



# Kent Academic Repository

Ortiz, Alejandra, Schander-Triplett, Katherine, Bailey, Shara E., Skinner, Matthew M., Hublin, Jean-Jacques and Schwartz, Gary T. (2020) *Enamel thickness variation in the deciduous dentition of extant large-bodied hominoids*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 173 (3). pp. 500-513. ISSN 0002-9483.

## Downloaded from

<https://kar.kent.ac.uk/84090/> The University of Kent's Academic Repository KAR

## The version of record is available from

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ajpa.24106>

## This document version

Author's Accepted Manuscript

## DOI for this version

## Licence for this version

UNSPECIFIED

## Additional information

## Versions of research works

### Versions of Record

If this version is the version of record, it is the same as the published version available on the publisher's web site. Cite as the published version.

### Author Accepted Manuscripts

If this document is identified as the Author Accepted Manuscript it is the version after peer review but before type setting, copy editing or publisher branding. Cite as Surname, Initial. (Year) 'Title of article'. To be published in *Title of Journal*, Volume and issue numbers [peer-reviewed accepted version]. Available at: DOI or URL (Accessed: date).

## Enquiries

If you have questions about this document contact [ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk](mailto:ResearchSupport@kent.ac.uk). Please include the URL of the record in KAR. If you believe that your, or a third party's rights have been compromised through this document please see our [Take Down policy](https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies) (available from <https://www.kent.ac.uk/guides/kar-the-kent-academic-repository#policies>).

1  
2  
3 **Enamel thickness variation in the deciduous dentition of extant large-bodied hominoids**  
4  
5  
6

7  
8 Alejandra Ortiz<sup>1,2</sup>, Katherine Schander-Triplett<sup>3</sup>, Shara E. Bailey<sup>2,4</sup>, Matthew M. Skinner<sup>4,5</sup>, Jean-  
9  
10 Jacques Hublin<sup>4</sup>, Gary T. Schwartz<sup>1</sup>  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 <sup>1</sup> Institute of Human Origins, School of Human Evolution and Social Change, Arizona State  
16  
17 University, Tempe, AZ, USA  
18

19  
20 <sup>2</sup> Center for the Study of Human Origins, Department of Anthropology, New York University,  
21  
22 New York, NY, USA  
23

24  
25 <sup>3</sup> Barrett, The Honors College, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Arizona State University

26  
27 <sup>4</sup> Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology,  
28  
29 Leipzig, Germany  
30

31  
32 <sup>5</sup> School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, United Kingdom  
33  
34

35  
36 \* Corresponding author.

37  
38 E-mail address: [ao706@nyu.edu](mailto:ao706@nyu.edu) (A. Ortiz)  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

## Abstract

### Objectives

Enamel thickness features prominently in hominoid evolutionary studies. To date, however, studies of enamel thickness in humans, great apes and their fossil relatives have focused on the permanent molar row. Comparatively little research effort has been devoted to tissue proportions within deciduous teeth. Here we attempt to fill this gap by documenting enamel thickness variation in the deciduous dentition of extant large-bodied hominoids.

### Materials and Methods

We used microcomputed tomography to image dental tissues in 80 maxillary and 78 mandibular deciduous premolars of *Homo sapiens*, *Pan troglodytes*, *Gorilla*, and *Pongo*. Two-dimensional virtual sections were created from the image volumes to quantify average (AET) and relative (RET) enamel thickness, as well as its distribution across the crown.

### Results

Our results reveal no significant differences in enamel thickness among the great apes. Unlike the pattern present in permanent molars, *Pongo* does not stand out as having relatively thicker-enameled deciduous premolars than *Pan troglodytes* and *Gorilla*. Humans, on the other hand, possess significantly thicker deciduous premolar enamel in comparison to great apes. Following expectations from masticatory biomechanics, we also find that the “functional” side (protocone, protoconid) of deciduous premolars generally possesses thicker enamel than the “nonfunctional” side.

**Discussion**

Our study lends empirical support to anecdotal observations that patterns of AET and RET observed for permanent molars of large-bodied apes do not apply to deciduous premolars. By documenting enamel thickness variation in hominoid deciduous teeth, this study provides the comparative context to interpret rates and patterns of wear of deciduous teeth and their utility in life history reconstructions.

## 1. Introduction

Enamel thickness and its distribution across the tooth crown have long been recognized as an important source of taxonomic, phylogenetic, and functional information of extinct and extant primates (e.g., Molnar & Gantt, 1977; Martin, 1985; Beynon and Wood, 1986; Shellis, Beynon, Reid, & Hiiemae, 1998; Schwartz, 2000a; Shimizu, 2002; Martin, Olejniczak, & Maas, 2003; Constantino, Lucas, Lee, & Lawn., 2009; McGraw, Pampush, & Daegling, 2012; but see Olejniczak et al., 2008a; Skinner, Alemseged, Gaunitz, & Hublin, 2015 for results suggesting the homoplastic nature of enamel thickness in hominins). Its high percentage of inorganic material (~96%) makes tooth enamel the hardest naturally produced substance in the body, such that teeth are extremely durable and therefore the best-preserved elements in the fossil record. The primary function of enamel is to aid in the mechanical reduction of food particles in the oral cavity. Increases in the quantity of enamel are thought to increase the functional longevity of teeth by slowing the degree of tooth loss due to abrasion and attrition and also by decreasing the likelihood of tooth failure during mastication (Myoung et al., 2009; Chai, 2014). Given the clear association with food bolus reduction, it has been argued that the quantity of enamel overlying the dentine core is an accurate indicator of dietary adaptations, with organisms feeding on hard objects having thicker-enameled teeth than those feeding on leaves and piths (e.g., Kay, 1981; Dumont, 1995; Teaford, 2007; Lucas, Constantino, Wood, & Lawn, 2008).

The prevalence of teeth in the fossil record, coupled with the intimate connection between tooth crown anatomy and dietary proclivities, has resulted in enamel thickness featuring prominently in studies of hominoid evolution. However, this research has focused almost exclusively on the permanent dentition (e.g., for extant hominoids: Molnar & Gantt, 1977; Martin, 1985; Shellis et al., 1998; Gantt, 1986; Schwartz, 2000a; Kono, 2004; Smith, Olejniczak,

1  
2  
3 Martin, & Reid, 2005; Smith, Olejniczak, Reid, Ferrell, & Hublin, 2006; Smith, Olejniczak, Reh,  
4 Reid, & Hublin, 2008; Smith, Kupczik, Machanda, Skinner, & Zermeno, 2012a; Kono & Suwa,  
5  
6 2008; Olejniczak, Tafforeau, Feeney, & Martin, 2008b; for fossil apes: Martin et al., 2003;  
7  
8 Smith, Martin, & Leakey, 2003; Olejniczak et al., 2008c; Zanolli et al., 2015; for fossil  
9  
10 hominins: Beynon & Wood, 1986; Grine & Martin, 1988; Conroy, 1991; Macho & Thackeray,  
11  
12 1992; Olejniczak et al., 2008a,d; Smith et al., 2012b; Skinner et al., 2015; Pan et al., 2016;  
13  
14 Martín-Francés et al., 2018; Zanolli et al., 2018). Comparatively little research effort has been  
15  
16 devoted to tissue proportions, including the amount of enamel, within deciduous teeth (Aiello,  
17  
18 Montgomery, & Dean, 1991; Gantt, Harris, Rafter, & Rahn, 2001; Grine, 2005; Mahoney, 2010,  
19  
20 2013; Fornai et al., 2014). A few general trends can be gleaned about the patterning of enamel  
21  
22 thickness within and across the molars of hominoids from these studies. It is well-established  
23  
24 that among extant large-bodied hominoids *Homo* has the thickest-enameled permanent molars,  
25  
26 followed by *Pongo*, *Pan*, and finally *Gorilla*<sup>1</sup>. This gradient has led to broad classifications, with  
27  
28 *Homo* and *Pongo* being characterized as having “thick” enamel, whereas *Pan* and *Gorilla* have  
29  
30 been variably characterized as having “thin” or “intermediate” enamel thickness (Martin, 1985;  
31  
32 Shellis et al., 1998).

33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Macho and Berner (1993) were among the first to quantify the uneven distribution of  
41  
42 enamel across the permanent molars of recent humans. Since their study, there has been an  
43  
44 emphasis on documenting differences in molar enamel distribution in other hominoids and  
45  
46 interpreting these differences within a strict functional framework based on integrating  
47  
48 knowledge about the mechanics of the mammalian chewing cycle and molar occlusal anatomy  
49  
50 (Kay, 1977; Chivers, Wood, & Bilsborough, 1984; Ross et al., 2009; Ungar, 2017). The  
51  
52

---

53  
54  
55 <sup>1</sup> Note that this pattern is based primarily on two-dimensional tooth sections and that it may slightly differ using  
56  
57 three-dimensional values of enamel thickness, especially in *Pongo* and *Pan* (e.g., see Kono, 2004).

1  
2  
3 mammalian, and thus primate, chewing cycle can be divided into a series of movements, or  
4 strokes: the closing, power, and opening strokes. The closing stroke, wherein the mandibular  
5 arcade is elevated towards the maxillary arcade, brings opposing teeth into close approximation.  
6  
7 Because the occlusal tables, and thus the main cusps, of opposing molars contact each other  
8 during the power stroke, it is not surprising that the nature of the food being reduced, coupled  
9 with the precise manner in which molars move into and out of centric occlusion, should be  
10 related to the distribution of enamel. Broadly speaking, enamel is expected to be thicker on the  
11 “functional” or “supporting” cusps (i.e., protocone and protoconid) than on the “non-functional”  
12 or “guiding” cusps (i.e., paracone and metaconid) (Macho & Berner, 1993; Macho & Spears,  
13 1999; Schwartz, 2000a). Studies of the patterning of enamel thickness distribution in hominoid  
14 permanent molars have provided mixed support for these functional expectations (Molnar &  
15 Gantt, 1977; Grine & Martin, 1988; Conroy, 1991; Macho & Berner, 1993; Schwartz, 2000a;  
16 Kono, 2004; Grine, 2005; Skinner et al., 2015). What has become apparent, however, is that the  
17 degree of asymmetry in enamel thickness between the lingual and buccal cusps is less  
18 pronounced moving distally along the permanent molar row, a fact that has been associated with  
19 more equivalent masticatory loads exerted over the “functional” and “non-functional” regions in  
20 the second and third molars (Spears & Macho, 1995).

21  
22 Other trends in enamel thickness variation along the permanent molar row have been  
23 observed. Using standard measures of the total volume of enamel across a molar crown (the  
24 indices of average and relative enamel thickness; Martin, 1985), there is a tendency for enamel  
25 thickness to increase from M1 to M3 (Macho & Berner, 1993, 1994; Grine & Martin, 1998;  
26 Shellis et al., 1998; Schwartz, 2000a,b; Grine et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2005, 2006, 2008;  
27 Olejniczak et al., 2008a; Feeney et al., 2010). Biomechanical models of mastication suggest that

1  
2  
3 the mandible acts like a third-class lever (Hylander, 1975; Mansour & Reynick, 1975; but see  
4  
5 Spencer, 1998, 1999). Following this model, it has been argued that the mandible experiences  
6  
7 higher bite forces posteriorly and that these bite forces have selected for thicker enamel on the  
8  
9 posterior molars of humans and other hominoids (Molnar & Ward, 1977; Macho & Berner,  
10  
11 1994; Spears & Macho, 1995, 1998; Macho & Spears, 1999). Alternatively, Grine (Grine, 2002,  
12  
13 2005; Grine et al., 2005) has proposed that the distal-ward increase in enamel thickness from M1  
14  
15 to M3 is simply the result of the differential reduction of the dentine crown component in  
16  
17 posterior molars (i.e., morphological hypothesis).  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 In stark contrast to the great deal that has been learned about the evolutionary and  
23  
24 functional significance of permanent molar enamel thickness, our understanding of dental tissue  
25  
26 proportions and distribution in hominoid deciduous postcanine teeth (referred to herein as  
27  
28 deciduous premolars)<sup>2</sup> is comparatively limited. In the past two decades progress has been made  
29  
30 in the characterization of dental tissue proportions – the amount of enamel versus the amount of  
31  
32 coronal dentine – in recent humans (Aiello et al., 1991; Harris et al., 1999; Gantt et al., 2001;  
33  
34 Grine, 2005; Mahoney, 2010, 2013) and fossil hominins (Zilberman et al., 1992; Zanolli et al.,  
35  
36 2010; Benazzi et al., 2011a; Fornai et al., 2014). Because these studies focused primarily either  
37  
38 on testing functional and morphological hypotheses related to the amount of enamel within  
39  
40 molar crowns (Gantt et al., 2001; Grine, 2005; Mahoney, 2010, 2013) or on taxonomic  
41  
42 differences between *Homo sapiens* and other hominin species (Zilberman et al., 1992; Bayle,  
43  
44 Braga, Mazurier, & Macchiarelli, 2009; Zanolli et al., 2010; Benazzi et al., 2011a,b; Fornai et al.,  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

---

52  
53 <sup>2</sup> Deciduous postcanine teeth are variably referred to as both “deciduous premolars” (dp) and “deciduous molars”  
54  
55 (dm). The latter emphasizes the functional and, in the case of the distalmost deciduous tooth, morphological  
56  
57 similarity between these teeth and the permanent molars. The former is used here to emphasize the developmental  
58  
59 linkage to the permanent premolars, as the permanent premolars are the succedaneous teeth that result from the  
60  
61 successional dental lamina extending directly off of the deciduous premolar primordia.

1  
2  
3 2014), our knowledge of the functional and/or taxonomic value of deciduous premolar enamel  
4 thickness in our closest living relatives – *Pan*, *Gorilla*, and *Pongo* – still has serious deficiencies.  
5  
6 What is currently known is based on observations of a single third (dp<sub>3</sub>) and fourth (dp<sub>4</sub>)  
7  
8 mandibular premolar per genus of great apes (Aiello et al., 1991). Although it appears from this  
9  
10 study that the trends in enamel thickness observed in permanent molars are also present in the  
11  
12 deciduous premolars, it is not entirely clear whether these trends will be observed within larger  
13  
14 samples of hominoid deciduous teeth. The lack of research is surprising considering that patterns  
15  
16 of deciduous dental wear (relative to that of the permanent molars) represent an important means  
17  
18 to infer biological age (e.g., age at death), as well as key aspects of the growth, development, and  
19  
20 life history of extinct and extant hominoids (Gustafson, 1950; Miles, 1963, 2001; Wolpoff, 1979;  
21  
22 Aiello et al., 1991; Skinner, 1997; Bermúdez de Castro et al., 2003; Trinkaus, 2011; Vieira,  
23  
24 Barbosa, Quintão, & Normando, 2015). In particular, the paucity of information on deciduous  
25  
26 premolar enamel in apes and early hominins has limited our ability to probe the purported  
27  
28 relationship between enamel thickness and rates of wear in the deciduous dentition.  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35 Here, we employ non-destructive microcomputed tomographic techniques to examine  
36  
37 enamel thickness and its distribution in 158 deciduous premolars of extant large-bodied  
38  
39 hominoids, including specimens representing the genera *Homo*, *Pan*, *Gorilla*, and *Pongo*. Our  
40  
41 goals are: 1) to document and compare measures of average and relative enamel within and  
42  
43 among humans and great apes; 2) to assess patterns of metamerism and inter-arcade variation in  
44  
45 enamel thickness within each genus; 3) to characterize the patterning of enamel thickness  
46  
47 distribution across the lingual, occlusal, and buccal tooth regions in each genus; and 4) to  
48  
49 analyze whether intra- and inter-generic trends of enamel thickness found in great ape and  
50  
51 human deciduous premolars follow those identified for permanent molars. By addressing these  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 questions in the largest, taxonomically diverse sample of hominoid deciduous teeth examined to  
4  
5 date, this study can serve as a benchmark for understanding deciduous enamel variation within  
6  
7 and between members of the hominoid clade and its implications for systematics and dietary  
8  
9 functional morphology.  
10  
11  
12  
13

## 14 **2. Materials and methods**

### 15 *2.1. Sample*

16  
17  
18  
19 Enamel thickness was examined in 80 maxillary (dp<sup>3</sup> and dp<sup>4</sup>) and 78 mandibular (dp<sub>3</sub>  
20  
21 and dp<sub>4</sub>) deciduous third and fourth premolars of *Homo sapiens*, *Pan troglodytes*, *Gorilla* sp.,  
22  
23 and *Pongo* sp. Sample sizes per premolar type and taxon are provided in Table 1. No intra-  
24  
25 individual antimeres were included. We made no attempt to record the sex of the individuals; it  
26  
27 should be noted, however, that enamel thickness of deciduous premolars does not appear to  
28  
29 differ between males and females (Aiello et al., 1991; Harris et al., 1999; Grine, 2005; but see  
30  
31 Gantt et al., 2001).  
32  
33  
34

35  
36 The *H. sapiens* sample mainly included individuals of African ancestry, followed by a  
37  
38 small number of individuals from European ancestry or of unknown geographic provenience.  
39  
40 Due to small sample sizes for great apes and, in many cases, the lack of exact provenance, no  
41  
42 subspecies delineation was made for *P. troglodytes*, and no species delineation was made for  
43  
44 *Gorilla* and *Pongo*. Specific details of the collections used and their institutions are provided in  
45  
46 SOM Table S1.  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 *2.2. Methods*

1  
2  
3 We used microcomputed tomography to image dental tissues virtually and create two-  
4 dimensional (2D) sections from the three-dimensional (3D) image volumes. Although several  
5 studies on permanent teeth have recently documented dental tissue proportions in 3D (e.g.,  
6 Kono, Suwa, & Tanijiri, 2002; Kono, 2004; Kono & Suwa, 2008; Olejniczak et al., 2008a,c),  
7 deciduous tooth enamel is comparatively thinner and more porous, and thus likely to wear at a  
8 faster rate not long after reaching functional occlusion (Aiello et al., 1991; Sumikawa, Marshall,  
9 Gee, & Marshall, 1999; Gantt et al., 2001). This means that a comprehensive 3D study requiring  
10 only unworn or lightly worn specimens would be difficult, if not impossible, to undertake.  
11 Individuals from the R.A. Dart Collection were scanned at the University of the Witwatersrand  
12 with a Nikon Metrology XTH 225/320 LC industrial CT system using the following parameters:  
13 70kV, 120 $\mu$ A, 1.0 mm aluminum filter, and isometric voxel size of 50-85 microns. Great ape  
14 specimens curated at the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University were imaged  
15 with an X-Tek HMXST Micro-CT system (125 kV, 80 $\mu$ A, 1.0 mm aluminum filter, and  
16 isometric voxel size of 45-65 microns), whereas those in the Institute of Human Origins at  
17 Arizona State University were scanned with a Skyscan 1173 (110 kV, 72 $\mu$ A, 1.0 mm aluminum  
18 filter, and an isometric voxel size of 35.8 microns). All other specimens were scanned at the Max  
19 Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology with either a BIR ACTIS 225/300 (130 kV, 100  
20  $\mu$ A, 0.25 mm brass filter) or a Skyscan 1172 (100 kV, 94  $\mu$ A, 2.0 mm aluminum and copper)  
21 scanner at isometric voxel size of 27-70 microns.

