternary International* Epub ahead of print June 8 2016
DOI [10.1016/j.quaint.2016.05.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2016.05.005).
- McAfee RK. 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geobios.2006.11.010).
- 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/0305-4403(88)90081-7).
- Palmqvist P, Torregrosa V, Pérez-Claros JA, Martínez-Navarro B, Turner A. 2007.** A reevaluation of the diversity of *Megantereon* (Mammalia, Carnivora, Machairodontinae) and the problem of species identification in extinct carnivores. *Journal of Vertebrate Paleontology* **27(1)**:160–175
DOI [10.1671/0272-4634\(2007\)27\[160:AROTDO\]2.0.CO;2](https://doi.org/10.1671/0272-4634(2007)27[160:AROTDO]2.0.CO;2).
- Palmqvist P, Martínez-Navarro B, Pérez-Claros JA, Torregrosa V, Figueirido B, Jiménez-Arenas JM, Patrocínio Espigares MP, Ros-Montoya S, De Renzi M. 2011.** The giant hyena *Pachycrocuta brevirostris*: modelling the bone-cracking behavior of an extinct carnivore. *Quaternary International* **243(1)**:61–79
DOI [10.1016/j.quaint.2010.12.035](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2010.12.035).
- Pickering TR, Domínguez-Rodrigo M, Egeland CP, Brain CK. 2004.** Beyond leopards: tooth marks and the contribution of multiple carnivore taxa to the accumulation of the Swartkrans Member 3 fossil assemblage. *Journal of Human Evolution* **46(5)**:595–604 DOI [10.1016/j.jhevol.2004.03.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhevol.2004.03.002).
- Pobiner BL, Blumenschine RJ. 2003.** A taphonomic perspective on Oldowan hominid encroachment on the carnivoran paleoguild. *Journal of Taphonomy* **1(2)**:115–141.
- Politis GG, Gutiérrez MA, Rafuse DJ, Blasi A. 2016.** The arrival of *Homo sapiens* into the Southern Cone at 14,000 years ago. *PLOS ONE* **1(9)**:e0162870
DOI [10.1371/journal.pone.0162870](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0162870).
- Prevosti FJ, Palmqvist P. 2001.** Análisis ecomorfológico del cánido hipercarnívoro *Theriodictis platensis* Mercerat (Mammalia, Carnivora), basado en un nuevo ejemplar del Pleistoceno de Argentina. *Ameghiniana* **38(4)**:375–384.
- Prevosti FJ, Schubert BW. 2013.** First taxon date and stable isotopes ($\delta^{13}\text{C}$, $\delta^{15}\text{N}$) for the large hypercarnivorous South American canid *Protocyon troglodytes* (Canidae, Carnivora). *Quaternary International* **305**:67–73 DOI [10.1016/j.quaint.2012.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2012.07.003).
- Prevosti FJ, Tonni EP, Bidegain JC. 2009.** Stratigraphic range of the large canids (Carnivora, Canidae) in South America, and its relevance to quaternary biostratigraphy. *Quaternary International* **210(1)**:76–81 DOI [10.1016/j.quaint.2009.06.034](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2009.06.034).


- Prevosti FJ, Vizcaíno S. 2006.** Paleoecology of the large carnivore guild from the Late Pleistocene of Argentina. *Acta Palaeontologica Polonica* **51**(3):407–422.
- Prevosti FJ, Zurita AE, Carlini AA. 2005.** Biostratigraphy, systematics, and paleoecology of *Procyon* Giebel, 1855 (Carnivora, Canidae) in South America. *Journal of South American Earth Sciences* **20**:5–12 DOI [10.1016/j.jsames.2005.05.005](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsames.2005.05.005).
- 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](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2016.03.011).
- Sala N, Arsuaga JL, Haynes G. 2014.** Taphonomic comparison of bone modifications caused by wild and captive wolves (*Canis lupus*). *Quaternary International* **330**:126–135 DOI [10.1016/j.quaint.2013.08.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2013.08.017).
- 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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. In: Fernicola JC, Prieto AR, Lazo DG, eds. *Publicación Especial de la Asociación Paleontológica Argentina 12, Vida y Obra de Florentino Ameghino*. Buenos Aires: Asociación Paleontológica Argentina, 69–79.
- 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](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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 of the United States of America **113**(4):862–867

DOI [10.1073/pnas.1502554112](https://doi.org/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](https://doi.org/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.



