



HAL
open science

Dental microwear foraging ecology of a large browsing ruminant in Northern Hemisphere: The European moose (*Alces alces*)

Emilie Berlioz, Charlotte Leduc, Emilia Hofman-Kamińska, Olivier Bignon-Lau, Rafal Kowalczyk, Gildas Merceron

► To cite this version:

Emilie Berlioz, Charlotte Leduc, Emilia Hofman-Kamińska, Olivier Bignon-Lau, Rafal Kowalczyk, et al.. Dental microwear foraging ecology of a large browsing ruminant in Northern Hemisphere: The European moose (*Alces alces*). *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology*, 2022, 586, pp.110754. 10.1016/j.palaeo.2021.110754 . hal-03435143

HAL Id: hal-03435143

<https://hal.science/hal-03435143>

Submitted on 30 Nov 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

1 Dental microwear foraging ecology of a large browsing ruminant in
2 Northern Hemisphere: the European moose (*Alces alces*)
3

4 **Authors:** Emilie Berlioz (1,2)*, Charlotte Leduc (3,4), Emilia Hofman-Kamińska (5), Olivier Bignon-Lau
5 (6), Rafał Kowalczyk (5), Gildas Merceron (2)

6

7 1: UMR5608 TRACES, team SMP3C; F-31058 Toulouse cedex 9, France

8 2: UMR7262 PALEVOPRIM ; 86073 Poitiers Cedex 9, France

9 3: INRAP Grand-Est; F-57063 Metz, France

10 4: UMR 8215 Trajectoires; F-92023 Nanterre Cedex, France

11 5: Mammal Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences; 17-230 Białowieża, Poland

12 6: UMR7041 ArScAn, team Ethnologie préhistorique, F-92023 Nanterre Cedex, France

13

14

15 * Corresponding author: Emilie Berlioz (emilie.berlioz@univ-tlse2.fr)

16

17 **Abstract:**

18 Years of studies have already highlighted the complex combination, in moose feeding ecology, of a
19 marked selectivity coupled with a significant dietary adaptability towards changes in the local resource
20 availability. Dental textures resulting from masticatory movements and the properties of ingested food
21 items constitute a link between the animal, its ecology and the environment it occupies. This approach
22 is efficient to decipher subtle variations in diet, at the interspecific but also intra-population scales.
23 In this study, we explore inter and intra population dietary variations among six Northern European
24 moose populations using DMTA. We show that moose feeding ecology spans a continuum between a
25 diet dominated by tender leaves and a diet consisting of lignified tissues. The structure of habitats is
26 the main driver of these dietary differences between populations. The absence of significant variation
27 between males and females or between seasons is interpreted as a reflection of the food selectivity of
28 this deer on a finer scale. The moose has a long common history with humans, constituting at certain
29 times and in certain places the main food resource of these populations, adapting in other contexts
30 and at other times to the repercussions of increasing anthropization and global climate change. We
31 aim here at characterizing the dental microwear texture diversity hidden within the “browsing” dietary
32 category. This work is also intended to be used as a reference for future paleontological or
33 archeological investigations. We believe that it will contribute to a better understanding of
34 the(paleo)ecology of the species and of the variations in its feeding ecology through time.

35

36 **Keywords:** cervid, diet, tooth wear, foraging behavior, European elk

37 1. Introduction

38 After the Last Glacial Maximum (26.5-19 cal kyr B.P.; Peltier and Fairbanks, 2006; Clark et al.,
39 2009), the moose (*Alces alces*) expanded across Europe until it occupied most of the continent
40 (Schmölcke and Zachos, 2005; Niedziałkowska et al., 2014). *A. alces* is reported in numerous
41 archeological sites in and outside Europe (see for example: Bridault, 1992; Leduc, 2012; Hofman-
42 Kamińska et al., 2019). The decline of European moose populations started in Europe at the beginning
43 of the Holocene after the Preboreal chronozone (11.5-10 cal kyr B.P. ; Schmölcke and Zachos, 2005).
44 Several causes are put forward (Hundertmark et al., 2002; Schmölcke and Zachos, 2005;
45 Niedziałkowska et al., 2014; Crees et al., 2016; Hofman-Kamińska et al., 2018; 2019), among which
46 habitat changes and human pressure may have played a crucial role (Cardillo et al., 2005). More
47 recently, *Alces alces* has gradually had to face the double challenge imposed by the increasing
48 anthropization of its home range and the recent global climate change (Apollonio et al., 2017; Jones et
49 al., 2019; Linnell et al., 2020).

50 Temperate and boreal biomes provide favorable environments for the present-day European
51 moose, which has affinities for habitats with cold seasonal climates (Garel, 2005). This cervid occupies
52 in Europe a large range of forested habitats as well as tundra and marshlands (Gębczyńska and
53 Raczyński, 1989; Homolka, 1998; Jędrzejewska and Jędrzejewski, 1998; Henttonen et al., 2011). Among
54 herbivores, while grazers mainly consume herbaceous monocotyledons, growing close to the ground
55 (60 to 100% of the diet; Gagnon and Chew, 2000), browsers, including moose, prefer dicotyledonous
56 plants (trees or forbs; more than 70% of their diet according to Gagnon and Chew, 2000). If moose is
57 generally described as a selective browser (Hofmann, 1989), the availability of vegetal resources in the
58 habitat is known to influence the feeding behavior of the species (Franzmann, 1981; Garel, 2005;
59 Shipley, 2010; Wam and Hjeljord, 2010). Very typical for moose are seasonal migrations and changes
60 of habitat used (Andersen, 1991; Ball et al., 2001; Singh et al., 2012; Borowik et al., 2020). In summer,
61 *A. alces* prefers habitats in close proximity to water, where it often feeds on aquatic plants (Goss, 1983;
62 Henttonen et al., 2011; Kuijper et al., 2016).

63 An important proportion of the diet of the European moose is composed of ligneous material
64 (Morow, 1976; Shipley et al., 1998; Garel, 2005; Spitzer et al., 2020). Browse, including lignified plants,
65 contain larger amounts of proteins and pectins compared to graze. While fibers are abundant and rich
66 in cellulose in graze, the smaller amount of fibers in browse can be strongly lignified, which reduces
67 their digestibility. Secondary compounds are also especially present in browse. They are deterrent for
68 most species and require special adaptations to limit their negative effects (Hagerman and Robbins,
69 1993; Clauss et al., 2008).

70 Dental microwear texture analysis (DMTA) is the analysis of tooth wear that results from a
71 combination of masticatory movements, physical properties and inner composition of masticated food
72 items (with a nutritional value, ingested intentionally or accidentally: i. e. insects) that make-up the diet,
73 as well as the accidental ingestion of soil and mineral particles (dust; Ungar, 2015; Calandra and
74 Merceron, 2016; DeSantis, 2016). By combining dental microwear texture analysis with controlled-
75 food trials simulating natural conditions, Merceron et al. (2016b) have moved forward the long-
76 standing debate regarding the relative influence of diet (dietary signal) and soil and mineral particles
77 (environmental signal) on dental microwear (see Appendix S2 in Calandra and Merceron, 2016 for a
78 review). These authors showed that while dust contributes to the formation of dental microwear, diet
79 is the primary cause. More recently, Schulz-Kornas et al. (2020) confirmed the important role of diet
80 but emphasized the multifactorial nature of dental microwear textures.

81 Dental microwear textures mirror what an animal has ingested during the last few days or
82 weeks of its life (Teaford and Glander, 1991; Merceron et al., 2010; Winkler et al., 2020). The diet of
83 herbivores constitutes a window over the vegetal structure of the habitat. The correspondence
84 between resource availability, diet and vegetal structure is more accurate when considering a non-
85 selective herbivore, such as red deer (*Cervus elaphus*, Gebert and Verheyden-Tixier, 2001).
86 Consequently, paleontologists have promoted this method to fulfill their need of a proxy for
87 paleoecological and paleoenvironmental reconstructions. However, this approach is also a

88 discriminant tool for revealing subtle differences in the diet not only for extinct but also for extant
89 species, at interspecific to intra-populational scales (Teaford and Oyen, 1989; Teaford and Robinson,
90 1989; Teaford and Glander, 1991; Merceron et al., 2010; Scott, 2012; Calandra et al., 2016a; Berlioz et
91 al., 2017; Bignon-Lau et al., 2017; Percher et al., 2018; Merceron et al., 2020). Recent studies including
92 experimental data have shown that dental microwear textures may significantly vary within each
93 dietary category (namely obligate grazer, variable grazer, browser-grazer intermediate, browser,
94 generalist and frugivore; Gagnon and Chew, 2000) depending on the maturity stage and water content
95 of grasses (Francisco et al., 2018; Winkler et al., 2019), or on the fruit/seed abundances and the nature
96 of the browsing diet (Ramdarshan et al., 2016; Merceron et al., 2018; Louail et al., 2021).

97 Our study is the first to explore the versatility of moose diet through dental microwear texture
98 analyses. In this study, we have a twofold objective: (1) Methodological: to go further into the
99 characterization of the dental microwear texture diversity hidden within the wide spectrum of the
100 browse diet. To achieve this objective, moose is a species of choice as its feeding preferences, surveyed
101 for decades, attest that it consumes only few herbaceous monocots and dicots (Shiple, 2010 and
102 references therein). (2) (Paleo)ecological: we aimed at exploring and documenting the feeding
103 behavior of extant moose populations with well-known habitats and ecology, using an approach
104 applicable to both present-day and fossil moose populations. In future investigations, this key-
105 reference could allow us to place into perspective past, present and future variations in the feeding
106 ecology of moose.

107 To this end, we explored inter- and intra-population variations in diet among six populations
108 of European *Alces alces* from northern Europe sampled in different habitats. Bearing in mind that
109 moose feeding ecology is a combination of selectivity and adaptability (Franzmann, 1981; Hofmann,
110 1989; Garel, 2005; Shipley, 2010; Wam and Hjeljord, 2010), we expected dental microwear texture
111 analysis to reveal inter-population dietary variations resulting from differences in resource availability
112 between contrasted habitats. We also expected seasonal (Biebrza populations) and sexual (Gausdal

113 and Målselv populations) intra-population variations in diet. For the Biebrza population, for which this
114 hypothesis could be tested, we also expected dietary variations resulting from seasonal changes of the
115 vegetal phenology and seasonal migrations.

116 **2. Material and Methods**

117 **2.1. Moose specimens studied**

118 A total of 193 individuals, belonging to six European populations of interest of *Alces alces*, were
119 included in the present study (Table S1, Figure 1). The specimens come from the Białowieża Primeval
120 Forest (n=10), from the region of Polesie (n=9) and Biebrza Marshes (n=43) in eastern Poland, the
121 region of Gausdal (n=62) and Målselv (n=59) in Norway and from the region of Småland (n=10) in
122 Sweden. The Polish samples are stored at the Zoological collection of the Mammal Research Institute,
123 Polish Academy of Sciences in Białowieża, Poland; the ones from Norway at the PALEVOPRIM lab,
124 University of Poitiers, France and the Swedish specimens at the University of Copenhagen Zoological
125 Museum, Denmark.

126 For most specimens, sex and date of death were provided (Table S1). The majority of the
127 individuals were adults, culled in the framework of cynegetic regulation or found dead. Most moose
128 from the study areas of Białowieża, Gausdal, Målselv and Småland were sampled between September
129 and November while the Polish specimens from Biebrza marshes were culled in summer and fall. No
130 date of death has been recorded for Polesie moose but most specimens must have been culled during
131 the hunting season, between September and December.

132 **2.2. Reference populations**

133 Four additional ungulate populations have been used as reference. Three of them are ruminant
134 browsing species with well-described and contrasting diets. *Cephalophus sylvicultor* (n=27) is an
135 African bovid inhabiting forested habitats from Guinea Conakry to Kenya. Fruits and seeds constitute
136 more than 70% of its diet (Estes, 1991). *Giraffa camelopardalis* (n=16) mostly browses on the highest
137 tree foliage (Leuthold and Leuthold, 1978; Estes, 1991; Parker et al., 2003; O'Connor et al., 2015;
138 Merceron et al., 2018). *Capreolus capreolus* (n=18) is a small-bodied European cervid, selectively

139 browsing dicot foliage and the most energetic semi-ligneous plants. Fruits and seeds are fallback foods
140 in fall and winter (Tixier and Duncan, 1996; Tixier et al., 1997; 1998). For the population from the
141 Bauges Natural Regional Park, used here as a reference, fruits represent a small proportion of its diet
142 (Redjadj et al., 2014; see also Merceron et al., 2020 in this volume). A fourth sample of reference of
143 grazing red deer (*Cervus elaphus*; n=19) from southern Spain (Azorit et al., 2012; Berlioz et al., 2017)
144 has been added as an out-group. Grasses are the predominant part of their diet (>50%) almost all year
145 round and constitute more than 90% during some months.

146 2.3. Study areas

147 The Białowieża Primeval Forest, located at the eastern border of Poland with Belarus (635 km²,
148 23°87'E, 52°77'N; Figure 1), constitutes one of the best-preserved lowland forests in Europe
149 (Jędrzejewska et al., 1994; Borowik et al., 2016). The Polish part of the forest covers 63,000 ha. The
150 forest consists of an important tree cover composed of both deciduous tree species and evergreen
151 coniferous trees: *Pinus sylvestris*, *Picea abies*, *Betula pendula*, *Alnus glutinosa*, *Quercus robur* and
152 *Carpinus betulus* being the most abundant tree species (Borowik et al., 2016; Modzelewska et al.,
153 2021). The primeval forest is peculiar in the sense that no less than three deer species (*Cervus elaphus*,
154 *Capreolus capreolus* and *Alces alces*; respectively 6, 2 and 0.08 individuals per km²) occur in sympatry
155 with *Bison bonasus* (0.75 individuals per km²) and *Sus scrofa* (5.4 individuals per km²) (Gębczyńska,
156 1980; Jędrzejewski et al., 2002; Borowik et al., 2013; Merceron et al., 2014; *European Bison Pedigree*
157 *Book*, 2020).

158 Polesie (Poland, 23° 8'E, 51° 26' N, Fig. 1) including Polesie National Park and its buffer zone, is
159 characterized by high spatial heterogeneity of habitats with patches of fen habitats interwoven with
160 typical forest habitats dominated by *Pinus sylvestris*, *Betula* sp. and *Alnus glutinosa* and small water
161 bodies (Borowik et al., 2020). The area is inhabited by four ungulate species: moose, red deer, roe
162 deer, and wild boar. To the best of our knowledge, the relative abundances of ungulates in Polesie are
163 not available.




Figure 1: Geographic range of moose in Europe and localization of the 6 populations of interest. Norway: Målselv, Gausdal; Sweden: Småland; Poland: Biebrza, Białowieża, Polesie. Range data for European moose are illustrated by a red dashed line and were downloaded from <http://www.iucnredlist.org>. Colors represent the ecoregions within *A. alces* range. In the legend, ecozones including populations of interest are in bold. Ecozone data are from Dinerstein et al. (2017).

164

165 The lowland Biebrza river valley (Poland; 22°35'E, 53°26'N, Fig. 1) includes Biebrza National
 166 Park (592 km²; Borowik et al., 2013) and the surrounding forest districts. It is the largest marshland in
 167 Central Europe, covering over 100,000 ha of floodplains, marshes, fens, coniferous and bog forests
 168 (Borowik et al., 2018). Vegetation is distributed along an altitudinal and flooding range. While *Carex*
 169 and *Phragmites australis* (both being herbaceous monocots) constitute the main vegetation close to
 170 rivers and in floodplains, *Betula pubescens*, *Salix cinerea*, *Salix pentandra*, *Alnus glutinosa*, *Frangula*
 171 *alnus* are the most represented tree species in peatlands. *Pinus sylvestris* and *Picea abies* are more
 172 abundant in dryer, more elevated areas (Gębczyńska and Raczyński, 1989; Wassen et al., 2006; Kuijper
 173 et al., 2016). In addition to the dominant ungulate population of moose (1-2 ind./km²), the area is

174 inhabited by a rare but increasing population of *Cervus elaphus* and lower densities of *Capreolus*
175 *capreolus* (Kuijper et al., 2016).