22 Each microCT dataset was filtered using a three-dimensional median and mean-of-least-  
23 variance filter and then imported into Amira v6.3 (Mercury Computer Systems) for dental tissue  
24 segmentation and enamel-dentine junction (EDJ) and outer enamel surface (OES) surface  
25 generation following well-established protocols detailed elsewhere (Skinner et al., 2008; Ortiz,  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Skinner, Bailey, & Hublin, 2012). The segmentation process was performed by AO. Only teeth  
4 with no or minor wear were included (equivalent to Molnar's [1971] first four wear stages). The  
5 wear stage associated with each tooth in our study sample is provided in SOM Table S1. Note,  
6 however, that assessments of dental wear were based on the entire tooth crown and that observed  
7 wear facets and dentine patches do not necessarily occur at the location of the slices used for  
8 enamel thickness calculations. Given the difficulty of reconstructing missing enamel in 3D  
9 (Skinner et al., 2015), no attempts were made to reconstruct cusp tips at the OES. Dentine horns,  
10 on the other hand, are relatively sharper structures that can be more easily and accurately  
11 reconstructed in 3D using specialized imaging software. Our sample included therefore  
12 specimens with reconstructed dentine horns, when necessary. Reconstructions were performed in  
13 Geomagic Wrap (3D Systems Design) by AO prior to making the virtual slices used for  
14 calculating dental tissue data. Intra-observer error associated with EDJ reconstruction was  
15 calculated in the  $dp^4$  of one *H. sapiens* and one *P. troglodytes*. Error calculation followed  
16 Skinner et al. (2015) and was negligible (~1-3%) based on EDJ surface areas retrieved from the  
17 different reconstructions. When necessary, cusp tips at the OES were reconstructed in 2D in  
18 Adobe® Photoshop® by AO. Error associated with 2D enamel reconstruction was on average  
19 1.7%, tested using an unworn (Molnar's [1971] grade 1)  $dp^4$  of *H. sapiens* cropped virtually at  
20 four different heights (SOM Fig. S1).

21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45 As per Skinner et al. (2015), each 3D digital model was rotated manually into anatomical  
46 position, where we subsequently created a virtual section perpendicular to the occlusal plane  
47 through the mesial cusps (Fig. 1a). Specifically, the plane passed through the dentine horns of the  
48 protocone and paracone of  $dp^3$ s and  $dp^4$ s, and through the dentine horns of the protoconid and  
49 metaconid of  $dp^3$ s and  $dp^4$ s, with the exception of great ape  $dp^3$ s, which generally possess a main  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 single cusp (protoconid) and require a different slicing protocol. Thus, for great ape dp<sub>3</sub>s, we  
4 followed Benazzi et al.'s (2014) protocol for premolars with no lingual cusp present whereby  
5 sections passed through the protoconid dentine horn and points on the labial and lingual cervical  
6 enamel at the widest labiolingual bi-cervical diameter. A scaled 2D image of each cross-section  
7 was saved as a TIFF format.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 As illustrated in Fig. 1 and described in detail in Table 2, the following variables were  
13 calculated in Adobe® Photoshop®: 1) total area of the tooth crown section, 2) area of enamel  
14 cap, 3) area of dentine crown, 4) length of the EDJ, and 5) bi-cervical diameter. We used these  
15 variables to obtain two widely used indices of enamel thickness (Martin, 1985; Grine & Martin,  
16 1988): average enamel thickness (AET) and relative enamel thickness (RET). AET is defined as  
17 the area of enamel cap divided by the length of the EDJ. The index RET is generated by dividing  
18 AET by the square root of the dentine crown area (multiplied by 100). RET provides therefore a  
19 dimensionless estimate of total enamel volume, allowing comparisons between groups of  
20 different tooth and body sizes. To document the patterning of enamel thickness distribution, we  
21 calculated the following linear measurements on upper and lower dp<sub>4</sub>s: lingual cervical wall  
22 thickness, mid-occlusal basin thickness, and buccal cervical wall thickness (Schwartz, 2000a).  
23 We did not collect these linear measurements on dp<sub>3</sub>s given that our sample sizes were  
24 considerably smaller and that great apes generally possess a single cusp in their dp<sub>3</sub>s.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44

45 The sectioning process was carried out by AO in Amira v6.3, whereas all measurements  
46 were taken by KS-T using Adobe® Photoshop®. To test for error throughout the entire process  
47 from slicing to measurement gathering, a randomly selected subsample of eight molars (one dp<sup>3</sup>  
48 and one dp<sup>4</sup> per genus) was reprocessed from start to finish by both authors using a blind study  
49 protocol in which any taxonomic and specimen identification was removed. Error in enamel  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 thickness measures between the first and second sessions (separated by ~one month) was on  
4  
5 average 3.2%. Significant differences between groups were assessed using Mann-Whitney *U* test  
6  
7 and Kruskal-Wallis test with post-hoc pairwise comparisons. All analyses were performed in  
8  
9 PAST (Hammer, Harper, & Ryan, 2001) and JMP (SAS Institute).  
10  
11  
12  
13

### 14 15 **3. Results**

16  
17 Table 3 provides the descriptive statistics (including the mean, standard deviation, and  
18  
19 coefficient of variation) for the different measurements of deciduous premolar enamel thickness  
20  
21 for all hominoid taxa. The individual measurements for each of the specimens analyzed are  
22  
23 reported in SOM Table S1. Scaled schematic diagrams illustrating differences in dental tissue  
24  
25 proportions in maxillary and mandibular deciduous fourth premolars are shown in Figure 2.  
26  
27 Figure 3 presents pie charts showing 2D tissue proportions per tooth type and taxon, while  
28  
29 boxplots demonstrating intergeneric differences in AET and RET indices are shown in Figure 4.  
30  
31 The relative area of enamel per unit crown area is greater in *Homo sapiens* (~26%-34% enamel)  
32  
33 than in great apes (~15%-24%), and tissue proportions in *P. troglodytes* and *Pongo sp.* are  
34  
35 strikingly similar in all tooth types analyzed (Fig. 3). Mean values for both AET and RET are  
36  
37 highest, without exception, in *H. sapiens*, providing clear support for modern humans possessing  
38  
39 the thickest postcanine deciduous enamel among extant large-bodied hominoids. AET and RET  
40  
41 indices among the great apes are very similar. From thinnest to thickness, the following pattern  
42  
43 of AET (by tooth position based on mean values) is observed: dp<sup>3</sup>s: *Gorilla sp.* < *P. troglodytes*  
44  
45 = *Pongo sp.*; dp<sup>4</sup>s: *P. troglodytes* < *Pongo sp.* < *Gorilla sp.*; dp<sub>3</sub>s: *P. troglodytes* < *Gorilla sp.* <  
46  
47 *Pongo sp.*; and dp<sub>4</sub>s: *P. troglodytes* < *Pongo sp.* < *Gorilla sp.* (Table 3, Fig. 4). This pattern  
48  
49 appears to be influenced by size, however (Table 3, Figs. 4): When the effects of size are taken  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 into account through calculation of RET, *Gorilla* sp. deciduous premolars are slightly more  
4  
5 thinly enameled than those of *P. troglodytes* and *Pongo* sp., whose RET indices are, in turn, more  
6  
7 similar to each other. The following pattern for RET is observed among the great apes (based on  
8  
9 mean values): *Gorilla* sp. < *Pongo* sp. ≤ *P. troglodytes* for maxillary and mandibular deciduous  
10  
11 premolars (Table 2, Fig. 4). *Pongo* sp. exhibits the highest coefficients of variation (CV) for both  
12  
13 AET and RET, followed by *Gorilla* sp., *Homo sapiens*, and *Pan troglodytes*. In some cases, CVs  
14  
15 for AET and RET of *Pan troglodytes* are considerably smaller than those found for all other  
16  
17 groups analyzed (Table 3).  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test and associated post-hoc pairwise comparisons for  
23  
24 AET and RET are presented in SOM Table S2 and Table 4, respectively. All pairwise group  
25  
26 differences for AET and RET in dp<sub>3</sub> are non-significant, except for *H. sapiens* vs. *Gorilla* sp. It  
27  
28 should be noted, however, that the lack of significance among groups could be at least partially  
29  
30 attributed to small sample sizes, as among the four tooth types analyzed, our dp<sub>3</sub> sample is the  
31  
32 smallest. As shown in Table 4, differences in AET and RET for dp<sup>3</sup>, dp<sup>4</sup>, and dp<sub>4</sub> between *H.*  
33  
34 *sapiens* and each of the great apes are, in all cases, significant, except for between *H. sapiens* and  
35  
36 *Pongo* sp. dp<sup>3</sup>s. Contrary to the results for humans, Kruskal-Wallis post-hoc pairwise  
37  
38 comparisons reveal that all differences in enamel thickness among the great apes are non-  
39  
40 significant..  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 Table 3 and Figure 4 also reveal some interesting intra-taxon patterns. On average, within  
46  
47 each hominoid group, dp<sup>4</sup>s and dp<sub>4</sub>s consistently possess greater AET and RET indices than their  
48  
49 mesial metamerer –dp<sup>3</sup>s and dp<sub>3</sub>s – respectively. We also note some trends in enamel thickness  
50  
51 between maxillary and mandibular antagonistic pairs (i.e., dp<sup>3</sup> vs. dp<sub>3</sub>; dp<sup>4</sup> vs. dp<sub>4</sub>). In almost all  
52  
53 cases, AET and RET means within each taxon are higher in dp<sup>3</sup> and dp<sup>4</sup> relative to their  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 mandibular counterparts, with this trend being more marked in *H. sapiens*, followed by *Pongo*  
4 sp. The only two exceptions to this trend occur in *P. troglodytes* (AET means for  $dp^4$  and  $dp_4$  are  
5 the same) and in *Gorilla* sp. (enamel is thicker in  $dp_3$  relative to  $dp^3$  based on RET means and  
6 similar based on AET).  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 Finally, we examined the patterning of enamel thickness distribution in each taxon using  
13 linear measurements (LCW, MOB, BCW). Consistent with functional expectations for maxillary  
14 teeth, linear measurements of  $dp^4$  reveal that enamel is consistently thickest on the lingual region  
15 in all groups (Fig. 5). Although the trend is less pronounced in  $dp_4$  than in  $dp^4$  as the difference  
16 between BCW and LCW is small, Fig. 5 also shows that the functional cusp of  $dp_4$  (protoconid)  
17 tends to have thicker enamel than the non-functional cusp (metaconid). Occlusal enamel  
18 thickness of both deciduous premolars ( $dp^4$  and  $dp_4$ ) consistently provides the smallest values  
19 (Fig. 5).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

#### 33 4. Discussion

34  
35 Extant large-bodied hominoids exhibit the following pattern of permanent molar enamel  
36 thickness (from thinnest to thickest): *Gorilla* < *Pan* < *Pongo* < *Homo*, where molars in *Gorilla*  
37 and *Pan* are characterized as having “thin” or “intermediate” enamel, and *Pongo* and *H. sapiens*  
38 are characterized as having “thick” enamel. Aiello et al.’s (1991) preliminary observations, on  
39 the other hand, noted a different pattern for the deciduous dentition, wherein enamel thickness  
40 did not greatly differ among the great apes. In agreement with Aiello et al. (1991), our results  
41 based on a large sample of deciduous premolars – the functional analog of permanent molars –  
42 found no significant differences in RET values among living members of the *Pan*, *Gorilla*, and  
43 *Pongo* clades. Broadly, our results for RET suggest the following trend for deciduous enamel  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 (from thinnest to thickest): *Gorilla* < *Pongo* ≤ *Pan* < *Homo*. Thus, contrary to what is observed  
4  
5 in the permanent molars, *Pongo* does not stand out as having more thickly enameled deciduous  
6  
7 premolars compared to African apes. *Gorilla* deciduous teeth, however, tend to have slightly  
8  
9 thinner (but not significantly different) enamel than those of *Pan* and *Pongo*, and *H. sapiens*  
10  
11 possesses significantly thicker enamel in their deciduous dentition compared to *Gorilla*, *Pan*, and  
12  
13 *Pongo*. Differences in 2D tissue proportions (% of enamel and dentine in the tooth crown)  
14  
15 between *H. sapiens* and great apes are also evident in all tooth types examined, with enamel  
16  
17 comprising ~26%34% of the total crown area in *H. sapiens* and only ~15%-24% in extant large-  
18  
19 bodied apes. Interestingly, Olejniczak et al. (2008d) noted clear differences in relative tissue  
20  
21 proportions between *H. sapiens* and Neanderthal permanent molars when analyzed in 3D, but not  
22  
23 in 2D. In this regard, it remains to be tested whether differences in tissue proportions found in  
24  
25 our study hold true when 3D data are considered.

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Schwartz (2000a) posited that the range of variation in RET for permanent molars was  
32  
33 larger in the so-called thick-enameled hominoids (i.e., *Pongo* and *Homo*) than in *Pan* and  
34  
35 *Gorilla*. This was not the case in deciduous teeth. CVs for AET and RET were greater in *Pongo*  
36  
37 and *Gorilla* than in *P. troglodytes* and to a lesser extent in *H. sapiens*. Caution is warranted,  
38  
39 however, since our *Pongo* and *Gorilla* samples likely included specimens from more than one  
40  
41 species, which could have resulted in a higher CVs relative to our species-level human and  
42  
43 chimpanzee samples. Comparative analyses have noted that measures of enamel thickness are  
44  
45 generally more variable in deciduous than in permanent molars (Gantt et al., 2001; Grine, 2005).  
46  
47 Overall, the levels of intra-generic and intra-tooth variation in enamel thickness found here are  
48  
49 similar to, or smaller than, those reported in previous studies of recent human deciduous  
50  
51 premolars (Gantt et al., 2001; Grine, 2005). According to Gantt et al. (2001), however, the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 inclusion of even minimally worn teeth likely artificially increased the range of variation in their  
4 reported enamel thickness measurements. Thinly enameled bunodont teeth, such as those  
5 analyzed here, wear down quickly, a fact that might have increased some of the CV values in our  
6 study.  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11

12 Although human and great ape deciduous premolars do not appear to follow the same  
13 patterns of inter-generic enamel thickness variation than their permanent functional analogs (i.e.,  
14 the permanent molars), inter-arcade (i.e., antagonistic) and metameric trends appear to be both  
15 relatively stable between deciduous and permanent teeth and consistent across hominoids.  
16  
17 Studies in recent humans have suggested that maxillary deciduous premolars and permanent  
18 molars have thicker enamel than their mandibular counterparts (Gantt, 1986; Gantt et al., 2001).  
19  
20 This observation is supported by our study as comparisons between antagonistic pairs (dp<sup>3</sup> vs.  
21 dp<sub>3</sub>, and dp<sup>4</sup> vs. dp<sub>4</sub>) reveal, in most cases, higher AET and RET means in maxillary than in  
22 mandibular deciduous teeth, especially in *H. sapiens* and *Pongo* sp. Furthermore, hominoid  
23 dental tissue research has provided strong evidence for a posterior increase in enamel thickness  
24 along the permanent molar row (Grine & Martin, 1998; Macho and Berner, 1993, 1994; Spears  
25 & Macho, 1995; Shellis et al., 1998; Schwartz, 2000b; Grine et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2005,  
26 2006, 2008, 2012a; Olejniczak et al., 2008a; Feeney et al., 2010; Skinner et al., 2015; Pan et al.,  
27 2016). Although enamel is considerably thinner on deciduous than on permanent teeth, a distal  
28 increase in deciduous premolar enamel thickness has been documented previously in fossil and  
29 recent humans (Zilberman et al., 1992; Harris et al., 1999; Grine, 2005; Gantt et al., 2001; Bayle  
30 et al., 2009; Zanolli et al., 2010; Mahoney, 2010, 2013; Benazzi et al., 2011a,b). In this regard,  
31 our results showing an increase in the amount of enamel from dp<sub>3</sub> to dp<sub>4</sub> are not only concordant  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 with previous studies of the human deciduous dentition, but also provide empirical support to  
4 anecdotal observations for great apes reported by Aiello et al. (1991).  
5  
6