B

CARNIVORE MARKS	GENERAL CHARACTERISITC	CHARACTERISATION BY CARNIVORE GROUP	REFERENCES
PITTING AND/OR PUNCTURES	(i) Produced by the pressure of tooth on bone	URSIDS: Pitting will be planar, flat-bottomed, superficial and circular or square/rectangular.	Binford, 1981; Haynes, 1982, 1983; Lyman, 1994; Domínguez-Rodrigo and Piqueras, 2003; Pickering et al., 2004; Delaney-Rivera et al., 2009; Burke, 2013; Saladié et al., 2013; Arilla et al., 2014; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016
	(ii) Can leave a superficial imprint (pitting) or deeper mark (puncture)	FELIDS: These can inflict important teeth marks that have an “axe-edge” or elongated V-shape.	
	(iii) Depth depends on the amount of pressure exerted and whether this occurs on the softer cancellous bone of the epiphysis or on the harder part of the shaft	CANIDS: Tooth impressions tend to have a cone or truncated-cone shape.	
SCRATCHES OR SCORES	(i) U-shaped	URSIDS: Characterised by short, wide, parallel groups or disordered and superimposed clusters of scratches with U-shape or, in some cases, quadrangular form. They can also leave elongated gouges.	Binford, 1981; Haynes, 1983; Lyman, 1994; Domínguez-Rodrigo and Piqueras, 2003; Pickering et al., 2004; Delaney-Rivera et al., 2009; Yravedra, Lagos & Bárcena, 2011; Burke, 2013; Saladié et al., 2013; Sala, Arsuaga & Haynes, 2014; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016
	(ii) Realised when teeth are dragged over a surface	FELIDS: Scoring will tend to be perpendicular to the long axis of the bone.	
	(iii) Can be superficial or present as gouges	CANIDS: These can leave numerous scores with different orientations.	
FURROWING	(i) Cancellous bone extraction from the epiphyses	URSIDS: These can crush, furrow, grind and leave crenulated edges.	Haynes, 1980, 1983; Binford, 1981; Lyman, 1994; Martin, 2008, 2016; Yravedra, Lagos & Bárcena, 2011; Burke, 2013; Saladié et al., 2013; Arilla et al., 2014; Sala, Arsuaga & Haynes, 2014; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016
	(ii) This action also can leave a crenulated edge, caused by the border of collapsed bone produced by the bite having an irregular edge	FELIDS: Some groups, such as jaguars, can furrow the epiphyses. CANIDS: These have ample furrowing capacity	
SPIRAL FRACTURES	(i) Fresh bone being broken due to pressure from the tooth leaving spiral borders (ii) Sometimes this action leaves notches in the wall of the bone	URSIDS: Reduced bone breaking capacity.	Binford, 1981; Haynes, 1982; 1983; Capaldo & Blumenschine, 1994; Lyman, 1994; Yravedra, Lagos & Bárcena, 2011; Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2012; Saladié et al., 2013; Sala, Arsuaga & Haynes, 2014; Sala & Arsuaga, 2016
		FELIDS: Reduced bone breaking capacity.	
		CANIDS: These can crush and break epiphyses and diaphyses	

De los Reyes et al., 2013 (Table 1)		
Specimen	Area mm ²	
XEN 30-12	33.93	1.53058386
	45.56	1.658583715
	10.92	1.038222638
	30.98	1.491081413
	13.02	1.114610984
	17.12	1.23350376

Martin, 2016				
Specimen	Length	Breadth	Area	Log Area
94-VIII-10-1	41.63	30.36	1263.8868	3.10170818
	23.37	21.86	510.8682	2.70830887
	7.1	5.01	35.571	1.55109607
	55.3	40.29	2228.037	3.3479224
	10.61	7.46	79.1506	1.89845421
	6.13	5.14	31.5082	1.49842359
	15.09	4.4	66.396	1.82214192
94-VIII-10-96	17.56	13.43	235.8308	2.37260052
94-VIII-10-24	7.99	8.64	69.0336	1.83906052
	5.17	4.99	25.7983	1.41159109
	6.84	8.3	56.772	1.75413419