176 The three Polish populations occupy the “Central European mixed forests” ecoregion as
177 defined by Dinerstein et al. (2017; <https://ecoregions2017.appspot.com/>) and are characterized by a
178 continental climate with Atlantic influences and clearly marked seasons (Jędrzejewska and
179 Jędrzejewski, 1998; Borowik et al., 2020).

180 Gausdal (Norway, 40 km², 9° 48'E, 61° 10'N, Fig. 1) is a boreal forest of medium altitude,
181 characterized by a sub-alpine continental climate. *Betula pubescens* is the most represented tree
182 species, while *Picea abies* is only present at lower altitudes. *Alces alces* is the main large mammal of
183 this locality (0.121 ind./km² in 1985-1987; Andersen, 1991; Andersen and Saether, 1992). Gausdal
184 population occupies the “Scandinavian & Russian taiga” ecoregion (Dinerstein et al., 2017).

185 Målselv (Norway), corresponding to the National Park of Øvre Dividalen (750 km², 19° 57' E,
186 68° 44' N; Fig. 1) is a boreal forest under a sub-continental climate, with oceanic influences (Davids et
187 al., 2006). The park is situated along the Swedish border. Open forests and swamps with *Pinus*, *Betula*
188 *nana* and *B. pubescens* are present in valleys under 700 m. Heathers, ferns and mosses constitute the
189 undergrowth. Between 700-1100 m, dwarf birches, ferns and *Epetrium nigrum* are abundant. At
190 higher elevations (1100-1700 m), the vegetation is mainly composed of mountain meadows with
191 grasses and sedges (Karlsson et al., 2005; Davids et al., 2006). In this area, *A. alces* is sympatric with
192 *Rangifer tarandus* (Karlsson et al., 2005; Davids et al., 2006). No information is given regarding the
193 relative densities of these two deer populations at the period of death. Målselv occupies the
194 “Scandinavian Montane birch forest & grasslands” ecoregion (Dinerstein et al., 2017).

195 Moose from Småland were sampled in southern Sweden (14° 40' E, 59° 49' N, Fig. 1) in the
196 Scandinavian taiga (Dinerstein et al., 2017). The density of moose in Småland is unknown. The area is
197 characterized by a boreal forest dominated by scots pine (*Pinus sylvestris*) and Norway spruce (*Picea*

198 *abies*). *Quercus* spp., typical of the bordering “Sarmatic mixed forest” ecoregion, is also abundant in
199 the area.

200 2.4. Dental microwear texture analysis

201 After molding mostly lower second molars (Figure 2A, Table S1) following standard procedures
202 (Merceron et al., 2016b) using high-resolution polyvinylsiloxane, disto-lingual facets of the protoconid
203 were scanned directly on the mold using “TRIDENT”, the white light confocal surface profilometer Leica
204 DCM8, with a 100x objective (working distance: 0.9 mm; numerical aperture: 0.90) at PALEVOPRIM lab
205 (UMR7262, CNRS & University of Poitiers). From a 251 × 333 μm surface (2584 × 1945 point cloud with
206 lateral x and y intervals of 0.129 μm and vertical sampling of 0.001 nm), pre-treatment was done
207 (Figure 2B; see Supplementary Information in Merceron et al., 2016b). A 200x200 μm subsurface was
208 extracted following Merceron et al. (2016b) on which Scale Sensitive Fractal Analyses (SSFA; with SFrax
209 and ToothFrax software, <http://www.surfract.com>) was applied following procedures shown in Scott
210 et al. (2006). We also computed Surface Texture Analysis (STA; with Leica Map v 8.0) parameters
211 following well-established procedures (Schulz et al., 2013a; Kaiser et al., 2016), as the combination of
212 both SSFA and ISO 25178-2 textural parameters allow for a comprehensive representation of the
213 surface textural information (Calandra et al., 2012). All acquired surfaces are visible in the Annexes 1-
214 1 to 1-6 and MNT files are available upon request to the corresponding author.

215 Complexity (Area-scale fractal complexity, hereafter *Asfc*) quantifies surface roughness (Scott
216 et al., 2009; Scott, 2012; DeSantis, 2016). Anisotropy (exact proportion Length-scale anisotropy of the
217 relief; *epLsar*) is used to quantify the preferential orientation of scars, mostly striations, on enamel
218 surfaces (Scott et al., 2006; Scott, 2012; DeSantis, 2016). The heterogeneity of the complexity
219 (Heterogeneity of the Area-scale fractal complexity, *HAsfc 81*, calculated on each surface divided into
220 9x9 sub-surfaces) describes variations of the complexity over a surface (Scott et al., 2006; 2009;
221 DeSantis, 2016). Textural fill volume (*Tfv*) characterizes the depth and width of scar features. The
222 textures of browsers, which consume tougher lignified plants, less rich in abrasive silica and generally
223 more brittle, are characterized by lower anisotropy than grazers, coupled with medium to high




Figure 2: Acquisition of dental textures for Dental Microwear Texture Analysis (DMTA). A: molding of the disto-lingual facet of the protoconid of second lower molars, circled in orange. B: Two contrasted moose dental textures, respectively specimen ZMK-1482 from Småland, Sweden and AA-nn2 from Biebrza marshes, Poland. Texture parameters responsible for significant differences are given in tables below each specimen.

224 complexity (Scott et al., 2005; Scott, 2012; Schulz et al., 2013a; DeSantis, 2016). The complexity of the
 225 heterogeneity, reflecting the diversity of ingested food items, is also higher for browsers (Schulz et al.,
 226 2013a). *Tfv* is high when the scars on dental facets are deep and/or wide (Scott et al., 2006; 2009;
 227 Scott, 2012).

228 For STA we focused on height (*Sa*, *Sp*, *Sq*, *S5v*), surface (*Sha*, *Sda*), feature (*Spd*) and volume
 229 (*Vm*, *Vmc*, *Vvc*) parameters. Schulz et al.(2013b) have shown that the textures of browsers are less

230 anisotropic, with lower volumes and heights, shallower furrows and fewer peaks compared to grazers.
 231 In previous STA studies, these 10 parameters have been identified as they are the most discriminating
 232 (Calandra et al., 2012; Schulz et al., 2013a; 2013b; Kaiser et al., 2016). All parameters are presented in
 233 Table 1. A detailed description of STA parameters is available in Calandra et al. (2012).

234 *Table 1 : Description of the ISO 25178-2 and SSFA parameters included in the study, based on Schulz et al. (2013) and Scott*
 235 *et al. (2006).*

Parameter	Parameter description	Unit
<i>Sa</i>	arithmetic mean of the absolute of the heights	μm
<i>Sp</i>	Maximum peak height	μm
<i>Sq</i>	Standard deviation of the height distribution	μm
<i>S5v</i>	Five point valley height	μm
<i>Sha</i>	close hill area	μm^2
<i>Sda</i>	close dale area	μm^2
<i>Spd</i>	density of peaks	$\text{n}/\mu\text{m}^2$
<i>Vm</i>	material volume at a given material ratio (p=10%)	$\mu\text{m}^3/\mu\text{m}^2$
<i>Vmc</i>	material volume of the core at a given material ratio (p=10%, q=80%)	$\mu\text{m}^3/\mu\text{m}^2$
<i>Vvc</i>	void volume of the core (p=10%, q=80%)	$\mu\text{m}^3/\mu\text{m}^2$
<i>Asfc</i>	Area-scale fractal complexity	
<i>epLsar</i>	exact proportion Length-scale anisotropy of the relief	
<i>HAsfc 81</i>	Heterogeneity of the Area-scale fractal complexity (81 cells)	
<i>Tfv</i>	Textural fill volume	μm^3

236

237 The analyses were performed with R software (R version 4.0.3, The R Foundation for Statistical
 238 Computing; Annex 2). The data exploration was performed following Zuur et al. (2010). Gaussian
 239 Generalized Linear Models (G-GLM) were first performed on the global dataset (6 populations, all
 240 seasons and both sexes) in order to identify if the differences in the vegetal structure in the habitats
 241 of the six moose populations could explain variations in dental microwear textures. At this step, sex
 242 and season were not taken into consideration as this information was not available for all specimens.
 243 Models, for variables that required it, were transformed (Box-Cox, Log, cubic root; this information is
 244 given for each parameter in Annex 3) before analyses to get closer to a gaussian distribution (Zuur et
 245 al., 2010; Smith and Warren, 2019). Transformed variables were tested again in order to check if the
 246 distribution was improved by the transformation. We then specifically focused on each of the two
 247 Norwegian moose populations (Gausdal, n=58; Målselv, n=53), by running a multivariate analysis of

248 variance (manova) followed by analyses of variance (anovas; F-tests) to test whether the sex drives
249 differences in diet among each population at the end of summer (specimens sampled in September-
250 October). Finally, we conducted a manova followed by anovas on Biebrza females (n=24) to explore
251 seasonal variations in diet between summer and fall (specimens sampled in July-August and
252 November-December). For differences between populations, Post-Hoc Tukey's Honestly Significant
253 Difference tests (HSD) were performed on texture parameters responsible for significant differences.
254 Only significant differences supported by HSD were discussed (Table 3, Annex 3). The R script for data
255 exploration and analyses and the raw results from the analyses are respectively available in Annexes 2
256 and 3.

257 Moreover, we also calculated the relative frequency of specimens with highly complex (high
258 complexity: $Asfc > 2.0$) and highly anisotropic (high anisotropy: $epLsar > 5.0 \times 10^{-3}$) microwear within
259 each sample of specimens, following Scott et al. (2012; see also Scott et al., 2012; Merceron et al.,
260 2016a). Although these thresholds were initially determined for primates, within the herbivore
261 ecospace, they are effective in identifying grazers, with highly anisotropic textures and browsers and
262 frugivores, with highly complex textures (Scott, 2012; Berlioz, 2017). They are useful when attempting
263 to identify ungulate populations characterized by homogeneously high anisotropy or complexity. Intra-
264 population homogeneity or heterogeneity of $Asfc$ and $epLsar$ is informative and easily interpreted in
265 terms of availability and choice of ingested food items (Table S2, Figure 3). Moose results were
266 compared to the frequencies of the four samples of reference. SSFA and STA parameters for these four
267 reference populations are given in Table 2. The frequency of specimens with high complexity ($Asfc$
268 > 2.0) and high anisotropy ($epLsar > 5.0 \times 10^{-3}$) highlighted inter-population and inter-specific differences
269 (Figure 3). No more than 5% of *C. elaphus* are characterized by highly complex textures while 90% of
270 the textures of this grazing deer are highly anisotropic. Among browsers, *C. capreolus* is characterized
271 by a high frequency of individuals with high $epLsar$. Among *G. camelopardalis* and *C. sylvicultor*, fewer
272 specimens present a high $epLsar$. The duiker differs from the giraffe in having more specimens with

273 high $Asfc$. The moose samples share a low frequency of individuals with high $epLsar$, far away from the
 274 red and roe deer samples but next to the values met in the giraffes and duikers (Figure 3, Table S2).





Figure 3: Frequency of specimens per population with high complexity ($Asfc > 2.0$) and high anisotropy ($epLsar > 5.00 \times 10^{-3}$). **Poland:** 1: Biebrza, 2: Białowieża, 3: Polesie; **Norway:** 4: Målselv, 5: Gausdal; **Sweden:** 6: Småland. Four samples of extant ungulate species with well-known diet are used as reference: from upper left to lower right: *Cervus elaphus*, *Capreolus capreolus*, *Giraffa camelopardalis* and *Cephalophus sylvicultor*.

275 3. Results

276 The frequencies of moose with highly complex ($Asfc > 2.0$) dental microwear textures varied
 277 from a population to another, with moose from Biebrza marshes having the highest value and
 278 Scandinavian samples, notably Småland, characterized by low frequency of specimens with complex
 279 enamel textures (Table S2, Figure 3).



280

281

282

283

284

285

286

287

288

289

290

291

292

293

Within the herbivore ecospace (explored through the DMTA of African bovids: Scott, 2012; and European cervids: Berlioz, 2017) and in comparison with reference populations (Table 2, Figures 4 and S2), the six moose populations are characterized by low to intermediate values of *epLsar* (Table 2, Figure 4A) low to high *Asfc* (Table 2, Figure 4B) and high *HAsfc* 81 (Table 2, Figure 4D). *Tfv* are intermediate to high (Table 2; Figure 4C). For height ISO parameters (Table 2, Figure 4, Table S1) we obtained a large range of values for *Sa*, *Sp* and *Sq* (respectively Figures 4G, 4H and 4I). The same kind of variation is observed for *S5v* (Figure 4F). Surface parameters *Sha* and *Sda* are generally low (Figure S2-D and S2-E). The feature ISO parameter *Spd* (Figure 4E) varies between low and intermediate values. Finally, concerning the volume parameters, *Vm* mean values are low (Figure S2-A). *Vmc* and *Vvc* are high for the six populations (respectively Figure S2-A and Figure S2-C).

Inter-population differences based on Gaussian GLM performed on the global dataset followed by manovas, anovas and supported by HSD Post-Hoc tests (Figure 4, see also Annex 3 for AIC and p-values) are presented in Table 3.

294 Through the intra-population anovas, we were not able to identify any significant difference
295 of texture, neither between females from Biebrza culled in July-August and November-December nor
296 between both sexes in September-October among Norwegian populations (p-values >0.05 in all cases).

297 4. Discussion

298 Moose is a selective browser whose nose anatomy limits its access to the herbaceous layer
299 (Shiple, 2010) therefore limiting the ingestion of soil particles close to the ground (Sanson et al.,
300 2007). In addition, moose populations studied in this article occupy relatively humid northern
301 European habitats. Diet has been shown to be one of the main drivers of dental wear (Merceron et al.,
302 2016b; Ramdarshan et al., 2016; Winkler et al., 2019; Ackermans et al., 2020; Schulz-Kornas et al.,
303 2020). These three arguments justify the interpretation of these results in terms of feeding ecology.

304 4.1. *Alces alces*: a browsing diet

305 Differences between *Cervus elaphus*, *Capreolus capreolus*, *Giraffa camelopardalis* and
306 *Cephalophus sylvicultor* in the frequencies of individuals with highly complex and highly anisotropic
307 enamel textures (Figure 3) depict variations in grass, fruit/seed components, tough foliage, and
308 lignified tissues in the diet of these ruminants. Among browsers, due to its small body mass, roe deer
309 targets the most nutritive and digestible foliage from semi-ligneous bushes and forbs avoiding as much
310 as possible lignified foliage (Tixier and Duncan, 1996; Tixier et al., 1997; 1998). Some foliage is tough
311 and therefore requires prevailing shearing forces (forces applied parallel to the planes of contact
312 between upper and lower teeth; Kay and Hiiemae, 1974) to extract cell content (Hua et al., 2015 and
313 references therein), explaining the high *epLsar* for roe deer. The duiker consumes high amount of large
314 and small fruits that require more crushing (forces applied perpendicularly to the upper and lower
315 dental facets during mastication; Kay and Hiiemae, 1974) before and during rumination, explaining the
316 high *Asfc* (Lumpkin and Kranz, 1984; Gagnon and Chew, 2000; Hua et al., 2015). The giraffe ingests
317 large quantities of foliage from the upper parts of trees, incorporating lignified small branches, which
318 require more crushing than shearing to extract cell content (Leuthold and Leuthold, 1978; Estes, 1991;
319 Parker et al., 2003; O'Connor et al., 2015; Merceron et al., 2018). Lignified small branches require less




Figure 4: Barplots representing mean and standard error of mean for textural parameters that are mentioned in the discussion of the article. Parameters are illustrated for the six moose populations. Poland: 1: Biebrza, 2: Białowieża, 3: Polesie; Norway: 4: Målselv, 5: Gausdal; Sweden: 6: Småland. In addition, for Biebrza, females culled in July-August are represented by a black bar while females sampled in November-December are in white. Males and females slaughtered in September-October in Målselv and Gausdal are in grey. Sexes are identified by symbols. On the right side of each barplot, mean and standard error of mean for the four samples of extant ungulate species used as reference are illustrated (from left to right: Giraffa camelopardalis, Cephalophus sylvicultor, Capreolus capreolus, Cervus elaphus).

