Altered food habits? Understanding the feeding preference of free-ranging Grey langur (*Semnopithecus entellus*) within an urban settlement.

Dishari Dasgupta^a, Arnab Banerjee^{b,c}, Rikita Karar^a, Debolina Banerjee^a, Shohini Mitra^a, Purnendu Sardar^d, Srijita Karmakar^{a,e}, Aparajita Bhattacharya^a, Swastika Ghosh^a, Pritha Bhattacharjee^a, Manabi Paul^{a,1}.

^aDepartment of Environmental Science, University of Calcutta, Kolkata, India.

^bCentre for Mathematical Biology and Ecology, Department of Mathematics, Jadavpur University, Kolkata, India.

^cSystems Ecology & Ecological Modelling Laboratory, Department of Zoology, Visva-Bharati University, Santiniketan, India.

^dDepartment of Environmental Science and Engineering, Indian Institute of Technology (ISM) Dhanbad, India.

^eDepartment of Biological Sciences, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research Kolkata, India.

¹Department of Environmental Science, University of Calcutta, 35, Ballygunge Circular Road, Kolkata- 700019, India.

tel. +91-9051050474

email: manabii.paul@gmail.com

23

24 **ABSTRACT**

25 Urbanization affects concurrent human-animal movements as a result of altered resource availability and
 26 land use pattern, which leads to considerable ecological consequences. While some animals find
 27 themselves adrift, homeless with the uncertainty of resources resulting from the urban encroachment,
 28 few of them manage to survive by altering their natural behavioural patterns, and co-exist with humans.
 29 Folivorous colobines, such as grey langur, whose feeding repertoire largely consists of plant parts, tend
 30 to be more attuned to the urban high-calorie food sources to attain maximum fitness benefits within the
 31 concrete jungle having an insignificant green cover. However, such a mismatch between their
 32 generalized feeding behaviour and specialized gut physiology reminds us of the Liem's paradox and
 33 demands considerable scientific attention which could tell us the story behind colobines' successful co-
 34 existence within human settlements. Besides understanding their population dynamics, the effective
 35 management of these urbanized, free-ranging, non-human primate populations also depends on their
 36 altered feeding preferences, altogether which could lead us to the development of an ecologically sound
 37 urban ecosystem. Here, we have used a field-based experimental set up which allows langurs to choose
 38 between natural and urban food options, being independent of any inter-specific conflicts over resources
 39 due to food scarcity. The multinomial logit model reveals the choice-based decision making of these
 40 free-ranging grey langurs in an urban settlement of West Bengal, India, where they have not only
 41 learned to approach the human-provisioned urban food items but also shown a keen interest in it. While
 42 urbanization imposes tremendous survival challenges to these animals, it also opens up for various
 43 alternative options for human-animal co-existence which is reflected in this study, and could guide us
 44 for the establishment of a sustainable urban ecosystem in the future.

45

46

47

48 **HIGHLIGHTS**

49 • The feeding repertoire of free-ranging grey langurs at Dakshineswar largely consists of urban
50 food items in contrast to the langurs of Nangi, and Nalpur who mostly depend on natural food
51 sources.

52

53 • High human-langur interactions together with the scarcity of natural plant-based food sources
54 could be considered as an intriguing driving force behind langurs' altered feeding habits in
55 Dakshineswar.

56

57 • The field-based experimental set up allows free-ranging langurs to choose between natural and
58 urban food options in an urban settlement like Dakshineswar.

59

60 • Urban food items outperformed natural food items as the most chosen one, indicating langurs'
61 altered feeding preferences which facilitate their successful co-existence within an urban
62 ecosystem.

63

64 **KEYWORDS**

65 Grey langur, free-ranging, urbanization, co-existence, feeding preference.

66

67

68

69 The global urban human population is set to reach the five billion mark by 2028 (ONU, 2018),
70 facilitating urban sprawling and subsequently contributing to natural habitat loss worldwide at an
71 unprecedented rate. This is expected to affect a large number of animals whose habitat ranges overlap
72 with urban areas (He et al., 2014; Martinuzzi et al., 2015; McDonald et al., 2008; Murray & St. Clair,
73 2015). Habitat fragmentation and encroachment due to such urban expansion, which is often irreversible,
74 has forced many homeless animals to live in close proximity to humans (Bateman & Fleming, 2012),
75 giving rise to frequent human-animal conflict (Devi & Saikia, 2008; Omondi et al., 2004; Messmer 2000;
76 Woodruffe et al., 2005). At the same time, some of these animals have also shown considerable
77 behavioural adaptations like altered nesting or denning habits, vocalization, migratory activities, mating
78 and breeding patterns, feeding behaviour (Able & Belthoff, 1998; Estes & Mannan, 2003; Kettlewell,
79 1961; Lowry et al., 2013; Slabbekoorn & Peet, 2003; Swedell et al., 2011) together with life history
80 modification to survive amidst anthropogenic stress. Such anthropogenic stress often creates
81 unpredictable selection pressure on these urban animals, leading to a sharp decline in species richness
82 and composition within an urban ecosystem (Erinjeri et al., 2017; Fuentes, 2012; Kale et al., 2012; H.
83 N. Kumara & Singh, 2004; Paul et al., 2016; Singh & Raghunatha Rao, 2004; Vitousek et al., 1997).
84 However, despite significant loss of biodiversity, urban expansion offers various high-calorie resource
85 options to the generalist species who have higher dietary as well as foraging plasticity, and therefore,
86 can adjust more readily to the altered habitat in contrast to the specialists (Fisher & Owens, 2004;
87 Vázquez & Simberloff, 2002). Moreover, such anthropogenic food sources remain available throughout
88 the year, thus providing a risky yet reliable and easily accessible resource option which is thought to be

one of the major driving forces behind human-animal co-existence within urban settlements (Bateman & Fleming, 2012; Lowry et al., 2013; Thabethe & Downs, 2018; Widdows et al., 2015). In some cases, urban-dwelling free-ranging animals have been shown to acquire a preference toward anthropogenic food items to minimize their foraging activities, so that could invest more energy and time in nurturing social relationships which is essential to attain better fitness benefits (Bryson-Morrison et al., 2016, 2017; Hoffman & O’Riain, 2012; Saj et al., 1999; Sha & Hanya, 2013; Thatcher et al., 2019).

India has more than 400 mammalian species, of which 17 are non-human primates with different conservation status (Karanth et al., 2010; Honnavalli N. Kumara et al., 2010; Molur et.al.,2003) who have ecological as well as socio-cultural importance. Three of these non-human primate species i.e., Rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*), bonnet macaques (*Macaca radiata*) and Hanuman langurs (*Semnopithecus entellus*) are frequently found in Indian cities, market places, temples, roadside settlements, etc., where they are often provisioned with human offered food items and space, worshipped and protected by *Hindus* (Sharma et al., 2011). Their wide distribution range and various feeding habits reflect their generalistic nature where they use a handful of novel strategies such as “coo-calls”, begging gestures, car raiding, etc. to acquire the available food items directly from humans (Arbib et al., 2008; Deshpande et al., 2018; Sha et al., 2009; Sinha, 2005). However, such close human-animal interaction is often lethal, affecting their chances of survival within urban ecosystems (Gosselink et al., 2007; Grinder & Krausman, 2001; Paul et al., 2016; Vijayan & Pati, 2002). Furthermore, these high-calorie urban food items could have a substantial effect on these animals’ physiology underlying their behavioural patterns, thereby reshaping intra and inter-specific group dynamics in contrast to their natural counterparts (Orams, 2002; Trave et al., 2017; Higginbottom & Scott, 2004). In this scenario, it

is imperative to understand how the oppression of urban expansion has thinned down the natural resources and influenced the lives of these animals, leading to urban-adaptation in these species.