Pickering et al., 2004 (Appendix A)				
Specimen	Length	Breadth	Area	Log Area
SWK 19683	3.2	2.7	8.64	0.936513742
	2.4	1.3	3.12	0.494154594
SWK 27684	5.3	3.3	17.49	1.242789809
	4.5	3.4	15.3	1.184691431
	3.6	2.2	7.92	0.898725182
	2.5	2.1	5.25	0.720159303
	3.1	1.8	5.58	0.746634199
SWK 287324	4.2	3	12.6	1.100370545
	2.3	1.5	3.45	0.537819095
SWK 29283	3.2	2.5	8	0.903089987
	1.9	1.8	3.42	0.534026106
	1.6	1.4	2.24	0.350248018
	2.6	1.7	4.42	0.645422269
	3	1.8	5.4	0.73239376
SWK 30555	6.8	4	27.2	1.434568904
SWK 30628	2.3	1.9	4.37	0.640481437
	2.2	1.9	4.18	0.621176282
SWK 35153	3.4	2.4	8.16	0.911690159
	3.3	3	9.9	0.995635195
SWK 36073	3.8	3.2	12.16	1.084933575
SWK 36361	4.9	4.5	22.05	1.343408594
SWK 36675	4	2.8	11.2	1.049218023
	4.1	4	16.4	1.214843848
	4.1	2.6	10.66	1.027757205

AREA OF PITTING/PUNCTURE (in mm)				LOG AREA			
MCNV 64-492	MNHN.F. PAM 119	MNW 1908.XI. 110	MLP	MCNV 64- 492	MNHN.F. PAM 119	MNW 1908.XI.110	MLP
12	48	51	64	1.079181246	1.681241237	1.707570176	1.806179974
15	49		18	1.176091259	1.69019608		1.255272505
54	30		7	1.73239376	1.477121255		0.84509804
20	9		26	1.301029996	0.954242509		1.414973348
			4				0.602059991

BOX	TAXONOMICAL DETERMINATION	ELEMENT	PITTING AND/OR PUNCTURES	SCRATCHES OR SCORES	SPIRAL FRACTURES	CRENULATED EDGES	TOTAL BONES WITH MARKS
1	Indeterminate	Diaphysis	1		8		8
4	Indeterminate	Diaphysis			1		1
6	Indeterminate	Diaphysis			1		1
8	Indeterminate	Diaphysis			4	1	4
8	Indeterminate	Diaphysis		1	1		1
8	Indeterminate	Diaphysis			1	1	1
10	Indeterminate	Diaphysis			1		1
10	Indeterminate	Diaphysis	1	1	2	1	2
12	Indeterminate	Diaphysis			1	1	1
13	Indeterminate	Diaphysis			1		1
6	Indeterminate	Diaphysis		1	1		1
5	Toxodontidae	Femur		1			1
6	Indeterminate	Indeterminate	1				1
14	Indeterminate	Indeterminate	1				1
TOTALS			4	4	22	4	25