7  
8 By invoking functional models of masticatory biomechanics, several researchers have  
9 argued that anterior-posterior gradients in enamel thickness along the permanent molar row  
10 reflect an increase in bite force magnitudes (Molnar & Ward, 1977; Macho & Berner, 1994;  
11 Spears & Macho, 1995, 1998; Macho and Spears, 1999). Although functional interpretations of  
12 the distal-ward increase in enamel thickness are controversial and clinical data on bite force in  
13 children are limited (Spencer, 1998; Grine, 2005; Mahoney, 2010; Mountain, Wood, & Toumba,  
14 2011; Edmonds & Glowacka, 2014), this argument has also been used by Gantt et al. (2001) and  
15 Mahoney (2013) to explain the presence of thickest enamel on the more posterior deciduous  
16 teeth. As dp4s possess both greater dentine and enamel areas than relatively smaller dp3s, the  
17 overall percentage of the tooth crown formed by enamel is ~3-7% greater in dp4 crowns. Grine  
18 (2005) and Mahoney (2010) noted that enamel thickness changes along the premolar/molar  
19 series are the result of different odontogenic processes operating in deciduous and permanent  
20 human molars. They suggest that the quantity of both enamel and dentine increase from dp3 to  
21 dp4, whereas increases in RET from M1 to M3 are due to a reduction in dentine in the posterior-  
22 most molars. In this vein, our results are consistent with their statement on deciduous premolars.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Overall, differences in the distribution of enamel across the molar crown found here lend  
43 support to the hypothesis that “functional” cusps possess thicker enamel than their “non-  
44 functional” counterparts to prolong a tooth crown’s functional longevity. Although this  
45 hypothesis was first proposed for permanent teeth of humans and other hominoids (Molnar &  
46 Gantt, 1977; Macho and Berner, 1993; Macho and Spears, 1999; Schwartz, 2000a; Kono, et al.,  
47 2002), enamel thickness differentials between the “functional” and “non-functional” cusps have  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 also been previously found for human deciduous premolars (Gantt et al., 2001; Grine, 2005; but  
4 see Mahoney, 2010). In addition, we found that, in all instances, hominoid deciduous premolars  
5  
6 possess less enamel across their occlusal basin than on the lingual and buccal regions, with this  
7  
8 trend being more marked in our *P. troglodytes* and *H. sapiens* samples. This is not only  
9  
10 consistent with regional patterns reported for *H. sapiens* dp4s (Grine, 2005), but also with Kono  
11  
12 and Suwa's (2008) observations on the presence of extremely thin occlusal enamel in the  
13  
14 permanent molars of bonobos and common chimpanzees.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 For decades, tooth wear has been used as a tool for age determination in archaeological  
20 and living human individuals (e.g., Gustafson, 1950; Miles, 1963, 2001; Kim, Kho, & Lee, 2000;  
21 Mays, 2002; Vieira et al., 2015). Paleoanthropologists have also used tooth wear (generally in  
22 combination with other features such as stages of dental eruption) as a coarse measure of the rate  
23 of growth and development of fossil and recent hominoid species, most often to reconstruct key  
24 aspects of their life history such as weaning age, interbirth intervals, mortality rates, and lifespan  
25 (Wolpoff, 1979; Aiello et al., 1991; Skinner, 1997; Bermúdez de Castro et al., 2003; Caspari &  
26 Lee, 2004; Nargolwalla, Begun, Dean, Reid, & Kordos, 2005; Smith, Toussaint, Reid,  
27 Olejniczak, & Hublin, 2007; Trinkaus, 2011). Although enamel thickness is a key factor  
28 influencing rates and patterns of dental wear (Molnar & Gantt, 1977; Molnar & Ward, 1977;  
29 Aiello et al., 1991), it is surprising that estimates of species' life history extrapolating from rates  
30 of dental wear do not explicitly take into account the influence of enamel thickness on wear rates  
31 (reviewed in Smith, 2013).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Although most life history inferences based on archaeological and fossil dental remains  
50 rely on evidence from permanent teeth, Aiello et al. (1991) noted the potential importance of  
51 deciduous teeth for inferring two key aspects of hominoids' life history: age at weaning and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 interbirth intervals. Acknowledging that their conclusions were preliminary given both their  
4 small samples and unknown age at death of the specimens used, Aiello et al. (1991) proposed  
5 that the pattern and magnitude of wear (attrition) found among hominoid deciduous teeth were  
6 suggestive of an earlier weaning and shorter interbirth interval in gorillas than in chimpanzees  
7 and orangutans. In this vein, the data presented here can be used to test the observed preliminary  
8 pattern in a more comprehensive manner. While there is now clearer evidence that weaning in  
9 apes is a complex and long process (Pusey, 1983; Smith, 2013; Smith et al., 2013; Smith, Austin,  
10 Hinde, Vogel, & Arora, 2017; Joannes-Boyau et al., 2019) and that recent minimally invasive  
11 state-of-the-art research offers a new exciting glimpse into weaning age in our hominin ancestors  
12 (Joannes-Boyau et al., 2019), we believe that exploring this life history trait using  
13 complementary lines of evidence, including the non-destructive approach of dental wear, is  
14 warranted considering that nursing behavior among apes is difficult to infer and systematically  
15 investigate both in the wild and in the fossil record.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Finally, although testing Aiello et al.'s (1991) hypothesis of age at weaning in gorillas is  
34 beyond the scope of the present study, our results support the argument that the greater degrees  
35 of dental wear on gorilla deciduous teeth relative to those of chimpanzees and orangutans cannot  
36 be attributed to differences in enamel thickness. That is, we found no significant differences in  
37 relative and average enamel thickness among the great apes, meaning that the enamel on the  
38 deciduous postcanine dentition of *Gorilla* is not significantly thinner than in *Pan* and *Pongo*.  
39 One additional conclusion derived from this study is that *Pongo* does not possess thicker-  
40 enameled deciduous premolars than African great apes. Patterns of food consumption during the  
41 early life of great ape individuals are complex and slight differences have been noted among  
42 populations and species, but in a very general sense, infants from both *Pan* and *Pongo* start  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 eating solid food by 0.5-1 years of age, which then constitutes an appreciable component of their  
4  
5 diet by the time they reach about 1-2 years of age (Smith et al., 2013, 2017). It is known,  
6  
7 however, that orangutans experience longer and sometimes cyclical periods of offspring  
8  
9 dependence and later weaning ages relative to other apes (Pusey, 1983; van Noordwijk, Willems,  
10  
11 Utami Atmoko, Kuzawa, & van Schaik, 2013; Smith et al., 2017). Thus, from the functional  
12  
13 perspective, investment in postcanine deciduous teeth with thicker enamel in orangutans would  
14  
15 be unexpected considering 1) that orangutans have the most prolonged nursing period than any  
16  
17 other apes, 2) that milk consumption is considerably less challenging for the masticatory  
18  
19 apparatus than solid food, and 3) that deciduous premolars among great apes remain in  
20  
21 functional occlusion for roughly the same amount of time (based on estimates of the timing of  
22  
23 dp3-4 and P3-4 emergence; see Smith, Crummett, & Brandt, 1994). Further research is needed to  
24  
25 better understand the evolutionary, functional, and developmental implications of the patterns of  
26  
27 enamel thickness variation in hominoid deciduous teeth, and our study represents an important  
28  
29 first step in this direction by providing the comparative context within which to interpret  
30  
31 deciduous tooth wear and its usefulness for inferring age at weaning in great apes and fossil  
32  
33 hominins.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 **Acknowledgments**

43  
44 For access to specimens, we thank the following individuals and institutions: Brendon Billings,  
45  
46 Nicholas Bacci, and University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa; Leipzig  
47  
48 University, Leipzig, Germany; Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig,  
49  
50 Germany; David Hunt and National Museum Natural History, Washington, DC.; Institute of  
51  
52 Human Origins, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ; Mark Omura and Harvard Museum of  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, MA; Thomas Koppe and University of Greifswald,  
4 Greifswald, Germany; Frieder Mayer, Christiane Funk, and Museum für Naturkunde, Berlin,  
5 Germany; and Phyletic Museum, Jena, Germany. We also thank Heiko Temming, David Plotzki,  
6 Lukas Westphal, Kudakwashe Jakata, and Evelyn Glaze for assistance. This research was  
7 supported by the Wenner-Gren Foundation (grant to AO) and the Max Planck Society.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