While several studies have been carried out on the naturally omnivorous macaques (Goldstein & Richard, 1989; Ganguly & Chauhan, 2018; Laska, 2001; Oppenheimer 1977), to understand their opportunistic feeding behaviour to co-exist with human settlements, there has been no study yet to quantify and compare the dietary preference of folivorous Hanuman langurs in urban areas. Due to their deity value, this species is endowed with ample human provisioning. However, their specialized tripartite stomach structure largely aids in the digestion of a leafy diet (Bauchop & Martucci, 1968; Caton, 1999). Moreover, unlike the terrestrial macaques, the arboreal nature of Hanuman langurs (Khanal et al., 2018) is also barring them from availing enough human provisioning which could supplement their cellulose-based diet. Therefore, it seems to be all the more difficult for these large-bodied colobines to obtain sufficient resources that could be invested in maintaining reproductive fitness within an ecosystem where their natural food options are either unavailable or scarce to support their energy demand.

Grey langurs (*Semnopithecus entellus*), commonly called Hanuman langurs have colonized various parts of the Indian subcontinent, ranging from the desert to forest fringes, and have lived with a diversified resource structure and human interference (Ashalakshmi et al., 2014; Chetan et al., 2014; Oppenheimer, 1977). In comparison to the other species of Hanuman langur, grey langurs' (*Semnopithecus entellus*) social organization is highly flexible (Caton, 1999; Newton, 1988; Rajpurohit et al., 2006; Sterck, 1999) and is often modified by the male-male competition followed by infanticides

(Broom et al., 2004; Hrdy SB 1974; Sharma et al., 2010). Besides unimale-bisexual troops, all-male bands are also common in these langurs (L. S. Rajpurohit et al., 2003). Even though they exploit a wide range of plant species including various plant parts, only a fraction of these so-called “Least Concern species” (IUCN 2003) can reach their reproductive age, which is again expected to reduce due to the adverse effect of urban encroachment (Kumara et.al., 2020). On the contrary, such urban settlements provide easy access to various anthropogenic low-fiber food sources which are mostly processed yet offer high-calorie to these ruminant folivores (Sayers, 2013). Few articles have reported human-langur cooperation through the food provisioning in Indian cities and towns, portraying them as ecological generalists in terms of habitat and diet. This mismatch in their expected and observed diet has made them one of the prime examples of Liem’s paradox which refers to the odd pairing of specialized anatomical features with a generalistic diet (Binning et al., 2009; Liem, 1980). However, it was later argued that such “asymmetry allows optimally foraging consumers to evolve phenotypic specializations on nonpreferred resources without compromising their ability to use preferred resources” (Robinson & Wilson, 1998). Hence, the development of alternate feeding patterns in these urbanized free-ranging gray langurs demands considerable scientific attention which could provide important insights into their eco-ethological adaptation for better management and policy-making to develop a sustainable urban ecosystem. Several studies have manifested ‘food-resources’ as one of the major contributing factors that limit primate’s group size and composition (Chapman, 1990). The Van Schaik model posits that in folivorous non-human primates, the intra-group scramble feeding-competition leads to differential reproductive success which has an immense role in establishing the hierarchical relationship within the group (Van Schaik 1989; Borries 1993). Therefore, the feeding behaviour of the grey langurs can provide interesting insights into the social dynamics, as well as the urban adaptation of the species. In

this article, we have focused on the feeding preference of group-living, free-ranging grey langurs in the urban areas of West Bengal, India, in a habitat where they successfully co-exist with humans.

METHODS

Study area and study animals

Free-ranging langur troops were identified through regular census methods between September 2018 to December 2018 in various parts of West Bengal, India, of which three distinct langur troops (one in Dakshineswar (22.6573° N, 88.3624° E), one in Nangi (22.4973° N, 88.2214° E), and one in Sarenga, Nalpur (22.5307° N, 88.1840° E)) were selected for long-term field-based observations, considering the various level of human interferences received by the langurs (ESM1,2). Observers visited the areas at random times during the day and walked on all roads, by-lanes, and fields covered with vegetation of the above three selected urban settlements. Whenever a troop of langurs was sighted, it was observed *ad libitum* for a minimum of 15 minutes to a maximum of one hour, during which the observer recorded their location, troop size, and behaviours (later categorized as either intra- or inter-specific interactions). These data were used to categorize langurs into four distinct life stages based on their physical and behavioural characteristics (Infant- dark fur colour and fully dependent on adults for their movement and feeding; Juvenile- light fur colour similar to adults but smaller in size and partially dependent on adults for their movement and feeding; sub adult- fully independent of adults but yet to attain sexual maturity, body size is typically in between that of juveniles and adults; adult- fully grown, independent individual who is sexually mature) and also to note their territories (by using GPS- eTrex30, Garmin).

177

178 *Long-term study*

179 For long-term field-based observations, we followed these three troops between January 2019 to March
180 2020 and recorded their behaviours using a combination of an equal number of instantaneous scans and
181 all occurrences sessions (AOS) (Altmann, 1974). Whenever any feeding behaviour was observed, the
182 observer recorded the details of the initiator, recipient, and their respective behaviours along with the
183 food types (food-census) and location. Then, we categorized food items being eaten by the langurs into
184 two distinct categories like ‘natural’ and ‘urban’ food sources (ESM 3a,b).

185

186 *Food-choice test*

187 We carried out a choice-based experiment in a field set-up to find out the feeding preferences of free-
188 ranging langurs in an urban settlement like Dakshineswar where they received maximum human
189 interference, including maximum food offerings (ESM 3a) (manuscript in preparation) and depend
190 mostly on ‘urban’ food sources, unlike the langurs of Nalpur and Nangi (Figure 1). We offered a food
191 tray of cardboard, with four types of food items (which were recorded as the ‘most frequently eaten’
192 food items during the food-census), each of them having a comparable quantity and size (ESM 4), at any
193 random times of a day between 0600 to 1800 hours. We used cauliflower and brinjal as ‘natural food’
194 items, whereas bread and peanuts were used as ‘urban food’ items. All of these offered food items were
195 fresh and suitable for human consumption. These were presented on the food tray in random order to
196 avoid any ‘side-bias’. Since peanuts were seen to be one of the most frequently eaten urban food items,
197 we used it for the choice-based experiment and offered it in a small paper bag (which is usually used by
198 people to offer peanuts to langurs during provisioning), making its quantity visually similar to the other

food items. Based on the food-census data, we sub-divided the study area, Dakshineswar, into three distinct zones representing various feeding options available to langurs (ESM 5). The experimenter randomly chose one zone and presented the food tray to a spot where the maximum number of troop members can have equal access to the food tray. The experimenter either waited until the food tray was empty or waited for ten minutes if the food tray remained unattended or partially attended by the langurs, before closing the session. Once started, the experiment remained undisturbed i.e. no human interference was allowed and the entire experiment was video-recorded. In order to avoid any bias, which could influence subsequent trials, the videos were decoded only in April 2020, after the completion of all experiments. We conducted a total of 83 experiments in the field set-up of which 74 experiments (where the food trays were attended by the langurs without having any human interference) were considered for the final analysis (ESM 6).

Scoring method

For each experiment, we recorded the times (in seconds) when a food item was ‘approached’ or attempted to be received by the langurs (FA), chosen to be eaten (FC), the delay between FA and FC (in seconds) (delay), number of rejection received by a food item (RJ), and the presence or absence of aggression shown by the langurs to possess a food item (AG). Then we scored the food items for each of these categories to reflect the langurs’ feeding preference separately for each experiment. Since the food tray had four food items, each of them had five scoring options for FA and FC. The food that was attempted to be taken first received a score of five and the last (fourth) one was given a score of two. If a food item remained unattempted, it received a score of one. Similar scoring was done for FC, where the food scored ‘one’ if it was not chosen to be eaten and ‘five’ for being eaten first. RJ was scored on a scale of a maximum of ‘eight’ to a minimum of ‘zero’, where food items scored ‘zero’ if they were not

rejected at all, and scored ‘eight’ when rejected for FA. Foods were scored ‘one’ if they received aggression and ‘zero’ if not, considering AG as an indication to the possessiveness for the most preferred food item which langurs did not want to share with. For ‘delay’ we scored them between ‘zero’ to ‘five’ where ‘zero’ represents no delay, ‘four’ for the maximum delay between FA and FC, and ‘five’ for the foods which were approached but not chosen to be eaten until the end of the experimental session.