1 **Data S1. Description of carnivore marks**

2 (i) MCNV 64-492: On the right tibia of cf. *Scelidotheriinae* gen. the marks are concentrated
3 on the distal epiphysis and medial face and, to a lesser degree, on the proximal epiphysis
4 (Fig. 4). The distal epiphysis has a different groups of marks (Fig. 4A, 4B). Near the medial
5 edge of the articular face is where most damage is observed. Here, four superficial pits are
6 positioned linearly and surrounded by scratches (Fig. 4A). Posteriorly-anteriorly oriented, the
7 first two pits are slightly smaller with a cuspid shape, while the other two are bigger. The pit
8 9 x 6 mm is almost double the size of the others. This mark was affected by post-depositional
9 agents that probably resulted in this size increase. The manganese spot located next to the
10 lateral side of the pit ends abruptly at the border and does not continue inside (Figure S1A).
11 Additionally, almost in the middle, the medial border protrudes inwards, into the pit, as if the
12 bone originally continued, separating this pit into two (Figure S1B). In consequence, it seems
13 likely that this pit began as two, and that post-depositional events debilitated the bony
14 separation between them. In this sense the edges of bone pits can be more affected by post-
15 depositional conditions, as their surroundings become more susceptible to flaking and
16 localised damage (Delaney-Rivera et al. 2009). On the lateral side of the distal articular face
17 (Fig. 4A), a larger transverse score was detected. Parallel U-shaped scores are located over
18 the metadiaphysis that continue beyond the rim with the four pits. One group of scores depart
19 from the furrowing towards the articular side, while another starts from the articular side and
20 runs towards the furrowing (Fig. 4B). They run parallel to the long axis of the bone and
21 surround significant furrowing. This pattern implies that the *tibia caudalis* and *flexor*
22 *digitorum longus* muscles were removed (Fig. 4C). Another significant furrow is present on
23 the medial face of the proximal epiphysis (Fig. 4E); this has extracted part of the inner
24 condyle. A crenulated rim surrounds this furrow, and there are parallel, V-shaped tooth marks
25 over the posterior face (Fig. 4C and Fig. 4E). There is one group of five marks on the distal
26 part and two on the proximal part, oriented posteriorly-medially. Three thick quadrangular-
27 shaped grooves were detected on the medial face of the diaphysis (Fig. 4D). One runs along
28 the entire face; the other two are smaller and more superficial. They start at the border of the
29 anterior face and run up to the medial face (see Table 2 for measurements).

30 (ii) MNHN.F.PAM 119: The marks detected that are attributable to carnivores are on the
31 distal epiphysis of the left humerus of *Glossotherium robustum* (Fig. 5). They are distributed
32 on the articular face, over the condyle and trochlear regions (Fig. 5A). Near the medial side
33 of the trochlear region, there are several V-shape punctures, surrounded by scratches (Fig.

34 5B). Part of the trochlea has disappeared and there are crenulated edges as a consequence of
35 the furrowing. On the condyle, at least seven scores were detected (Fig. 5C), four of which
36 are parallel. Superficial scratches were also observed. In the border of this region, over the
37 lateral side, are two wide grooves (Fig. 5D) (see Table 2 for measurements).

38 (iii) 1908. XI.110: On the left humerus of *Glossotherium robustum* housed at the MNW,
39 there is a corrugated fracture over the lateral face of the condyle that encompasses both
40 anterior and posterior faces (Fig. 6A and Fig.6B). The epicondyle has been destroyed and the
41 border has a crenulated edge. The collapsed bone is covered with sediment and the rim of the
42 fracture is the same colour as the rest of the specimen: thus the fracture must have occurred
43 prior to burial. Although the furrowing and crenulated edge is weak evidence of carnivore
44 intervention (Domínguez-Rodrigo et al., 2015), the deltoid crest of the posterior face also has
45 a possible puncture with sediment inside (Fig. 6B). Additionally, in the posterior view, the
46 fractured border is flaked resulting from pressure exerted on it (Fig.6C and Fig.6D). The
47 regularity of the fracturing on both the anterior and posterior faces supports the proposal that
48 the marks on this bone could have resulted from the action of carnivores (see Table 2 for
49 measurements).

50 (iv) From the megamammal bones in the MLP assemblage, a condyle of a distal femur of
51 Toxodontidae was identified, with eight elongated, short, long and U-shaped scratches (Fig.
52 7). In addition, 22 bone shafts from smaller unidentified mammals display spiral fractures.
53 Some of these also present scratches, crenulated edges or light pitting (Figs. 8 and 9). Semi-
54 circular notches were also identified. Two indeterminate bones have bigger punctures (Fig.
55 10). Spiral fractures can be confused with human intervention or can occur naturally
56 (Binford, 1981; Lyman, 1994). Nevertheless, the presence of other typical carnivore damage
57 such as scratches and perforations, enables us to consider them as being produced by
58 carnivore activity (see Table 2 for measurements and detail of marks in Table S6).