## 17 **References**

- 18  
19 Aiello, L.C., Montgomery, C., & Dean, C. (1991). The natural history of deciduous tooth  
20 attrition in hominoids. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 21, 397-412.  
21  
22  
23  
24 Bayle, P., Braga, J., Mazurier, A., & Macchiarelli, R. (2009). High-resolution assessment of the  
25 dental developmental pattern and characterization of tooth tissue proportions in the late  
26 Upper Paleolithic child from La Madeleine, France. *American Journal of Physical*  
27 *Anthropology*, 138, 493-498.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Benazzi, S., Fornai, C., Bayle, P., Coquerelle, M., Kullmer, O., Mallegni, F., Weber, G.W.  
34 (2011a). Comparison of dental measurement systems for taxonomic assignment of  
35 Neanderthal and modern human lower second deciduous molars. *Journal of Human*  
36 *Evolution*, 61, 320-326.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Benazzi, S., Douka, K., Fornai, C., Bauer, C.C., Kullmer, O., Svoboda, J., Pap, I., Mallegni, F.,  
43 Bayle, P., Coquerelle, M., Condemi, S., Ronchitelli, A., Harvati, K., & Weber, G.W.  
44 (2011b). Early dispersal of modern humans in Europe and implications for Neanderthal  
45 behaviour. *Nature*, 479, 525-528.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Bermúdez de Castro, J.M., Martínón-Torres, M., Sarmiento, S., Lozano, M., Arsuaga, J.L., &  
52 Carbonell, E. (2003). Rates of anterior tooth wear in Middle Pleistocene hominins from  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Sima de los Huesos (Sierra de Atapuerca, Spain). *Proceedings of the National Academy*  
4 *of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100, 11992-11996.  
5  
6  
7  
8 Beynon, A.D., & Wood, B.A. (1986). Variations in enamel thickness and structure in East  
9  
10 African hominids. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 70, 177-193.  
11  
12 Caspari, R., & Lee, S.H. (2004). Older age becomes common late in human evolution.  
13  
14 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101,  
15  
16 10895-10900.  
17  
18  
19 Chai, H. (2014). On the mechanical properties of tooth enamel under spherical indentation. *Acta*  
20  
21 *Biomaterialia*, 10, 4852-4860.  
22  
23  
24 Chivers, D.J., Wood, B.A., & Bilsborough, A. (1984). *Food acquisition and processing in*  
25  
26 *primates*. New York, Springer Science +Business Media, LLC.  
27  
28  
29 Conroy, G.C. (1991). Enamel thickness in South African australopithecines: noninvasive  
30  
31 evaluation by computed tomography. *Palaeontologica Africana*, 28, 53-59.  
32  
33  
34 Constantino, P.J., Lucas, P.W., Lee, J.J.-W., & Lawn, B.R. (2009). The influence of fallback  
35  
36 foods on great ape tooth enamel. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 140, 653-  
37  
38 660.  
39  
40  
41 Dumont, E.R. (1995). Enamel thickness and dietary adaptation among extant primates and  
42  
43 chiropterans. *Journal of Mammalogy* 76, 1127-1136.  
44  
45  
46 Edmonds, H.M., & Glowacka, H. (2014). The ontogeny of bite force: a test of the constrained  
47  
48 lever model. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 153 S58, 112.  
49  
50  
51 Feeney, R.N.M., Zermeno, J.P., Reid, D.J., Nakashima, S., Sano, H., Bahar, A., Hublin, J.-J., &  
52  
53 Smith, T.M. (2010). Enamel thickness in Asian human canines and premolars.  
54  
55 *Anthropological Science*, 118, 191-198.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Fornai, C, Benazzi, S., Svoboda, J., Pap, I., Harvati, K., Weber, G.W. (2014). Enamel thickness  
4 variation of deciduous first and second upper molars in modern humans and  
5  
6 Neanderthals. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 76, 83-91.  
7  
8  
9  
10 Gantt, D.G. (1986). Enamel thickness and ultrastructure in hominoids: with reference to form,  
11 function and phylogeny. In D.R. Swindler, & J. Erwin (Eds.), *Comparative Primate*  
12 *Biology* (pp. 453-475). New York, Alan R. Liss.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Gantt, D.G., Harris, E.F., Rafter, J.A., & Rahn, J.K. (2001). Distribution of enamel thickness on  
18 human deciduous molars. In A. Brook (Ed.), *Dental Morphology* (pp. 167-190).  
19 Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Grine, F.E. (2002). Scaling of tooth enamel thickness, and molar crown size reduction in modern  
25 humans. *South African Journal of Science*, 98, 503-509.  
26  
27  
28  
29 Grine, FE. (2005). Enamel thickness of deciduous and permanent molars in modern *Homo*  
30 *sapiens*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 126, 14-31.  
31  
32  
33 Grine, F.E., Spencer, M.A., Demes, B., Smith, H.F., Strait, D.S., Constant, D.A. (2005). Molar  
34 enamel thickness in the Chacma Baboon, *Papio ursinus* (Kerr 1792). *American Journal*  
35 *of Physical Anthropology*, 128, 812-822.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Grine, F.E., & Martin, L.B. (1988). Enamel thickness and development in *Australopithecus* and  
41 *Paranthropus*. In F.E. Grine (Ed.), *Evolutionary history of the "robust"*  
42 *Australopithecines* (pp. 3-42). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Gustafson, G. (1950). Age determinations on teeth. *Journal of the American Dental Association*,  
48 41, 45-54.  
49  
50  
51  
52 Hammer, Ø., Harper, D.A.T., & Ryan, P.D. (2001). PAST: Paleontological statistics software  
53 package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica*, 4, 1-9.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Harris, E.F., Hicks, J.D., & Barcroft, B.D. (1999). Absence of sexual dimorphism in enamel  
4 thickness of human deciduous molars. In J.T. Mayhall, T. Heikkinen (Eds.), *Dental*  
5  
6 *Morphology, Proceedings of the 11th International Symposium on Dental Morphology*  
7  
8 (pp. 338-349). Finland, Oulu University Press.  
9  
10  
11  
12 Hylander, W.L. (1975). The human mandible: lever or link? *American Journal of Physical*  
13  
14 *Anthropology*, 43, 227-242.  
15  
16  
17 Joannes-Boyau, R., Adams, J.W., Austin, C., Arora, M., Moffat, I., Herries, A.I.R., Tonge, M.P.,  
18  
19 Benazzi, S., Evans, A.R., Kullmer, O., Wroe, S., Dosseto, A., & Fiorenza, L. (2019).  
20  
21 Elemental signatures of *Australopithecus africanus* teeth reveal seasonal dietary stress.  
22  
23 *Nature*, 572, 112-115.  
24  
25  
26 Kay, R.F. (1977). The evolution of molar occlusal in the cercopithecidae and early catarrhines.  
27  
28 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 46, 327-352.  
29  
30  
31 Kay, R.F. (1981). The nut-crackers: a new theory of the adaptations of the Ramapithecinae.  
32  
33 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 55: 141-151.  
34  
35  
36 Kim, Y.-K., Kho, H.-S., & Lee, K.-H. (2000). Age estimation by occlusal tooth wear. *Journal of*  
37  
38 *Forensic Science*, 45, 303-309.  
39  
40  
41 Kono, R. (2004). Molar enamel thickness and distribution patterns in extant great apes and  
42  
43 humans, new insights based on a 3-dimensional whole crown perspective.  
44  
45 *Anthropological Science*, 112, 121-146.  
46  
47  
48 Kono, R.T., Suwa, G., & Tanijiri, T. (2002). A three-dimensional analysis of enamel distribution  
49  
50 patterns in human permanent first molars. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 47, 867-875.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Kono, R.T., & Suwa, G. (2008). Enamel distribution patterns of extant human and hominoid  
4  
5 molars: occlusal versus lateral enamel thickness. *Bulletin of the National Museum of*  
6  
7 *Nature and Science D*, 34, 1-9.  
8  
9
- 10 Lucas, P., Constantino, P., Wood, B., Lawn, B. (2008). Dental enamel as a dietary indicator in  
11  
12 mammals. *Bioessays*, 30, 374-385.  
13  
14
- 15 Macho, G.A., & Thackeray, J.F. (1992). Computed tomography and enamel thickness of  
16  
17 maxillary molars of Plio-Pleistocene hominids from Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, and  
18  
19 Kromdraai (South Africa): an exploratory study. *American Journal of Physical*  
20  
21 *Anthropology*, 89, 133-143.  
22  
23
- 24 Macho, G.A., & Berner, M.E. (1993). Enamel thickness of human maxillary molars  
25  
26 reconsidered. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 92, 189-200.  
27  
28
- 29 Macho, G.A., & Berner, M.E. (1994) Enamel thickness and the helicoidal plane. *American*  
30  
31 *Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 94, 327-337.  
32
- 33 Macho, G.A., & Spears, I.R. (1999). Effects of loading on the biomechanical behavior of molars  
34  
35 of *Homo*, *Pan*, and *Pongo*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 109, 211-227.  
36  
37
- 38 Mahoney, P. (2010). Two-dimensional patterns of human enamel thickness on deciduous (dm1,  
39  
40 dm2) and permanent first (M1) mandibular molars. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 55, 115-  
41  
42 126.  
43
- 44 Mahoney, P. (2013), Testing functional and morphological interpretations of enamel thickness  
45  
46 along the deciduous tooth row in human children. *American Journal of Physical*  
47  
48 *Anthropology*, 151, 518-525.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3 Mansour, R.M., & Reynick, R.J. (1975). In vivo occlusal forces and moments: I. Forces  
4  
5 measured in terminal hinge position and associated moments. *Journal of Dental*  
6  
7 *Research*, 54, 114-120.  
8  
9
- 10 Martin, L. (1985). Significance of enamel thickness in hominoid evolution. *Nature*, 314, 260-  
11  
12 263.  
13
- 14 Martin, L.B., Olejniczak, A.J., & Maas, M.C. (2003). Enamel thickness and microstructure in  
15  
16 pitheciin primates, with comments on dietary adaptations of the middle Miocene  
17  
18 hominoid *Kenyapithecus*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 45, 351-367.  
19  
20
- 21 Martín-Francés, L., Martínón-Torres, M., Martínez de Pinillos, M., García-Campos, C.,  
22  
23 Modesto-Mata, M., Zanolli, C., Rodríguez, L., Bermúdez de Castro, J.M. (2018). Tooth  
24  
25 crown tissue proportions and enamel thickness in Early Pleistocene *Homo antecessor*  
26  
27 molars (Atapuerca, Spain). *PLoS One*, 13, e0203334.  
28  
29
- 30  
31 Mays, S. (2002). The relationship between molar wear and age in an early 19th century AD  
32  
33 archaeological human skeletal series of documented age at death. *Journal of*  
34  
35 *Archaeological Science*, 29, 861-871.  
36  
37
- 38 McGraw, W.S., Pampush, J.D., & Daegling, D.J. (2012). Enamel thickness and durophagy in  
39  
40 mangabeys revisited. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 147, 326-333.  
41
- 42 Miles, A.E.W. (1963). Dentition in the Estimation of Age. *Journal of Dental Research*, 42, 255-  
43  
44 263.  
45  
46
- 47 Miles, A.E.W. (2001). The Miles method of assessing age from tooth wear revisited. *Journal of*  
48  
49 *Archaeological Science*, 28, 973-982.  
50
- 51 Molnar, S. (1971). Human tooth wear, tooth function and cultural variability. *American Journal*  
52  
53 *of Physical Anthropology*, 34, 27-42.  
54  
55  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3 Molnar, S., & Ward, S.C. (1977). On the hominid masticatory complex: biomechanical and  
4  
5 evolutionary perspectives. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 6, 551-568.  
6  
7  
8 Molnar, S., & Gantt, D.G. (1977). Functional implications of primate enamel thickness.  
9  
10 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 46, 447-454.  
11  
12 Mountain, G., Wood, D., & Toumba, J. (2011). Bite force measurement in children with primary  
13  
14 dentition. *International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry*, 21, 112-118.  
15  
16  
17 Nargolwalla, M.C., Begun, D.R., Dean, M.C., Reid, D.J., & Kordos, L. (2005). Dental  
18  
19 development and life history in *Anapithecus hernyaki*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 49,  
20  
21 99-121.  
22  
23  
24 Myoung, S., Lee, J., Constantino, P., Lucas, P., Chai, H., & Lawn, B. (2009). Morphology and  
25  
26 fracture of enamel. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 42, 1947-1951.  
27  
28  
29 Olejniczak, A.J., Smith, T.M., Skinner, M.M., Grine, F.E., Feeney, R.N.M., Thackeray, F.J., &  
30  
31 Hublin, J.-J. (2008a). Three-dimensional molar enamel distribution and thickness in  
32  
33 *Australopithecus* and *Paranthropus*. *Biology Letters*, 4, 406-410.  
34  
35  
36 Olejniczak, A.J., Tafforeau, P., Feeney, R.N.M., & Martin, L.B. (2008b). Three-dimensional  
37  
38 primate molar enamel thickness. *Journal of Human Evolution* 54, 187e195.  
39  
40  
41 Olejniczak, A.J., Smith, T.M., Wei, W., Potts, R., Ciochon, R., Kullmer, O., Schrenk, F., &  
42  
43 Hublin, J.-J. (2008c). Molar enamel thickness and dentine horn height in  
44  
45 *Gigantopithecus blacki*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 135, 85-91.  
46  
47  
48 Olejniczak, A.J., Smith, T.M., Feeney, R.N.M., Macchiarelli, R., Mazurier, A., Bondioli, L.,  
49  
50 Rosas, A., Fortea, J., de la Rasilla, M., García-Tabernero, A., Radovic, J., Skinner,  
51  
52 M.M., Toussaint, M., & Hublin, J.-J. (2008d). Dental tissue proportions and enamel  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 thickness in Neandertal and modern human molars. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 55,  
4  
5 12-23.  
6  
7  
8 Ortiz, A., Skinner, M.M., Bailey, S.E., & Hublin, J.-J. (2012). Carabelli's trait revisited: An  
9  
10 examination of mesiolingual features at the enamel-dentine junction and enamel surface  
11  
12 of *Pan* and *Homo sapiens* upper molars. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 63, 586-596.  
13  
14  
15 Pan, L., Dumoncel, J., de Beer, F., Hoffman, J., Thackeray, J.F., Duployer, B., Tenailleau, C., &  
16  
17 Braga, J. (2016). Further morphological evidence on South African earliest *Homo* lower  
18  
19 postcanine dentition: enamel thickness and enamel dentine junction. *Journal of Human*  
20  
21 *Evolution*, 96, 82-96.  
22  
23  
24 Pusey, A.E. (1983). Mother-offspring relationships in chimpanzees after weaning. *Animal*  
25  
26 *Behaviour*, 31, 363-377.  
27  
28  
29 Ross, C.F., Reed, D.A., Washington, R.L., Eckhardt, A., Anapol, F., & Shahnoor, N. (2009).  
30  
31 Scaling of chew cycle duration in primates. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*,  
32  
33 138, 30-44.  
34  
35  
36 Schwartz, G.T. (2000a). Taxonomic and functional aspects of the patterning of enamel thickness  
37  
38 distribution in extant large-bodied hominoids. *American Journal of Physical*  
39  
40 *Anthropology*, 111, 221-244  
41  
42  
43 Schwartz, G.T. (2000b). Enamel thickness and the helicoidal wear plane in modern human  
44  
45 mandibular molars. *Archives of Oral Biology* 45, 401-409.  
46  
47  
48 Skinner, M. (1997). Dental wear in immature late Pleistocene European hominines. *Journal of*  
49  
50 *Archaeological Science*, 24, 677-700.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Skinner, M.M., Wood, B., Boesch, C., Olejniczak, A.J., Rosas, A., Smith, T.M., & Hublin, J.-J.  
4  
5 (2008). Dental trait expression at the enamel-dentine junction of lower molars in extant  
6  
7 and fossil hominoids. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 54, 173-186.  
8  
9  
10 Skinner, M.M., Alemseged, Z., Gaunitz, C., & Hublin, J.-J. (2015). Enamel thickness trends in  
11  
12 Plio-Pleistocene hominin mandibular molars. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 85, 35-45.  
13  
14 Shellis, R.P., Beynon, A.D., Reid, D.J., & Hiiemae, K.M. (1998). Variations in molar enamel  
15  
16 thickness among primates. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 35, 507-522.  
17  
18  
19 Shimizu, D. (2002). Functional implications of enamel thickness in the lower molars of red  
20  
21 colobus (*Procolobus badius*) and Japanese macaque (*Macaca fuscata*). *Journal of*  
22  
23 *Human Evolution*, 43, 605-620.  
24  
25  
26 Smith, B.H., Crummett, T.L., & Brandt, K.L. (1994). Ages of eruption of primate teeth: a  
27  
28 compendium for aging individuals or comparing life histories. *Yearbook of Physical*  
29  
30 *Anthropology*, 37, 177-231.  
31  
32  
33 Smith, T.M. (2013). Teeth and human life-history evolution. *Annual Review of Anthropology*,  
34  
35 42, 191-208.  
36  
37  
38 Smith, T.M., Martin, L.B., & Leakey, M.G. (2003). Enamel thickness, microstructure and  
39  
40 development in *Afropithecus turkanensis*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 44, 283-306.  
41  
42  
43 Smith, T.M., Olejniczak, A.J., Martin, L.B., & Reid, D.J. (2005). Variation in hominoid molar  
44  
45 enamel thickness. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 48, 575-592.  
46  
47  
48 Smith, T.M., Olejniczak, A.J., Reid, D.J., Ferrell, R.J., & Hublin, J.-J. (2006). Modern human  
49  
50 molar enamel thickness and enamel dentine junction shape. *Archives of Oral Biology*,  
51  
52 51, 974-995.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3 Smith, T.M., Toussaint, M., Reid, D.J., Olejniczak, A.J., & Hublin, J.-J. (2007). Rapid dental  
4 development in a Middle Paleolithic Belgian Neanderthal. *Proceedings of the National*  
5 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104, 20220-20225.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Smith, T.M., Olejniczak, A.J., Reh, S., Reid, D.J., & Hublin, J.-J. (2008). Brief communication:  
11 enamel thickness trends in the dental arcade of humans and chimpanzees. *American*  
12 *Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 136, 237-241.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Smith, T.M., Kupczik, K., Machanda, Z., Skinner, M.M., & Zermeno, J.P. (2012a). Enamel  
18 thickness in Bornean and Sumatran orangutan dentitions. *American Journal of Physical*  
19 *Anthropology*, 147, 417-426.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Smith, T.M., Olejniczak, A.J., Zermeno, J.P., Tafforeau, P., Skinner, M.M., Hoffmann, A.,  
25 Radovic, J., Toussaint, M., Kruszynski, R., Menter, C., Moggi-Cecchi, J., Glasmacher,  
26 U.A., Kullmer, O., Schrenk, F., Stringer, C., & Hublin, J.-J. (2012b). Variation in  
27 enamel thickness within the genus *Homo*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 62, 395-411.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Smith, T.M., Machanda, Z., Bernard, A.B., Donovan, R.M., Papakyrikos, A.M., Muller, M.N., &  
34 Wrangham, R. (2013). First molar eruption, weaning, and life history in living wild  
35 chimpanzees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
36 *America*, 110, 2787-2791.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Smith, T.M., Austin, C., Hinde, K., Vogel, E.R., & Arora, M. (2017). Cyclical nursing patterns  
43 in wild orangutans. *Science Advances*, 3, e1601517.  
44  
45  
46  
47 Spears, I.R., & Macho, G.A. (1995). The helicoidal occlusal plane-a functional and  
48 biomechanical appraisal of molars. In R.J. Radlenski, & H. Renz (Ed.), *Dental*  
49 *Morphology, Proceedings of the 10th international Symposium on Dental Morphology*  
50 (pp. 391-397). Berlin, "M" Marketing Services.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3 Spears, I.R., & Macho, G.A. (1998). Biomechanical behavior of modern human molars:  
4  
5 implications for interpreting the fossil record. *American Journal of Physical*  
6  
7 *Anthropology*, 106, 467-482.  
8  
9
- 10 Spencer, M.A. (1998). Force reduction in the primate masticatory system: electromyographic  
11  
12 tests of biomechanical hypotheses. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 34, 25-54.  
13  
14
- 15 Spencer, M.A. (1999). Constraints on masticatory system evolution in anthropoid primates.  
16  
17 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 108, 483-506.  
18
- 19 Sumikawa, D.A., Marshall, G.S., Gee, L., & Marshall, S.J. (1999). Microstructure of primary  
20  
21 tooth dentin. *Journal of Pediatric Dentistry*, 21, 439-444.  
22  
23
- 24 Teaford, M.F. (2007). What do we know and not know about diet and enamel structure? In P.  
25  
26 Ungar (Ed.), *Evolution of the human diet*. (pp. 56-76). Oxford, Oxford University Press.  
27  
28
- 29 Trinkaus, E. (2011). Late Pleistocene adult mortality patterns and modern human establishment.  
30  
31 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 108,  
32  
33 1267-1271.  
34
- 35 Ungar, P. S. (2017). *Evolution's bite. A story of teeth, diet, and human origins*. New Jersey,  
36  
37 Princeton University Press.  
38  
39
- 40 van Noordwijk, M.A., Willems, E.P., Utami Atmoko, S.S., Kuzawa, C.W., & van Schaik, C.P.  
41  
42 (2013). Multi-year lactation and its consequences in Bornean orangutans (*Pongo*  
43  
44 *pygmaeus wurmbii*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 67, 805-814.  
45  
46
- 47 Vieira, E.P., Barbosa, M.S., Quintão, C.C.A., & Normando, D. (2015). Relationship of tooth  
48  
49 wear to chronological age among indigenous Amazon populations. *PLoS ONE*, 10,  
50  
51 e0116138.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Wolpoff, M.H. (1979). The Krapina dental remains. *American Journal of Physical*  
4  
5 *Anthropology*, 50, 67-114.  
6  
7  
8 Zanolli, C., Bayle, P., & Macchiarelli, R. (2010). Tissue proportions and enamel thickness  
9  
10 distribution in the early Middle Pleistocene human deciduous molars from Tighenif,  
11  
12 Algeria. *Comptes Rendus Palévol*, 9, 341-348.  
13  
14  
15 Zanolli, C., Dean, C., Rook, L., Bondioli, L., Mazurier, A., & Macchiarelli, R. (2015). Enamel  
16  
17 thickness and enamel growth in *Oreopithecus*: Combining microtomographic and  
18  
19 histological evidence. *Comptes Rendus Palévol*, 15, 209-226.  
20  
21  
22 Zanolli, C., Pan, L., Dumoncel, J., Kullmer, O., Kundrať, M., Liu, W., Macchiarelli, R., Mancini,  
23  
24 L., Schrenk, F., & Tuniz, C. (2018). Inner tooth morphology of *Homo erectus* from  
25  
26 Zhoukoudian. New evidence from an old collection housed at Uppsala University,  
27  
28 Sweden. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 116, 1-13.  
29  
30  
31 Zilberman, U., Skinner, M., & Smith, P. (1992). Tooth components of mandibular deciduous  
32  
33 molars of *Homo sapiens sapiens* and *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*: a radiographic  
34  
35 study. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 87, 255-262.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

## Figure legends

**Fig 1.** Protocol used to collect enamel thickness data. (a) occlusal view of a three-dimensional model of a tooth with dentine in yellow and enamel rendered transparent. The red line indicates the plane of section, passing through the dentine horns of the two mesial cusps. (b) two-dimensional image of a cross-section from which enamel thickness measurements were collected. (c) area of total section (dashed lines). (d) area of enamel cap (dashed lines). (e) area of dentine crown (dashed lines). (f) length of enamel-dentine junction (black line) and bi-cervical diameter (red arrow). (g) length of lingual cervical wall, mid-occlusal basin, and buccal cervical wall (red arrows). Right  $dp_4$  of *H. sapiens* depicted. Not to scale.

**Fig 2.** Cross sections through the mesial cusps of (a)  $dp_4$  and (b)  $dp_4$  with examples of dental tissue proportions in humans and great apes. Right premolars depicted.

**Fig 3.** Pie charts showing 2D dental tissue proportions for (a) *H. sapiens*, (b) *P. troglodytes*, (c) *Gorilla* sp., (d) *Pongo* sp. Dentine in dark gray. Enamel in light gray.

**Fig 4.** Box plots of (a-b) average enamel thickness (AET), and (c-d) relative enamel thickness (RET) for upper and lower deciduous premolars per taxon.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Fig. 5.** Patterning of enamel thickness distribution using LCW, MOB, and BCW linear measurements for (a)  $dp^4$  and (b)  $dp_4$ . See Table 2 for abbreviations.

1  
2  
3 **Enamel thickness variation in the deciduous dentition of extant large-bodied hominoids**  
4  
5  
6

7  
8 Alejandra Ortiz<sup>1,2</sup>, Katherine Schander-Triplett<sup>3</sup>, Shara E. Bailey<sup>2,4</sup>, Matthew M. Skinner<sup>4,5</sup>, Jean-  
9  
10 Jacques Hublin<sup>4</sup>, Gary T. Schwartz<sup>1</sup>  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 <sup>1</sup> Institute of Human Origins, School of Human Evolution and Social Change, Arizona State  
16  
17 University, Tempe, AZ, USA  
18

19  
20 <sup>2</sup> Center for the Study of Human Origins, Department of Anthropology, New York University,  
21  
22 New York, NY, USA  
23

24  
25 <sup>3</sup> Barrett, The Honors College, College of Liberal Arts and Sciences, Arizona State University  
26

27  
28 <sup>4</sup> Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology,  
29  
30 Leipzig, Germany

31  
32 <sup>5</sup> School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, United Kingdom  
33  
34

35  
36 \* Corresponding author.

37  
38 E-mail address: [ao706@nyu.edu](mailto:ao706@nyu.edu) (A. Ortiz)  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

## Abstract

### Objectives

Enamel thickness features prominently in hominoid evolutionary studies. To date, however, studies of enamel thickness in humans, great apes and their fossil relatives have focused on the permanent molar row. Comparatively little research effort has been devoted to tissue proportions within deciduous teeth. Here we attempt to fill this gap by documenting enamel thickness variation in the deciduous dentition of extant large-bodied hominoids.

### Materials and Methods

We used microcomputed tomography to image dental tissues in 80 maxillary and 78 mandibular deciduous premolars of *Homo sapiens*, *Pan troglodytes*, *Gorilla*, and *Pongo*. Two-dimensional virtual sections were created from the image volumes to quantify average (AET) and relative (RET) enamel thickness, as well as its distribution **patterning** across the crown.

### Results

Our results reveal no significant differences in enamel thickness among the great apes. Unlike the pattern present in permanent molars, *Pongo* does not stand out as having relatively thicker-enameled deciduous premolars than *Pan troglodytes* and *Gorilla*. Humans, on the other hand, possess significantly thicker deciduous premolar enamel in comparison to great apes. Following expectations from masticatory biomechanics, we also find that the “functional” side (protocone, protoconid) of deciduous premolars generally possesses thicker enamel than the “nonfunctional” side.

## Discussion

Our study lends empirical support to anecdotal observations that patterns of AET and RET observed for permanent molars of large-bodied apes do not apply to deciduous premolars. By documenting enamel thickness variation in hominoid deciduous teeth, this study provides the comparative context to interpret rates and patterns of wear of deciduous teeth and their utility in life history reconstructions.

## 1. Introduction

Enamel thickness and its distribution across the tooth crown have long been recognized as an important source of taxonomic, phylogenetic, and functional information of extinct and extant primates (e.g., Molnar & Gantt, 1977; Martin, 1985; Beynon and Wood, 1986; Shellis, Beynon, Reid, & Hiiemae, 1998; Schwartz, 2000a; Shimizu, 2002; Martin, Olejniczak, & Maas, 2003; Constantino, Lucas, Lee, & Lawn., 2009; McGraw, Pampush, & Daegling, 2012; but see Olejniczak et al., 2008a; Skinner, Alemseged, Gaunitz, & Hublin, 2015 for results suggesting the homoplastic nature of enamel thickness in hominins). Its high percentage of inorganic material (~96%) makes tooth enamel the hardest naturally produced substance in the body, such that teeth are extremely durable and therefore the best-preserved elements in the fossil record. The primary function of enamel is to aid in the mechanical reduction of food particles in the oral cavity. Increases in the quantity of enamel are thought to increase the functional longevity of teeth by slowing the degree of tooth loss due to abrasion and attrition and also by decreasing the likelihood of tooth failure during mastication (Myoung et al., 2009; Chai, 2014). Given the clear association with food bolus reduction, it has been argued that the quantity of enamel overlying the dentine core is an accurate indicator of dietary adaptations, with organisms feeding on hard objects having thicker-enameled teeth than those feeding on leaves and piths (e.g., Kay, 1981; Dumont, 1995; Teaford, 2007; Lucas, Constantino, Wood, & Lawn, 2008).