Statistical analysis

We used the scores for FA, FC, RJ, AG, and delay for all statistical analyses which were carried out using *StatistiXL* (version 2.0), and *R* (version 4.0.2). We ran a correlation analysis to check the inter-relation between various factors like ‘attempt’ (FA), ‘choice’ (FC), ‘delay’, ‘rejection’ (RJ), and ‘aggression’ (AG) which were affecting the final food selection by the langurs. To verify the results of the correlation we used a generalized linear models (GLM) and checked which parameter was finally affecting the final selection of the food items. We used the FC as the response variable, whereas FA, AG, RJ, and ‘delay’ were incorporated into the model as the predictor variables. We used a ‘Poisson’ distribution for the response variable to run the model. The distribution of the residuals was evaluated to check how well the model fits the data (ESM 7). A ‘principal component analysis’ (PCA) was conducted for descriptors like FA, FC, AG, RJ, and delay to check their effect on the food selection separately for three zones (Figure 2).

244 *Multinomial logit model*

245 To explain the preference of one food over another, i.e., food choice, we ran varied combination of
 246 multinomial logit models (MLM). Since we were interested in checking the predictive values of
 247 different independent variables like aggression, rejection, etc. on the final outcome of food choice, we
 248 ran 2 different sets of MLMs – separately for the ‘approach’ and ‘choice’ probabilities (Table 1). These
 249 two sets had four sub-models each where we employed a ‘leave one component out’ (LOCO) approach
 250 to meet our goal. The LOCO approach leaves one food component out at each sub-model step to check
 251 the order of selection of the subsequent food item. Besides, the models also evaluate the importance of
 252 the independent variables or descriptors in the outcome.

253

254 The first set used the food approach as the outcome and the second set used the goal function of final
 255 food choice. When one food was approached i.e being attempted to be received by langurs, the
 256 probabilities of approaching the next food items can be determined subsequently by using set 1 MLMs.
 257 We ran four sub-set MLMs to check what would be the next approached food items separately while
 258 considering either brinjal, bread, cauliflower, or peanuts as the ‘first approached’ food item (Table 1a).
 259 Higher scores of the odds ratio confirm the results of MLM estimates thereafter (Table 2a) and
 260 subsequently rank the different food approach preferences according to the LOCO tactic.

261

262 Simultaneously, the set 2 MLMs were processed to establish and validate the preferred order of food
 263 items being chosen (final food choice) by the langurs during the experiment (Table 1b, 2b). The LOCO
 264 here assumes that one food has been consumed (and thus exhausted) and subsequently calculates the
 265 probabilities of choosing the next item. Since all food items were provided equally (i.e. equal probability

of choice at the beginning), the model considered the frequencies of alternatives equal to 0.25. We used the Newton-Raphson method from the package ‘*mlogit*’ in *R* to run the MLM (Croissant, 2020). The estimates of the MLM were plotted after normalizing to 1.0 (to avoid the negative values) for the visual representation (Figure 5).

Food sharing

We recorded the incidents of food sharing between langurs, if any, out of the total 221 successful cases (where the food items were attended by langurs) from a total of 296 cases (four food options for 74 experiments). We included the details of the initiator, recipient, proportion of food being shared, and the interest of the initiator to share the food item with the recipient (i.e. shared forcefully or not). We used social network analysis (SNA) by using *Cytoscape* where we used various life stages (adult, subadult, juvenile, and infant) as a ‘node’ and an incident of food sharing between them as a ‘link’, separately for each food type (Figure 3). Here, we calculated the ‘*indegree*’ and ‘*outdegree*’ for each node representing the number of food sharing behaviour initiated and received by them respectively.

Ethical note

No langurs were harmed during this work. All work reported here was purely observation-based and did not involve direct handling of langurs in any manner, therefore, was in accordance with approved guidelines of animal rights regulations of the Government of India. The research reported in this paper was sanctioned by DST-INSPIRE, Government of India (approval number:

DST/INSPIRE/04/2018/001287, dated 24th July 2018), and was also notified to the Principal Chief Conservator of Forests (PCCF), West Bengal, India.

RESULTS

Food census

Feeding habit of free-ranging langurs greatly varied between locations (Contingency chi square: $\chi^2 = 122.15$, $df = 2$, $p > 0.0001$). Langurs of Dakshineswar largely depended on urban food sources (83%) which were mostly human offered (manuscript in preparation), whereas in Nalpur and Nangi they mostly relied on the natural food sources (84% and 82% respectively) (Figure 1).

Food choice test

We carried out a total of 83 experimental trials in Dakshineswar, of which 74 were successful. The experimental outcomes were perused by ‘Correlation analysis’ and ‘Generalized linear model (GLM)’. Correlation analysis- Rejection (RJ) was seen to be highly correlated to attempt (FA), choice (FC), and ‘delay’. A significant positive correlation ($r = 0.755$, $p < 0.01$) was found between RJ and ‘delay’. On the other hand, high negative correlations with FA and FC ($r = \text{FA: } -0.504$, $\text{FC: } -0.814$; $p < 0.01$) represented inverse relations of the same with these factors. FC was highly and positively correlated to FA ($r = 0.685$, $p < 0.01$), especially towards a few food items like bread and brinjal (bread = 0.786, brinjal = 0.726, cauliflower = 0.594, peanuts = 0.606). On the contrary, ‘delay’ had significant negative effects on FC ($r = -0.76$, $p < 0.01$) (Figure 4).

The GLM confirmed the significant effects of predictor variables like attempt, rejection and delay on the final food choice. Considering the estimates and p-values, while FA (positive) and RJ (negative) showed more significant effects on the FC ($p < 0.01$), ‘delay’ had a lesser impact (negative) ($p < 0.05$) (Table 3). An even distribution of the residuals on either side of ‘0.0 line’ indicated that the model had a good valid fit (ESM 7).

Aggression (AG) had a slight negative influence on both FC and RJ ($-0.29 \leq r \leq 0$ i.e. weak negative) (Figure 4, Table 3). However, the linear model (LM) plot revealed that when AG was not present (left panel, aggression = 0) and ‘delay’ was minimum (red color bands), FC was highest for lower RJ and vice-versa. Right panel showed that the presence of AG increased the ‘delay’ in FC (width of the colour bands represents the ‘increase’) (Figure 6a). Furthermore, a detailed LM plot revealed that with an increase in the FA, probabilities for FC increased, but both RJ and ‘delay’ lowered the FC (Figure 6b).

Principal component analysis (PCA)

Results of PCA showed that most of the variability in the experimental observations could be explained through PC1 (79.20%), and subsequently another 10.60% by PC2 (Table 4). The PCA biplot revealed that the ‘zones’ had no impact on food selection by langurs. The arrows associated with descriptors ‘attempt’ and ‘choice’ remained close to each other, and pointed in the direction of the increasing values of both PC1 and PC2 (the signs of the eigenvectors are also positive for both PC1 and 2, Table 4, Figure 2), thereby confirming their positive effects on the food selection. However, ‘delay’ almost overlapped with the ‘rejection’ and pointed in the direction of the low value of PC1 but high value of PC2 (the signs of the eigenvectors for PC1 is negative and positive for PC2, Table 4, Figure 2), revealing their negative

impact on the food selection. The individual loading of ‘aggression’ was only -0.99 on PC5, therefore considered to have a minimal effect (Table 4).

Multinomial logit model

The multinomial logit model (MLM) provided a higher score for bread (estimate value: -0.075) among others, revealing the probability of approaching bread as the 2nd alternative, followed by cauliflower (estimate value: -0.155), and peanuts (estimate value: -0.368) when brinjal was attempted first. Similarly, the MLM picked up bread, cauliflower, and peanuts, one by one, as the first attempted food item, and checked the probability of approach for the rest. Together with MLM estimate values, odds ratio confirmed the highest approach probabilities for brinjal, followed by bread, cauliflower, and peanuts (Table 1a, 2a, Figure 5a). However, for the choice probabilities, bread scored highest for both the MLM estimates and odds ratio, followed by brinjal, cauliflower, and peanuts (Table 1b, 2b, Figure 5b).