320 crushing than fruits to be processed, which explains that the giraffe presents lower *Asfc* than the
 321 duiker. The red deer population consuming large amounts of abrasive grasses, requiring substantial
 322 shearing forces, accounts for the particularly high *epLsar* for this grazing population.

323 For all moose populations, frequencies strongly differ from the ones observed for the grazing
 324 red deer reference population. With a low frequency of individuals with highly anisotropic dental
 325 microwear texture (Figure 3), the diet composition of moose appears in general different from that of
 326 the roe deer, suggesting a lower amount of tough foliage requiring mainly shearing action. The
 327 variations of frequencies of individuals with complex surfaces (Figure 3) reflect variations in the
 328 abundance of hard tissues in the diet depending on local food resources and season. Significant

329 variations in *Asfc* indicates a diet richer in hard tissues for Biebrza population than for Scandinavian
 330 populations (Figure 4B).

331 *Table 2: Inter- and intra-population values for DMTA-SSFA and DMTA-STA parameters. m: mean; s: standard error of mean;*
 332 *n= sample size. Populations: 1: Biebrza; 2: Białowieża; 3: Polesie; 4: Målselv; 5: Gausdal; 6: Småland. STA parameters: height*
 333 *parameters: Sa, Sp, Sq, S5v, surface parameters: Sha, Sda, feature parameters: Spd and volume parameters: Vm, Vmc, Vvc.*
 334 *SSFA parameters: Asfc: complexity; ePLsar: anisotropy; HASfc 81: heterogeneity of the complexity (9x9 cells), Tfv: Textural fill*
 335 *volume. Mean and standard error of mean for SSFA and STA parameters are also given for the four reference populations: C.*
 336 *s.: Cephalophus silvicultor, G. c.: Giraffa camelopardalis, C. e.: Cervus elaphus, C. c.: Capreolus capreolus.*

loc	season	sex	n	Sa		Sp		Sq		S5v		Sha		Sda		Spd (10 ⁻³)		Vm		Vmc		Vvc		Asfc		ePLsar (10 ⁻³)		HASfc81		Tfv			
				m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s	m	s
1	all	all	43	0.44	0.04	1.59	0.13	0.69	0.06	3.92	0.34	743.0	130.8	395.8	28.6	0.32	0.06	0.018	0.002	0.41	0.04	0.49	0.05	4.17	0.49	2.15	0.23	1.63	0.16	29179.7	2619.8		
	jul.	all	12	0.39	0.06	1.64	0.23	0.62	0.11	3.45	0.43	793.9	140.5	402.2	46.8	0.46	0.13	0.021	0.004	0.36	0.06	0.46	0.08	3.27	0.43	2.40	0.49	1.53	0.21	28269.3	4649.4		
	aug.	f	11	0.42	0.06	1.70	0.24	0.67	0.10	3.68	0.39	810.6	158.2	396.4	50.9	0.42	0.14	0.022	0.004	0.39	0.06	0.49	0.08	3.55	0.36	2.08	0.41	1.54	0.23	28543.2	5084.3		
		m	1	0.07	/	1.01	/	0.10	/	0.83	/	659.8	/	466.6	/	0.95	/	0.004	/	0.08	/	0.10	/	0.26	/	5.90	/	1.37	/	25256.0	/		
	mar.	all	1	0.33	/	1.52	/	0.46	/	3.06	/	389.3	/	362.7	/	1.50	/	0.018	/	0.34	/	0.45	/	3.28	/	3.02	/	0.62	/	30910.7	/		
	apr.	f	1	0.33	/	1.52	/	0.46	/	3.06	/	389.3	/	362.7	/	1.50	/	0.018	/	0.34	/	0.45	/	3.28	/	3.02	/	0.62	/	30910.7	/		
	nov.	all	18	0.53	0.09	1.73	0.25	0.79	0.12	4.16	0.44	749.3	188.4	443.2	59.2	0.22	0.06	0.020	0.004	0.51	0.09	0.60	0.11	4.57	0.87	2.13	0.40	1.63	0.23	32545.2	4782.1		
	dec.	f	13	0.51	0.09	1.81	0.31	0.76	0.11	4.23	0.57	693.3	232.8	501.2	74.1	0.19	0.07	0.022	0.005	0.47	0.10	0.59	0.13	4.12	0.71	1.93	0.53	1.80	0.30	33436.9	5654.8		
		m	4	0.38	0.13	1.30	0.53	0.57	0.21	3.39	0.37	910.9	623.8	243.9	32.1	0.32	0.14	0.018	0.010	0.36	0.10	0.47	0.17	3.07	0.48	2.38	0.33	1.25	0.27	25604.1	11345.9		
	2	all	all	9	0.24	0.05	1.14	0.16	0.36	0.07	2.25	0.48	539.2	136.5	394.9	75.5	1.07	0.28	0.012	0.002	0.25	0.06	0.32	0.07	2.65	0.77	2.99	0.82	1.20	0.22	33501.1	4876.6	
sep.		all	2	0.15	0.07	0.82	0.39	0.19	0.10	0.73	0.02	282.7	16.7	297.4	66.6	1.86	0.31	0.009	0.006	0.17	0.08	0.22	0.12	0.94	0.68	6.35	2.97	0.91	0.60	46186.3	10372.6		
oct.		f	1	0.22	/	1.21	/	0.29	/	0.75	/	299.4	/	230.8	/	2.18	/	0.015	/	0.24	/	0.34	/	1.62	/	9.32	/	0.31	/	56558.9	/		
		m	1	0.08	/	0.43	/	0.09	/	0.72	/	266.1	/	364.0	/	1.55	/	0.003	/	0.09	/	0.10	/	0.25	/	3.38	/	1.50	/	35813.7	/		
3	all	all	10	0.37	0.05	1.26	0.22	0.55	0.09	2.21	0.24	334.5	137.5	385.7	61.4	0.53	0.15	0.016	0.004	0.36	0.05	0.43	0.08	2.22	0.23	3.88	0.75	1.13	0.34	20344.3	5714.7		
	may	all	1	0.25	/	0.97	/	0.34	/	1.87	/	499.1	/	284.5	/	1.13	/	0.010	/	0.26	/	0.29	/	1.67	/	4.68	/	0.51	/	29951.4	/		
	june	m	1	0.25	/	0.97	/	0.34	/	1.87	/	499.1	/	284.5	/	1.13	/	0.010	/	0.26	/	0.29	/	1.67	/	4.68	/	0.51	/	29951.4	/		
	nov.	all	59	0.35	0.03	1.16	0.11	0.52	0.05	2.24	0.17	790.7	132.1	434.0	41.9	0.50	0.07	0.014	0.002	0.34	0.03	0.39	0.04	1.79	0.16	2.87	0.28	1.25	0.12	24376.5	2096.1		
4	may	all	1	0.37	/	1.36	/	0.51	/	1.30	/	763.3	/	426.6	/	0.65	/	0.014	/	0.38	/	0.49	/	1.36	/	5.03	/	0.45	/	32380.0	/		
	june	f	1	0.37	/	1.36	/	0.51	/	1.30	/	763.3	/	426.6	/	0.65	/	0.014	/	0.38	/	0.49	/	1.36	/	5.03	/	0.45	/	32380.0	/		
	nov.	all	5	0.21	0.03	0.71	0.07	0.30	0.04	1.53	0.18	220.8	70.1	179.8	41.5	0.54	0.13	0.009	0.001	0.21	0.02	0.24	0.02	1.87	0.62	1.76	0.34	1.27	0.52	15370.1	6614.1		
	dec.	f	4	0.19	0.03	0.69	0.09	0.27	0.04	1.41	0.17	185.0	77.8	191.2	51.6	0.54	0.16	0.008	0.002	0.19	0.02	0.23	0.03	1.36	0.45	1.93	0.39	1.40	0.65	17960.2	7856.8		
		m	1	0.28	/	0.78	/	0.42	/	2.02	/	364.2	/	134.5	/	0.53	/	0.009	/	0.27	/	0.28	/	3.93	/	1.08	/	0.76	/	5009.7	/		
	sep.	all	53	0.36	0.04	1.20	0.12	0.54	0.06	2.33	0.19	854.7	146.6	458.1	45.1	0.50	0.07	0.014	0.002	0.35	0.04	0.40	0.04	1.79	0.17	2.94	0.30	1.26	0.13	25075.2	2226.7		
	oct.	f	23	0.32	0.06	1.05	0.14	0.48	0.09	2.33	0.29	677.3	103.9	424.4	74.7	0.35	0.06	0.012	0.002	0.29	0.05	0.32	0.05	1.75	0.25	2.19	0.26	1.30	0.22	24394.0	3397.9		
		m	30	0.40	0.05	1.32	0.18	0.58	0.07	2.32	0.26	984.3	241.3	483.9	56.2	0.61	0.12	0.016	0.003	0.39	0.05	0.46	0.06	1.82	0.23	3.51	0.47	1.23	0.16	25597.5	2994.9		
	5	all	all	62	0.42	0.07	1.48	0.24	0.62	0.10	2.47	0.26	542.3	67.2	431.5	42.9	0.53	0.07	0.018	0.004	0.39	0.06	0.47	0.07	2.25	0.36	3.30	0.30	1.45	0.20	20262.1	2210.2	
		nov.	all	1	0.31	/	1.05	/	0.44	/	2.17	/	656.1	/	242.0	/	0.50	/	0.011	/	0.30	/	0.34	/	1.70	/	1.92	/	0.70	/	6288.7	/	
dec.		f	1	0.31	/	1.05	/	0.44	/	2.17	/	656.1	/	242.0	/	0.50	/	0.011	/	0.30	/	0.34	/	1.70	/	1.92	/	0.70	/	6288.7	/		
all		all	59	0.42	0.07	1.51	0.25	0.64	0.10	2.50	0.27	555.3	70.5	443.1	44.6	0.53	0.07	0.019	0.004	0.40	0.07	0.48	0.08	2.28	0.37	3.36	0.31	1.49	0.21	20604.1	2291.8		
sep.		f	28	0.62	0.14	2.09	0.49	0.92	0.20	3.20	0.52	406.2	58.0	532.7	79.7	0.40	0.07	0.027	0.008	0.57	0.13	0.67	0.15	3.27	0.73	3.00	0.37	1.79	0.36	23368.9	3445.7		
oct.		m	30	0.26	0.02	1.01	0.11	0.39	0.04	1.90	0.19	681.0	118.8	368.9	39.4	0.63	0.12	0.011	0.002	0.25	0.02	0.32	0.03	1.39	0.16	3.76	0.49	1.24	0.24	18710.5	3079.7		
6	all	all	10	0.22	0.03	0.92	0.15	0.32	0.04	1.48	0.19	439.7	84.3	354.6	58.4	0.82	0.14	0.010	0.002	0.22	0.03	0.28	0.04	1.12	0.14	3.03	0.41	0.86	0.14	15592.5	3608.4		
	G. c.		16	0.37	0.04	1.69	0.16	0.51	0.06	2.55	0.20	897.2	112.8	313.9	83.3	1.66	0.13	0.023	0.003	0.38	0.10	0.47	0.07	1.97	0.23	2.17	0.44	0.68	0.12	27251.7	4762.5		
	C. s.		27	0.71	0.08	2.79	0.30	0.93	0.11	3.57	0.38	778.9	194.1	627.4	51.9	1.32	0.21	0.035	0.004	0.78	0.07	0.99	0.11	3.50	0.50	3.04	0.33	0.61	0.04	40349.2	1744.8		
	C. e.		19	0.41	0.07	1.71	0.25	0.54	0.08	2.27	0.26	728.0	88.7	664.0	72.7	0.89	0.16	0.021	0.004	0.45	0.09	0.56	0.09	1.06	0.10	7.26	3.78	0.80	0.08	8183.5	1251.2		
	C. c.		18	0.54	0.08	1.96	0.23	0.73	0.10	3.08	0.39	993.9	458.2	430.8	45.4	0.81	0.34	0.024	0.004	0.58	0.05	0.71	0.09	2.61	0.59	6.05	0.55	0.70	0.05	36152.8	4490.7		

337
 338 These interpretations based on dental microwear analysis are in line with previous studies
 339 based on other proxies exploring the feeding ecology of this cervid that underlined the importance of
 340 ligneous elements in its diet (rumen content analysis: Morow, 1976; measured bites: Shipley, 2010;
 341 feces analysis: Kuijper et al., 2016). *Alces alces* has specific physiological adaptations, including the
 342 ability to produce tannin-binding proteins which counteract the negative effects of tannins (toxicity,
 343 astringency and limiting for digestibility and absorption) of the woody species that make up its

344 preferred diet (Hagerman and Robbins, 1993; Clauss et al., 2008; Moreira et al., 2013; Spitzer et al.,
 345 2020). Among ingested elements are buds, twigs, stems, foliage and berries. Bark and leaf-litter can
 346 also constitute large amounts of moose diet. For instance, bark represents up to 39% of moose spring-
 347 diet before the spring green-up and leaf litter accounts for 55-65% of early winter diet in Central
 348 Alberta (Renecker and Hudson, 1988). The specialized long muscular prehensile nose of moose,
 349 however, prevents it from consuming the herbaceous layer, so grass and forbs never make up a large
 350 part of its diet (Shipley, 2010; Spitzer et al., 2020). However, the amount of grasses and forbs in diet
 351 varies seasonally and from one habitat to another. While many studies report a small amount of
 352 herbaceous monocots (<1.5% sedges, rushes, and grasses; e.g. in Morow, 1976), others populations
 353 may incorporate more of them, especially in summer (up to 25% for one Norwegian population in
 354 Wam and Hjeljord, 2010; 10-17% of sedges, rushes and grasses in Biebrza moose diet in Kuijper et al.,
 355 2016).

356 *Table 3: Significant inter-population differences supported by HSD tests. Populations: 1: Biebrza; 2: Białowieża; 3: Polesie; 4:*
 357 *Målselv; 5: Gausdal; 6: Småland.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1		S5v, Spd		Sp, S5v, Asfc	Sp, Sq, S5v, Asfc	Sa, Sp, Sq, S5v, Asfc, Tfv
2						Tfv
3						
4						
5						
6						

358

359 4.2. Different ways to browse: inter-population variations

360 Shipley (2010) defines the feeding ecology of moose as being “a continuum between the
 361 facultative specialist and the facultative generalist”. In many habitats across Europe, *Alces alces* is
 362 indeed focusing mainly on only one genus of plant, if not one species only. For example, *Salix* spp.
 363 account for 50 to 60 % of the diet in certain regions and seasons, as is the case with Biebrza moose
 364 summer diet (Sæther and Andersen, 1990; Kuijper et al., 2016), and *Pinus sylvestris* represents more
 365 than 60% of moose winter diet in Sweden (Shipley et al., 1998). Browse resource in particular can be

366 based on one species only, as is the case for *Betula pubescens* in the winter diet of Gausdal moose
367 (Sæther and Andersen, 1990). However, moose is also able to broaden or even change the spectrum
368 of foods it consumes whenever this is necessary, following seasonal variation in vegetal phenology or
369 environmental changes (Franzmann, 1981; Garel, 2005; Hofman-Kamińska et al., 2019) and important
370 inter-regional dietary differences exist (Morow, 1976; Shipley, 2010). Further exploring the inter-
371 population feeding ecology of *A. alces* through DMTA (Figure 4) has allowed us to identify inter-
372 population differences in diet, that reflect a wider disparity hidden behind Scott's "browser" and
373 "frugivore" dietary categories (Scott, 2012).