The prevalence of teeth in the fossil record, coupled with the intimate connection between tooth crown anatomy and dietary proclivities, has resulted in enamel thickness featuring prominently in studies of hominoid evolution. However, this research has focused almost exclusively on the permanent dentition (e.g., for extant hominoids: Molnar & Gantt, 1977; Martin, 1985; Shellis et al., 1998; Gantt, 1986; Schwartz, 2000a; Kono, 2004; Smith, Olejniczak,

1  
2  
3 Martin, & Reid, 2005; Smith, Olejniczak, Reid, Ferrell, & Hublin, 2006; Smith, Olejniczak, Reh,  
4 Reid, & Hublin, 2008; Smith, Kupczik, Machanda, Skinner, & Zermeno, 2012a; Kono & Suwa,  
5 2008; Olejniczak, Tafforeau, Feeney, & Martin, 2008b; for fossil apes: Martin et al., 2003;  
6 Smith, Martin, & Leakey, 2003; Olejniczak et al., 2008c; Zanolli et al., 2015; for fossil  
7 hominins: Beynon & Wood, 1986; Grine & Martin, 1988; Conroy, 1991; Macho & Thackeray,  
8 1992; Olejniczak et al., 2008a,d; Smith et al., 2012b; Skinner et al., 2015; Pan et al., 2016;  
9 Martín-Francés et al., 2018; Zanolli et al., 2018). Comparatively little research effort has been  
10 devoted to tissue proportions, including the amount of enamel, within deciduous teeth (Aiello,  
11 Montgomery, & Dean, 1991; Gantt, Harris, Rafter, & Rahn, 2001; Grine, 2005; Mahoney, 2010,  
12 2013; Fornai et al., 2014). A few general trends can be gleaned about the patterning of enamel  
13 thickness within and across the molars of hominoids from these studies. It is well-established  
14 that among ~~that~~ extant large-bodied hominoids *Homo* has the thickest-enameled permanent  
15 molars, followed by *Pongo*, *Pan*, and finally *Gorilla*<sup>1</sup>. This gradient has led to broad  
16 classifications, with *Homo* and *Pongo* being characterized as having “thick” enamel, whereas  
17 *Pan* and *Gorilla* have been variably characterized as having “thin” or “intermediate” enamel  
18 thickness (Martin, 1985; Shellis et al., 1998).

19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Macho and Berner (1993) were among the first to quantify the uneven distribution of  
41 enamel across the permanent molars of recent humans. Since their study, there has been an  
42 emphasis on documenting differences in molar enamel distribution in other hominoids and  
43 interpreting these differences within a strict functional framework based on integrating  
44 knowledge about the mechanics of the mammalian chewing cycle and molar occlusal anatomy  
45 (Kay, 1977; Chivers, Wood, & Bilsborough, 1984; Ross et al., 2009; Ungar, 2017). The  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

---

54  
55 <sup>1</sup> Note that this pattern is based primarily on two-dimensional tooth sections and that it may slightly differ using  
56 three-dimensional values of enamel thickness, especially in *Pongo* and *Pan* (e.g., see Kono, 2004).  
57

1  
2  
3 mammalian, and thus primate, chewing cycle can be divided into a series of movements, or  
4 strokes: the closing, power, and opening strokes. The closing stroke, wherein the mandibular  
5 arcade is elevated towards the maxillary arcade, brings opposing teeth into close approximation.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 ~~The power stroke involves the movement of the mandible such that opposing teeth move into~~  
11 ~~and then back out of centric occlusion.~~ Because the occlusal tables, and thus the main cusps, of  
12 opposing molars contact each other during the power stroke, it is not surprising that the nature of  
13 the food being reduced, coupled with the precise manner in which molars move into and out of  
14 centric occlusion, should be related to the distribution of enamel. Broadly speaking, enamel is  
15 expected to be thicker on the “functional” or “supporting” cusps (i.e., protocone and protoconid)  
16 than on the “non-functional” or “guiding” cusps (i.e., paracone and metaconid) (Macho &  
17 Berner, 1993; Macho & Spears, 1999; Schwartz, 2000a). Studies of the patterning of enamel  
18 thickness distribution in hominoid permanent molars have provided mixed support for these  
19 functional expectations (Molnar & Gantt, 1977; Grine & Martin, 1988; Conroy, 1991; Macho &  
20 Berner, 1993; Schwartz, 2000a; Kono, 2004; Grine, 2005; Skinner et al., 2015). What has  
21 become apparent, however, is that the degree of asymmetry in enamel thickness between the  
22 lingual and buccal cusps is less pronounced ~~moving as we move~~ distally along the permanent  
23 molar row, a fact that has been associated with more equivalent masticatory loads exerted over  
24 the “functional” and “non-functional” regions in the second and third molars (Spears & Macho,  
25 1995).

26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Other trends in enamel thickness variation along the permanent molar row have been  
48 observed. Using standard measures of the total volume of enamel across a molar crown (the  
49 indices of average and relative enamel thickness; Martin, 1985), there is a tendency for enamel  
50 thickness to increase from M1 to M3 (Macho & Berner, 1993, 1994; Grine & Martin, 1998;  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Shellis et al., 1998; Schwartz, 2000a,b; Grine et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2005, 2006, 2008;  
4  
5 Olejniczak et al., 2008a; Feeney et al., 2010). Biomechanical models of mastication suggest that  
6  
7 the mandible acts like a third-class lever (Hylander, 1975; Mansour & Reynick, 1975; but see  
8  
9 Spencer, 1998, 1999). Following this model, it has been argued that the mandible experiences  
10  
11 higher bite forces posteriorly and that these bite forces have selected for thicker enamel on the  
12  
13 posterior molars of humans and other hominoids (Molnar & Ward, 1977; Macho & Berner,  
14  
15 1994; Spears & Macho, 1995, 1998; Macho & Spears, 1999). Alternatively, Grine (Grine, 2002,  
16  
17 2005; Grine et al., 2005) has proposed that the distal-ward increase in enamel thickness from M1  
18  
19 to M3 is simply the result of the differential reduction of the dentine crown component in  
20  
21 posterior molars (i.e., morphological hypothesis).  
22  
23  
24  
25

26 In stark contrast to the great deal that has been learned about the evolutionary and  
27  
28 functional significance of permanent molar enamel thickness, our understanding of dental tissue  
29  
30 proportions and distribution in hominoid deciduous postcanine teeth (referred to herein as  
31  
32 deciduous premolars)<sup>2</sup> is comparatively limited. In the past two decades progress has been made  
33  
34 in the characterization of dental tissue proportions – the amount of enamel versus the amount of  
35  
36 coronal dentine – in recent humans (Aiello et al., 1991; Harris et al., 1999; Gantt et al., 2001;  
37  
38 Grine, 2005; Mahoney, 2010, 2013) and fossil hominins (Zilberman et al., 1992; Zanolli et al.,  
39  
40 2010; Benazzi et al., 2011a; Fornai et al., 2014). Because these studies focused primarily either  
41  
42 on testing functional and morphological hypotheses related to the amount of enamel within  
43  
44 molar crowns (Gantt et al., 2001; Grine, 2005; Mahoney, 2010, 2013) or on taxonomic  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

---

52 <sup>2</sup> Deciduous postcanine teeth are variably referred to as both “deciduous premolars” (dp) and “deciduous molars”  
53 (dm). The latter emphasizes the functional and, in the case of the distalmost deciduous tooth, morphological  
54 similarity between these teeth and the permanent molars. The former is used here to emphasize the developmental  
55 linkage to the permanent premolars, as the permanent premolars are the succedaneous teeth that result from the  
56 successional dental lamina extending directly off of the deciduous premolar primordia.  
57

1  
2  
3 differences between *Homo sapiens* and other hominin species (Zilberman et al., 1992; Bayle,  
4 Braga, Mazurier, & Macchiarelli, 2009; Zanolli et al., 2010; Benazzi et al., 2011a,b; Fornai et al,  
5 2014), our knowledge of the functional and/or taxonomic value of deciduous premolar enamel  
6 thickness in our closest living relatives – *Pan*, *Gorilla*, and *Pongo* – still has serious deficiencies.  
7  
8 What is currently known is based on observations of a single third (dp<sub>3</sub>) and fourth (dp<sub>4</sub>)  
9  
10 mandibular premolar per genus of great apes (Aiello et al., 1991). Although it appears from this  
11  
12 study that the trends in enamel thickness observed in permanent molars are also present in the  
13  
14 deciduous premolars, it is not entirely clear whether these trends will be observed within larger  
15  
16 samples of hominoid deciduous teeth. The lack of research is surprising considering that patterns  
17  
18 of deciduous dental wear (relative to that of the permanent molars) represent an important means  
19  
20 to infer biological age (e.g., age at death), as well as key aspects of the growth, development, and  
21  
22 life history of extinct and extant hominoids (Gustafson, 1950; Miles, 1963, 2001; Wolpoff, 1979;  
23  
24 Aiello et al., 1991; Skinner, 1997; Bermúdez de Castro et al., 2003; Trinkaus, 2011; Vieira,  
25  
26 Barbosa, Quintão, & Normando, 2015). In particular, the paucity of information on deciduous  
27  
28 premolar enamel in apes and early hominins has limited our ability to probe the purported  
29  
30 relationship between enamel thickness and rates of wear in the deciduous dentition.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 Here, we employ non-destructive microcomputed tomographic techniques to examine  
41  
42 enamel thickness and its distribution in 158 deciduous premolars of extant large-bodied  
43  
44 hominoids, including specimens representing the genera *Homo*, *Pan*, *Gorilla*, and *Pongo*. Our  
45  
46 goals are: 1) to document and compare measures of average and relative enamel within and  
47  
48 among humans and great apes; 2) to assess patterns of metameric and inter-arcade variation in  
49  
50 enamel thickness within each genus; 3) to characterize the patterning of enamel thickness  
51  
52 distribution across the lingual, occlusal, and buccal tooth regions in each genus; and 4) to  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 analyze whether intra- and inter-generic trends of enamel thickness found in great ape and  
4 human deciduous premolars follow those identified for permanent molars. By addressing these  
5 questions in the largest, taxonomically diverse sample of hominoid deciduous teeth examined to  
6 date, this study can serve as a benchmark for understanding deciduous enamel variation within  
7 and between members of the hominoid clade and its implications for systematics and dietary  
8 functional morphology.  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

## 19 **2. Materials and methods**

### 20 *2.1. Sample*

21  
22 Enamel thickness was examined in 80 maxillary (dp<sup>3</sup> and dp<sup>4</sup>) and 78 mandibular (dp<sub>3</sub>  
23 and dp<sub>4</sub>) deciduous third and fourth premolars of *Homo sapiens*, *Pan troglodytes*, *Gorilla* sp.,  
24 and *Pongo* sp. Sample sizes per premolar type and taxon are provided in Table 1. No intra-  
25 individual antimeres were included. We made no attempt to record the sex of the individuals; it  
26 should be noted, however, that enamel thickness of deciduous premolars does not appear to  
27 differ between males and females (Aiello et al., 1991; Harris et al., 1999; Grine, 2005; but see  
28 Gantt et al., 2001).  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 The *H. sapiens* sample mainly included individuals of African ancestry, followed by a  
41 small number of individuals from European ancestry or of unknown geographic provenience.  
42 Due to small sample sizes for great apes and, in many cases, the lack of exact provenance, no  
43 subspecies delineation was made for *P. troglodytes*, and no species delineation was made for  
44 *Gorilla* and *Pongo*. Specific details of the collections used and their institutions are provided in  
45 SOM Table S1.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## 2.2. Methods

We used microcomputed tomography to image dental tissues virtually and create two-dimensional (2D) sections from the three-dimensional (3D) image volumes. Although several studies on permanent teeth have recently documented dental tissue proportions in 3D (e.g., Kono, Suwa, & Tanijiri, 2002; Kono, 2004; Kono & Suwa, 2008; Olejniczak et al., 2008a,c), deciduous tooth enamel is comparatively thinner and more porous, and thus likely to wear at a faster rate not long after reaching functional occlusion (Aiello et al., 1991; Sumikawa, Marshall, Gee, & Marshall, 1999; Gantt et al., 2001). This means that a comprehensive 3D study requiring only unworn or lightly worn specimens would be difficult, if not impossible, to undertake. Individuals from the R.A. Dart Collection were scanned at the University of the Witwatersrand with a Nikon Metrology XTH 225/320 LC industrial CT system using the following parameters: 70kV, 120 $\mu$ A, 1.0 mm aluminum filter, and isometric voxel size of 50-85 microns. Great ape specimens curated at the Museum of Comparative Zoology at Harvard University were imaged with an X-Tek HMXST Micro-CT system (125 kV, 80 $\mu$ A, 1.0 mm aluminum filter, and isometric voxel size of 45-65 microns), whereas those in the Institute of Human Origins at Arizona State University were scanned with a Skyscan 1173 (110 kV, 72 $\mu$ A, 1.0 mm aluminum filter, and an isometric voxel size of 35.8 microns). All other specimens were scanned at the Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology with either a BIR ACTIS 225/300 (130 kV, 100  $\mu$ A, 0.25 mm brass filter) or a Skyscan 1172 (100 kV, 94  $\mu$ A, 2.0 mm aluminum and copper) scanner at isometric voxel size of 27-70 microns.

Each microCT dataset was filtered using a three-dimensional median and mean-of-least-variance filter and then imported into Amira v6.3 (Mercury Computer Systems) for dental tissue segmentation and enamel-dentine junction (EDJ) and outer enamel surface (OES) surface

1  
2  
3 generation following well-established protocols detailed elsewhere (Skinner et al., 2008; Ortiz,  
4  
5 Skinner, Bailey, & Hublin, 2012). The segmentation process was performed by AO. Only teeth  
6  
7 with no or minor wear were included (equivalent to Molnar's [1971] first four wear stages). The  
8  
9 wear stage associated with each tooth in our study sample is provided in SOM Table S1. Note,  
10  
11 however, that assessments of dental wear were based on the entire tooth crown and that observed  
12  
13 wear facets and dentine patches do not necessarily occur at the location of the slices used for  
14  
15 enamel thickness calculations. Given the difficulty of reconstructing missing enamel in 3D  
16  
17 (Skinner et al., 2015), no attempts were made to reconstruct cusp tips at the OES. Dentine horns,  
18  
19 on the other hand, are relatively sharper structures that can be more easily and accurately  
20  
21 reconstructed in 3D using specialized imaging software. Our sample included therefore  
22  
23 specimens with reconstructed dentine horns, when necessary. Reconstructions were performed in  
24  
25 Geomagic Wrap (3D Systems Design) by AO prior to making the virtual slices used for  
26  
27 calculating dental tissue data. Intra-observer error associated with EDJ reconstruction was  
28  
29 calculated in the  $dp^4$  of one *H. sapiens* and one *P. troglodytes*. Error calculation followed  
30  
31 Skinner et al. (2015) and was negligible (~1-3%) based on EDJ surface areas retrieved from the  
32  
33 different reconstructions. When necessary, cusp tips at the OES were reconstructed in 2D in  
34  
35 Adobe® Photoshop® by AO. Error associated with 2D enamel reconstruction was on average  
36  
37 1.7%, tested using an unworn (Molnar's [1971] grade 1)  $dp^4$  of *H. sapiens* cropped virtually at  
38  
39 four different heights (SOM Fig. S1).

40  
41  
42 As per Skinner et al. (2015), each 3D digital model was rotated manually into anatomical  
43  
44 position, where we subsequently created a virtual section perpendicular to the occlusal plane  
45  
46 through the mesial cusps (Fig. 1a). Specifically, the plane passed through the dentine horns of the  
47  
48 protocone and paracone of  $dp^3$ s and  $dp^4$ s, and through the dentine horns of the protoconid and  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 metaconid of dp<sub>3s</sub> and dp<sub>4s</sub>, with the exception of great ape dp<sub>3s</sub>, which generally possess a main  
4 single cusp (protoconid) and require a different slicing protocol. Thus, for great ape dp<sub>3s</sub>, we  
5 followed Benazzi et al.'s (2014) protocol for premolars with no lingual cusp present whereby  
6 sections passed through the protoconid dentine horn and points on the labial and lingual cervical  
7 enamel at the widest labiolingual bi-cervical diameter. A scaled 2D image of each cross-section  
8 was saved as a TIFF format.

9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 As illustrated in Fig. 1 and described in detail in Table 2, the following variables were  
18 calculated in Adobe® Photoshop®: 1) total area of the tooth crown section, 2) area of enamel  
19 cap, 3) area of dentine crown, 4) length of the EDJ, and 5) bi-cervical diameter. We used these  
20 variables to obtain two widely used indices of enamel thickness (Martin, 1985; Grine & Martin,  
21 1988): average enamel thickness (AET) and relative enamel thickness (RET). AET is defined as  
22 the area of enamel cap divided by the length of the EDJ. The index RET is generated by dividing  
23 AET by the square root of the dentine crown area (multiplied by 100). RET provides therefore a  
24 dimensionless estimate of total enamel volume, allowing comparisons between groups of  
25 different tooth and body sizes. To document the patterning of enamel thickness distribution, we  
26 calculated the following linear measurements on upper and lower dp<sub>4s</sub>: lingual cervical wall  
27 thickness, mid-occlusal basin thickness, and buccal cervical wall thickness (Schwartz, 2000a).  
28 We did not collect these linear measurements on dp<sub>3s</sub> given that our sample sizes were  
29 considerably smaller and that great apes generally possess a single cusp in their dp<sub>3s</sub>.