First attempted vs eaten food

Bread and brinjal were chosen as the first attempted food item (scored ‘five’ for FA) for 31% and 32% cases respectively, followed by cauliflower (23%) and peanuts (14%). However, not always the first attempted foods were chosen to be eaten first. Langurs switched their preference between the first attempt to first choice for 29.7% cases, and mostly for bread (Goodness of fit: $\chi^2 = 31.08$, df = 3, $p < 0.0001$) (ESM 6).

Food sharing

Only 18% of the total successful cases were recorded where langurs shared the received food items with their troop members during the experimental trials. However, the shared food items mostly consisted of the least preferred peanuts (53%), and cauliflower (22%) (Goodness of fit: $\chi^2 = 44.72$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.0001$) (ESM 8). Social network analysis revealed that food sharing mostly occurs between adults (Goodness of fit: *Outdegree*: $\chi^2 = 75.35$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.0001$; *Indegree*: $\chi^2 = 40.39$, $df = 3$, $p < 0.0001$) and largely for peanuts, and cauliflower (Figure 3).

DISCUSSION

Folivores colobines have received considerable research attention because of their unique ability to ingest large quantities of foliage (Newton, 1992; Oates 1988; Struhsaker & Oates, 1975). Their multipartite stomachs are lined with mucus-secreting glands which facilitate the fermentation of leafy diet in the presence of cellulolytic bacteria (Caton, 1999). However, the dietary composition of free-ranging Hanuman langurs (*Semnopithecus entellus*) seems to be relatively complex. They often use a diverse array of plant parts including leaves, stalks, shoots, buds, flowers, and fruit to utilize the available resources at its best (Yoshida, 1967; Vandercone et al., 2012). Besides, Srivastava and Winkler added insectivory and human-provisioning to the Hanuman langurs' feeding repertoire (Srivastava, 1989,1991; Winkler 1988). However, these feeding habits were mostly seasonal and plant parts still accounted for a significant portion of their regular diet (Koenig & Borries, 2001) similar to the langur group of Nungi, and Nalpur.

372 Surprisingly, the langur troop of Dakhineswar, West Bengal, India, was spotted to thrive largely (83% of
373 the total diet) on the ‘urban’ food sources for their sustenance within human settlements, throughout the
374 year. Similar to other free-ranging scavengers like dogs, jackals, monkeys, (Butler & du Toit, 2002; Paul
375 et al., 2016; Sanyal et al., 2010) this langur troop was observed to rely upon human generosity and food
376 provisioning, seeking easy access to the ‘urban’ food sources (Dasgupta et al., manuscript in
377 preparation). However, unlike these carnivorous, and omnivorous scavengers, langur’s stomach
378 physiology looks alike to that of herbivores such as Macropodidae (Caton, 1999). Therefore, human-
379 provisioned ‘urban’ food sources could have an inevitable health impact, followed by potential
380 behavioural alteration in these urban-adapted free-ranging langurs.

381
382 Our field-based observational data reflected the highest degree of human interference in Dakhineswar
383 where langurs frequently approached humans to acquire ‘urban’ food sources, in contrast to the langurs
384 of Nangi, and Nalpur where they opted for foraging and scavenging and depended mostly on ‘natural’
385 food sources. Therefore, high human-langur interactions could be considered as an intriguing driving
386 force behind langurs’ altered feeding habits in Dakhineswar. Moreover, the scarcity of plants and crop
387 fields within the urban settlement like Dakhineswar might be another reason behind langurs’ consistent
388 dependence on the ‘urban’ food options. In this context, the choice-based field experiment allowed us to
389 understand whether it was the scarcity of the ‘natural food’ sources or the easy accessibility of the
390 ‘urban food’ sources that lured them to get accustomed to the urban ecosystem.

391
392 The experimental set up allowed langurs to choose between natural and urban food sources, keeping
393 aside the factors like scantiness, and human influences. Langurs chose brinjal, and bread consistently

394 either as the first or second food options, in all the three zones of Dakhineswar, reflecting their feeding
395 preferences within urban settlements. The outcomes of the experiments manifested the ‘attempt’ to be a
396 significant precursor to the food selection. Moreover, its close association to the descriptor, ‘food
397 choice’, for the increasing values of both principal components 1 and 2 in the PCA confirmed the
398 significance of langur’s approach towards a particular food item. Therefore, it can be interpreted that the
399 food had to be approached first prior to the final selection, allowing langurs for choice-based decision-
400 making. However, the effects of ‘rejection’ and ‘delay’ were also substantial, and the final food
401 selection by the langurs seemed to be non-random but a consequence of all the above three factors. A
402 significant positive correlation between ‘rejection’ and ‘delay’ revealed that more delays in food
403 selection might lead to the ultimate rejection of that particular food item. A greater rate of rejection
404 negatively facilitated the final choice, whereas swifter attempts towards food led to less rejection.
405 Therefore, when an increased ‘attempt’ escalated the probabilities for the final food selection, ‘delay’
406 gave rise to a dilemma between ‘food choice’ and ‘rejection’ which finally lowered the chances of
407 selection for a given food item. ‘Aggression’ also had some negative effects on both ‘choice’ and
408 ‘rejection’. Although it increased the ‘delay’ in final food selection, langurs used aggression to possess
409 their chosen food items without being forced to share it with other troop members. Hence, our
410 experiments revealed an active preference-based food selection by langurs within an urban settlement
411 like Dakhineswar, driven neither by human interference, nor the scantiness of natural food options but
412 by a keen interest towards specific food items. The multinomial logit model contemplated all of these
413 factors for the final food selection by the langurs and revealed brinjal and bread to be the most attempted
414 and first approached food items, followed by cauliflower and peanuts. However, bread outperformed
415 brinjal as the most chosen food item for which langurs often switched their first approached food to the
416 final selection, indicating their inclination to the urban food option.

417

418 In the case of food-provisioning where humans provide a food item of their choice to the animals, the
 419 animals have no scope to choose but to receive the offered food items. In our experimental set-up
 420 langurs had the liberty to choose from a platter of offered food items, without any human interference,
 421 and the underlying assumption was that the outcome of the experiment would be influenced only by
 422 their preference, if any. Our findings suggested that these langurs engaged with the items that were
 423 offered in the food-tray and chose bread and brinjal solely based on their feeding preference. Moreover,
 424 the social network analysis revealed that the adult langurs occasionally had the privilege to receive a
 425 food share from the focal langur, which rarely comprised of bread or brinjal, in contrast to the juveniles
 426 and subadults who hardly managed to get access to it, thereby showing their fondness for it.

427

428 *Conclusions*

429 Although the impact of such ‘urban’ food sources on Hanuman langurs’ physiology is still debatable
 430 (Geffroy et al., 2017; Maréchal et al., 2016), it can be interpreted that these free-ranging Hanuman
 431 langurs of Dakhineswar not only learned to approach human-provisioned ‘urban’ foods but they
 432 acquired preferences for some of it which could facilitate their co-existence within an urban ecosystem.
 433 However, resource provisioning is often being correlated to peoples’ intension to get in touch with the
 434 wildlife, imposing a considerable threat to free-ranging animals’ survival chances (Orams, 2002; Trave
 435 et al., 2017). Yet, such man-animal interaction opens up possibilities for alternative easy access to
 436 resources like food and shelter for these animals who have lost their home due to urban encroachment
 437 (Cox & Gaston, 2018; Lowry et al., 2013; Theobald et al., 1997). Moreover, it has been shown that the
 438 ability to digest carbohydrates provided ancestral dog populations an advantage over wolves, facilitating

the process of domestication, as the dogs could now utilize human-generated resources (Axelsson et al., 2013). Undoubtedly, our experimental results are an example of such urban adaptation where folivorous arboreal Hanuman langurs find their interest in terrestrial urban food items. Therefore, besides their deity value, the free-ranging Hanuman langurs' successful co-existence with humans and their wide distribution throughout the Indian subcontinent could be well-explained by their altered yet opportunistic feeding pattern.