374 With especially high *Asfc* and *HAsfc 81* coupled with low *epLsar* for most specimens (Figure 3,
375 4A, 4B, 4D, Table S1, Figure S1), dental microwear textures of Biebrza moose place this population
376 among browsers, at one of the extremes of the herbivore ecospace. Such results reflect a browsing
377 diet dominated by hard tissues (Figure 3, Table 2). High mean values for height ISO parameters (*S5v*,
378 *Sa*, *Sp*, *Sq*; Figure 4 F, G, H, I) complete the characterization of the food ingested by these moose. *S5v*
379 is an estimate of the depth of the valleys composing the dental texture. A high *S5v* typically is the result
380 of chewing large hard items that produce deep pits on the dental facet (i.e. fruits, seeds or bark:
381 Calandra et al., 2012; Leach, 2013). High *Sa*, *Sp* and *Sq* also reflect the consumption of hard items
382 (Calandra et al., 2012; Kaiser et al., 2016). Feces analysis of Biebrza moose in summer supports our
383 results, demonstrating that up to 80% of the diet of moose was composed of lignified species of shrubs
384 and trees, including almost 60% of *Salix cinerea* (Kuijper et al., 2016). When browsing, moose takes
385 large, non-selective bites, including not only stripped leaves but also harder lignified elements like
386 twigs (Vivås et al., 1991; Kossak, 1992; Shipley et al., 1998). In Biebrza, moose consume a particularly
387 high proportion of these large lignified elements compared to other populations. Peculiarities of the
388 vegetal availability in this relatively open habitat could explain this diet consisting of more lignified
389 plants (Kuijper et al., 2016). As a result, their DMTA differs significantly from that of Scandinavian
390 moose. The populations of Målselv, Gausdal and Småland are indeed characterized by particularly low

391 values of *Asfc* (Figure 4B) and *S5v* (Figure 4F). *Sp* values are also lower for Scandinavian moose (Figure
392 4H) as will be further discussed below.

393 The populations of Polesie and Białowieża reflected comparable values for texture parameters.
394 This may result from utilization of similar mosaic habitats including wet forests, marshlands and river
395 valleys (Kossak, 1992; Jędrzejewska and Jędrzejewski, 1998). Strong habitat heterogeneity of both
396 areas make moose dependent on a more diversified diet (Borowik et al., 2020). These two populations
397 are characterized by medium *epLsar* and *HAsfc 81* and high *Asfc* (Table 2, Figure 4) that, coupled with
398 frequencies (Figure 3) of specimens with highly anisotropic (*epLsar*) and highly complex (*Asfc*) textures,
399 reflect a browsing diet dominated by leaves. Differences of SSFA parameters between Polesie and
400 Biebrza moose are not significant (Figure 4). However, the *S5v* values (Tables 2, 3 and Figure 4F) and
401 the frequency plot (Figure 3) suggest less lignified elements in the diet of Białowieża moose compared
402 to Biebrza moose. Such results are coherent with previous studies of the feeding ecology of Białowieża
403 moose. In Białowieża, moose diet is indeed most of the year composed of almost 60% leaves and twigs
404 from shrubs and trees including semi-ligneous brambles (*Rubus* sp.) and ligneous trees and bushes
405 (*Salix* sp., *Betula pubescens*, *Populus tremula*, *Frangula alnus*, *Sorbus aucuparia*). Less-lignified dwarf
406 shrubs compose 35% of moose diet notably including *Vaccinium vitis-idaea* and *Vaccinium myrtillus* in
407 spring. Diet also includes dicots from the herbaceous layer (*Lysiamachia vulgaris*, *Vicia* sp., *Juncus*
408 *effusus*), 7% grasses and sedges, and some water plants (Kossak, 1992 and references therein). The
409 ISO feature parameter *Spd* is also significantly different between Białowieża and Biebrza (Figure 4E).
410 *Spd* represents the density of peaks on the dental texture and is therefore influenced by the contacts
411 of the tooth with the dietary bolus and by attrition (Kaiser and Brinkmann, 2006; Leach, 2013). If we
412 refer to Kaiser et al. (2016, based on three datasets : ungulates, rabbits and primates), higher *Spd*,
413 rather than directly reflecting peculiarities of the ingesta properties, is negatively correlated with the
414 occlusal degree of freedom (see also Calandra et al., 2016b). As we consider dietary variations between
415 populations belonging to the same species, a higher *Spd* for Białowieża moose may result from
416 processing a dietary bolus that induce higher masticatory constraints.

417 Compared to Biebrza, Scandinavian moose sampled from Norwegian (Gausdal and Målselv)
418 and Swedish (Småland) boreal forests constitute a group characterized by markedly lower *Asfc*. *EpLsar*
419 is low to intermediate and *HAsfc 81* presents intermediate values (Table 2 and Figure 4). *S5v* (Figure
420 4F) and *Sp* are also significantly lower than for Biebrza. Such results for Scandinavian moose may
421 therefore reflect the ingestion of fewer large hard elements. These results are compatible with a leaf-
422 dominated diet and may be explained by the fact that dental textures reflect moose summer diet (most
423 specimens were culled in September-October). Indeed, while twigs are the most consumed items in
424 winter, Scandinavian moose summer diet consists of a high proportion of young leaves (Wam and
425 Hjeljord, 2010). Two extensive studies (Norway: Hörnberg, 2001; Sweden: Wam and Hjeljord, 2010)
426 have shown that *Betula* spp., *Salix* spp., *Pinus silvestris*, *Juniperus communis*, *Sorbus aucuparia* and
427 *Populus tremula* were the six main browse species consumed by *Alces alces* in Scandinavia. *Betula* spp.
428 are preferentially selected in summer, while *Sorbus aucuparia* are eaten preferentially in winter.
429 *Vaccinium myrtillus* is one of the few species dominating moose diet all year round. Mean percentage
430 of herbaceous monocots and dicots account for less than 9% and 2.5% of the diet, respectively (means
431 calculated on the basis of the results of the fecal analysis of 12 Norwegian moose populations, taken
432 from Figure 4 in Wam and Hjeljord, 2010). The asynchronous melting of the Scandinavian snow cover
433 compared to Poland results in a delayed growing season (Karlsen et al., 2009), that in turn may result
434 in the availability of less mature, therefore less lignified vegetation at the same period. This could also
435 contribute to DMTA differences with Biebrza moose and the tendency toward lower *Asfc* (Figure 4B)
436 and *HAsfc 81* (Figure 4D) than observed for Polesie and Białowieża moose.

437 In Gausdal, plant diversity is low, dominated by *Betula pubescens* and *Pinus sylvestris*, resulting
438 for moose to almost exclusively forage on deciduous *B. pubescens* (Sæther and Andersen, 1990; Davids
439 et al., 2006). In Målselv however, moose focus on a taxonomically more diversified diet composed of
440 *Salix* spp., *Sorbus aucuparia*, *Populus tremula*, *Prunus padus* (Sæther and Andersen, 1990). The
441 difference in diet between the two Norwegian populations is not reflected by the dental microwear
442 textures here as the main browsing resources of these two populations likely share similar physical

443 and mechanical properties (Figure 4, Table 2). DMTA inter-population similarities may be increased for
444 these two populations as their dental textures reflect the summer diet, characterized by the
445 abundance of deciduous leafy resources in many habitats in both temperate and boreal biomes. The
446 dental microwear textures of Småland moose are comparable to those of other Scandinavian ones.
447 Similarly, they are interpreted as reflecting a diet dominated by soft and non-tough leaves. *Tfv* (Figure
448 4C) measures the volume of surface roughness, taking into account the whole surface. As *S5v* (which
449 focuses on the 5 deepest valleys of the surface only), it is classically higher when deep and/or large
450 marks are present on the dental facets, a situation that is typical of a diet dominated by hard elements
451 (Scott et al., 2006; Scott, 2012; DeSantis, 2016). Therefore, the significant *Tfv* differences between
452 Småland moose and Biebrza and Białowieża moose reflect the fact that the Polish and Swedish
453 populations are at both ends of a continuum between a diet dominated by tender leaves and a diet
454 dominated by lignified plants.

455 Exploring sexual dietary differences among Gausdal and Målselv populations showed that the
456 summer diets of moose cows and bulls are similar in terms of physical and mechanical properties.
457 During this season, males and females focus mainly on young leaves. In the same way, the exploration
458 of seasonal dietary variation of Biebrza moose cows showed that there were no differences between
459 summer and fall (see below).

460 4.3. An edifying example of selective browsing: Biebrza moose

461 Moose from Biebrza marshes constitute an interesting illustration of the selective behavior of
462 this deer, which is reflected by its dental microwear textures. In this locality, moose occupy valleys,
463 characterized by swamps and marshes, and by extensive open sedge-dominated communities in spring
464 and summer. In fall and winter, due to the flooding of the floodplain, moose migrate to the edges of
465 the valleys, at a higher elevation and in more forested areas (pine forests) (Borowik et al., 2020).
466 Kuijper (2016) performed a microscopic analysis of epidermal fragments occurring in moose fecal
467 material sampled during the vegetation growing season (June-August) and showed that during this
468 period woody material represents 80% of moose diet, including 60% of willow (*Salix cinerea*). While

469 the herbaceous vegetation constitutes the main resource available in this summer habitat, herbaceous
470 monocotyledons, including sedges and rushes, represent only 20% of their diet during this season
471 (Wassen et al., 2006). DNA-based analysis of moose diet in Biebrza in winter also showed dominance
472 of woody species in their diet with *Pinus sylvestris*, *Alnus* spp., *Ribes* spp., *Corylus avellana* and *Carpinus*
473 *betulus* most often browsed (Czernik et al., 2013). As mentioned earlier, dental microwear textures,
474 notably the high *Asfc*, indicate a diet mainly composed of lignified tissues for both summer and winter
475 (Table 2; Figures 3,4A-D, F and S1). While seasonal variations in the vegetal phenology coupled with
476 moose annual migration between contrasted habitats at Biebrza result in important seasonal changes
477 in vegetal resource availability (Borowik et al., 2020), dental microwear textures does not reflect these
478 changes, as diet for both seasons reflects similar physical and mechanical properties of the food
479 resources. Based on feces analyses, Czernik et al. (2013; DNA analysis; sampling from March to
480 December) and Kuijper et al. (2016; microscopic analysis; sampling from June to August) came to the
481 same conclusions. Bearing in mind that microwear is well known for its ability to emphasize seasonal
482 and/or sexual differences in diet corresponding to fluctuations in needs and resource availability
483 (Teaford and Oyen, 1989; Teaford and Robinson, 1989; Teaford and Glander, 1991; Merceron et al.,
484 2010; Berlioz et al., 2017; Percher et al., 2018), the absence of significant seasonal differences in dental
485 microwear textures between Biebrza females culled in summer and winter supports the selective
486 behavior of this population. A relatively large size of home-ranges for moose, as well as migratory
487 strategies (up to 25 km², depending on habitat, season, sex and age of the individuals; Franzmann,
488 1981; Cederlund and Sand, 1994; Borowik et al., 2021) may facilitate the search for the preferred
489 resources. Biebrza moose focus all year long on preferred food resources rather than considering most
490 abundant food items, a feeding behavior that contrasts with e.g. the red deer, this species being
491 characterized by a high trophic plasticity (Goffin and De Crombrughe, 1976; Gebert and Verheyden-
492 Tixier, 2001; Berlioz, 2017).

493 5. Conclusions

494 The feeding ecology of moose is a complex combination of marked selectivity and significant
495 dietary adaptability toward changes in local resource availability, that dental microwear texture
496 analyses (DMTA) witness. We explored and perceived this variability at the inter- and intra-population
497 scales, through the investigation of six moose populations from northern Europe occupying three
498 contrasting types of habitats. The diversity of physical and mechanical properties of the ingested food
499 items and the masticatory dynamics required to comminute them have allowed us to highlight
500 different ways to browse, demonstrating once again the capacity of DMTA to decipher even subtle
501 dietary differences. The use of both SSFA and STA parameters led us to describe and discuss different
502 aspects of these dietary variations. DMTA reveal that the diet of these present-day European moose
503 varies along a continuum between soft-leaf browsing and a browsing diet dominated by lignified
504 tissues. By studying the intra-specific scale of dietary variation and by highlighting such a continuum
505 rather than considering separate dietary categories among browsers, we pursue the work initiated on
506 African bovids, getting a step closer to ecological diversity and contributing to a now growing DMTA
507 corpus of reference for European large ungulates. Our results are in good agreement with previous
508 studies of the habitat and feeding ecology of the same populations. The availability of resources in
509 each type of habitat, from Scandinavian boreal forests to Polish marshes, seems to be the strongest
510 driver of the dental microwear texture variations for moose at the inter-population scale. At the intra-
511 populational scale, no significant dietary differences between males and females or between seasons
512 were identified. In Biebrza marshes in particular, we have shown that there is no difference in diet
513 between females in summer and fall, even though summer and fall habitats are very contrasted in
514 terms of resources availability. Our findings underline the strong selectivity in feeding behavior of this
515 cervid and complete our knowledge of the ecology of this population.

516 The present study has obvious potential to contribute to future paleontological and
517 archeological investigations through the analysis of dental microwear textures. Such studies would

518 provide a better understanding of past adaptative answers of moose facing paleoenvironmental
519 changes.

520 **Acknowledgements**

521 This study was funded by the French Agency for Research [ANR TRIDENT, ANR-13-JSV7-0008-
522 01, PI: G. Merceron], the Polish National Science Centre [Grant No N N304 301940], the WP 1.3 of the
523 LabEx DynamiTe (University Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonnes) and the PCR “Du Dernier Maximum Glaciaire
524 à l'optimum climatique dans le Bassin parisien et ses marges” [2019-2021; P.I.: Sylvain Griselin, Ludovic
525 Mevel].

526 Authors are grateful to Kristian Murphy Gregersen, Centre for Geogenetics, responsable of
527 the Quaternary Zoology Collections (Zoological Museum of Copenhagen - Denmark) and Daniel
528 Klingberg Johansson, from the collections staff, responsible of the Mammals and Amphibians
529 Collection (Zoological Museum of Copenhagen - Denmark), and the staff of the Zoological Collection
530 of Mammal Research Institute, Polish Academy of Sciences in Białowieża. The authors also thank
531 Vebjørn Veiberg and Olav Strand from the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA) for giving
532 us access to Norwegian material at NINA, G. Reynaud and L. Painault (PALEVOPRIM, Poitiers, France)
533 for administrative guidance, Sabine Riffaut for artwork of the figure 2, M. Colyn and A. Ramdarshan
534 for discussion. Finally, the authors would like to thank I. Calandra and an anonymous reviewer as well
535 as the guest editor T. Tütken, who helped to improve the quality of this manuscript.

536 **Data Availability**

537 Research data are available upon request to the corresponding author.

538 **References**

- 539 Ackermans, N.L., Winkler, D.E., Martin, L.F., Kaiser, T.M., Clauss, M., Hatt, J.-M., 2020. Dust and grit
540 matter: abrasives of different size lead to opposing dental microwear textures in
541 experimentally fed sheep (*Ovis aries*). *Journal of Experimental Biology* 223.
542 doi:10.1242/jeb.220442
- 543 Andersen, R., 1991. Habitat deterioration and the migratory behaviour of moose (*Alces alces* L.) in
544 Norway. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 28, 102–108.
- 545 Andersen, R., Saether, B.-E., 1992. Functional response during winter of a herbivore, the moose, in
546 relation to age and size. *Ecology* 73, 542–550.
- 547 Apollonio, M., Belkin, V.V., Borkowski, J., Borodin, O.I., Borowik, T., Cagnacci, F., Danilkin, A.A., Danilov,
548 P.I., Faybich, A., Ferretti, F., 2017. Challenges and science-based implications for modern

549 management and conservation of European ungulate populations. *Mammal research* 62, 209–
550 217.

551 Azorit, C., Tellado Ruiz, M.S., Oya, A., Moro, J., 2012. Seasonal and specific diet variations in sympatric
552 red and fallow deer of southern Spain: a preliminary approach to feeding behaviour. *Animal*
553 *Production Science* 52, 720–727.