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 The sectioning process was carried out by AO in Amira v6.3, whereas all measurements  
48 were taken by KS-T using Adobe® Photoshop®. To test for error throughout the entire process  
49 from slicing to measurement gathering, a randomly selected subsample of eight molars (one dp<sup>3</sup>  
50 and one dp<sup>4</sup> per genus) was reprocessed from start to finish by both authors using a blind  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 study protocol in which any taxonomic and specimen identification was removed. Error in  
4 enamel thickness measures between the first and second sessions (separated by ~one month) was  
5 on average 3.2%. Significant differences between groups were assessed using Mann-Whitney *U*  
6 test and Kruskal-Wallis test with post-hoc pairwise comparisons. All analyses were performed in  
7 PAST (Hammer, Harper, & Ryan, 2001) and JMP (SAS Institute).  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

### 17 3. Results

18  
19 Table 3 provides the descriptive statistics (including the mean, standard deviation, and  
20 coefficient of variation) for the different measurements of deciduous premolar enamel thickness  
21 for all hominoid taxa. The individual measurements for each of the specimens analyzed are  
22 reported in SOM Table S1. Scaled schematic diagrams illustrating differences in dental tissue  
23 proportions in maxillary and mandibular deciduous fourth premolars are shown in Figure 2.  
24 Figure 3 presents pie charts showing 2D tissue proportions per tooth type and taxon, while  
25 boxplots demonstrating intergeneric differences in AET and RET indices are shown in Figure 4.  
26 The relative area of enamel per unit crown area is greater in *Homo sapiens* (~26%-34% enamel)  
27 than in great apes (~15%-24%), and tissue proportions in *P. troglodytes* and *Pongo sp.* are  
28 strikingly similar in all tooth types analyzed (Fig. 3). Mean values for both AET and RET are  
29 highest, without exception, in *H. sapiens*, providing clear support for modern humans possessing  
30 the thickest postcanine deciduous enamel among extant large-bodied hominoids. AET and RET  
31 indices among the great apes are very similar. From thinnest to thickness, the following pattern  
32 of AET (by tooth position based on mean values) is observed: dp<sup>3</sup>s: *Gorilla sp.* < *P. troglodytes*  
33 = *Pongo sp.*; dp<sup>4</sup>s: *P. troglodytes* < *Pongo sp.* < *Gorilla sp.*; dp<sup>3</sup>s: *P. troglodytes* < *Gorilla sp.* <  
34 *Pongo sp.*; and dp<sup>4</sup>s: *P. troglodytes* < *Pongo sp.* < *Gorilla sp.* (Table 3, Fig. 4). This pattern  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 appears to be influenced by size, however (Table 3, Figs. 4): When the effects of size are taken  
4 into account through calculation of RET, *Gorilla* sp. deciduous premolars are slightly more  
5 thinly enameled than those of *P. troglodytes* and *Pongo* sp., whose RET indices are, in turn, more  
6 similar to each other. The following pattern for RET is observed among the great apes (based on  
7 mean values): *Gorilla* sp. < *Pongo* sp. ≤ *P. troglodytes* for maxillary and mandibular deciduous  
8 premolars (Table 2, Fig. 4). *Pongo* sp. exhibits the highest coefficients of variation (CV) for both  
9 AET and RET, followed by *Gorilla* sp., *Homo sapiens*, and *Pan troglodytes*. In some cases, CVs  
10 for AET and RET of *Pan troglodytes* are considerably smaller than those found for all other  
11 groups analyzed (Table 3).

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 The results of the Kruskal-Wallis test and associated post-hoc pairwise comparisons for  
25 AET and RET are presented in SOM Table S2 and Table 4, respectively. All pairwise group  
26 differences for AET and RET in dp<sub>3</sub> are non-significant, except for *H. sapiens* vs. *Gorilla* sp. It  
27 should be noted, however, that the lack of significance among groups could be at least partially  
28 attributed to small sample sizes, as among the four tooth types analyzed, our dp<sub>3</sub> sample is the  
29 smallest. As shown in Table 4, differences in AET and RET for dp<sup>3</sup>, dp<sup>4</sup>, and dp<sub>4</sub> between *H.*  
30 *sapiens* and each of the great apes are, in all cases, significant, except for between *H. sapiens* and  
31 *Pongo* sp. dp<sup>3</sup>s. Contrary to the results for humans, Kruskal-Wallis post-hoc pairwise  
32 comparisons reveal that all differences in enamel thickness among the great apes are non-  
33 significant..

34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Table 3 and Figure 4 also reveal some interesting intra-taxon patterns. On average, within  
48 each hominoid group, dp<sup>4</sup>s and dp<sub>4</sub>s consistently possess greater AET and RET indices than their  
49 mesial metameres –dp<sup>3</sup>s and dp<sub>3</sub>s – respectively. We also note some trends in enamel thickness  
50 between maxillary and mandibular antagonistic pairs (i.e., dp<sup>3</sup> vs. dp<sub>3</sub>; dp<sup>4</sup> vs. dp<sub>4</sub>). In almost all  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 cases, AET and RET means within each taxon are higher in  $dp^3$  and  $dp^4$  relative to their  
4  
5 mandibular counterparts, with this trend being more marked in *H. sapiens*, followed by *Pongo*  
6  
7 sp. The only two exceptions to this trend occur in *P. troglodytes* (AET means for  $dp^4$  and  $dp_4$  are  
8  
9 the same) and in *Gorilla* sp. (enamel is thicker in  $dp_3$  relative to  $dp^3$  based on RET means and  
10  
11 similar based on AET).  
12  
13

14  
15 Finally, we examined the patterning of enamel thickness distribution in each taxon using  
16  
17 linear measurements (LCW, MOB, BCW). Consistent with functional expectations for maxillary  
18  
19 teeth, linear measurements of  $dp^4$  reveal that enamel is consistently thickest on the lingual region  
20  
21 in all groups (Fig. 5). Although the trend is less pronounced in  $dp_4$  than in  $dp^4$  as the difference  
22  
23 between BCW and LCW is small, Fig. 5 also shows that the functional cusp of  $dp_4$  (protoconid)  
24  
25 tends to have thicker enamel than the non-functional cusp (metaconid). Occlusal enamel  
26  
27 thickness of both deciduous premolars ( $dp^4$  and  $dp_4$ ) consistently provides the smallest values  
28  
29 (Fig. 5).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

#### 35 4. Discussion

36  
37 Extant large-bodied hominoids exhibit the following pattern of permanent molar enamel  
38  
39 thickness (from thinnest to thickest): *Gorilla* < *Pan* < *Pongo* < *Homo*, where molars in *Gorilla*  
40  
41 and *Pan* are characterized as having “thin” or “intermediateaverage” enamel, and *Pongo* and *H.*  
42  
43 *sapiens* are characterized as having “thick” enamel. Aiello et al.’s (1991) preliminary  
44  
45 observations, on the other hand, noted a different pattern for the deciduous dentition, wherein  
46  
47 enamel thickness did not greatly differ among the great apes. In agreement with Aiello et al.  
48  
49 (1991), our results based on a large sample of deciduous premolars – the functional analog of  
50  
51 permanent molars – found no significant differences in RET values among living members of the  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 *Pan*, *Gorilla*, and *Pongo* clades. Broadly, our results for RET suggest the following trend for  
4 deciduous enamel (from thinnest to thickest): *Gorilla* < *Pongo* ≤ *Pan* < *Homo*. Thus, contrary to  
5  
6 what is observed in the permanent molars, *Pongo* does not stand out as having more thickly  
7  
8 enameled deciduous premolars compared to African apes. *Gorilla* deciduous teeth, however,  
9  
10 tend to have slightly thinner (but not significantly different) enamel than those of *Pan* and  
11  
12 *Pongo*, and *H. sapiens* possesses significantly thicker enamel in their deciduous dentition  
13  
14 compared to *Gorilla*, *Pan*, and *Pongo*. Differences in 2D tissue proportions (% of enamel and  
15  
16 dentine in the tooth crown) between *H. sapiens* and great apes are also evident in all tooth types  
17  
18 examined, with enamel comprising ~26%34% of the total crown area in *H. sapiens* and only  
19  
20 ~15%-24% in extant large-bodied apes. Interestingly, Olejniczak et al. (2008d) noted clear  
21  
22 differences in relative tissue proportions between *H. sapiens* and Neanderthal permanent molars  
23  
24 when analyzed in 3D, but not in 2D. In this regard, it remains to be tested whether differences in  
25  
26 tissue proportions found in our study hold true when 3D data are considered.  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 Schwartz (2000a) posited that the range of variation in RET for permanent molars was  
34  
35 larger in the so-called thick-enameled hominoids (i.e., *Pongo* and *Homo*) than in *Pan* and  
36  
37 *Gorilla*. This was not the case in deciduous teeth. ~~Coefficients of variation (CVs)~~ for AET and  
38  
39 RET were greater in *Pongo* and *Gorilla* ~~and *Pongo*~~ than in *P. troglodytes* and to a lesser extent in  
40  
41 *H. sapiens*. Caution is warranted, however, since our *Pongo* and *Gorilla* ~~and *Pongo*~~ samples  
42  
43 likely included specimens from more than one species, which could have resulted in a higher  
44  
45 CVs relative to our species-level human and chimpanzee samples. Comparative analyses have  
46  
47 noted that measures of enamel thickness are generally more variable in deciduous than in  
48  
49 permanent molars (Gantt et al., 2001; Grine, 2005). Overall, the levels of intra-generic and intra-  
50  
51 tooth variation in enamel thickness found here are similar to, or smaller than, those reported in  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 previous studies of recent human deciduous premolars (Gantt et al., 2001; Grine, 2005).  
4

5 According to Gantt et al. (2001), however, the inclusion of even minimally worn teeth likely  
6  
7 artificially increased the range of variation in their reported enamel thickness measurements.  
8

9  
10 Thinly enameled bunodont teeth, such as those analyzed here, wear down quickly, a fact that  
11  
12 might have increased some of the CV values in our study.  
13

14  
15 Although human and great ape deciduous premolars do not appear to follow the same  
16  
17 patterns of inter-generic enamel thickness variation than their permanent functional analogs (i.e.,  
18  
19 the permanent molars), inter-arcade (i.e., antagonistic) and metameric trends appear to be both  
20  
21 relatively stable between deciduous and permanent teeth and consistent across hominoids.  
22

23  
24 Studies in recent humans have suggested that maxillary deciduous premolars and permanent  
25  
26 molars have thicker enamel than their mandibular counterparts (Gantt, 1986; Gantt et al., 2001).  
27

28 This observation is supported by our study as comparisons between antagonistic pairs (dp<sup>3</sup> vs.  
29  
30 dp<sub>3</sub>, and dp<sup>4</sup> vs. dp<sub>4</sub>) reveal, in most cases, higher AET and RET means in maxillary than in  
31  
32 mandibular deciduous teeth, especially in *H. sapiens* and *Pongo* sp. Furthermore, hominoid  
33  
34 dental tissue research has provided strong evidence for a posterior increase in enamel thickness  
35  
36 along the permanent molar row (Grine & Martin, 1998; Macho and Berner, 1993, 1994; Spears  
37  
38 & Macho, 1995; Shellis et al., 1998; Schwartz, 2000b; Grine et al., 2005; Smith et al., 2005,  
39  
40 2006, 2008, 2012a; Olejniczak et al., 2008a; Feeney et al., 2010; Skinner et al., 2015; Pan et al.,  
41  
42 2016). Although enamel is considerably thinner on deciduous than on permanent teeth, a distal  
43  
44 increase in deciduous premolar enamel thickness has been documented previously in fossil and  
45  
46 recent humans (Zilberman et al., 1992; Harris et al., 1999; Grine, 2005; Gantt et al., 2001; Bayle  
47  
48 et al., 2009; Zanolli et al., 2010; Mahoney, 2010, 2013; Benazzi et al., 2011a,b). In this regard,  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54 our results showing an increase in the amount of enamel from dp<sub>3</sub> to dp<sub>4</sub> are not only concordant  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 with previous studies of the human deciduous dentition, but also provide empirical support to  
4 anecdotal observations for great apes reported by Aiello et al. (1991).  
5  
6

7  
8 By invoking functional models of masticatory biomechanics, several researchers have  
9 argued that anterior-posterior gradients in enamel thickness along the permanent molar row  
10 reflect an increase in bite force magnitudes (Molnar & Ward, 1977; Macho & Berner, 1994;  
11 Spears & Macho, 1995, 1998; Macho and Spears, 1999). Although functional interpretations of  
12 the distal-ward increase in enamel thickness are controversial and clinical data on bite force in  
13 children are limited (Spencer, 1998; Grine, 2005; Mahoney, 2010; Mountain, Wood, & Toumba,  
14 2011; Edmonds & Glowacka, 2014), this argument has also been used by Gantt et al. (2001) and  
15 Mahoney (2013) to explain the presence of thickest enamel on the more posterior deciduous  
16 teeth. As dp4s possess both greater dentine and enamel areas than relatively smaller dp3s, the  
17 overall percentage of the tooth crown formed by enamel is ~3-7% greater in dp4 crowns. Grine  
18 (2005) and Mahoney (2010) noted that enamel thickness changes along the premolar/molar  
19 series are the result of different odontogenic processes operating in deciduous and permanent  
20 human molars. They suggest that the quantity of both enamel and dentine increase from dp3 to  
21 dp4, whereas increases in RET from M1 to M3 are due to a reduction in dentine in the posterior-  
22 most molars. In this vein, our results are consistent with their statement on deciduous premolars.  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Overall, differences in the distribution of enamel across the molar crown found here lend  
43 support to the hypothesis that “functional” cusps possess thicker enamel than their “non-  
44 functional” counterparts to prolong a tooth crown’s functional longevity. Although this  
45 hypothesis was first proposed for permanent teeth of humans and other hominoids (Molnar &  
46 Gantt, 1977; Macho and Berner, 1993; Macho and Spears, 1999; Schwartz, 2000a; Kono, et al.,  
47 2002), enamel thickness differentials between the “functional” and “non-functional” cusps have  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 also been previously found for human deciduous premolars (Gantt et al., 2001; Grine, 2005; but  
4 see Mahoney, 2010). In addition, we found that, in all instances, hominoid deciduous premolars  
5  
6 possess less enamel across their occlusal basin than on the lingual and buccal regions, with this  
7  
8 trend being more marked in our *P. troglodytes* and *H. sapiens* samples. This is not only  
9  
10 consistent with regional patterns reported for *H. sapiens* dp4s (Grine, 2005), but also with Kono  
11  
12 and Suwa's (2008) observations on the presence of extremely thin occlusal enamel in the  
13  
14 permanent molars of bonobos and common chimpanzees.  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 For decades, tooth wear has been used as a tool for age determination in archaeological  
20 and living human individuals (e.g., Gustafson, 1950; Miles, 1963, 2001; Kim, Kho, & Lee, 2000;  
21 Mays, 2002; Vieira et al., 2015). Paleoanthropologists have also used tooth wear (generally in  
22 combination with other features such as stages of dental eruption) as a coarse measure of the rate  
23 of growth and development of fossil and recent hominoid species, most often to reconstruct key  
24 aspects of their life history such as weaning age, interbirth intervals, mortality rates, and lifespan  
25 (Wolpoff, 1979; Aiello et al., 1991; Skinner, 1997; Bermúdez de Castro et al., 2003; Caspari &  
26 Lee, 2004; Nargolwalla, Begun, Dean, Reid, & Kordos, 2005; Smith, Toussaint, Reid,  
27 Olejniczak, & Hublin, 2007; Trinkaus, 2011). Although enamel thickness is a key factor  
28 influencing rates and patterns of dental wear (Molnar & Gantt, 1977; Molnar & Ward, 1977;  
29 Aiello et al., 1991), it is surprising that estimates of species' life history extrapolating from rates  
30 of dental wear do not explicitly take into account the influence of enamel thickness on wear rates  
31 (reviewed in Smith, 2013).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49 Although most life history inferences based on archaeological and fossil dental remains  
50 rely on evidence from permanent teeth, Aiello et al. (1991) noted the potential importance of  
51 deciduous teeth for inferring two key aspects of hominoids' life history: age at weaning and  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 interbirth intervals. Acknowledging that their conclusions were preliminary given both their  
4 small samples and unknown age at death of the specimens used, Aiello et al. (1991) proposed  
5 that the pattern and magnitude of wear (attrition) found among hominoid deciduous teeth were  
6 suggestive of an earlier weaning and shorter interbirth interval in gorillas than in chimpanzees  
7 and orangutans. In this vein, the data presented here can be used to test the observed preliminary  
8 pattern in a more comprehensive manner. While there is now clearer evidence that weaning in  
9 apes is a complex and long process (Pusey, 1983; Smith, 2013; Smith et al., 2013; Smith, Austin,  
10 Hinde, Vogel, & Arora, 2017; Joannes-Boyau et al., 2019<sup>8</sup>) and that recent minimally invasive  
11 state-of-the-art research offers a new exciting glimpse into weaning age in our hominin ancestors  
12 (Joannes-Boyau et al., 2019<sup>8</sup>), we believe that exploring this life history trait using  
13 complementary lines of evidence, including the non-destructive approach of dental wear, is  
14 warranted considering that nursing behavior among apes is difficult to infer and systematically  
15 investigate both in the wild and in the fossil record.