COMPETING INTERESTS

We have no competing financial interests.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

DD and AB equally contributed to this work. DD, RK, DB, SM, SK, ABh, and SG carried out the field work. MP and DD coded the entire data. AB and MP carried out all the statistical analyses. AB prepared the correlation matrix, ran PCA, GLM, and MLM to interpret the data. MP conceptualized the study, got grants to support the work, designed the fieldwork and supervised the work. MP, DD, PB drafted the manuscript. PS prepared the GIS map. PB provided the laboratory support to carry out the analysis. Author AB acknowledges the DSKPD Fellowship of University grants commission (no. BL/17-18/0490). All the authors acknowledge Dr. Anindita Bhadra, Associate Professor, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research- Kolkata, India, for her valuable inputs to the study and gave final approval for publication.

FUNDING

This work was funded by project from Department of Science and Technology, India (DST/INSPIRE/04/2018/001287) and was supported by the Department of Environmental Science, University of Calcutta, Kolkata, India.

REFERENCES

Able, K. P., & Belthoff, J. R. (1998). Rapid “evolution” of migratory behaviour in the introduced house finch of eastern North America. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 265(1410), 2063–2071. DOI: 10.1098/rspb.1998.0541

Altmann, J. (1974). Observational study of behavior: sampling methods. *Behaviour*, 49(3-4), 227-266.

Arbib, M. A., Liebal, K., & Pika, S. (2008). Primate vocalization, gesture, and the evolution of human language. *Current Anthropology*, 49(6), 1053–1076. DOI:10.1086/593015

Ashalakshmi, N. C., Nag, K. S. C., & Karanth, K. P. (2014). Molecules support morphology: species status of South Indian populations of the widely distributed Hanuman langur. *Conservation Genetics*, 16(1), 43–58. DOI:10.1007/s10592-014-0638-4

Axelsson, E., Ratnakumar, A., Arendt, M. L., Maqbool, K., Webster, M. T., Perloski, M., Liberg, O.,

- 480 Arnemo, J. M., Hedhammar, Å., & Lindblad-Toh, K. (2013). The genomic signature of dog
481 domestication reveals adaptation to a starch-rich diet. *Nature*, 495(7441), 360–364.
482 DOI:10.1038/nature11837
483
- 484 Bateman, P. W., & Fleming, P. A. (2012). Big city life: Carnivores in urban environments. *Journal of*
485 *Zoology*, 287(1), 1–23. DOI:10.1111/j.1469-7998.2011.00887.x
- 486 Bauchop, T., & Martucci, R. W. (1968). Ruminant-like digestion of the langur monkey. *Science*,
487 161(3842), 698–699. DOI:10.1126/science.161.3842.698
488
- 489 Binning, S. A., Chapman, L. J., & Cosandey-Godin, A. (2009). Specialized morphology for a generalist
490 diet: Evidence for Liem’s Paradox in a cichlid fish. *Journal of Fish Biology*, 75(7), 1683–1699.
491 DOI:10.1111/j.1095-8649.2009.02421.x
492
- 493 Borries, C. (1993). Ecology of female social relationships: Hanuman langurs (*Presbytis entellus*) and the
494 van Schaik model. *Folia Primatologica*, 61(1), 21-30.
495
- 496 Broom, M., Borries, C., & Koenig, A. (2004). Infanticide and infant defence by males - Modelling the
497 conditions in primate multi-male groups. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*, 231(2), 261–270.
498 DOI:10.1016/j.jtbi.2004.07.001
499

- 500 Bryson-Morrison, N., Matsuzawa, T., & Humle, T. (2016). Chimpanzees in an anthropogenic landscape:
501 Examining food resources across habitat types at Bossou, Guinea, West Africa. *American Journal of*
502 *Primatology*, 78(12), 1237–1249. DOI:10.1002/ajp.22578
- 503
- 504 Bryson-Morrison, N., Tzanopoulos, J., Matsuzawa, T., & Humle, T. (2017). Activity and Habitat Use of
505 Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes verus*) in the Anthropogenic Landscape of Bossou, Guinea, West Africa.
506 *International Journal of Primatology*, 38(2), 282–302. DOI:10.1007/s10764-016-9947-4
- 507 Butler, J. R. A., & du Toit, J. T. (2002). Diet of free-ranging domestic dogs (*Canis familiaris*) in rural
508 Zimbabwe: Implications for wild scavengers on the periphery of wildlife reserves. *Animal Conservation*,
509 5(1), 29–37. DOI:10.1017/S136794300200104X
- 510
- 511 Caton, J. M. (1999). Digestive strategy of the Asian colobine genus *Trachypithecus*. *Primates*, 40(2),
512 311–325. DOI:10.1007/BF02557555
- 513
- 514 Chapman, C. A. (1990). Ecological constraints on group size in three species of neotropical
515 primates. *Folia Primatologica*, 55(1), 1-9.. DOI:10.1159/000156492
- 516
- 517 Chetan, N., Praveen, K. K., & Vasudeva, G. K. (2014). Delineating ecological boundaries of hanuman
518 langur species complex in peninsular India using MaxEnt modeling approach. *PLoS ONE*, 9(2), 1–11.
519 DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0087804
- 520

- 521 Cox, D. T. C., & Gaston, K. J. (2018). Human–nature interactions and the consequences and drivers of
522 provisioning wildlife. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*,
523 373(1745). DOI:10.1098/rstb.2017.0092
- 524
- 525 Croissant, Y. (2020). mlogit: Multinomial Logit Models. R package version 1.1-0. [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mlogit)
526 [project.org/package=mlogit](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mlogit)
- 527 Deshpande, A., Gupta, S., & Sinha, A. (2018). Intentional communication between wild bonnet
528 macaques and humans. *Scientific Reports*, 8(1), 1–12. DOI:10.1038/s41598-018-22928-z
- 529
- 530 Devi, O. S., & Saikia, P. K. (2008). Human-monkey conflict: A case study at Gauhati University
531 Campus, Jalukbari, Kamrup, Assam. *Zoos' Print Journal*, 23(2), 15–18.
- 532
- 533 Erinjery, J. J., Kavana, T. S., & Singh, M. (2017). Behavioural Variability in Macaques and Langurs of
534 the Western Ghats, India. *Folia Primatologica*, 88(3), 293–306. DOI:10.1159/000480010
- 535
- 536 Estes, W. A., & Mannan, R. W. (2003). Feeding behavior of Cooper's Hawks at urban and rural nests in
537 southeastern Arizona. *The Condor*, 105(1), 107-116.
- 538
- 539 Fisher, D. O., & Owens, I. P. F. (2004). *The comparative method in conservation biology*. 19(7).
540 DOI:10.1016/j.tree.2004.05.004

541

542 Fuentes, A. (2012). Ethnoprimatology and the anthropology of the human-primate interface. *Annual*
543 *Review of Anthropology*, 41, 101–117. DOI:10.1146/annurev-anthro-092611-145808

544

545 Ganguly, I., & Chauhan, N. S. (2018). Dietary preference and feeding patterns of the urban Rhesus
546 Macaque *Macaca mulatta* (Mammalia: Primates: Cercopithecidae) in Asola-Bhatti Wildlife Sanctuary in
547 India. *Journal of Threatened Taxa*, 10(15), 12907-12915.

