Tooth chipping can reveal the diet and bite forces of fossil hominins
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Mammalian tooth enamel is often chipped, providing clear evidence for localized contacts with large hard food objects. Here, we apply a simple fracture equation to estimate peak bite forces directly from chip size. Many fossil hominins exhibit antemortem chips on their posterior teeth, indicating their use of high bite forces. The inference that these species must have consumed large hard foods such as seeds is supported by the occurrence of similar chips among known modern-day seed predators such as orangutans and peccaries. The existence of tooth chip signatures also provides a way of identifying the consumption of rarely eaten foods that dental microwear and isotopic analysis are unlikely to detect.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Diet is intricately tied to almost all aspects of an organism’s lifestyle. Palaeontologists trying to reconstruct the behaviour of fossil species benefit greatly from knowing what the members of those species were eating. However, the tools currently available for dietary reconstruction are few, and all have limitations. Tooth chipping analysis is a new methodology that can provide immediate information on diet, both in the types of foods eaten and in the forces used to process those foods.

Tooth enamel is a brittle material that is easily chipped at high loads. Such chipping results when a large hard object forcefully contacts the tooth near an occlusal edge (Chai & Lawn 2007). Small hard objects do not cause chipping, instead inducing microscale plastic deformation in the enamel at the points of contact (Lucas et al. 2008). Neither do soft objects cause chipping, instead inducing microscale plastic deformation in the enamel at the points of contact (see the electronic supplementary material). Chip sizes $h$ from the tooth side wall and tooth base diameters $D$ were measured from these photographs (figure 1) to the nearest 0.03 mm. Consideration was given only to antemortem chips (i.e., those with smoothed edges, indicative of wear occurring subsequent to the fracture event). Chip size data are tabulated in the electronic supplementary material. Critical loads for chip formation were then estimated from the relation ($Chai & Lawn 2007$)

$$P_F = T^hD^{3/2},$$

(2.1)

where $T$ is a coefficient proportional to material ‘toughness’ (intrinsic resistance to crack growth). We used data from failure tests on modern human enamel to calibrate this relation via a linear least squares best fit of $P_F$ versus $h$ data to obtain $T = 9.3$ MN m$^{-3/2}$ (see the electronic supplementary material).

For comparison, we turned to an earlier study by Demes & Creel (1988) of maximum possible bite forces $P_{max}$ from jaw mechanics of great apes and fossil hominins. Their analysis produced ‘bite force equivalents’ from an analysis of jaw muscle sizes and lever arms. Following Demes & Creel, we converted these equivalents to absolute forces by calibrating proportionality factors from the average maximum bite forces for male and female Macaca fascicularis from Hylander (1979). This procedure yielded maximum estimated bite forces of 720 and 510 N for human males and females, a little below estimates for human first molars using ‘soft’ bite force gauges (Braun et al. 1995) but within a broad range of values from other methods of bite force estimation (Hylander 1977).

3. RESULTS

Individual chip/tooth sizes $h/D$ for the various living and fossil species are plotted in figure 2a (see also table S1). Note the wide range of values for each species. Clearly, the chip location must lie within the range $0 < h/D < 0.5$. Our data lie within $h/D < 0.3$, indicating a practical chip limit in normal dental function. Higher $h/D$ would cause the starter cracks to arrest at the dentine and, at ultra-high loads, to split the tooth. Substitution of $h/D = 0.3$ into equation (2.1) provides a corresponding limiting bite force

$$P_{max} = 0.16T^hD^{3/2}.$$  (3.1)

Table 1 compares bite forces $P_{max}$ calculated from equation (3.1) for fossil hominins as well as for...
extant primates and peccaries, using averaged molar sizes \( D \) (Demes & Creel 1988), with \( P_F \) calculated from equation (2.1), using the highest measured \( h \) (see table S1).

Values of \( P_{\text{max}} \) calculated from equation (3.1) are plotted in figure 2b versus estimates of maximum bite force \( P_{\text{jaw}} \) from jaw mechanics. The straight line through the data is a least squares best fit (red circle, \( P. \) boisei; red square, \( P. \) robustus; red triangle, \( A. \) aferensis; red diamond, \( A. \) africanus; inverted triangle, \( H. \) erectus; blue circle, \( H. \) sapiens; blue triangle, \( G. \) gorilla spp.; blue square, \( P. \) pygmaeus; blue diamond, \( P. \) troglodytes; blue inverted triangle, \( M. \) spp.).