16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Finally, although testing Aiello et al.'s (1991) hypothesis of age at weaning in gorillas is  
34 beyond the scope of the present study, our results support the argument that the greater degrees  
35 of dental wear on gorilla deciduous teeth relative to those of chimpanzees and orangutans cannot  
36 be attributed to differences in enamel thickness. That is, we found no significant differences in  
37 relative and average enamel thickness among the great apes, meaning that the enamel on the  
38 deciduous postcanine dentition of *Gorilla* is not significantly thinner than in *Pan* and *Pongo*.  
39 One additional conclusion derived from this study is that *Pongo* does not possess thicker-  
40 enameled deciduous premolars than African great apes. Patterns of food consumption during the  
41 early life of great ape individuals are complex and slight differences have been noted among  
42 populations and species, but in a very general sense, infants from both *Pan* and *Pongo* start  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 eating solid food by 0.5-1 years of age, which then constitutes an appreciable component of their  
4  
5 diet by the time they reach about 1-2 years of age (Smith et al., 2013, 2017). It is known,  
6  
7 however, that orangutans experience longer and sometimes cyclical periods of offspring  
8  
9 dependence and later weaning ages relative to other apes (Pusey, 1983; van Noordwijk, Willems,  
10  
11 Utami Atmoko, Kuzawa, & van Schaik, 2013; Smith et al., 2017). Thus, from the functional  
12  
13 perspective, investment in postcanine deciduous teeth with thicker enamel in orangutans would  
14  
15 be unexpected considering 1) that orangutans have the most prolonged nursing period than any  
16  
17 other apes, 2) that milk consumption is considerably less challenging for the masticatory  
18  
19 apparatus than solid food, and 3) that deciduous premolars among great apes remain in  
20  
21 functional occlusion for roughly the same amount of time (based on estimates of the timing of  
22  
23 dp3-4 and P3-4 emergence; see Smith, Crummett, & Brandt, 1994). Further research is needed to  
24  
25 better understand the evolutionary, functional, and developmental implications of the patterns of  
26  
27 enamel thickness variation in hominoid deciduous teeth, and our study represents an important  
28  
29 first step in this direction by providing the comparative context within which to interpret  
30  
31 deciduous tooth wear and its usefulness for inferring age at weaning in great apes and fossil  
32  
33 hominins.  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

## 42 **Acknowledgments**

43  
44 For access to specimens, we thank the following individuals and institutions: Brendon Billings,  
45  
46 Nicholas Bacci, and University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa; Leipzig  
47  
48 University, Leipzig, Germany; Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Leipzig,  
49  
50 Germany; David Hunt and National Museum Natural History, Washington, DC.; Institute of  
51  
52 Human Origins, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ; Mark Omura and Harvard Museum of  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 Comparative Zoology, Cambridge, MA; Thomas Koppe and University of Greifswald,  
4 Greifswald, Germany; Frieder Mayer, Christiane Funk, and Museum für Naturkunde, Berlin,  
5 Germany; and Phyletic Museum, Jena, Germany. We also thank Heiko Temming, David Plotzki,  
6 Lukas Westphal, Kudakwashe Jakata, and Evelyn Glaze for assistance. This research was  
7 supported by the Wenner-Gren Foundation (grant to AO) and the Max Planck Society.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16

## 17 **References**

- 18  
19 Aiello, L.C., Montgomery, C., & Dean, C. (1991). The natural history of deciduous tooth  
20 attrition in hominoids. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 21, 397-412.  
21  
22  
23  
24 Bayle, P., Braga, J., Mazurier, A., & Macchiarelli, R. (2009). High-resolution assessment of the  
25 dental developmental pattern and characterization of tooth tissue proportions in the late  
26 Upper Paleolithic child from La Madeleine, France. *American Journal of Physical*  
27 *Anthropology*, 138, 493-498.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Benazzi, S., Fornai, C., Bayle, P., Coquerelle, M., Kullmer, O., Mallegni, F., Weber, G.W.  
34 (2011a). Comparison of dental measurement systems for taxonomic assignment of  
35 Neanderthal and modern human lower second deciduous molars. *Journal of Human*  
36 *Evolution*, 61, 320-326.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Benazzi, S., Douka, K., Fornai, C., Bauer, C.C., Kullmer, O., Svoboda, J., Pap, I., Mallegni, F.,  
43 Bayle, P., Coquerelle, M., Condemi, S., Ronchitelli, A., Harvati, K., & Weber, G.W.  
44 (2011b). Early dispersal of modern humans in Europe and implications for Neanderthal  
45 behaviour. *Nature*, 479, 525-528.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51 Bermúdez de Castro, J.M., Martínón-Torres, M., Sarmiento, S., Lozano, M., Arsuaga, J.L., &  
52 Carbonell, E. (2003). Rates of anterior tooth wear in Middle Pleistocene hominins from  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Sima de los Huesos (Sierra de Atapuerca, Spain). *Proceedings of the National Academy*  
4 *of Sciences of the United States of America*, 100, 11992-11996.  
5  
6  
7  
8 Beynon, A.D., & Wood, B.A. (1986). Variations in enamel thickness and structure in East  
9  
10 African hominids. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 70, 177-193.  
11  
12 Caspari, R., & Lee, S.H. (2004). Older age becomes common late in human evolution.  
13  
14 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 101,  
15  
16 10895-10900.  
17  
18  
19 Chai, H. (2014). On the mechanical properties of tooth enamel under spherical indentation. *Acta*  
20  
21 *Biomaterialia*, 10, 4852-4860.  
22  
23  
24 Chivers, D.J., Wood, B.A., & Bilsborough, A. (1984). *Food acquisition and processing in*  
25  
26 *primates*. New York, Springer Science +Business Media, LLC.  
27  
28  
29 Conroy, G.C. (1991). Enamel thickness in South African australopithecines: noninvasive  
30  
31 evaluation by computed tomography. *Palaeontologica Africana*, 28, 53-59.  
32  
33  
34 Constantino, P.J., Lucas, P.W., Lee, J.J.-W., & Lawn, B.R. (2009). The influence of fallback  
35  
36 foods on great ape tooth enamel. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 140, 653-  
37  
38 660.  
39  
40  
41 Dumont, E.R. (1995). Enamel thickness and dietary adaptation among extant primates and  
42  
43 chiropterans. *Journal of Mammalogy* 76, 1127-1136.  
44  
45  
46 Edmonds, H.M., & Glowacka, H. (2014). The ontogeny of bite force: a test of the constrained  
47  
48 lever model. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 153 S58, 112.  
49  
50  
51 Feeney, R.N.M., Zermeno, J.P., Reid, D.J., Nakashima, S., Sano, H., Bahar, A., Hublin, J.-J., &  
52  
53 Smith, T.M. (2010). Enamel thickness in Asian human canines and premolars.  
54  
55 *Anthropological Science*, 118, 191-198.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Fornai, C, Benazzi, S., Svoboda, J., Pap, I., Harvati, K., Weber, G.W. (2014). Enamel thickness  
4 variation of deciduous first and second upper molars in modern humans and  
5  
6 Neanderthals. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 76, 83-91.  
7  
8  
9  
10 Gantt, D.G. (1986). Enamel thickness and ultrastructure in hominoids: with reference to form,  
11 function and phylogeny. In D.R. Swindler, & J. Erwin (Eds.), *Comparative Primate*  
12 *Biology* (pp. 453-475). New York, Alan R. Liss.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Gantt, D.G., Harris, E.F., Rafter, J.A., & Rahn, J.K. (2001). Distribution of enamel thickness on  
18 human deciduous molars. In A. Brook (Ed.), *Dental Morphology* (pp. 167-190).  
19 Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Grine, F.E. (2002). Scaling of tooth enamel thickness, and molar crown size reduction in modern  
25 humans. *South African Journal of Science*, 98, 503-509.  
26  
27  
28  
29 Grine, FE. (2005). Enamel thickness of deciduous and permanent molars in modern *Homo*  
30 *sapiens*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 126, 14-31.  
31  
32  
33 Grine, F.E., Spencer, M.A., Demes, B., Smith, H.F., Strait, D.S., Constant, D.A. (2005). Molar  
34 enamel thickness in the Chacma Baboon, *Papio ursinus* (Kerr 1792). *American Journal*  
35 *of Physical Anthropology*, 128, 812-822.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Grine, F.E., & Martin, L.B. (1988). Enamel thickness and development in *Australopithecus* and  
41 *Paranthropus*. In F.E. Grine (Ed.), *Evolutionary history of the "robust"*  
42 *Australopithecines* (pp. 3-42). New York: Aldine de Gruyter.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47 Gustafson, G. (1950). Age determinations on teeth. *Journal of the American Dental Association*,  
48 41, 45-54.  
49  
50  
51  
52 Hammer, Ø., Harper, D.A.T., & Ryan, P.D. (2001). PAST: Paleontological statistics software  
53 package for education and data analysis. *Palaeontologia Electronica*, 4, 1-9.  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Harris, E.F., Hicks, J.D., & Barcroft, B.D. (1999). Absence of sexual dimorphism in enamel  
4 thickness of human deciduous molars. In J.T. Mayhall, T. Heikkinen (Eds.), *Dental*  
5  
6 *Morphology, Proceedings of the 11th International Symposium on Dental Morphology*  
7  
8 (pp. 338-349). Finland, Oulu University Press.  
9  
10  
11  
12 Hylander, W.L. (1975). The human mandible: lever or link? *American Journal of Physical*  
13  
14 *Anthropology*, 43, 227-242.  
15  
16  
17 Joannes-Boyau, R., Adams, J.W., Austin, C., Arora, M., Moffat, I., Herries, A.I.R., Tonge, M.P.,  
18  
19 Benazzi, S., Evans, A.R., Kullmer, O., Wroe, S., Dosseto, A., & Fiorenza, L. (2019).  
20  
21 Elemental signatures of *Australopithecus africanus* teeth reveal seasonal dietary stress.  
22  
23 *Nature*, 572, 112-115.  
24  
25  
26 Kay, R.F. (1977). The evolution of molar occlusal in the cercopithecidae and early catarrhines.  
27  
28 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 46, 327-352.  
29  
30  
31 Kay, R.F. (1981). The nut-crackers: a new theory of the adaptations of the Ramapithecinae.  
32  
33 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 55: 141-151.  
34  
35  
36 Kim, Y.-K., Kho, H.-S., & Lee, K.-H. (2000). Age estimation by occlusal tooth wear. *Journal of*  
37  
38 *Forensic Science*, 45, 303-309.  
39  
40  
41 Kono, R. (2004). Molar enamel thickness and distribution patterns in extant great apes and  
42  
43 humans, new insights based on a 3-dimensional whole crown perspective.  
44  
45 *Anthropological Science*, 112, 121-146.  
46  
47  
48 Kono, R.T., Suwa, G., & Tanijiri, T. (2002). A three-dimensional analysis of enamel distribution  
49  
50 patterns in human permanent first molars. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 47, 867-875.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Kono, R.T., & Suwa, G. (2008). Enamel distribution patterns of extant human and hominoid  
4  
5 molars: occlusal versus lateral enamel thickness. *Bulletin of the National Museum of*  
6  
7 *Nature and Science D*, 34, 1-9.  
8  
9  
10 Lucas, P., Constantino, P., Wood, B., Lawn, B. (2008). Dental enamel as a dietary indicator in  
11  
12 mammals. *Bioessays*, 30, 374-385.  
13  
14 Macho, G.A., & Thackeray, J.F. (1992). Computed tomography and enamel thickness of  
15  
16 maxillary molars of Plio-Pleistocene hominids from Sterkfontein, Swartkrans, and  
17  
18 Kromdraai (South Africa): an exploratory study. *American Journal of Physical*  
19  
20 *Anthropology*, 89, 133-143.  
21  
22  
23 Macho, G.A., & Berner, M.E. (1993). Enamel thickness of human maxillary molars  
24  
25 reconsidered. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 92, 189-200.  
26  
27  
28 Macho, G.A., & Berner, M.E. (1994) Enamel thickness and the helicoidal plane. *American*  
29  
30 *Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 94, 327-337.  
31  
32  
33 Macho, G.A., & Spears, I.R. (1999). Effects of loading on the biomechanical behavior of molars  
34  
35 of *Homo*, *Pan*, and *Pongo*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 109, 211-227.  
36  
37  
38 Mahoney, P. (2010). Two-dimensional patterns of human enamel thickness on deciduous (dm1,  
39  
40 dm2) and permanent first (M1) mandibular molars. *Archives of Oral Biology*, 55, 115-  
41  
42 126.  
43  
44  
45 Mahoney, P. (2013), Testing functional and morphological interpretations of enamel thickness  
46  
47 along the deciduous tooth row in human children. *American Journal of Physical*  
48  
49 *Anthropology*, 151, 518-525.  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Mansour, R.M., & Reynick, R.J. (1975). In vivo occlusal forces and moments: I. Forces  
4  
5 measured in terminal hinge position and associated moments. *Journal of Dental*  
6  
7 *Research*, 54, 114-120.  
8  
9
- 10 Martin, L. (1985). Significance of enamel thickness in hominoid evolution. *Nature*, 314, 260-  
11  
12 263.  
13  
14
- 15 Martin, L.B., Olejniczak, A.J., & Maas, M.C. (2003). Enamel thickness and microstructure in  
16  
17 pitheciin primates, with comments on dietary adaptations of the middle Miocene  
18  
19 hominoid *Kenyapithecus*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 45, 351-367.  
20  
21
- 22 Martín-Francés, L., Martínón-Torres, M., Martínez de Pinillos, M., García-Campos, C.,  
23  
24 Modesto-Mata, M., Zanolli, C., Rodríguez, L., Bermúdez de Castro, J.M. (2018). Tooth  
25  
26 crown tissue proportions and enamel thickness in Early Pleistocene *Homo antecessor*  
27  
28 molars (Atapuerca, Spain). *PLoS One*, 13, e0203334.  
29  
30
- 31 Mays, S. (2002). The relationship between molar wear and age in an early 19th century AD  
32  
33 archaeological human skeletal series of documented age at death. *Journal of*  
34  
35 *Archaeological Science*, 29, 861-871.  
36  
37
- 38 McGraw, W.S., Pampush, J.D., & Daegling, D.J. (2012). Enamel thickness and durophagy in  
39  
40 mangabeys revisited. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 147, 326-333.  
41
- 42 Miles, A.E.W. (1963). Dentition in the Estimation of Age. *Journal of Dental Research*, 42, 255-  
43  
44 263.  
45  
46
- 47 Miles, A.E.W. (2001). The Miles method of assessing age from tooth wear revisited. *Journal of*  
48  
49 *Archaeological Science*, 28, 973-982.  
50  
51
- 52 Molnar, S. (1971). Human tooth wear, tooth function and cultural variability. *American Journal*  
53  
54 *of Physical Anthropology*, 34, 27-42.  
55  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3 Molnar, S., & Ward, S.C. (1977). On the hominid masticatory complex: biomechanical and  
4  
5 evolutionary perspectives. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 6, 551-568.  
6  
7  
8 Molnar, S., & Gantt, D.G. (1977). Functional implications of primate enamel thickness.  
9  
10 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 46, 447-454.  
11  
12 Mountain, G., Wood, D., & Toumba, J. (2011). Bite force measurement in children with primary  
13  
14 dentition. *International Journal of Paediatric Dentistry*, 21, 112-118.  
15  
16  
17 Nargolwalla, M.C., Begun, D.R., Dean, M.C., Reid, D.J., & Kordos, L. (2005). Dental  
18  
19 development and life history in *Anapithecus hernyaki*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 49,  
20  
21 99-121.  
22  
23  
24 Myoung, S., Lee, J., Constantino, P., Lucas, P., Chai, H., & Lawn, B. (2009). Morphology and  
25  
26 fracture of enamel. *Journal of Biomechanics*, 42, 1947-1951.  
27  
28  
29 Olejniczak, A.J., Smith, T.M., Skinner, M.M., Grine, F.E., Feeney, R.N.M., Thackeray, F.J., &  
30  
31 Hublin, J.-J. (2008a). Three-dimensional molar enamel distribution and thickness in  
32  
33 *Australopithecus* and *Paranthropus*. *Biology Letters*, 4, 406-410.  
34  
35  
36 Olejniczak, A.J., Tafforeau, P., Feeney, R.N.M., & Martin, L.B. (2008b). Three-dimensional  
37  
38 primate molar enamel thickness. *Journal of Human Evolution* 54, 187e195.  
39  
40  
41 Olejniczak, A.J., Smith, T.M., Wei, W., Potts, R., Ciochon, R., Kullmer, O., Schrenk, F., &  
42  
43 Hublin, J.-J. (2008c). Molar enamel thickness and dentine horn height in  
44  
45 *Gigantopithecus blacki*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 135, 85-91.  
46  
47  
48 Olejniczak, A.J., Smith, T.M., Feeney, R.N.M., Macchiarelli, R., Mazurier, A., Bondioli, L.,  
49  
50 Rosas, A., Fortea, J., de la Rasilla, M., García-Tabernero, A., Radovic, J., Skinner,  
51  
52 M.M., Toussaint, M., & Hublin, J.-J. (2008d). Dental tissue proportions and enamel  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 thickness in Neandertal and modern human molars. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 55,  
4  
5 12-23.  
6

7  
8 Ortiz, A., Skinner, M.M., Bailey, S.E., & Hublin, J.-J. (2012). Carabelli's trait revisited: An  
9  
10 examination of mesiolingual features at the enamel-dentine junction and enamel surface  
11  
12 of *Pan* and *Homo sapiens* upper molars. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 63, 586-596.  
13

14  
15 Pan, L., Dumoncel, J., de Beer, F., Hoffman, J., Thackeray, J.F., Duployer, B., Tenailleau, C., &  
16  
17 Braga, J. (2016). Further morphological evidence on South African earliest *Homo* lower  
18  
19 postcanine dentition: enamel thickness and enamel dentine junction. *Journal of Human*  
20  
21 *Evolution*, 96, 82-96.  
22

23  
24 Pusey, A.E. (1983). Mother-offspring relationships in chimpanzees after weaning. *Animal*  
25  
26 *Behaviour*, 31, 363-377.  
27

28  
29 Ross, C.F., Reed, D.A., Washington, R.L., Eckhardt, A., Anapol, F., & Shahnoor, N. (2009).  
30  
31 Scaling of chew cycle duration in primates. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*,  
32  
33 138, 30-44.  
34

35  
36 Schwartz, G.T. (2000a). Taxonomic and functional aspects of the patterning of enamel thickness  
37  
38 distribution in extant large-bodied hominoids. *American Journal of Physical*  
39  
40 *Anthropology*, 111, 221-244  
41

42  
43 Schwartz, G.T. (2000b). Enamel thickness and the helicoidal wear plane in modern human  
44  
45 mandibular molars. *Archives of Oral Biology* 45, 401-409.  
46

47  
48 Skinner, M. (1997). Dental wear in immature late Pleistocene European hominines. *Journal of*  
49  
50 *Archaeological Science*, 24, 677-700.  
51