548

549 Geffroy, B., Sadoul, B., & Ellenberg, U. (2017). Ecotourism's Promise and Peril. *Ecotourism's Promise*
550 *and Peril*, 9–27. DOI:10.1007/978-3-319-58331-0

551

552 Goldstein, S. J., & Richard, A. F. (1989). Ecology of rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*) in northwest
553 Pakistan. *International Journal of Primatology*, 10(6), 531–567. DOI:10.1007/BF02739364

554

555 Gosselink, T. E., Van Deelen, T. R., Warner, R. E., & Mankin, P. C. (2007). Survival and cause-specific
556 mortality of red foxes in agricultural and urban areas of Illinois. *The Journal of Wildlife*
557 *Management*, 71(6), 1862-1873. DOI:10.2193/2006-020

558

559 Grinder, M., & Krausman, P. R. (2001). Morbidity - Mortality factors and survival of an urban coyote
560 population in Arizona. *Journal of Wildlife Diseases*, 37(2), 312–317. DOI:10.7589/0090-3558-37.2.312

561

562 He, C., Liu, Z., Tian, J., & Ma, Q. (2014). Urban expansion dynamics and natural habitat loss in China:
563 A multiscale landscape perspective. *Global Change Biology*, 20(9), 2886–2902. DOI:10.1111/gcb.12553

564

565 Higginbottom, K., & Scott, N. (2008). Strategic planning of wildlife tourism in Australia. *Journal of*
566 *Ecotourism*, 7(2-3), 102-115.

567 Hoffman, T. S., & O’Riain, M. J. (2012). Landscape requirements of a primate population in a human-
568 dominated environment. *Frontiers in Zoology*, 9, 1–17. DOI:10.1186/1742-9994-9-1

569

570 Hrdy, S. B. (1974). Male-male competition and infanticide among the langurs (*Presbytis entellus*) of
571 Abu, Rajasthan. *Folia primatologica*, 22(1), 19-58.

572

573 Kale, M., Dudhe, N., Kasambe, R., Chakane, S., & Bhattacharya, P. (2012). Impact of urbanization on
574 avian population and its status in Maharashtra state, India. *International Journal of Applied*
575 *Environmental Sciences*, 7(1), 59–76.

576

577 Karanth, K. K., Nichols, J. D., & Hines, J. E. (2010). Occurrence and distribution of Indian primates.
578 *Biological Conservation*, 143(12), 2891–2899. DOI:10.1016/j.biocon.2010.02.011

579

580 Kettlewell, H. B. D. (1961). The Phenomenon of Industrial Melanism in Lepidoptera. *Annual Review of*

581 *Entomology*, 6(1), 245–262. DOI:10.1146/annurev.en.06.010161.001333

582

583 Khanal, L., Chalise, M. K., Wan, T., & Jiang, X. (2018). Riverine barrier effects on population genetic
584 structure of the Hanuman langur (*Semnopithecus entellus*) in the Nepal Himalaya. *BMC Evolutionary*
585 *Biology*, 18(1), 1–16. DOI:10.1186/s12862-018-1280-4

586

587 Koenig, A., & Borries, C. (2001). Socioecology of Hanuman langurs: The story of their success.
588 *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 10(4), 122–137. DOI:10.1002/evan.1026

589

590 Kumara, H. N., & Singh, M. (2004). Distribution and abundance of primates in rain forests of the
591 Western Ghats, Karnataka, India and the conservation of *Macaca silenus*. *International Journal of*
592 *Primates*, 25(5), 1001–1018. DOI:10.1023/B:IJOP.0000043348.06255.7f

593

594 Kumara, Honnavalli N., Kumar, S., & Singh, M. (2010). Of how much concern are the “least concern”
595 species? Distribution and conservation status of bonnet macaques, rhesus macaques and Hanuman
596 langurs in Karnataka, India. *Primates*, 51(1), 37–42. DOI:10.1007/s10329-009-0168-8

597

598 Kumara, H.N., Kumar, A. & Singh, M. 2020. *Semnopithecus entellus*. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species
599 2020: e.T39832A17942050. DOI:10.2305/IUCN.UK.2020- 2.RLTS.T39832A17942050.en

600

- 601 Laska, M. (2001). A comparison of food preferences and nutrient composition in captive squirrel
602 monkeys, *Saimiri sciureus*, and pigtail macaques, *Macaca nemestrina*. *Physiology and Behavior*, 73(1–
603 2), 111–120. DOI:10.1016/S0031-9384(01)00439-5
- 604
- 605 Liem, K. F. (1980). Adaptive significance of intra- and interspecific differences in the feeding
606 repertoires of cichlid fishes. *Integrative and Comparative Biology*, 20(1), 295–314.
607 DOI:10.1093/icb/20.1.295
- 608 Lowry, H., Lill, A., & Wong, B. B. M. (2013). Behavioural responses of wildlife to urban environments.
609 *Biological Reviews*, 88(3), 537–549. DOI:10.1111/brv.12012
- 610
- 611 Maréchal, L., Semple, S., Majolo, B., & MacLarnon, A. (2016). Assessing the effects of tourist
612 provisioning on the health of wild Barbary macaques in Morocco. *PLoS ONE*, 11(5), 1–19.
613 DOI:10.1371/journal.pone.0155920
- 614
- 615 Martinuzzi, S., Withey, J. C., Pidgeon, A. M., Plantinga, A. J., McKerrow, A. J., Williams, S. G.,
616 Helmers, D. P., & Radeloff, V. C. (2015). Future land-use scenarios and the loss of wildlife habitats in
617 the southeastern United States. *Ecological Applications*, 25(1), 160–171. DOI:10.1890/13-2078.1
- 618
- 619 McDonald, R. I., Kareiva, P., & Forman, R. T. T. (2008). The implications of current and future
620 urbanization for global protected areas and biodiversity conservation. *Biological Conservation*, 141(6),
621 1695–1703. DOI:10.1016/j.biocon.2008.04.025

622

623 Messmer, T. A. (2000). The emergence of human–wildlife conflict management: turning challenges into
624 opportunities. *International Biodeterioration & Biodegradation*, 45(3-4), 97-102.

625

626 Molur, S., Brandon-Jones, D., Dittus, W., Eudey, A. A., Kumar, A., Singh, M., ... & Walker, S. (2003).
627 Status of South Asian Primates. *CBSG, South Asia. IUCN/SSC Primate Specialist Group*.

628 Murray, M. H., & St. Clair, C. C. (2015). Individual flexibility in nocturnal activity reduces risk of road
629 mortality for an urban carnivore. *Behavioral Ecology*, 26(6), 1520–1527. DOI:10.1093/beheco/arv102

630

631 Newton, P. (1992). Feeding and ranging patterns of forest hanuman langurs (*Presbytis entellus*).
632 *International Journal of Primatology*, 13(3), 245–285. DOI:10.1007/BF02547816

633

634 Newton, P. N. (1988). The variable social organization of hanuman langurs (*Presbytis entellus*),
635 infanticide, and the monopolization of females. *International Journal of Primatology*, 9(1), 59–77.
636 DOI:10.1007/BF02740198

637

638 Oates, J. F. (1988). The diet of the olive colobus monkey, *Procolobus verus*, in Sierra
639 Leone. *International journal of primatology*, 9(5), 457-478.

640

641 Omondi, S. A. (2004). *The role of civil society in conflict management: a case study of the Catholic*

642 *Church in the 1994 Rwanda genocide* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Nairobi).

643

644 ONU. (2018). World Urbanization Prospects. In *Demographic Research* (Vol. 12).

645 DOI:10.4054/demres.2005.12.9

646

647 Oppenheimer, J. R. (1977). Forest structure and its relation to activity of the capuchin monkey

648 (*Cebus*). *Use of Non-human Primates in Biomedical Research*, 74-84.

649

650 Orams, M. B. (2002). Feeding wildlife as a tourism attraction: A review of issues and impacts. *Tourism*

651 *Management*, 23(3), 281–293. DOI:10.1016/S0261-5177(01)00080-2

652

653 Paul, M., Sen Majumder, S., Sau, S., Nandi, A. K., & Bhadra, A. (2016). High early life mortality in

654 free-ranging dogs is largely influenced by humans. *Scientific Reports*, 6(January), 1–8.

