File ID	459474
Filename	Errata and Updates 2012

SOURCE (OR PART OF THE FOLLOWING SOURCE):

Type	Dissertation
Title	A chimpanzee Mega-Culture? Exploring behavioral continuity in Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii across northern DR Congo
Author	T.C. Hicks
Faculty	Faculty of Science
Year	2010
Pages	300
ISBN	978-90-76894-92-8

FULL BIBLIOGRAPHIC DETAILS:
http://dare.uva.nl/record/359327

ERRATA AND UPDATES, PH.D. THESIS OF T. C. HICKS, NOVEMBER 2012

'I thought I was wrong once, but I was mistaken.'

Thanks to Thurston T. Hicks

I. ERRATA

1. Chapter 1, Table VIII (pages 36-38). The plant name rows could be better lined up. There are gaps created where the local name has 2 parts.

2. Chapter 1, Table VIII (page 37). *Strychnos* and *Saba* are listed as trees (T) and not, as they should be, vines (V).

3. Chapter 1, Figure 13 (page 42). Photo c was not included, despite what the caption says.

4. Chapter 1, Table XII (pages 45-46). In the reference list, on several occasions the tables are listed as VIa, VIb, or VIc, when they should obviously be Tables XIIa, XIIb, and XIIc.

5. In Chapter 2, the text for Figure 4 (page 64) refers to the raw data in Appendix IV. But there is no Appendix IV! Please see Hicks et al. 2012 (*American Journal of Primatology*) for more information.

6. Appendix I of Chapter 2 (page 69). The number of total km walked by TH in Camp Louis was a misprint: it should have read '1234.94', not '12340.94'. The former figure however is also incorrect. We actually walked 1277.9 km in Camp Louis Forest, and 356.8 km in Gangu (as was correctly stated in Chapter 1).

7. The last line of the first paragraph on page 102: there were four honey tools at the site, not three.

8. Table XI, Chapter 4, Section 4 (page 125). Wet season percentage (19 dung samples) adds up to 102.5%, an impossibility. I redid the calculation and it should read: 'Other / unknown = 0.8 (0-13.25).'

9. Table XIII, Chapter 4, Section 4(page 126). The row total of the final column for *Desplatsia dewevrei* should add up to 2 (not 1). This means that the column 'Dry 2004/2005' should add up to 27. The final total fruits should thus be 165, not 164.

10. Table IVb (page 167). Somehow the table rows for this analysis were switched around in the final printing. For the analysis of fresh nests, the first line of results, which is incorrectly labeled 'N/S Uele', should actually be 'Intercept'. 'Seasonwet' should show a trend, but not 'Landscape disturbed.' The corrected table is as follows:

Only fresh nests considered:

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	Pr(>|z|)
(Intercept)	-1.77649	0.237296	-7.4864	7.08E-14
NSUeleS	-0.38582	0.363172	-1.06237	0.288069
Seasonwet	**-0.49923**	**0.266225**	**-1.87521**	**0.060764**
LandscapeDisturbed	-0.73381	1.043126	-0.70347	0.481764
LandscapeSavanna	-13.5444	773.784	-0.0175	0.986034
LandscapeWet	0.158927	0.236238	0.672743	0.501111
PC1	0.362952	0.386383	0.939358	0.347547
PC2	0.50981	0.3729	1.36715	0.171578
dfr	0.312333	0.199758	1.563563	0.11792
fd	0.158846	0.114509	1.387185	0.165385
ac_term	0.469012	0.600702	0.780772	0.434936

11. Page 195: The word ‘March’ which appears randomly at the end of the page is a typo.
12. Page 219 (under Case Three). The chimpanzee ‘workshop’ description does not appear on page 164, but on page 232. Likewise, on page 236 the description of the workshop is incorrectly referred to as being on page 109.
13. ‘Epigaeic’ is misspelled occasionally in Chapter 5.

II. UPDATES (based on the author’s re-survey of the Gangu Forest in 2012)

1. In our 2012 resurvey of the Gangu Forest, we found a nest site with five ‘half ground nests’ (see page 181 for a description of this nest type) built on a steep hillside (another eight ground nests at this site were ‘whole’ nests, and there were also eleven tree nests present). Thus the phenomenon may not be limited, as I speculated in the thesis, to the east bank of the Bima River, but may be tied closely to hillsides. Nevertheless, this nest type was much more frequently-encountered in the East Bima forests than elsewhere, and the phenomenon requires further investigation.
2. In our 2012 survey of the Gangu Forest we focused on identifying the occupants of the unidentified insect holes at tool sites of the type which I had in the thesis assumed were

for species of non-epigaeic ants. We encountered irrefutable evidence (to be described in detail elsewhere) that some of these insect holes were actually occupied by underground stingless bees, probably *Meliponula (Axestotrigona) ferruginea,* and that the chimpanzees had been probing for honey and / or larvae. We can therefore say that the Bili chimpanzees use longer tools to hunt for epigaeic driver ants and shorter tools to access both non-epigaeic ants and underground bee hives. As for our South Uele tool sites, we must now be open to the possibility that some of them may have been for bees.

3. Update for page 36: On our 2012 re-survey we found abundant evidence of the fruits of *Duboscia (*almost certainly species *macrocarpa*) in the Gangu and Bili forests. Also *Annonnidium mannii* was found to be present (if rare). It is not clear why we missed these fruits the first time around, as they were quite familiar to the author from his previous work in the forests of Central Africa.