554 Ball, J.P., Nordengren, C., Wallin, K., 2001. Partial migration by large ungulates: characteristics of
555 seasonal moose *Alces alces* ranges in northern Sweden. *Wildlife Biology* 7, 39–47.

556 Berlioz, E., 2017. Écologie alimentaire et paléoenvironnements des cervidés européens du Pléistocène
557 inférieur: le message des textures de micro-usure dentaire (PhD Thesis). Université de Poitiers,
558 France.

559 Berlioz, E., Azorit, C., Blondel, C., Tellado Ruiz, M.S., Merceron, G., 2017. Deer in an arid habitat: dental
560 microwear textures track feeding adaptability. *Hystrix, the Italian Journal of Mammalogy* 28,
561 222–230.

562 Bignon-Lau, O., Catz, N., Berlioz, E., Veiberg, V., Strand, O., Merceron, G., 2017. Dental microwear
563 textural analyses to track feeding ecology of reindeer: a comparison of two contrasting
564 populations in Norway. *Mammal Research* 62, 111–120.

565 Borowik, T., Cornulier, T., Jędrzejewska, B., 2013. Environmental factors shaping ungulate abundances
566 in Poland. *Acta Theriologica* 58, 403–413.

567 Borowik, T., Wawrzyniak, P., Jędrzejewska, B., 2016. Red deer (*Cervus elaphus*) fertility and survival of
568 young in a low-density population subject to predation and hunting. *Journal of Mammalogy*
569 97, 1671–1681.

570 Borowik, T., Ratkiewicz, M., Maślanko, W., Duda, N., Rode, P., Kowalczyk, R., 2018. Living on the edge—
571 The predicted impact of renewed hunting on moose in national parks in Poland. *Basic and*
572 *Applied Ecology* 30, 87–95.

573 Borowik, T., Ratkiewicz, M., Maślanko, W., Duda, N., Kowalczyk, R., 2020. The level of habitat
574 patchiness influences movement strategy of moose in eastern Poland. *PLoS ONE* 15,
575 e0230521.

576 Borowik, T., Kowalczyk, R., Maślanko, W., Duda, N., Ratkiewicz, M., 2021. Annual movement strategy
577 predicts within-season space use by moose. *Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology* 75, 1–11.

578 Bridault, A., 1992. The status of Elk during the Mesolithic. *Anthropozoologica* 16, 151–160.

579 Calandra, I., Merceron, G., 2016. Dental microwear texture analysis in mammalian ecology. *Mammal*
580 *Review* 46, 215–228.

581 Calandra, I., Schulz, E., Pinnow, M., Krohn, S., Kaiser, T.M., 2012. Teasing apart the contributions of
582 hard dietary items on 3D dental microtextures in primates. *Journal of Human Evolution* 63,
583 85–98.

584 Calandra, I., Zub, K., Szafrńska, P.A., Zalewski, A., Merceron, G., 2016a. Silicon-based plant defences,
585 tooth wear and voles. *Journal of Experimental Biology* 219, 501–507.

586 Calandra, I., Labonne, G., Schulz-Kornas, E., Kaiser, T.M., Montuire, S., 2016b. Tooth wear as a means
587 to quantify intra-specific variations in diet and chewing movements. *Scientific Reports* 6, 1–9.

588 Cardillo, M., Mace, G.M., Jones, K.E., Bielby, J., Bininda-Emonds, O.R., Sechrest, W., Orme, C.D.L.,
589 Purvis, A., 2005. Multiple causes of high extinction risk in large mammal species. *Science* 309,
590 1239–1241.

591 Cederlund, G., Sand, H. akan, 1994. Home-range size in relation to age and sex in moose. *Journal of*
592 *Mammalogy* 75, 1005–1012.

593 Clark, P.U., Dyke, A.S., Shakun, J.D., Carlson, A.E., Clark, J., Wohlfarth, B., Mitrovica, J.X., Hostetler,
594 S.W., McCabe, A.M., 2009. The last glacial maximum. *Science* 325, 710–714.

595 Clauss, M., Kaiser, T.M., Hummel, J., 2008. The morphophysiological adaptations of browsing and
596 grazing mammals. In: Gordon, I.J., prins, H.H.T. (Eds.), *The Ecology of Browsing and Grazing*.
597 Springer, pp. 47–88.

598 Crees, J.J., Carbone, C., Sommer, R.S., Benecke, N., Turvey, S.T., 2016. Millennial-scale faunal record
599 reveals differential resilience of European large mammals to human impacts across the
600 Holocene. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* 283, 20152152.

601 Czernik, M., Taberlet, P., Świsłocka, M., Czajkowska, M., Duda, N., Ratkiewicz, M., 2013. Fast and
602 efficient DNA-based method for winter diet analysis from stools of three cervids: moose, red
603 deer, and roe deer. *Acta Theriologica* 58, 379–386.

604 Davids, C., Gwynn, J.P., Dowdall, M., 2006. Terrestrial monitoring in Øvre Dividalen (No. 42–12).
605 Statens Straalevern.

606 DeSantis, L.R., 2016. Dental microwear textures: reconstructing diets of fossil mammals. *Surface*
607 *Topography: Metrology and Properties* 4, 1–12.

608 Dinerstein, E., Olson, D., Joshi, A., Vynne, C., Burgess, N.D., Wikramanayake, E., Hahn, N., Palminteri,
609 S., Hedao, P., Noss, R., 2017. An ecoregion-based approach to protecting half the terrestrial
610 realm. *BioScience* 67, 534–545.

611 Estes, R., 1991. *The behavior guide to African mammals*. University of California Press Berkeley.

612 European Bison Pedigree Book, Raczyński Jan. ed, 2020. Białowieża National Park. Białowieża.

613 Francisco, A., Brunetière, N., Merceron, G., 2018. Gathering and Analyzing Surface Parameters for Diet
614 Identification Purposes. *Technologies* 6, 75.
615 doi:<https://doi.org/10.3390/technologies6030075>

616 Franzmann, A.W., 1981. *Alces alces*. *Mammalian Species* 154, 1–7.

617 Gagnon, M., Chew, A.E., 2000. Dietary preferences in extant African Bovidae. *Journal of Mammalogy*
618 81, 490–511.

619 Garel, M., 2005. Conséquences de la chasse et des contraintes environnementales sur la démographie
620 des populations d'ongulés. L'exemple du mouflon méditerranéen (*Ovis gmelini musimon* ×
621 *Ovis* sp.) en France et de l'élan (*Alces alces*) en Norvège. (PhD Thesis). Université Claude
622 Bernard-Lyon I, France, Lyon.

623 Gębczyńska, Z., 1980. Food of the roe deer and red deer in the Białowieża Primeval Forest. *Acta*
624 *Theriologica* 25, 487–500.

625 Gębczyńska, Z., Raczyński, J., 1989. Distribution, population structure, and social organization of moose
626 in the Biebrza Valley, Poland. *Acta Theriologica* 34, 195–217.

627 Gebert, C., Verheyden-Tixier, H., 2001. Variations of diet composition of red deer (*Cervus elaphus* L.)
628 in Europe. *Mammal Review* 31, 189–201.

629 Goffin, R.A., De Crombrughe, S.A., 1976. Régime alimentaire du cerf (*Cervus elaphus* L.) et du
630 chevreuil (*Capreolus capreolus* L.) et critères de capacité stationnelle de leurs habitats.
631 *Mammalia* 40, 355–376.

632 Goss, R.J., 1983. *Deer antlers, regeneration, evolution and function*, Academic Press. ed. New York.

633 Hagerman, A.E., Robbins, C.T., 1993. Specificity of tannin-binding salivary proteins relative to diet
634 selection by mammals. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 71, 628–633.

635 Henttonen, H., Stubbe, M., Maran, T., Tikhonov, A., 2011. *Alces alces* [WWW Document]. The IUCN
636 Red List of Threatened Species 2016. URL <http://www.iucnredlist.org>

637 Hofman-Kamińska, E., Merceron, G., Bocherens, H., Makowiecki, D., Piličiauskienė, G., Ramdarshan,
638 A., Berlioz, E., Kowalczyk, R., 2018. Foraging habitats and niche partitioning of European large
639 herbivores during the Holocene—Insights from 3D dental microwear texture analysis.
640 *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 506, 183–195.

641 Hofman-Kamińska, E., Bocherens, H., Drucker, D.G., Fyfe, R.M., Gumiński, W., Makowiecki, D., Pacher,
642 M., Piličiauskienė, G., Samojlik, T., Woodbridge, J., 2019. Adapt or die—Response of large
643 herbivores to environmental changes in Europe during the Holocene. *Global Change Biology*
644 25, 2915–2930.

645 Hofmann, R.R., 1989. Evolutionary steps of ecophysiological adaptation and diversification of
646 ruminants: a comparative view of their digestive system. *Oecologia* 78, 443–457.

647 Homolka, M., 1998. *Moose (Alces alces) in the Czech Republic: Chances for survival in the man-made*
648 *landscape*, Folia Zoological Monographs. Institute of Vertebrate Biology, Academy of
649 Sciences of the Czech Republic.

650 Hörnberg, S., 2001. The relationship between moose (*Alces alces*) browsing utilisation and the
651 occurrence of different forage species in Sweden. *Forest Ecology and Management* 149, 91–
652 102.

653 Hua, L.-C., Brandt, E.T., Meullenet, J.-F., Zhou, Z.-R., Ungar, P.S., 2015. An in vitro study of dental
654 microwear formation using the BITE Master II chewing machine. *American Journal of Physical*
655 *Anthropology* 158, 769–775.

656 Hundertmark, K.J., Shields, G.F., Udina, I.G., Bowyer, R.T., Danilkin, A.A., Schwartz, C.C., 2002.
657 Mitochondrial phylogeography of moose (*Alces alces*): late Pleistocene divergence and
658 population expansion. *Molecular Phylogenetics and Evolution* 22, 375–387.

659 Jędrzejewska, B., Jędrzejewski, W., 1998. Abundance of Prey. In: *Predation in Vertebrate Communities*.
660 Springer, pp. 28–96.

661 Jędrzejewska, B., Okarma, H., Jędrzejewski, W., Milkowski, L., 1994. Effects of exploitation and
662 protection on forest structure, ungulate density and wolf predation in Białowieża Primeval
663 Forest, Poland. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 664–676.

664 Jędrzejewski, W., Schmidt, K., Theuerkauf, J., Jędrzejewska, B., Selva, N., Zub, K., Szymura, L., 2002. Kill
665 rates and predation by wolves on ungulate populations in Białowieża Primeval Forest (Poland).
666 *Ecology* 83, 1341–1356.

667 Jones, H., Pekins, P., Kantar, L., Sidor, I., Ellingwood, D., Lichtenwalner, A., O’Neal, M., 2019. Mortality
668 assessment of moose (*Alces alces*) calves during successive years of winter tick (*Dermacentor*
669 *albipictus*) epizootics in New Hampshire and Maine (USA). *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 97, 22–
670 30.

671 Kaiser, T.M., Brinkmann, G., 2006. Measuring dental wear equilibriums—the use of industrial surface
672 texture parameters to infer the diets of fossil mammals. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
673 *Palaeoecology* 239, 221–240.

674 Kaiser, T.M., Clauss, M., Schulz-Kornas, E., 2016. A set of hypotheses on tribology of mammalian
675 herbivore teeth. *Surface Topography: Metrology and Properties* 4, 014003.

676 Karlsen, S.R., Høgda, K.A., Wielgolaski, F.E., Tolvanen, A., Tømmervik, H., Poikolainen, J., Kubin, E.,
677 2009. Growing-season trends in Fennoscandia 1982–2006, determined from satellite and
678 phenology data. *Climate Research* 39, 275–286.

679 Karlsson, S., Neuvonen, S., Thannheiser, D., 2005. Plant ecology, herbivory, and human impact in
680 Nordic mountain birch forests. Springer Science & Business Media.

681 Kay, R.F., Hiiemae, K.M., 1974. Jaw movement and tooth use in recent and fossil primates. *American*
682 *Journal of Physical Anthropology* 40, 227–256.

683 Kossak, S., 1992. Foraging habits and behaviour of moose calves in virgin forest. *Acta Theriologica* 37,
684 51–51.

685 Kuijper, D.P.J., Devriendt, K., Bormans, M., Van Diggelen, R., 2016. Do moose redistribute nutrients in
686 low-productive fen systems? *Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment* 234, 40–47.

687 Leach, R., 2013. Characterisation of areal surface texture. Springer.

688 Leduc, C., 2012. Ungulates exploitation for subsistence and raw material, during the Maglemose
689 culture in Denmark: the example of Mullerup site (Sarauw’s Island) in Sjælland. *Danish Journal*
690 *of Archaeology* 1, 62–81.

691 Leuthold, B.M., Leuthold, W., 1978. Ecology of the giraffe in Tsavo East National Park, Kenya. *African*
692 *Journal of Ecology* 16, 1–20.

693 Linnell, J.D., Cretois, B., Nilsen, E.B., Rolandsen, C.M., Solberg, E.J., Veiberg, V., Kaczensky, P., Van
694 Moorter, B., Panzacchi, M., Rauset, G.R., 2020. The challenges and opportunities of coexisting
695 with wild ungulates in the human-dominated landscapes of Europe’s Anthropocene. *Biological*
696 *Conservation* 244, 108500.

697 Louail, M., Ferchaud, S., Souron, A., Walker, A.E., Merceron, G., 2021. Dental microwear textures differ
698 in pigs with overall similar diets but fed with different seeds. *Palaeogeography,*
699 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 110415.

700 Lumpkin, S., Kranz, K.R., 1984. *Cephalophus sylvicultor*. *Mammalian Species* 225, 1–7.

701 Merceron, G., Escarguel, G., Angibault, J.-M., Verheyden-Tixier, H., 2010. Can dental microwear
702 textures record inter-individual dietary variations? *PLoS ONE* 5, 1–9.

703 Merceron, G., Hofman-Kamińska, E., Kowalczyk, R., 2014. 3D dental microwear texture analysis of
704 feeding habits of sympatric ruminants in the Białowieża Primeval Forest, Poland. *Forest*
705 *Ecology and Management* 328, 262–269.

706 Merceron, G., Novello, A., Scott, R.S., 2016a. Paleoenvironments inferred from phytoliths and dental
707 microwear texture analyses of meso-herbivores. *Geobios* 49, 135–146.

708 Merceron, G., Ramdarshan, A., Blondel, C., Boisserie, J.-R., Brunetiere, N., Francisco, A., Gautier, D.,
709 Milhet, X., Novello, A., Pret, D., 2016b. Untangling the environmental from the dietary: dust
710 does not matter. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B* 283, 1–8.

711 Merceron, G., Colyn, M., Geraads, D., 2018. Browsing and non-browsing extant and extinct giraffids:
712 Evidence from dental microwear textural analysis. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
713 *Palaeoecology* 505, 128–139.

714 Merceron, G., Berlioz, E., Vonhof, H., Green, D.R., Garel, M., Noûs, C., Tütken, T., 2020. Tooth tales told
715 by dental diet proxies: an alpine community of sympatric ruminants as a model to decipher
716 the ecology of fossil fauna. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 110077.

717 Modzelewska, A., Kamińska, A., Fassnacht, F.E., Stereńczak, K., 2021. Multitemporal hyperspectral tree
718 species classification in the Białowieża Forest World Heritage site. *Forestry: An International*
719 *Journal of Forest Research* 94, 464–476.

720 Moreira, L.M., Leonel, F. de P., Vieira, R.A.M., Pereira, J.C., 2013. A new approach about the digestion
721 of fibers by ruminants. *Revista Brasileira De Saúde E Produção Animal* 14, 382–395.

722 Morow, K., 1976. Food habits of moose from Augustów Forest. *Acta Theriologica* 21, 101–116.

723 Niedziałkowska, M., Hundertmark, K.J., Jędrzejewska, B., Niedziałkowski, K., Sidorovich, V.E., Górny,
724 M., Veeroja, R., Solberg, E.J., Laaksonen, S., Sand, H., 2014. Spatial structure in European
725 moose (*Alces alces*): genetic data reveal a complex population history. *Journal of Biogeography*
726 41, 2173–2184.