- 1  
2  
3 Skinner, M.M., Wood, B., Boesch, C., Olejniczak, A.J., Rosas, A., Smith, T.M., & Hublin, J.-J.  
4  
5 (2008). Dental trait expression at the enamel-dentine junction of lower molars in extant  
6  
7 and fossil hominoids. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 54, 173-186.  
8  
9  
10 Skinner, M.M., Alemseged, Z., Gaunitz, C., & Hublin, J.-J. (2015). Enamel thickness trends in  
11  
12 Plio-Pleistocene hominin mandibular molars. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 85, 35-45.  
13  
14 Shellis, R.P., Beynon, A.D., Reid, D.J., & Hiiemae, K.M. (1998). Variations in molar enamel  
15  
16 thickness among primates. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 35, 507-522.  
17  
18  
19 Shimizu, D. (2002). Functional implications of enamel thickness in the lower molars of red  
20  
21 colobus (*Procolobus badius*) and Japanese macaque (*Macaca fuscata*). *Journal of*  
22  
23 *Human Evolution*, 43, 605-620.  
24  
25  
26 Smith, B.H., Crummett, T.L., & Brandt, K.L. (1994). Ages of eruption of primate teeth: a  
27  
28 compendium for aging individuals or comparing life histories. *Yearbook of Physical*  
29  
30 *Anthropology*, 37, 177-231.  
31  
32  
33 Smith, T.M. (2013). Teeth and human life-history evolution. *Annual Review of Anthropology*,  
34  
35 42, 191-208.  
36  
37  
38 Smith, T.M., Martin, L.B., & Leakey, M.G. (2003). Enamel thickness, microstructure and  
39  
40 development in *Afropithecus turkanensis*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 44, 283-306.  
41  
42  
43 Smith, T.M., Olejniczak, A.J., Martin, L.B., & Reid, D.J. (2005). Variation in hominoid molar  
44  
45 enamel thickness. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 48, 575-592.  
46  
47  
48 Smith, T.M., Olejniczak, A.J., Reid, D.J., Ferrell, R.J., & Hublin, J.-J. (2006). Modern human  
49  
50 molar enamel thickness and enamel dentine junction shape. *Archives of Oral Biology*,  
51  
52 51, 974-995.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3 Smith, T.M., Toussaint, M., Reid, D.J., Olejniczak, A.J., & Hublin, J.-J. (2007). Rapid dental  
4 development in a Middle Paleolithic Belgian Neanderthal. *Proceedings of the National*  
5 *Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104, 20220-20225.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Smith, T.M., Olejniczak, A.J., Reh, S., Reid, D.J., & Hublin, J.-J. (2008). Brief communication:  
11 enamel thickness trends in the dental arcade of humans and chimpanzees. *American*  
12 *Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 136, 237-241.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Smith, T.M., Kupczik, K., Machanda, Z., Skinner, M.M., & Zermeno, J.P. (2012a). Enamel  
18 thickness in Bornean and Sumatran orangutan dentitions. *American Journal of Physical*  
19 *Anthropology*, 147, 417-426.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 Smith, T.M., Olejniczak, A.J., Zermeno, J.P., Tafforeau, P., Skinner, M.M., Hoffmann, A.,  
25 Radovic, J., Toussaint, M., Kruszynski, R., Menter, C., Moggi-Cecchi, J., Glasmacher,  
26 U.A., Kullmer, O., Schrenk, F., Stringer, C., & Hublin, J.-J. (2012b). Variation in  
27 enamel thickness within the genus *Homo*. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 62, 395-411.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33 Smith, T.M., Machanda, Z., Bernard, A.B., Donovan, R.M., Papakyrikos, A.M., Muller, M.N., &  
34 Wrangham, R. (2013). First molar eruption, weaning, and life history in living wild  
35 chimpanzees. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*  
36 *America*, 110, 2787-2791.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42 Smith, T.M., Austin, C., Hinde, K., Vogel, E.R., & Arora, M. (2017). Cyclical nursing patterns  
43 in wild orangutans. *Science Advances*, 3, e1601517.  
44  
45  
46  
47 Spears, I.R., & Macho, G.A. (1995). The helicoidal occlusal plane-a functional and  
48 biomechanical appraisal of molars. In R.J. Radlenski, & H. Renz (Ed.), *Dental*  
49 *Morphology, Proceedings of the 10th international Symposium on Dental Morphology*  
50 (pp. 391-397). Berlin, "M" Marketing Services.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Spears, I.R., & Macho, G.A. (1998). Biomechanical behavior of modern human molars:  
4  
5 implications for interpreting the fossil record. *American Journal of Physical*  
6  
7 *Anthropology*, 106, 467-482.  
8  
9
- 10 Spencer, M.A. (1998). Force reduction in the primate masticatory system: electromyographic  
11  
12 tests of biomechanical hypotheses. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 34, 25-54.  
13  
14
- 15 Spencer, M.A. (1999). Constraints on masticatory system evolution in anthropoid primates.  
16  
17 *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 108, 483-506.  
18
- 19 Sumikawa, D.A., Marshall, G.S., Gee, L., & Marshall, S.J. (1999). Microstructure of primary  
20  
21 tooth dentin. *Journal of Pediatric Dentistry*, 21, 439-444.  
22  
23
- 24 Teaford, M.F. (2007). What do we know and not know about diet and enamel structure? In P.  
25  
26 Ungar (Ed.), *Evolution of the human diet*. (pp. 56-76). Oxford, Oxford University Press.  
27  
28
- 29 Trinkaus, E. (2011). Late Pleistocene adult mortality patterns and modern human establishment.  
30  
31 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 108,  
32  
33 1267-1271.  
34
- 35 Ungar, P. S. (2017). *Evolution's bite. A story of teeth, diet, and human origins*. New Jersey,  
36  
37 Princeton University Press.  
38  
39
- 40 van Noordwijk, M.A., Willems, E.P., Utami Atmoko, S.S., Kuzawa, C.W., & van Schaik, C.P.  
41  
42 (2013). Multi-year lactation and its consequences in Bornean orangutans (*Pongo*  
43  
44 *pygmaeus wurmbii*). *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology*, 67, 805-814.  
45  
46
- 47 Vieira, E.P., Barbosa, M.S., Quintão, C.C.A., & Normando, D. (2015). Relationship of tooth  
48  
49 wear to chronological age among indigenous Amazon populations. *PLoS ONE*, 10,  
50  
51 e0116138.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

- 1  
2  
3 Wolpoff, M.H. (1979). The Krapina dental remains. *American Journal of Physical*  
4  
5 *Anthropology*, 50, 67-114.  
6  
7  
8 Zanolli, C., Bayle, P., & Macchiarelli, R. (2010). Tissue proportions and enamel thickness  
9  
10 distribution in the early Middle Pleistocene human deciduous molars from Tighenif,  
11  
12 Algeria. *Comptes Rendus Palévol*, 9, 341-348.  
13  
14  
15 Zanolli, C., Dean, C., Rook, L., Bondioli, L., Mazurier, A., & Macchiarelli, R. (2015). Enamel  
16  
17 thickness and enamel growth in *Oreopithecus*: Combining microtomographic and  
18  
19 histological evidence. *Comptes Rendus Palévol*, 15, 209-226.  
20  
21  
22 Zanolli, C., Pan, L., Dumoncel, J., Kullmer, O., Kundrať, M., Liu, W., Macchiarelli, R., Mancini,  
23  
24 L., Schrenk, F., & Tuniz, C. (2018). Inner tooth morphology of *Homo erectus* from  
25  
26 Zhoukoudian. New evidence from an old collection housed at Uppsala University,  
27  
28 Sweden. *Journal of Human Evolution*, 116, 1-13.  
29  
30  
31 Zilberman, U., Skinner, M., & Smith, P. (1992). Tooth components of mandibular deciduous  
32  
33 molars of *Homo sapiens sapiens* and *Homo sapiens neanderthalensis*: a radiographic  
34  
35 study. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*, 87, 255-262.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Figure legends

**Fig 1.** Protocol used to collect enamel thickness data. (a) occlusal view of a three-dimensional model of a tooth with dentine in yellow and enamel rendered transparent. The red line indicates the plane of section, passing through the dentine horns of the two mesial cusps. (b) two-dimensional image of a cross-section from which enamel thickness measurements were collected. (c) area of total section (dashed lines). (d) area of enamel cap (dashed lines). (e) area of dentine crown (dashed lines). (f) length of enamel-dentine junction (black line) and bi-cervical diameter (red arrow). (g) length of lingual cervical wall, mid-occlusal basin, and buccal cervical wall (red arrows). Right  $dp_4$  of *H. sapiens* depicted. Not to scale.

**Fig 2.** Cross sections through the mesial cusps of (a)  $dp^4$  and (b)  $dp_4$  with examples of dental tissue proportions in humans and great apes. Right premolars depicted.

**Fig 3.** Pie charts showing 2D dental tissue proportions for (a) *H. sapiens*, (b) *P. troglodytes*, (c) *Gorilla* sp., (d) *Pongo* sp. Dentine in dark gray. Enamel in light gray.

**Fig 4.** Box plots of (a-b) average enamel thickness (AET), and (c-d) relative enamel thickness (RET) for upper and lower deciduous premolars per taxon.

1  
2  
3 **Fig. 5.** Patterning of enamel thickness distribution using LCW, MOB, and BCW linear  
4 measurements for (a)  $dp^4$  and (b)  $dp_4$ . See Table 2 for abbreviations.  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig 1. Protocol used to collect enamel thickness data. (a) occlusal view of a three-dimensional model of a tooth with dentine in yellow and enamel rendered transparent. The red line indicates the plane of section, passing through the dentine horns of the two mesial cusps. (b) two-dimensional image of a cross-section from which enamel thickness measurements were collected. (c) area of total section (dashed lines). (d) area of enamel cap (dashed lines). (e) area of dentine crown (dashed lines). (f) length of enamel-dentine junction (black line) and bi-cervical diameter (red arrow). (g) length of lingual cervical wall, mid-occlusal basin, and buccal cervical wall (red arrows). Right dp4 of *H. sapiens* depicted. Not to scale.




Fig 2. Cross sections through the mesial cusps of (a) dp4 and (b) dp4 with examples of dental tissue proportions in humans and great apes. Right premolars depicted.




Fig. 3. Pie charts showing 2D dental tissue proportions for (a) *H. sapiens*, (b) *P. troglodytes*, (c) *Gorilla sp.*, (d) *Pongo sp.* Dentine in dark gray. Enamel in light gray.

254x203mm (300 x 300 DPI)




Fig 4. Box plots of (a-b) average enamel thickness (AET), and (c-d) relative enamel thickness (RET) for upper and lower deciduous premolars per taxon.

254x203mm (300 x 300 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Fig. 5. Patterning of enamel thickness distribution using LCW, MOB, and BCW linear measurements for (a) dp4 and (b) dp4. See Table 2 for abbreviations.

247x73mm (300 x 300 DPI)

**Table 1.** Sample composition by taxon and tooth type.

Taxon	dp <sup>3</sup>	dp <sup>4</sup>	dp <sub>3</sub>	dp <sub>4</sub>
<i>H. sapiens</i>	13	12	12	24
<i>P. troglodytes</i>	9	15	3	9
<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	6	11	8	11
<i>Pongo</i> sp.	6	8	5	6

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

**Table 2.** Variables used for analysis of enamel thickness variation and distribution.

Measurement	Description
Total section	Area of total section (in mm <sup>2</sup> ), including area of enamel cap and area of dentine crown
Area <sub>e</sub>	Area of enamel cap (in mm <sup>2</sup> ), including lingual, occlusal, and buccal enamel
Area <sub>d</sub>	Area of dentine crown (in mm <sup>2</sup> ): area of coronal dentine between the EDJ and a straight line along the lingual and buccal cervical margins
EDJ	Length of the enamel-dentine junction (in mm)
BCD	Bi-cervical diameter (in mm): linear distance between the lingual and buccal cervical margins
AET	Average enamel thickness (in mm): area of enamel cap divided by the length of the EDJ
RET	AET divided by the square root of the dentine crown area and multiplied by 100
LCW	Lingual cervical wall (in mm): linear thickness of enamel along the lingual wall of the protocone (dp <sup>3</sup> and dp <sup>4</sup> ) or metaconid (dp <sub>3</sub> and dp <sub>4</sub> ), 1mm from dentine horn
MOB	Midocclusal basin (in mm): linear thickness of enamel in the most inferior portion of the occlusal basin
BCW	Buccal cervical wall (in mm): linear thickness of enamel along the buccal wall of the paracone (dp <sup>3</sup> and dp <sup>4</sup> ) or protoconid (dp <sub>3</sub> and dp <sub>4</sub> ), 1mm from dentine horn

**Table 3.** Mean, standard deviation, and coefficient of variation for the different measures of enamel thickness in hominoid deciduous premolars.

Taxon	Tooth	n	Total section		Area <sub>e</sub>		Area <sub>d</sub>		BCD		EDJ		AET			RET		
			mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	mean	SD	CV	mean	SD	CV		
<i>H. sapiens</i>	dp <sup>3</sup>	13	35.30	4.03	9.48	1.52	25.82	3.28	7.71	0.26	16.62	1.11	0.57	0.09	0.16	11.31	2.00	0.18
	dp <sup>4</sup>	12	41.56	4.19	14.12	2.42	27.44	3.00	8.72	0.46	17.23	1.41	0.82	0.15	0.18	15.81	3.14	0.20
	dp <sub>3</sub>	12	32.05	2.90	8.30	1.39	23.75	2.75	6.18	0.41	15.54	0.96	0.54	0.11	0.2	11.12	2.59	0.23
	dp <sub>4</sub>	24	36.41	4.88	11.21	1.76	25.20	4.00	7.04	0.44	16.88	1.61	0.67	0.12	0.18	13.50	3.12	0.23
<i>P. troglodytes</i>	dp <sup>3</sup>	9	24.72	1.56	4.99	0.45	19.74	1.25	6.39	0.41	14.01	0.45	0.36	0.03	0.08	8.02	0.71	0.09
	dp <sup>4</sup>	15	28.87	4.65	6.81	1.09	22.06	4.17	8.10	0.51	14.77	1.32	0.46	0.07	0.15	9.98	1.90	0.19
	dp <sub>3</sub>	3	21.98	2.78	3.97	0.40	18.01	2.39	4.80	0.44	12.94	1.03	0.31	0.01	0.03	7.25	0.43	0.06
	dp <sub>4</sub>	9	28.68	2.79	6.83	1.45	21.85	1.75	6.43	0.51	14.76	0.78	0.46	0.11	0.24	9.93	2.18	0.22
<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	dp <sup>3</sup>	6	53.11	7.43	8.08	1.46	45.03	6.94	9.95	0.85	22.28	2.17	0.37	0.07	0.19	5.51	1.41	0.26
	dp <sup>4</sup>	11	54.03	11.91	11.97	2.18	42.06	10.48	10.84	1.12	21.89	2.38	0.55	0.08	0.15	8.59	1.53	0.18
	dp <sub>3</sub>	8	37.89	4.65	6.05	1.51	31.84	4.32	7.26	0.95	16.55	1.13	0.37	0.10	0.27	6.56	1.83	0.28
	dp <sub>4</sub>	11	54.60	8.32	10.92	1.88	43.68	7.71	9.14	0.98	20.99	1.98	0.52	0.09	0.17	8.02	1.74	0.22
<i>Pongo</i> sp.	dp <sup>3</sup>	6	35.03	6.55	7.24	2.13	27.79	5.82	8.82	0.36	17.08	1.93	0.43	0.13	0.30	8.27	2.72	0.33
	dp <sup>4</sup>	8	39.69	5.94	9.47	2.12	30.22	5.14	9.90	0.89	17.44	1.72	0.55	0.13	0.24	10.06	2.72	0.27
	dp <sub>3</sub>	5	28.40	3.51	5.04	0.77	23.36	3.70	6.62	0.32	13.54	1.28	0.38	0.08	0.21	7.95	2.34	0.29
	dp <sub>4</sub>	6	36.40	5.10	7.57	0.93	28.83	5.13	8.05	0.35	16.30	1.77	0.47	0.09	0.19	8.98	2.67	0.30

Abbreviations: SD: standard deviation; CV: coefficient of variation. CV presented only for AET and RET

**Table 4.** Kruskal-Wallis test with postdoc pairwise comparisons of enamel thickness indices (AET bottom/RET top). Significant *p*-values bolded.

dp <sup>3</sup>	<i>H. sapiens</i>	<i>P. troglodytes</i>	<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	<i>Pongo</i> sp.
<i>H. sapiens</i>	-	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	N.S.
<i>P. troglodytes</i>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-	N.S.	N.S.
<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	N.S.	-	N.S.
<i>Pongo</i> sp.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-
dp <sup>4</sup>	<i>H. sapiens</i>	<i>P. troglodytes</i>	<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	<i>Pongo</i> sp.
<i>H. sapiens</i>	-	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.01</b>
<i>P. troglodytes</i>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	-	N.S.	N.S.
<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	N.S.	-	N.S.
<i>Pongo</i> sp.	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	N.S.	N.S.	-
dp <sub>3</sub>	<i>H. sapiens</i>	<i>P. troglodytes</i>	<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	<i>Pongo</i> sp.
<i>H. sapiens</i>	-	N.S.	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	N.S.
<i>P. troglodytes</i>	N.S.	-	N.S.	N.S.
<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	N.S.	-	N.S.
<i>Pongo</i> sp.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	-
dp <sub>4</sub>	<i>H. sapiens</i>	<i>P. troglodytes</i>	<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	<i>Pongo</i> sp.
<i>H. sapiens</i>	-	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	<b>&lt;0.001</b>	<b>&lt;0.05</b>
<i>P. troglodytes</i>	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	-	N.S.	N.S.
<i>Gorilla</i> sp.	<b>&lt;0.01</b>	N.S.	-	N.S.
<i>Pongo</i> sp.	<b>&lt;0.05</b>	N.S.	N.S.	-

N.S.: non-significant