59

60 **Data S2. Description of Pampean carnivores**

61 (i) The ursid *Arctotherium angustidens* evolved during the Ensenadan Stage/Age. This large
62 ‘short-faced’ bear was a member of the megafauna and recent estimations of its body mass
63 indicate that the animal weighed more than a tonne (Soibelzon et al., 2014). Recent
64 morphometric studies also indicate that this bear probably had an omnivorous diet
65 supplemented by meat or carrion, as dental pathologies detected in some individuals of

66 *Arctotherium* probably resulted from chewing bones (Figueirido & Soibelzon, 2010).
67 Moreover, Soibelzon et al. (2014) have found biomechanical and isotopic evidence of *A.*
68 *angustidens* having an omnivorous diet but with scavenging abilities. Other smaller bears that
69 appeared later in South America, including *Arctotherium vetustum*, *Arctotherium bonariense*
70 and *Arctotherium tarijense*, had a more plant-based diet (Figueirido & Soibelzon, 2010).

71 (ii) Three felids were also present in these ecosystems. The dirk-toothed sabre cat *Smilodon*
72 *populator* was the top predator in this region: its estimated body mass has been calculated as
73 being between 220-360 kg, but it could have reached up to 400 kg (Christiansen & Harris,
74 2006). This sabre-toothed cat may even have been capable of hunting juvenile *Megatherium*
75 *americanum* (Tardigrada, Megatheriidae), with a body mass of adult individuals ranging
76 between 4.000 and 6.000 kg (Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006; Bocherens et al., 2016). However,
77 the large sabre-like canines that it used to attack to the throat of its prey (Antón et al., 2004)
78 precluded *Smilodon* from breaking or consuming bones regularly, although they could have
79 inflicted important bone damage during hunting and/or soft-tissues consumption (Van
80 Valkeburgh & Hertel, 1993; Marean & Ehrhardt 1995; Binder & Van Valkenburgh, 2010).
81 The other two hypercarnivorous felids were *Puma concolor*, with an estimated body mass of
82 47-50 kg (Christiansen & Harris, 2006; Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006), and *Panthera onca*,
83 weighing *ca.* 120 kg (Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006). Although these species would have fed on
84 prey of *ca.* 600 kg; occasionally these preyed on juvenile megamammals (Prevosti
85 & Vizcaíno, 2006). The puma could have inflicted substantial mark on bone but would not
86 usually have consumed it (Muñoz et al., 2008; Kaufmann et al. 2016). In contrast, *Panthera*
87 *onca* was potentially able to break and consume bone (Martín, 2008; Domínguez-Rodrigo et
88 al., 2015).

89 (iii) Hypercarnivorous canids were also present in these ecosystems at the same time. They
90 could have cooperated in order to hunt large mammals and juvenile megamammals, and they
91 would also have had the ability to scavenge (Prevosti & Palmqvist, 2001; Prevosti, Zurita &
92 Carlini, 2005; Prevosti & Schubert, 2013). This may have been the case for *Theriodictis*
93 *platensis*, weighing *ca.* 37 kg, which evolved during the Ensenadan Stage/Age. It could have
94 preyed upon animals of around 600 kg, animals of extreme age classes (i.e., very old or
95 juvenile individuals), or diseased members of the megafauna (Prevosti & Palmqvist, 2001).
96 During the Pleistocene, there were various species of *Protocyon*, weighing between 20 and
97 25 kg. These could have hunted middle-sized mammals, scavenged carcasses of
98 megamammals, and may even have competed with *Smilodon populator* (Prevosti, Zurita &

99 Carlini, 2005; Prevosti & Schubert, 2013; Bocherens et al., 2016). *Canis nehringui*, weighing
100 *ca.* 32 kg, was present during the late Pleistocene-early Holocene and although it would have
101 generally fed on medium-sized mammals, pack-hunting of bigger species may have been
102 possible (Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006). *Dusicyon avus*, weighing *ca.* 14 kg, would have
103 specialised in smaller species, but consumption of larger mammals cannot be ruled out
104 (Prevosti & Vizcaíno, 2006).