655 DOI:10.1038/srep19641

656

657 Rajpurohit, L., Chhangani, A., & Mohnot, S. (2006). Population dynamics of Hanuman langur,

658 *Semnopithecus entellus* around Jodhpur (India) during 1995-2000 . *Proc Nat Sci India*, 76((B) II), 141–

659 147.

660

661 Rajpurohit, L. S., Chhangani, A. K., Rajpurohit, R. S., & Mohnot, S. M. (2003). Observation of a

- 662 sudden resident-male replacement in a unimale bisexual troop of Hanuman langurs, *Semnopithecus*
663 *entellus*, around Jodhpur (India). *Folia Primatologica*, 74(2), 85–87. DOI:10.1159/000070002
- 664
- 665 Robinson, B. W., & Wilson, D. S. (1998). Optimal foraging, specialization, and a solution to Liem's
666 paradox. *American Naturalist*, 151(3), 223–235. <https://doi.org/10.1086/286113>
- 667
- 668 Saj, T., Sicotte, P., & Paterson, J. D. (1999). Influence of human food consumption on the time budget
669 of vervets. *International Journal of Primatology*, 20(6), 977–994. DOI:10.1023/a:1020886820759
- 670
- 671 Sanyal, A. K., Dey, J. K., & Kankane, P. L. (2010). *the Jackals of Tollygunge Club , Kolkata.*
672 *III*(April), 37–45.
- 673
- 674 Sayers, K. (2013). On folivory, competition, and intelligence: Generalisms, overgeneralizations, and
675 models of primate evolution. *Primates*, 54(2), 111–124. DOI:10.1007/s10329-012-0335-1
- 676
- 677 Sha, J. C. M., Gumert, M. D., Lee, B. P. Y. H., Jones-Engel, L., Chan, S., & Fuentes, A. (2009).
678 Macaque-Human interactions and the societal perceptions of macaques in Singapore. *American Journal*
679 *of Primatology*, 71(10), 825–839. DOI:10.1002/ajp.20710
- 680
- 681 Sha, J. C. M., & Hanya, G. (2013). Diet, Activity, Habitat Use, and Ranging of Two Neighboring

- 682 Groups of Food-Enhanced Long-Tailed Macaques (*Macaca fascicularis*). *American Journal of*
683 *Primatology*, 75(6), 581–592. DOI:10.1002/ajp.22137
- 684
- 685 Sharma, G., Ram, C., & Rajpurohit, L. S. (2010). A case study of infanticide after resident male
686 replacement in *Semnopithecus entellus* around Jodhpur (India). *Proceedings of the Zoological Society*,
687 63(2), 93–98. DOI:10.1007/s12595-010-0013-5
- 688 Sharma, G., Ram, C., & Rajpurohit, L. S. (2011). Study of man-monkey conflict and its management in
689 Jodhpur, Rajasthan (India). *Journal of Evolutionary Biology Research*, 3(1), 1–3.
690 <http://www.academicjournals.org/jebr>
- 691
- 692 Singh, M., & Raghunatha Rao, N. (2004). Population dynamics and conservation of commensal bonnet
693 macaques. *International Journal of Primatology*, 25(4), 847–
694 859. DOI:10.1023/B:IJOP.00000029125.54747.ee
- 695
- 696 Sinha, A. (2005). Not in their genes: Phenotypic flexibility, behavioural traditions and cultural evolution
697 in wild bonnet macaques. *Journal of Biosciences*, 30(1), 51–64. DOI:10.1007/BF02705150
- 698
- 699 Slabbekoorn, H., & Peet, M. (2003). Birds sing at a higher pitch in urban noise. *Nature*, 424(6946), 267.
700 DOI:10.1038/424267a
- 701

- 702 Srivastava, A. (1989). Feeding ecology and behaviour of Hanuman langur, *Presbytis entellus*. *PhD*
703 *Thesis*.
- 704
- 705 Srivastava, A. (1991). Insectivory and its significance to langur diets. *Primates*, 32(2), 237–241.
706 DOI:10.1007/BF02381181
- 707
- 708 Sterck, E. H. M. (1999). Variation in langur social organization in relation to the socioecological model,
709 human habitat alteration, and phylogenetic constraints. *Primates*, 40(1), 199–213.
710 DOI:10.1007/BF02557711
- 711
- 712 Struhsaker, T. T., & Oates, J. F. (1975). Comparison of the behavior and ecology of red colobus and
713 black-and-white colobus monkeys in Uganda: a summary. *Socio-ecology and psychology of primates*.
714 *Mouton, The Hague*, 103-123.
- 715
- 716 Swedell, L., Saunders, J., Schreier, A., Davis, B., Tesfaye, T., & Pines, M. (2011). Female “dispersal” in
717 hamadryas baboons: Transfer among social units in a multilevel society. *American Journal of Physical*
718 *Anthropology*, 145(3), 360–370. DOI:10.1002/ajpa.21504
- 719
- 720 Thabethe, V., & Downs, C. T. (2018). Citizen science reveals widespread supplementary feeding of
721 African woolly-necked storks in suburban areas of KwaZulu-Natal, South Africa. *Urban Ecosystems*,
722 21(5), 965–973. DOI:10.1007/s11252-018-0774-6

723

724 Thatcher, H. R., Downs, C. T., & Koyama, N. F. (2019). Anthropogenic influences on the time budgets
725 of urban vervet monkeys. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 181(September 2018), 38–44.
726 DOI:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2018.09.014

727

728 Theobald, D. M., Miller, J. R., & Hobbs, N. T. (1997). Estimating the cumulative effects of development
729 on wildlife habitat. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, 39(1), 25–36. DOI:10.1016/S0169-2046(97)00041-
730 8

731 Trave, C., Brunnschweiler, J., Sheaves, M., Diedrich, A., & Barnett, A. (2017). Are we killing them with
732 kindness? Evaluation of sustainable marine wildlife tourism. *Biological Conservation*, 209, 211–222.
733 DOI:10.1016/j.biocon.2017.02.020

734

735 Vandercone, R. P., Dinadh, C., Wijethunga, G., Ranawana, K., & Rasmussen, D. T. (2012). Dietary
736 Diversity and Food Selection in Hanuman Langurs (*Semnopithecus entellus*) and Purple-Faced Langurs
737 (*Trachypithecus vetulus*) in the Kaludiyapokuna Forest Reserve in the Dry Zone of Sri Lanka.
738 *International Journal of Primatology*, 33(6), 1382–1405. DOI:10.1007/s10764-012-9629-9

739

740 Vázquez, D. P., & Simberloff, D. (2002). Ecological specialization and susceptibility to disturbance:
741 Conjectures and refutations. *American Naturalist*, 159(6), 606–623. DOI:10.1086/339991

742

743 Van Schaik, C. P. (1989). The ecology of social relationships amongst female primates. *Comparative*

744 *socioecology*, 195-218.

745

746 Vijayan, S., & Pati, B. P. (2002). Impact of changing cropping patterns on man-animal conflicts around
747 Gir protected area with specific reference to Talala sub-district, Gujarat, India. *Population and*
748 *Environment*, 23(6), 541–559. DOI:10.1023/A:1016317819552

749

750 Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A., Lubchenco, J., & Melillo, J. M. (1997). Human domination of Earth's
751 ecosystems. *Science*, 277(5325), 494–499. DOI:10.1126/science.277.5325.494

752

753 Widdows, C. D., Ramesh, T., & Downs, C. T. (2015). Factors affecting the distribution of large spotted
754 genets (*Genetta tigrina*) in an urban environment in South Africa. *Urban Ecosystems*, 18(4), 1401–1413.
755 DOI:10.1007/s11252-015-0449-5

756

757 Winkler, P. (1988). Feeding behavior of a food-enhanced troop of Hanuman langurs (*Presbytis entellus*)
758 in Jodhpur, India. *Ecology and behavior of food enhanced primate groups*, 3-24.

759

760 Woodroffe, R., Thirgood, S., & Rabinowitz, A. (Eds.). (2005). *People and wildlife, conflict or co-*
761 *existence?* (No. 9). Cambridge University Press.

762

763 Yoshiba, K. (1967). An ecological study of Hanuman langurs, *Presbytis entellus*. *Primates*, 8(2), 127–

154. DOI:10.1007/BF01772157

LEGENDS TO FIGURES

Figure 1: Stacked bar diagram showing the feeding habit of free-ranging langurs at three locations, Dakshineswar, Nalpur, and Nangi. Black and grey bars represent the percentage of ‘natural’ and ‘urban’ food items being eaten by the free-ranging langurs.

Figure 2: Biplot representing the distribution of variables in 2D space for the Principal component analysis (PCA) having descriptors like attempt, choice, delay, rejection, and aggression. Circles represent three different zones of Dakshineswar

Figure 3: Food-sharing networks of free-ranging hanuman langurs for various food items like a) bread, b) brinjal, c) cauliflower, and d) peanuts. The solid black circle represents a node, depicting a particular life stage of langurs. The black arrow represents one food-sharing behaviour between two nodes, which originated from the initiator and directed towards the recipient.

Figure 4: The correlogram representing the inter-relation between factors like ‘attempt’ (FA), ‘choice’ (FC), ‘rejection’ (RJ), ‘aggression’ (AG), and ‘delay’. It provides the correlation coefficient values (r) for each combination of factors and separately for each of the four food items along with their level of significance.

785

786 **Figure 5:** Bar diagrams representing the normalized values of MLM estimates separately for a)
787 ‘approach’, and b) ‘choice’ probabilities. The X-axis represents the a) first approached and b) first
788 chosen foods.

789

790 **Figure 6:** Linear model (LM) plot representing the variations in the choice of food for ‘rejection’ and
791 ‘delay’. The width of the colour bands increases with the delay. a) LM plots showing different levels of
792 ‘aggression’ has different effects on food choice. The left panel represents data for ‘zero aggression’,
793 whereas the right panel shows that the ‘presence of aggression’ increases the delay in food choice. b)
794 LM plots showing the effects of ‘attempt’ on food choice, together with ‘delay’ and ‘rejection’. Each
795 panel represents a particular ‘delay’ score. For example, the top left panel is for ‘no delay’ or ‘zero’
796 delay score, and the bottom right is for the ‘maximum delay’ i.e. score five.

797

798 **LEGENDS TO TABLES**

799 **Table 1:** Table representing the estimates, and p-values of the multinomial logit models, set 1 and 2
800 respectively for a) approach, and b) choice probabilities. These two sets represent four sub-models each.
801 Here, we employed a ‘leave one component out’ (LOCO) approach which leaves one food component
802 out at each sub-model step to check the order of selection of the subsequent food item.

803

804 **Table 2:** Table representing the odds ratio separately for a) approach, and b) choice probabilities.

805

Table 3: Table showing the outcomes of the generalised linear model (GLM). ‘Attempt’ shows a positive estimate value for $p < 0.01$, whereas ‘rejection’ and ‘delay’ come up with negative estimate values for $p < 0.01$ and $p < 0.05$ respectively. Though ‘aggression’ has a negative estimate value, it is not significant. Significant codes: 0 ‘***’ 0.001 ‘**’ 0.01 ‘*’ 0.05 ‘.’ 0.1 ‘.’ 1.

Table 4: Tabulated representation for the principal component analysis (PCA). It represents the ‘proportion of variance’ for each principal component (PC), followed by a ‘cumulative proportion’. It also displays the individual loading for each descriptor like ‘attempt’, ‘choice’, ‘delay’, ‘rejection’, and ‘aggression’.

826

827

828 **Figure 1**

829

830

831

832

833

834

Figure 2

843

844

845 **Figure 3**

846

847

848

849

850

851 **Figure 4**

852 **Figure 5**

870 **Figure 6**

897 **Table 1.**

a)	Coefficients	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	p value
Bread is approached first	Attempt: Brinjal	0.075	0.129	0.580	0.562
	Attempt: Cauliflower	-0.080	0.126	-0.631	0.528
	Attempt: Peanuts	-0.293	0.126	-2.322	0.020 *
Brinjal is approached first	Attempt: Bread	-0.075	0.129	-0.580	0.562
	Attempt: Cauliflower	-0.155	0.128	-1.206	0.228
	Attempt: Peanuts	-0.367	0.128	-2.868	0.004 **
Cauliflower is approached first	Attempt: Bread	0.080	0.126	0.631	0.528
	Attempt: Brinjal	0.155	0.128	1.206	0.228
	Attempt: Peanuts	-0.213	0.124	-1.713	0.087 .
Peanuts is approached first	Attempt: Bread	0.293	0.126	2.322	0.020 *
	Attempt: Brinjal	0.368	0.128	2.868	0.004 **
	Attempt: Cauliflower	0.213	0.124	1.713	0.087 .
b)	Coefficients	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	p value
Bread is chosen first	Choice: Brinjal	-0.045	0.114	-0.399	0.690
	Choice: Cauliflower	-0.309	0.113	-2.747	0.006 **
	Choice: Peanuts	-0.374	0.113	-3.301	0.001 ***
Brinjal is chosen first	Choice: Bread	0.045	0.114	0.399	0.690
	Choice: Cauliflower	-0.264	0.111	-2.371	0.018 *
	Choice: Peanuts	-0.328	0.112	-2.935	0.003 **
Cauliflower is chosen first	Choice: Bread	0.309	0.113	2.747	0.006 **
	Choice: Brinjal	0.264	0.111	2.371	0.018 *
	Choice: Peanuts	-0.065	0.109	-0.596	0.551
Peanuts is chosen first	Choice: Bread	0.374	0.113	3.301	0.001 ***
	Choice: Brinjal	0.328	0.112	2.935	0.003 **
	Choice: Cauliflower	0.065	0.109	0.596	0.551

898

899

Table 2

a) Approach probabilities			Odds ratio
Bread is approached first	Attempt: Brinjal		1.078
	Attempt: Cauliflower		0.923
	Attempt: Peanuts		0.746
Brinjal is approached first	Attempt: Bread		0.928
	Attempt: Cauliflower		0.857
	Attempt: Peanuts		0.692
Cauliflower is approached first	Attempt: Bread		1.083
	Attempt: Brinjal		1.167
	Attempt: Peanuts		0.808
Peanuts is approached first	Attempt: Bread		1.340
	Attempt: Brinjal		1.445
	Attempt: Cauliflower		1.238
b) Choice probabilities			Odds ratio
Bread is chosen first	Choice: Brinjal		0.956
	Choice: Cauliflower		0.734
	Choice: Peanuts		0.688
Brinjal is chosen first	Choice: Bread		1.047
	Choice: Cauliflower		0.768
	Choice: Peanuts		0.720
Cauliflower is chosen first	Choice: Bread		1.362
	Choice: Brinjal		1.302
	Choice: Peanuts		0.937
Peanuts is chosen first	Choice: Bread		1.453
	Choice: Brinjal		1.389
	Choice: Cauliflower		1.067

928

929 **Table 3.**

	Estimate	Std. Error	z value	p value
Attempt	0.152	0.031	4.950	7.43e-07 ***
Rejection	-0.171	0.028	-6.102	1.05e-09 ***
Delay	-0.067	0.030	-2.252	0.0243 *
Aggression	-0.041	0.158	-0.259	0.7957

930

931

932

933

934

935

936

937

938

939

940

941

942

943

944

945

946

947

948

949

950

951

952

953

954

955 **Table 4.**

	PC1	PC2	PC3	PC4	PC5
Proportion of Variance	0.792	0.106	0.072	0.026	0.004
Cumulative proportion	0.792	0.898	0.970	0.996	1.000
Loadings of eigenvectors:					
Attempt	0.266	0.859		0.437	
Choice	0.444	0.285	0.153	-0.835	
Delay	-0.456	0.298	-0.789	-0.284	
Rejection	-0.724	0.303	0.595	-0.172	
Aggression					-0.999

956

957

958

959

960

961

962

963

964

965

966

967

968

969

970

971

972

973