727 O'Connor, D.A., Butt, B., Foufopoulos, J.B., 2015. Foraging ecologies of giraffe (*Giraffa camelopardalis*
728 *reticulata*) and camels (*Camelus dromedarius*) in northern Kenya: effects of habitat structure
729 and possibilities for competition? *African Journal of Ecology* 53, 183–193.

730 Parker, D.M., Bernard, R.T.F., Colvin, S.A., 2003. The diet of a small group of extralimital giraffe. *African*
731 *Journal of Ecology* 41, 245–253.

732 Peltier, W.R., Fairbanks, R.G., 2006. Global glacial ice volume and Last Glacial Maximum duration from
733 an extended Barbados sea level record. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 25, 3322–3337.

734 Percher, A.M., Merceron, G., Nsi Akoue, G., Galbany, J., Romero, A., Charpentier, M.J., 2018. Dental
735 microwear textural analysis as an analytical tool to depict individual traits and reconstruct the
736 diet of a primate. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 165, 123–138.

737 Ramdarshan, A., Blondel, C., Brunetiere, N., Francisco, A., Gautier, D., Surault, J., Merceron, G., 2016.
738 Seeds, browse, and tooth wear: a sheep perspective. *Ecology and Evolution* 6, 5559–5569.

739 Redjadj, C., Darmon, G., Maillard, D., Chevrier, T., Bastianelli, D., Verheyden, H., Loison, A., Saïd, S.,
740 2014. Intra- and interspecific differences in diet quality and composition in a large herbivore
741 community. *PLoS ONE* 9, e84756.

742 Renecker, L.A., Hudson, R.J., 1988. Seasonal quality of forages used by moose in the aspen-dominated
743 boreal forest, central Alberta. *Ecography* 11, 111–118.

744 Sæther, B.-E., Andersen, R., 1990. Resource limitation in a generalist herbivore, the moose *Alces alces*:
745 ecological constraints on behavioural decisions. *Canadian Journal of Zoology* 68, 993–999.

746 Sanson, G.D., Kerr, S.A., Gross, K.A., 2007. Do silica phytoliths really wear mammalian teeth? *Journal*
747 *of Archaeological Science* 34, 526–531.

748 Schmölcke, U., Zachos, F.E., 2005. Holocene distribution and extinction of the moose (*Alces alces*,
749 *Cervidae*) in Central Europe. *Mammalian Biology* 70, 329–344.

750 Schulz, E., Piotrowski, V., Clauss, M., Mau, M., Merceron, G., Kaiser, T.M., 2013a. Dietary abrasiveness
751 is associated with variability of microwear and dental surface texture in rabbits. *PLoS ONE* 8,
752 1–7.

753 Schulz, E., Calandra, I., Kaiser, T.M., 2013b. Feeding ecology and chewing mechanics in hoofed
754 mammals: 3D tribology of enamel wear. *Wear* 300, 169–179.

755 Schulz-Kornas, E., Winkler, D.E., Clauss, M., Carlsson, J., Ackermans, N.L., Martin, L.F., Hummel, J.,
756 Müller, D.W., Hatt, J.-M., Kaiser, T.M., 2020. Everything matters: Molar microwear texture in
757 goats (*Capra aegagrus hircus*) fed diets of different abrasiveness. *Palaeogeography,*
758 *Palaeoclimatology, Palaeoecology* 552, 109783.

759 Scott, J.R., 2012. Dental microwear texture analysis of extant African Bovidae. *Mammalia* 76, 157–174.

760 Scott, J.R., Godfrey, L.R., Jungers, W.L., Scott, R.S., Simons, E.L., Teaford, M.F., Ungar, P.S., Walker, A.,
761 2009. Dental microwear texture analysis of two families of subfossil lemurs from Madagascar.
762 *Journal of Human Evolution* 56, 405–416.

763 Scott, R.S., Ungar, P.S., Bergstrom, T.S., Brown, C.A., Grine, F.E., Teaford, M.F., Walker, A., 2005. Dental
764 microwear texture analysis shows within-species diet variability in fossil hominins. *Nature* 436,
765 693–695.

766 Scott, R.S., Ungar, P.S., Bergstrom, T.S., Brown, C.A., Childs, B.E., Teaford, M.F., Walker, A., 2006. Dental
767 microwear texture analysis: technical considerations. *Journal of Human Evolution* 51, 339–
768 349.

769 Scott, R.S., Teaford, M.F., Ungar, P.S., 2012. Dental microwear texture and anthropoid diets. *American*
770 *Journal of Physical Anthropology* 147, 551–579.

771 Shipley, L., 2010. Fifty years of food and foraging in moose: lessons in ecology from a model herbivore.
772 *Alces: A Journal Devoted to the Biology and Management of Moose* 46, 1–13.

773 Shipley, L.A., Blomquist, S., Danell, K., 1998. Diet choices made by free-ranging moose in northern
774 Sweden in relation to plant distribution, chemistry, and morphology. *Canadian Journal of*
775 *Zoology* 76, 1722–1733.

776 Singh, N.J., Börger, L., Dettki, H., Bunnefeld, N., Ericsson, G., 2012. From migration to nomadism:
777 movement variability in a northern ungulate across its latitudinal range. *Ecological*
778 *Applications* 22, 2007–2020.

779 Smith, C., Warren, M., 2019. GLMs in R for ecology. Smith and Warren.

780 Spitzer, R., Felton, A., Landman, M., Singh, N.J., Widemo, F., Cromsigt, J.P., 2020. Fifty years of
781 European ungulate dietary studies: a synthesis. *Oikos* 129, 1668–1680.

782 Teaford, M.F., Glander, K.E., 1991. Dental microwear in live, wild-trapped *Alouatta palliata* from Costa
783 Rica. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 85, 313–319.

784 Teaford, M.F., Oyen, O.J., 1989. Live primates and dental replication: new problems and new
785 techniques. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 80, 73–81.

786 Teaford, M.F., Robinson, J.G., 1989. Seasonal or ecological differences in diet and molar microwear in
787 *Cebus nigrivittatus*. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 80, 391–401.

788 Tixier, H., Duncan, P., 1996. Are European roe deer browsers? A review of variations in the composition
789 of their diets. *Revue d'Ecologie* 51, 1–15.

790 Tixier, H., Duncan, P., Scehovic, J., Yant, A., Gleizes, M., Lila, M., 1997. Food selection by European roe
791 deer (*Capreolus capreolus*): effects of plant chemistry, and consequences for the nutritional
792 value of their diets. *Journal of Zoology* 242, 229–245.

793 Tixier, H., Maizeret, C., Duncan, P., Bertrand, R., Poirel, C., Roger, M., 1998. Development of feeding
794 selectivity in roe deer. *Behavioural Processes* 43, 33–42.

795 Ungar, P.S., 2015. Mammalian dental function and wear: A review. *Biosurface and Biotribology* 1, 25–
796 41.

797 Vivås, H.J., Sæther, B.-E., Andersen, R., 1991. Optimal twig-size selection of a generalist herbivore, the
798 moose *Alces alces*: implications for plant-herbivore interactions. *The Journal of Animal Ecology*
799 56, 395–408.

800 Wam, H.K., Hjeljord, O., 2010. Moose summer and winter diets along a large scale gradient of forage
801 availability in southern Norway. *European Journal of Wildlife Research* 56, 745–755.

802 Wassen, M.J., Okruszko, T., Kardel, I., Chormanski, J., Swiatek, D., Mioduszewski, W., Bleuten, W.,
803 Querner, E.P., El Kahloun, M., Batelaan, O., Meire, P., 2006. Eco-hydrological functioning of the
804 Biebrza wetlands: lessons for the conservation and restoration of deteriorated wetlands.
805 Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, *Ecological Studies* 191, 285–310.

806 Winkler, D.E., Schulz-Kornas, E., Kaiser, T.M., De Cuyper, A., Clauss, M., Tütken, T., 2019. Forage silica
807 and water content control dental surface texture in guinea pigs and provide implications for
808 dietary reconstruction. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116, 1325–1330.
809 Winkler, D.E., Schulz-Kornas, E., Kaiser, T.M., Codron, D., Leichliter, J., Hummel, J., Martin, L.F., Clauss,
810 M., Tütken, T., 2020. The turnover of dental microwear texture: Testing the “last supper” effect
811 in small mammals in a controlled feeding experiment. *Palaeogeography, Palaeoclimatology,*
812 *Palaeoecology* 557, 109930.
813 Zuur, A.F., Ieno, E.N., Elphick, C.S., 2010. A protocol for data exploration to avoid common statistical
814 problems. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 1, 3–14.
815
816

817 Supplementary Informations

818 **Table S1:** information and texture parameters for all specimens. Populations: 1: Biebrza; 2: Białowieża;
819 3: Polesie; 4: Målselv; 5: Gausdal; 6: Småland. Tooth: lm: lower molar; UM: upper molar; dP4: decidual
820 4th premolar. Seasons: jf: January-February; ma: Mars-April; mj: May-June; ja: July-August; so:
821 September-October; nd: November-December. Sex: f is for female, m is for male. / is used when data
822 is missing.

823

824

825 **Table S2: Sample sizes (n) and frequencies (%) of specimens with high complexity ($Asfc > 2.0$) and**
826 **high anisotropy ($epLsar > 5 \times 10^{-3}$), for the six moose populations and the four reference populations.**
827 Data were used for Figure 2.

828

829 **Figure S1: Complexity ($Asfc$) and Heterogeneity of the complexity ($HAsfc_{81}$) for the six moose**
830 **populations and for reference populations.** Mean and standard error of mean are represented for:
831 **Poland:** 1: Biebrza, 2: Białowieża, 3: Polesie; **Norway:** 4: Målselv, 5: Gausdal; **Sweden:** 6: Småland.
832 Reference populations with well-known diet, from left to right: *Cervus elaphus*, *Giraffa*
833 *Camelopardalis*, *Capreolus capreolus* and *Cephalophus sylvicultor*.

834

835 **Figure S2:** mean and standard error of mean for textural parameters that are not illustrated in Figure
836 4. A: Vm ; B: Vmc ; C: Vvc ; D: Sha ; E: Sa . **Upper line:** parameters are illustrated for the six moose
837 populations. **Poland:** 1: Biebrza, 2: Białowieża, 3: Polesie; **Norway:** 4: Målselv, 5: Gausdal; **Sweden:** 6:
838 Småland. **Second line:** for Biebrza, females culled in July-August are identified by a sun symbol while
839 females sampled in November-December are illustrated by a dead leaf. Sexes are identified by
840 symbols. **Bottom line:** values for the four samples of extant species used as reference (from left to
841 right: *Giraffa camelopardalis*, *Cephalophus sylvicultor*, *Cervus elaphus*, *Capreolus capreolus*) are given.
842

843 **Annex 1:** Photosimulations and false color elevation maps of molar facets of the six moose populations,
844 scanned at the PALEVOPRIM Lab by E. Berlioz, PhD, with "TRIDENT" white light confocal microscope
845 Leica DCM8. **Poland:** Annex 1_1: Biebrza, Annex 1_2: Białowieża, Annex 1_3: Polesie; **Norway:** Annex
846 1_4: Målselv, Annex 1_5: Gausdal; **Sweden:** Annex 1_6: Småland.

847

848 **Annex 2:** R script used to explore and analyze the dataset of the present study.

849

850 **Annex 3:** Raw results for GLM, manovas and anovas performed on the datasets (at the inter-population
851 and intra-population scales).

852

853 Table S1 :

reference	pop.	tooth	sex	season	<i>Sa</i>	<i>Sp</i>	<i>Sq</i>	<i>S5v</i>	<i>Sha</i>	<i>Sda</i>	<i>Spd</i> (10 ⁻³)	<i>Vm</i> (10 ⁻³)	<i>Vmc</i>	<i>Vvc</i>	<i>Asfc</i>	<i>epLsar</i> (10 ⁻³)	<i>H81</i>	<i>Tfv</i>
aa201091	5	lm2	f	so	0.27	1.44	0.39	1.89	363.13	310.29	0.13	14.11	0.28	0.36	1.40	1.86	1.12	50416.4
aa219275	5	lm2	f	so	0.16	0.79	0.24	1.32	603.55	200.65	0.48	8.50	0.16	0.19	0.84	2.06	0.80	37218.6
aa235258	5	lm2	/	/	0.12	0.63	0.15	0.71	296.93	115.46	0.90	4.51	0.13	0.17	0.49	3.06	0.62	5329.4
aa237228	5	lm2	m	so	0.28	0.67	0.44	2.98	38.34	373.26	0.25	5.59	0.23	0.24	1.90	1.68	2.31	2664.7
aa237299	5	lm2	m	so	0.26	1.38	0.51	2.13	/	284.08	0.05	13.79	0.24	0.40	1.42	1.93	2.79	19533.6
aa237309	5	lm2	m	so	0.08	0.41	0.10	0.66	360.34	242.24	0.63	3.02	0.08	0.11	0.14	2.47	0.95	0.0
aa254284	5	lm2	f	so	0.19	0.76	0.27	1.57	466.69	129.29	1.33	5.73	0.19	0.20	2.18	0.80	0.88	1812.0
aa263104	5	lm2	f	so	2.17	5.07	2.80	9.43	156.84	465.91	0.28	42.31	2.48	2.60	15.66	1.67	0.80	35693.8
aa263122	5	lm2	m	so	0.19	0.87	0.24	0.77	325.18	288.05	2.75	8.49	0.22	0.27	0.78	7.00	0.33	959.3
aa263154	5	lm2	f	so	0.13	0.40	0.19	0.98	497.60	151.19	0.55	2.95	0.13	0.13	0.53	4.66	0.94	639.5
aa263155	5	lm2	m	so	0.11	0.60	0.14	0.59	114.51	349.45	0.60	5.25	0.12	0.15	0.22	5.71	1.02	0.0
aa263159	5	lm2	m	so	0.21	0.68	0.27	2.30	615.03	374.38	1.10	8.81	0.23	0.30	1.24	6.92	0.83	1492.2
aa263162	5	lm2	f	so	0.20	0.99	0.26	1.05	410.37	302.47	1.08	9.82	0.21	0.26	0.79	7.40	0.48	20145.2
aa263163	5	lm2	f	so	0.71	1.44	1.09	3.91	133.90	263.62	0.23	16.69	0.64	0.71	6.57	2.37	1.19	48632.2
aa263172	5	lm2	f	so	0.12	0.65	0.19	1.26	265.22	121.87	0.43	9.43	0.11	0.15	1.03	3.62	0.73	426.4
aa263173	5	lm2	f	so	0.17	0.72	0.25	1.10	1146.56	135.57	0.68	10.17	0.16	0.20	0.84	3.21	0.61	39755.7
aa263177	5	lm2	f	so	0.14	0.52	0.23	1.72	452.04	272.39	0.35	3.80	0.13	0.15	0.80	0.98	0.99	106.6
aa263178	5	lm2	m	so	0.15	0.74	0.22	1.68	211.55	350.38	0.28	7.10	0.15	0.18	1.16	2.76	0.97	42247.5
aa263183	5	lm2	m	so	0.48	1.52	0.71	3.77	1651.00	439.36	0.23	14.20	0.43	0.49	3.32	0.57	1.26	29067.1
aa263184	5	lm2	f	so	0.43	1.77	0.76	2.71	/	1179.18	0.08	16.07	0.38	0.57	1.68	4.86	1.77	13010.7
aa263186	5	lm2	f	so	2.16	7.57	3.35	4.71	/	1701.35	0.00	126.91	1.94	2.72	5.72	4.29	5.37	32880.8
aa263187	5	lm2	m	so	0.25	1.67	0.35	1.52	248.43	959.96	0.13	14.61	0.26	0.39	0.56	3.40	1.15	60047.7
aa263190	5	lm2	m	so	0.11	0.51	0.14	0.56	344.50	142.10	0.90	7.84	0.13	0.16	0.32	6.92	0.57	426.4
aa263191	5	lm2	f	so	1.81	4.08	2.46	7.41	264.81	763.77	0.10	41.22	1.88	1.64	11.50	2.99	1.56	35643.5
aa263197	5	lm2	f	so	1.36	2.79	2.10	6.34	/	669.31	0.00	37.75	0.98	0.88	6.80	3.48	3.23	49807.4
aa263202	5	lm2	m	so	0.26	0.89	0.36	2.01	524.60	200.02	0.75	8.81	0.27	0.31	2.14	2.69	0.52	20465.0
aa263214	5	lm2	f	nd	0.31	1.05	0.44	2.17	656.10	241.98	0.50	11.45	0.30	0.34	1.70	1.92	0.70	6288.7
aa263216	5	lm2	f	so	0.18	0.61	0.31	2.54	760.19	431.08	0.25	5.45	0.14	0.16	1.83	2.18	1.03	746.1
aa263218	5	lm2	m	so	0.35	1.15	0.46	2.06	402.92	591.80	0.58	11.67	0.37	0.44	0.89	8.58	0.91	8100.7
aa263221	5	lm2	m	so	0.22	0.57	0.29	1.43	792.17	164.36	0.88	7.39	0.24	0.22	1.35	5.25	0.79	21211.1
aa263222	5	lm2	f	so	0.07	0.45	0.10	0.48	463.87	140.54	1.23	3.68	0.07	0.10	0.28	3.84	0.51	0.0
aa263227	5	lm2	f	so	0.89	2.45	1.32	4.84	32.02	826.84	0.18	50.42	0.79	0.74	5.36	4.20	2.30	31565.7
aa263230	5	lm2	f	so	0.11	0.55	0.17	1.38	508.49	133.09	0.58	3.11	0.11	0.11	1.09	1.00	0.58	17693.7
aa263232	5	lm2	f	so	1.73	7.23	2.63	7.11	/	1267.92	0.03	108.54	1.60	2.17	6.77	0.71	3.13	42193.4
aa263233	5	lm2	m	so	0.17	0.66	0.23	1.91	1616.61	222.05	0.40	6.77	0.18	0.20	1.49	1.87	0.60	34641.3
aa263235	5	lm2	m	so	0.25	0.65	0.39	1.35	761.13	222.36	0.35	6.92	0.24	0.28	1.75	2.04	0.93	29844.8
aa263244	5	lm2	m	so	0.48	2.16	0.74	2.59	2531.59	337.74	0.15	23.71	0.45	0.48	3.35	2.38	1.00	28497.6
aa263248	5	lm2	m	so	0.33	1.29	0.43	1.73	487.73	898.16	0.73	17.28	0.36	0.46	1.33	6.55	0.66	10735.7
aa263250	5	lm2	m	so	0.10	0.51	0.14	1.01	486.00	220.41	1.33	4.85	0.10	0.13	0.59	1.50	0.62	11831.3