4. DISCUSSION

The analysis of enamel chips adds a simple but powerful new tool for evaluating jaw performance and reconstructing diet. The technique is valid for any dentate fossil or living vertebrate (see the electronic supplementary material) and provides estimates of bite forces commensurate with other techniques. In this context, it may be noted that values from the jaw mechanics analysis of Demes & Creel may be underestimates because of simplifications in the underlying two-dimensional lever mechanics (Thomason 1991; Ellis et al. 2008). Independent food fracture experiments suggest that orangutans are capable of cracking open macadamia nuts at forces over 2 kN (Lucas et al. 1994, 2009), which compares with \( P_{\text{max}} = 2.5 \) kN calculated from equation (3.1) for a mean molar size of 14.0 mm for this animal. Similarly, peccaries are capable of fracturing \( I. \) palm nuts at \( P_{\text{max}} = 3.4 \) kN (Kiltie 1982), which compares with a value 2.3 kN calculated for a measured mean molar size 13.3 mm. The relatively high incidence of chipping on the teeth of orangutans and peccaries (table 2) and many fossil hominins visually

Figure 1. (a) Photograph of antemortem chips on teeth of \( P. \) robustus. (b) Schematic of enamel chip geometry. Scale bar, (a) 4 mm.

Figure 2. (a) Plot of chip dimension \( h \) relative to tooth diameter \( D \) for a variety of living species and fossil hominins. Values of \( h \) and \( D \) are from individual chips (excluding small chips, \( h < 0.1 \) mm). Note upper limit \( h/D \approx 0.30 \). (b) Plot of maximum chipping force \( P_{\text{max}} \) from equation (3.1) using averaged molar diameter \( D \) versus \( P_{\text{jaw}} \) from jaw mechanics. Solid line is a least squares best fit (red circle, \( P. \) boisei; red square, \( P. \) robustus; red triangle, \( A. \) aferensis; red diamond, \( A. \) africanus; inverted triangle, \( H. \) erectus; blue circle, \( H. \) sapiens; blue triangle, \( G. \) gorilla spp.; blue square, \( P. \) pygmaeus; blue diamond, \( P. \) troglodytes; blue inverted triangle, \( M. \) spp.).
We can go further and analyse the intrinsic resistance to fracture of mammalian dentition in terms of tooth morphology. Almost certainly, such resistance is subject to selective pressure, with tooth dimensions optimized to enable maximum efficiency in food processing (Lucas 2004). We have already indicated how the maximum sustainable bite force $P_{\text{max}}$ scales with tooth size $D$ in equation (3.1). Another important tooth dimension is enamel thickness $t$. Teeth with thin enamel may fracture by a mode other than chip spallation, e.g. by longitudinal propagation of ribbon-like radial and margin cracks around the side walls from the occlusal surface to the margin (or vice versa) (Chai et al. 2009; Lawn & Lee 2009; Lee et al. 2009). Such modes are favoured at contact locations $h$ in excess of $0.30D$. Longitudinal cracks of this kind are less likely to leave a visible imprint on the tooth surface. Nevertheless, they weaken the tooth structure, and in extreme cases can lead to penetration through the dentine with consequent tooth splitting. Tooth size and enamel thickness may therefore have evolved in part to afford protection against potentially catastrophic effects of fracture in the eating of hard food objects.
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Table 1. Maximum bite forces for fossil hominins and select extant mammals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>taxon</th>
<th>maximum bite force (N)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Paranthropus boisei</em></td>
<td>1751 3471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Paranthropus robustus</em></td>
<td>1742 2769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Australopithecus africanus</em></td>
<td>1253 2598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Australopithecus afarensis</em></td>
<td>1860 2305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Australopithecus anamensis</em></td>
<td>1671 2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Homo erectus</em></td>
<td>1085 2075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Homo sapiens</em></td>
<td>970 1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pongo abelii</em></td>
<td>1086 1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pongo pygmaeus</em></td>
<td>1243 2120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tayassu pecari</em></td>
<td>1187 1766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gorilla</em></td>
<td>910 1470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lophocebus albigena</em></td>
<td>624 875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macaca</em></td>
<td>961 1086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Relative chip frequencies in living taxa.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>taxon</th>
<th>% individuals with one or more chips</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Pongo abelii</em></td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tayassu pecari</em></td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Lophocebus albigena</em></td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pongo pygmaeus</em></td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Macaca</em></td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gorilla</em></td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pan troglodytes</em></td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Relative chip frequencies in living taxa.

confirmed the consumption of large hard foods and the use of high bite forces to process these foods. A lower incidence of chipping on gorilla and chimpanzee teeth suggests that these animals process such foods less frequently. Our method also circumvents the requirement of a nearly complete fossil cranium to obtain an estimate of bite force. All that is needed is a few teeth with well-formed chips.

Tooth chipping can provide information about diet that other methods tend to miss. For example, the hard objects that cause chipping are orders of magnitude larger than objects recordable in dental microwear (Lucas 2004; Lucas et al. 2008). Also, because chipping patterns are permanent, they can reveal the practice of hard-object feeding even if it was a rare event, as is the case with many fallback foods (Marshall & Wrangham 2007; Constantino & Wright 2009). Such incidences may be missed by microwear analysis, in which wear features are rapidly replaced (Grine & Kay 1988; Teaford & Oyen 1989), or by isotopic analysis where the signal from rarely eaten foods can be masked by that from more commonly eaten items (Sponheimer & Lee-Thorp 1999; Yeakel et al. 2007). Interestingly, postcanines of the robust australopithecine *Paranthropus boisei* show enamel chips but no evidence of hard objects in their dental microwear (Ungar et al. 2008).