854

855

reference	pop.	tooth	sex	season	Sa	Sp	Sq	S5v	Sha	Sda	Spd (10-3)	Vm (10-3)	Vmc	Vvc	Asfc	epLsar (10-3)	H81	Tfv
aa263251	5	lm2	f	so	0.20	0.70	0.31	2.61	779.69	678.50	0.23	8.79	0.19	0.25	1.22	1.81	1.93	30550.6
aa263259	5	lm2	m	so	0.18	1.36	0.24	1.08	172.92	224.12	0.50	8.99	0.19	0.22	1.14	0.66	0.64	24835.1
aa263266	5	lm2	f	so	0.57	2.18	0.90	3.48	/	655.43	0.10	23.01	0.49	0.60	3.05	2.28	1.24	28969.2
aa263273	5	lm2	m	so	0.22	0.61	0.36	2.88	1550.25	125.67	0.23	6.45	0.19	0.20	3.63	0.57	0.51	3943.8
aa263281	5	lm2	m	so	0.33	1.18	0.41	1.31	350.86	356.71	2.68	14.59	0.38	0.50	1.71	8.49	0.37	17054.2
aa263285	5	lm2	m	so	0.07	0.50	0.11	1.04	858.08	90.51	0.70	2.30	0.07	0.09	0.70	2.04	0.59	0.0
aa263286	5	lm2	m	so	0.29	0.69	0.44	0.90	827.21	439.36	0.75	6.34	0.28	0.26	0.90	8.47	0.70	20271.0
aa263289	5	lm2	m	so	0.43	1.17	0.64	2.66	876.11	451.41	0.35	16.41	0.38	0.46	1.76	0.70	1.78	37653.6
aa263290	5	lm2	f	so	0.13	0.49	0.23	1.30	61.95	401.97	0.25	7.72	0.11	0.15	0.52	5.31	0.82	2558.1
aa263291	5	lm2	f	so	2.11	10.84	3.34	10.71	/	1133.31	0.03	167.86	1.70	2.31	9.45	1.29	6.69	48305.8
aa263295	5	lm2	f	so	0.35	0.98	0.43	1.21	264.37	661.50	0.53	8.48	0.39	0.44	0.29	7.32	0.96	1172.5
aa263296	5	lm2	/	/	0.35	0.80	0.49	2.51	61.25	260.59	0.20	5.98	0.36	0.34	3.16	1.47	0.89	28992.1
aa263299	5	lm2	m	so	0.24	0.96	0.31	0.87	765.65	314.93	0.78	9.04	0.26	0.34	0.51	6.18	0.70	54859.7
aa263312	5	lm2	/	so	0.11	0.57	0.17	1.13	546.19	90.09	1.08	3.98	0.11	0.13	0.93	1.28	0.57	0.0
aa263315	5	lm2	m	so	0.53	3.39	1.09	4.79	/	/	0.00	56.30	0.37	0.82	2.01	5.56	7.25	23040.5
aa263323	5	lm2	f	so	0.22	0.85	0.27	0.82	444.36	361.37	1.18	11.07	0.26	0.32	0.64	6.50	0.41	17373.9
aa263336	5	lm2	m	so	0.44	1.34	0.59	1.98	/	580.21	0.23	20.73	0.47	0.54	1.10	5.60	0.80	35788.0
aa263339	5	lm2	m	so	0.19	0.56	0.31	2.06	112.25	249.00	0.40	4.61	0.18	0.21	1.45	1.49	0.91	639.5
aa263361	5	lm2	f	so	0.20	0.61	0.30	1.72	162.08	206.66	0.50	6.41	0.17	0.21	1.45	0.38	1.26	31294.9
aa263362	5	lm2	m	so	0.22	0.62	0.37	3.56	/	515.45	0.05	5.60	0.23	0.28	1.29	2.35	3.51	0.0
aa49641	5	lm2	m	so	0.27	0.93	0.53	2.72	/	689.95	0.08	14.48	0.23	0.33	1.58	0.65	1.14	21462.7
aa56851	5	lm2	f	so	0.41	1.10	0.74	4.15	/	1122.97	0.05	14.85	0.27	0.28	2.32	1.62	8.14	34969.7
aa56853	5	lm2	f	so	0.10	0.51	0.16	1.82	291.89	226.26	0.53	2.85	0.08	0.10	0.99	1.38	0.77	746.1
aa257373	4	lm2	f	so	0.18	0.58	0.24	1.17	481.71	366.48	1.13	4.57	0.19	0.21	0.52	2.99	0.65	33341.1
aa257381	4	lm2	f	so	0.18	0.79	0.28	2.05	651.27	425.28	0.70	8.60	0.17	0.21	1.08	2.64	0.95	38052.1
aa257396	4	lm2	m	so	0.65	1.50	0.83	2.02	527.48	703.73	0.58	16.86	0.75	0.83	2.19	9.26	0.70	22159.9
aa257398	4	lm2	f	so	0.12	0.53	0.19	1.84	675.60	116.79	0.45	6.08	0.11	0.13	1.51	0.43	0.80	52121.8
aa257400	4	lm2	m	so	0.45	1.12	0.63	2.98	2437.06	538.35	0.15	11.45	0.47	0.51	1.71	3.13	1.65	45866.0
aa257403	4	lm2	m	so	0.29	0.88	0.42	1.98	383.64	341.92	1.25	12.87	0.30	0.34	2.13	4.80	0.69	29205.2
aa257404	4	lm2	m	so	0.19	0.81	0.27	1.48	601.05	189.70	1.25	8.83	0.19	0.24	1.53	2.24	0.56	29418.4
aa257405	4	lm2	m	so	0.16	0.48	0.23	1.73	220.00	155.91	3.28	5.54	0.17	0.20	1.99	2.20	0.58	18546.4
aa257411	4	lm2	m	so	0.19	0.51	0.34	2.27	19.14	379.73	0.20	6.01	0.15	0.17	1.25	1.18	1.48	746.1
aa257416	4	lm2	f	so	0.25	1.17	0.35	2.42	1192.10	229.91	0.33	10.59	0.26	0.32	1.72	0.62	1.12	37964.7
aa257419	4	lm2	f	so	0.29	1.36	0.55	3.18	700.18	1073.77	0.18	15.03	0.20	0.29	1.81	3.61	4.58	16674.9
aa257420	4	lm2	m	so	0.34	1.13	0.53	2.14	911.96	630.73	0.28	20.09	0.29	0.43	1.72	3.24	1.31	42516.4
aa257421	4	lm2	m	so	0.19	0.65	0.35	1.93	/	315.19	0.08	7.93	0.17	0.19	0.60	4.02	0.86	37139.9
aa257439	4	lm2	m	so	0.48	1.77	0.60	1.18	833.88	590.27	0.78	27.24	0.60	0.71	0.88	10.29	0.41	41113.4
aa257441	4	lm2	f	so	1.19	2.52	1.71	4.18	/	911.45	0.08	24.47	1.18	1.05	4.46	1.31	1.69	19255.4
aa257444	4	lm2	m	so	0.22	0.71	0.28	0.75	489.67	327.32	1.65	8.75	0.27	0.28	0.81	5.49	0.43	49474.4

856

857

reference	pop.	tooth	sex	season	Sa	Sp	Sq	S5v	Sha	Sda	Spd (10-3)	Vm (10-3)	Vmc	Vvc	Asfc	epLsar (10-3)	H81	Tfv
aa257446	4	lm2	f	so	0.28	0.70	0.46	2.77	19.04	377.04	0.18	7.92	0.25	0.26	1.87	4.13	1.11	18439.8
aa257447	4	lm2	f	so	0.21	0.80	0.33	2.95	/	332.87	0.05	8.36	0.19	0.20	2.47	0.22	1.49	16521.2
aa257448	4	lm2	m	so	0.42	1.70	0.52	2.19	1136.82	357.95	0.48	26.71	0.47	0.65	1.28	4.69	0.54	39709.4
aa257449	4	lm2	m	so	0.36	0.97	0.58	2.32	/	901.35	0.10	7.65	0.29	0.30	1.13	4.14	3.07	36026.9
aa257452	4	lm2	f	so	0.14	0.48	0.22	1.24	632.50	169.06	0.38	7.04	0.13	0.15	0.68	1.80	0.80	852.7
aa257456	4	lm2	m	so	0.26	0.89	0.36	1.67	2221.00	175.08	0.43	9.57	0.27	0.28	2.31	2.07	0.59	19612.3
aa257509	4	lm2	m	so	0.44	0.97	0.68	2.78	180.41	713.51	0.13	10.05	0.39	0.42	0.67	0.72	1.69	15775.1
aa257519	4	lm2	m	so	0.50	1.95	0.68	1.92	1517.55	1084.14	0.48	25.82	0.51	0.63	1.55	8.24	1.09	37796.3
aa257521	4	lm2	f	so	0.14	0.80	0.24	1.16	1086.13	236.59	0.43	2.70	0.12	0.13	1.28	3.76	1.20	532.9
aa257526	4	lm2	f	so	0.11	0.48	0.17	0.74	237.16	148.41	0.90	4.90	0.09	0.13	0.49	1.07	1.01	426.4
aa257528	4	lm2	m	so	0.98	5.20	1.66	6.79	/	1510.74	0.05	67.27	0.80	1.30	3.68	1.95	4.24	50841.7
aa257534	4	lm2	f	so	0.29	0.96	0.45	2.40	211.61	238.31	0.20	12.01	0.25	0.28	2.05	2.68	0.77	34980.2
aa257535	4	lm2	f	so	0.30	0.84	0.54	1.88	938.04	682.99	0.33	7.60	0.25	0.29	1.14	3.00	0.51	7567.8
aa257538	4	lm2	m	so	0.53	1.07	0.91	3.54	34.66	555.82	0.08	11.42	0.41	0.43	3.50	4.15	1.29	25326.0
aa257539	4	lm2	m	so	0.16	0.58	0.24	1.72	379.24	330.64	0.48	6.33	0.15	0.17	0.72	4.64	0.71	0.0
aa257544	4	lm2	f	so	0.60	3.23	0.95	4.97	/	572.03	0.03	36.42	0.51	0.65	4.56	2.67	1.00	41674.3
aa257546	4	lm2	m	so	0.09	0.49	0.13	0.92	565.34	262.61	0.98	3.47	0.09	0.12	0.31	3.19	1.61	4263.5
aa257547	4	lm2	f	so	1.10	1.96	1.71	6.76	/	427.19	0.08	28.17	0.72	0.71	4.17	2.08	3.76	32429.0
aa257557	4	lm2	f	so	0.17	0.61	0.27	1.62	434.35	212.25	0.35	7.65	0.14	0.14	1.46	2.46	1.18	0.0
aa257597	4	lm2	m	nd	0.28	0.78	0.42	2.02	364.16	134.46	0.53	9.07	0.27	0.28	3.93	1.08	0.76	5009.7
aa257602	4	lm2	f	so	0.31	0.87	0.45	2.95	1743.33	238.97	0.28	12.12	0.32	0.39	2.44	0.53	1.05	47538.5
aa257604	4	lm2	f	so	0.23	1.03	0.32	1.47	401.74	189.82	0.33	15.20	0.23	0.27	1.30	3.19	0.47	21850.6
aa257607	4	lm2	m	so	0.72	3.11	1.26	6.61	/	629.97	0.08	42.57	0.53	0.70	4.95	0.94	2.60	47684.8
aa257610	4	lm2	m	so	0.49	0.84	0.67	2.54	895.02	665.37	0.35	6.94	0.51	0.50	1.54	4.77	0.84	8846.8
aa257617	4	lm2	m	so	0.24	0.84	0.33	1.53	573.92	133.45	0.70	9.61	0.24	0.28	2.08	1.98	0.60	6075.5
aa257618	4	lm2	f	so	0.48	1.43	0.61	1.90	1138.98	1639.40	0.55	18.26	0.56	0.60	0.93	3.42	0.54	45051.7
aa257622	4	lm2	f	so	0.22	0.71	0.31	1.40	1152.22	127.72	0.23	6.76	0.23	0.26	1.47	2.22	0.73	17587.1
aa257624	4	lm2	f	nd	0.11	0.49	0.16	1.14	153.76	100.74	0.90	4.14	0.12	0.15	0.93	2.00	0.62	38904.8
aa257626	4	lm2	f	so	0.23	0.66	0.33	1.45	57.29	326.97	0.33	9.32	0.24	0.27	1.00	1.07	3.19	17906.9
aa257627	4	lm2	m	so	0.71	2.08	1.03	3.08	158.09	330.82	0.30	26.85	0.67	0.80	5.00	0.52	1.35	36413.0
aa257632	4	lm2	f	nd	0.23	0.83	0.34	1.88	147.09	156.68	0.38	11.94	0.23	0.25	2.55	1.38	0.65	20571.6
aa257636	4	lm2	f	nd	0.22	0.61	0.32	1.21	403.73	167.77	0.73	8.37	0.21	0.27	1.48	3.00	0.99	3197.7
aa257642	4	lm2	m	so	0.17	0.77	0.24	1.33	347.05	264.31	0.68	6.46	0.17	0.21	1.20	1.19	1.36	7354.6
aa257645	4	lm2	m	so	0.25	1.67	0.32	1.30	5332.98	276.09	0.13	15.31	0.27	0.37	0.73	1.71	1.47	23982.4
aa257680	4	lm2	m	so	0.13	0.65	0.18	1.36	643.83	221.90	1.35	5.49	0.12	0.14	0.77	1.76	0.89	426.4
aa257683	4	lm	m	so	0.07	0.42	0.11	1.19	509.91	224.18	0.75	3.29	0.06	0.09	0.38	1.93	1.38	106.6
aa257704	4	lm2	m	so	0.79	2.77	1.04	3.78	3820.31	669.10	0.30	51.21	0.84	1.05	2.15	7.58	0.49	31373.5
aa257705	4	lm2	f	so	0.10	0.53	0.15	1.43	253.60	376.01	0.15	4.74	0.10	0.11	0.50	0.41	0.91	18653.0
aa257708	4	lm2	m	so	0.36	1.06	0.50	1.58	656.32	310.95	0.93	10.56	0.38	0.40	1.69	0.82	0.62	21104.5

858

859

reference	pop.	tooth	sex	season	Sa	Sp	Sq	S5v	Sha	Sda	Spd (10-3)	Vm (10-3)	Vmc	Vvc	Asfc	epLsar (10-3)	H81	Tfv
aa257710	4	lm2	f	so	0.21	1.12	0.31	1.77	862.75	341.51	0.43	15.46	0.22	0.28	1.28	3.95	0.45	41639.0
aa257726	4	lm2	f	nd	0.18	0.85	0.24	1.43	35.40	339.48	0.18	9.45	0.21	0.25	0.47	1.34	3.35	9166.6
aa257729	4	lm2	f	mj	0.37	1.36	0.51	1.30	763.31	426.64	0.65	14.38	0.38	0.49	1.36	5.03	0.45	32380.0
aa257731	4	lm2	m	so	1.14	2.04	1.61	2.97	194.41	727.27	0.13	19.01	1.16	1.05	4.12	2.48	1.78	39018.2
170602	3	UM2	/	/	0.40	1.11	0.52	2.43	535.41	210.62	0.78	11.31	0.46	0.47	3.37	4.05	0.63	31550.2
170603	3	lm2	f	jf	0.63	2.56	0.88	3.61	/	683.08	0.08	49.16	0.63	0.65	1.69	3.11	1.10	24279.3
170604	3	lm2	f	jf	0.30	1.09	0.45	2.55	24.40	374.87	0.13	13.38	0.27	0.38	1.60	3.29	0.86	7994.1
170605	3	UM2	m	/	0.34	1.28	0.44	2.64	1156.82	467.18	0.90	16.51	0.41	0.43	2.16	2.23	0.75	30173.2
170752	3	lm2	m	ja	0.68	2.51	1.06	1.59	/	573.39	0.03	31.84	0.65	1.02	3.04	1.03	0.89	58565.5
170765	3	lm2	f	nd	0.45	0.99	0.81	2.97	24.50	645.11	0.10	13.18	0.29	0.31	3.02	5.32	4.11	12364.3
170766	3	UM2	f	jf	0.22	0.71	0.31	1.76	45.89	245.58	0.40	6.40	0.22	0.27	1.54	0.95	0.94	5969.0
170892	3	UM2	/	ja	0.19	0.52	0.28	1.25	170.64	213.86	1.25	2.94	0.17	0.16	1.58	8.92	1.03	1279.1
aa_04-05-18	3	lm2	m	mj	0.25	0.97	0.34	1.87	499.13	284.51	1.13	9.93	0.26	0.29	1.67	4.68	0.51	29951.4
AA-321AC	2	UM	/	/	0.22	0.89	0.42	4.56	137.87	249.56	0.13	11.22	0.21	0.29	2.47	0.49	1.60	46334.4
AA-322AC	2	UM	/	/	0.14	0.78	0.25	1.30	800.08	900.67	0.58	4.94	0.14	0.18	1.39	4.78	0.95	49802.9
AA-324AC	2	UM	/	/	0.17	1.30	0.25	1.05	305.31	109.87	2.05	8.27	0.17	0.21	2.67	3.57	1.08	3943.8
AA-326AC	2	UM	/	/	0.70	2.11	0.94	4.43	567.57	595.22	1.15	28.73	0.76	0.86	9.20	0.58	0.77	35510.4
AA-327AC	2	UM	/	/	0.17	0.75	0.24	2.19	545.63	275.45	0.63	7.83	0.16	0.24	1.55	1.88	0.74	26433.9
AA-A4	2	UM2	m	so	0.08	0.43	0.09	0.72	266.09	363.96	1.55	2.90	0.09	0.10	0.25	3.38	1.50	35813.7
AA-A5	2	lm2	f	/	0.21	1.72	0.28	1.21	435.73	250.02	2.23	14.15	0.24	0.29	2.87	1.79	1.00	32007.6
AA-A6	2	dP4	f	/	0.17	0.86	0.28	2.64	/	618.17	0.05	8.91	0.17	0.24	1.65	2.57	1.27	18228.0
AA-A7	2	lm	f	/	0.33	1.37	0.54	3.70	1495.44	355.75	0.18	18.34	0.30	0.40	2.78	1.55	2.83	30377.7
Zinv_85099	2	lm	f	so	0.22	1.21	0.29	0.75	299.41	230.76	2.18	14.73	0.24	0.34	1.62	9.32	0.31	56558.9
AA_120992	1	lm	f	ja	0.72	3.36	1.44	5.44	/	303.25	0.00	58.55	0.51	0.88	4.62	0.88	2.03	33701.2
AA-04-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	0.21	0.94	0.33	2.54	/	204.89	0.13	10.75	0.19	0.23	1.86	1.74	0.83	55745.8
AA-08-2010	1	lm2	m	nd	0.19	0.62	0.28	3.07	1534.75	223.93	0.55	6.33	0.19	0.22	2.42	2.21	1.01	36879.6
AA-120989	1	UM2	f	ja	0.79	2.52	1.05	2.11	1764.96	611.15	0.38	37.14	0.88	0.80	2.49	0.63	0.80	24392.7
AA-120990	1	lm2	f	ja	0.26	1.01	0.41	2.62	399.58	177.80	1.68	13.60	0.23	0.29	3.80	0.91	0.74	8527.1
AA-120991	1	UM	f	ja	0.29	2.28	0.51	3.31	818.93	485.98	0.68	20.27	0.19	0.30	4.01	3.39	1.77	52179.4
AA-120992	1	lm2	f	ja	0.72	3.36	1.44	5.44	/	303.25	0.00	58.55	0.51	0.88	4.62	0.88	2.03	33701.2
AA-120994	1	UM2	f	ja	0.47	1.14	0.65	5.06	/	621.04	0.23	13.71	0.50	0.52	4.29	3.88	1.71	25513.1
AA-12937	1	lm	f	ja	0.22	1.64	0.43	4.83	497.17	435.39	0.23	21.35	0.18	0.23	2.35	4.27	2.79	39011.4
AA-138864	1	lm2	f	ja	0.20	0.87	0.33	2.68	418.77	265.27	0.30	7.11	0.18	0.22	2.79	2.86	0.95	4583.3
AA-138865	1	lm2	f	ja	0.44	1.58	0.77	4.51	/	234.10	0.18	20.87	0.42	0.59	5.31	1.81	2.83	43136.8
AA-140164	1	lm2	f	ja	0.59	2.11	0.86	2.64	760.43	637.24	0.23	30.48	0.52	0.88	2.08	0.32	0.97	51273.6
AA-15-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	0.90	3.43	1.07	2.48	/	485.71	0.13	48.43	1.10	1.26	1.97	6.04	1.64	37805.0
AA-16-2010	1	UM2	f	nd	0.15	0.52	0.30	3.61	1355.58	355.51	0.10	6.42	0.13	0.18	2.25	0.42	3.67	2470.8
AA-17-2010	1	lm	f	nd	0.54	2.76	0.80	3.75	603.07	623.19	0.28	32.65	0.52	0.58	3.72	1.63	0.94	32913.0
AA-18-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	1.23	4.23	1.60	3.64	/	756.39	0.13	55.80	1.19	1.86	3.04	6.13	0.85	38786.7

860

861

reference	pop.	tooth	sex	season	Sa	Sp	Sq	S5v	Sha	Sda	Spd (10-3)	Vm (10-3)	Vmc	Vvc	Asfc	epLsar (10-3)	H81	Tfv
AA-22-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	0.18	0.90	0.39	3.82	1921.01	512.12	0.18	5.32	0.12	0.19	2.42	0.67	2.96	4911.8
AA-24-2010	1	lm2	m	nd	0.19	0.72	0.31	3.94	/	337.84	0.08	7.06	0.19	0.28	2.21	1.51	1.89	2451.5
AA-30-2010	1	lm2	m	nd	0.73	2.87	1.18	4.06	/	192.17	0.08	46.97	0.61	0.96	4.31	2.92	1.49	51680.2
AA-32-2010	1	lm2	m	nd	0.40	1.00	0.53	2.49	287.08	221.72	0.58	10.11	0.44	0.44	3.35	2.86	0.64	11405.0
AA-33-2010	1	UM2	f	nd	0.29	1.10	0.39	2.10	639.77	164.11	0.95	8.72	0.30	0.30	2.62	0.61	0.64	30670.9
AA-36-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	0.37	1.55	0.64	5.60	110.87	347.33	0.10	26.67	0.31	0.43	5.90	1.56	1.30	34658.6
AA-37-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	0.65	1.59	0.90	3.33	152.94	303.68	0.23	17.86	0.70	0.66	9.49	0.61	1.46	63564.7
AA-3769	1	lm2	/	/	0.39	1.20	0.57	2.60	29.87	311.04	0.13	13.29	0.37	0.46	1.33	4.73	1.75	54068.3
A-39370-69	1	UM3	f	ma	0.33	1.52	0.46	3.06	389.25	362.68	1.50	17.66	0.34	0.45	3.28	3.02	0.62	30910.7
A-39405-70	1	UM2	m	ja	0.07	1.01	0.10	0.83	659.83	466.58	0.95	3.98	0.08	0.10	0.26	5.90	1.37	25256.0
A-39432-70	1	lm2	f	ja	0.35	1.36	0.51	5.12	759.45	305.12	0.48	15.55	0.37	0.42	5.05	1.79	1.34	22703.3
AA-41-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	0.28	1.01	0.46	2.27	735.95	542.48	0.15	10.15	0.26	0.34	1.50	1.63	1.96	26433.9
AA-42-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	0.54	1.68	0.91	9.13	/	646.92	0.08	12.66	0.50	0.52	8.26	0.58	1.78	53428.7
AA-43-2010	1	lm2	/	nd	1.52	2.52	2.14	6.31	874.30	485.84	0.10	14.21	1.49	1.23	16.42	3.67	0.94	48717.3
AA-45-2010	1	lm	f	nd	0.49	1.19	0.86	6.45	27.12	395.46	0.08	14.22	0.30	0.34	5.90	2.24	1.37	2025.2
AA-48-2010	1	lm2	f	nd	0.72	2.57	1.20	6.31	/	1177.59	0.00	34.47	0.54	0.72	4.63	1.28	4.01	51264.9
AA-nn10	1	lm2	/	/	0.39	1.21	0.55	2.82	439.16	193.28	1.13	13.67	0.37	0.40	4.52	0.76	0.51	13217.0
AA-nn13	1	lm2	/	/	0.44	1.12	0.65	3.33	3643.33	365.23	0.18	13.85	0.42	0.48	4.88	0.26	1.27	22780.2
AA-nn14	1	lm2	/	/	0.18	1.60	0.60	5.59	/	312.00	0.03	4.70	0.12	0.16	5.47	2.52	3.01	30804.1
AA-nn16	1	lm2	/	/	0.43	1.88	0.67	4.13	1544.67	313.99	0.20	14.86	0.40	0.55	5.11	1.60	1.50	19484.6
AA-nn3	1	lm2	/	/	0.12	0.73	0.19	1.42	956.20	178.44	0.53	3.16	0.11	0.13	1.15	0.53	0.71	20465.0
AA-nn4	1	lm2	/	/	0.16	0.61	0.23	2.60	285.07	353.59	0.23	9.22	0.16	0.19	1.21	2.53	2.01	0.0
AA-nn5	1	lm1	/	/	0.43	1.25	0.66	4.06	/	444.87	0.08	9.63	0.42	0.43	4.33	1.46	1.03	6182.1
AA-nn6	1	lm2	/	/	0.39	1.36	0.69	2.11	23.13	249.70	0.10	16.22	0.29	0.35	3.94	3.22	2.01	29872.7
AA-nn7	1	dp4	/	/	0.50	1.20	0.75	4.52	272.36	344.28	0.20	15.44	0.46	0.47	4.24	0.91	1.33	16734.4
AA-nn8	1	lm2	/	/	0.66	2.60	1.60	14.24	9.44	367.25	0.05	22.52	0.48	0.56	16.72	1.11	6.02	32099.5
AA-w2011	1	lm	/	/	0.34	1.35	0.51	2.17	230.63	415.95	0.10	20.72	0.32	0.43	2.58	2.81	1.37	41220.0
ZMK1482	6	lm2	f	so	0.15	0.50	0.19	0.56	233.55	99.48	1.10	5.57	0.18	0.22	0.56	2.21	0.49	6075.5
ZMK1484	6	lm2	f	so	0.14	0.43	0.19	1.48	284.54	166.51	0.75	4.45	0.15	0.21	0.90	2.52	0.75	2984.5
ZMKCN1448	6	lm2	f	so	0.18	0.57	0.26	1.05	858.98	272.27	0.45	6.28	0.18	0.22	0.62	3.09	0.58	2131.8
ZMKCN1481	6	lm2	f	so	0.36	0.89	0.65	1.87	/	595.78	0.15	9.81	0.30	0.32	1.85	2.07	1.72	13933.4
ZMKCN1483	6	lm2	f	so	0.13	0.65	0.19	1.32	322.57	221.49	0.48	11.00	0.13	0.16	0.85	4.43	1.00	426.4
ZMKCN2924	6	lm2	f	/	0.36	1.46	0.60	4.12	210.44	749.37	0.03	14.41	0.35	0.48	2.40	1.08	1.05	15609.0
MK1044	6	lm2	m	so	0.19	0.94	0.25	1.41	372.29	328.30	0.98	6.42	0.21	0.26	0.78	5.25	0.50	20145.2
ZMKK91	6	lm2	f	so	0.09	0.31	0.13	1.14	243.86	119.70	0.55	3.87	0.09	0.11	0.84	3.11	0.52	959.3
ZMKMK939	6	lm2	m	so	0.20	0.69	0.27	1.47	1311.60	606.93	0.65	7.70	0.22	0.29	0.51	4.37	0.62	33573.5
ZMKMK940	6	lm2	f	so	0.13	0.51	0.23	1.35	121.30	595.62	0.13	5.06	0.13	0.16	0.84	1.91	2.59	3197.7

862

863


864 Table S2:

Population	n	n (Asfc>2.0)	n (epLsar>0.005)	% (Asfc>2.0)	% (epLsar>0.005)
1-Biebrza	44	35	3	79.5	6.8
Jul.-Aug.	12	11	1	91.7	8.3
Nov.-Dec.	18	14	2	77.8	11.1
2-Białowieża	10	5	1	50.0	10.0
3-Polesie	9	4	2	44.4	22.2
4-Målselv	59	18	5	27.8	8.5
5-Gausdal	62	15	16	24.2	25.8
6-Småland	10	1	1	10.0	10.0
<i>Giraffa camelopardalis</i>	16	7	1	43.8	6.3
<i>Cephalophus silvicultor</i>	3	20	3	74.1	11.1
<i>Cervus elaphus</i>	19	1	17	5.3	89.5
<i>Capreolus capreolus</i>	18	7	13	38.9	72.2

865

866

867 Figure S1:



868

869

870 Figure S2:

