



LJMU Research Online

Busia, L, Schaffner, CM and Aureli, F

Watch out! Insecure relationships affect vigilance in wild spider monkeys (Ateles geoffroyi)

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/id/eprint/11947/>

Article

Citation (please note it is advisable to refer to the publisher's version if you intend to cite from this work)

Busia, L, Schaffner, CM and Aureli, F (2019) Watch out! Insecure relationships affect vigilance in wild spider monkeys (Ateles geoffroyi). Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology, 73 (12). ISSN 0340-5443

LJMU has developed [LJMU Research Online](#) for users to access the research output of the University more effectively. Copyright © and Moral Rights for the papers on this site are retained by the individual authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may download and/or print one copy of any article(s) in LJMU Research Online to facilitate their private study or for non-commercial research. You may not engage in further distribution of the material or use it for any profit-making activities or any commercial gain.

The version presented here may differ from the published version or from the version of the record. Please see the repository URL above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information please contact researchonline@ljmu.ac.uk

<http://researchonline.ljmu.ac.uk/>

1 **Watch out!**

2 **Insecure relationships affect vigilance in wild spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*)**

3 Laura Busia^{1,2}, Colleen M. Schaffner^{2,3}, Filippo Aureli^{2,4}

4 ¹ School of Sociology and Anthropology, Sun Yat-sen University, Kang Le Lu, Haizhu Qu, Guangzhou, 510275,
5 China;

6 ² Instituto de Neuroetologia, Universidad Veracruzana, Av. Dr. Castelazo Ayala S/N, Col. Industrial Animas, CP
7 91190, Xalapa, Veracruz, México;

8 ³ Psychology Department, Adams State University, Alamosa, CO, 81101, USA;

9 ⁴ Research Centre in Evolutionary Anthropology and Palaeoecology, Liverpool John Moores University,
10 Liverpool, UK.

11
12 **Corresponding author:**

13 Laura Busia

14 laura.busia@gmail.com

15
16
17 **Abstract**

18 Vigilance is used to monitor extra-group threats as well as risky group members. We examined whether relationship
19 quality affects vigilance patterns of spider monkeys. We used focal animal sampling to collect data on social
20 interactions and individual vigilance of all adults and subadults (N=22) in a community of well-habituated Geoffroy's
21 spider monkeys living in the protected area of Otoch Ma'ax Yetel Kooch, Yucatan, Mexico. Through a principal
22 component analysis of seven indices of social interactions, we previously obtained three components of relationship
23 quality, reflecting the levels of compatibility, value and security. Such components could differentially affect vigilance
24 depending on whether vigilance is directed to extra-group threats or risky group members. We tested whether an
25 individual's vigilance was affected by 1) the mean level of compatibility, the mean level of value and the mean level of
26 security across subgroup members, 2) the lowest level of compatibility, the lowest level of value and the lowest level of
27 security with any subgroup member, and 3) the mean level of compatibility, the mean level of value and the mean level
28 of security with neighbors (i.e., subgroup members within 5 m). We did not find evidence for any effect of compatibility
29 and value; however, security did affect vigilance, as individuals were more vigilant when they had a less secure
30 relationship with the subgroup member with the lowest level of security or with the average neighbor.

31
32 **Key words:** vigilance, social monitoring, relationship quality, spider monkeys, fission-fusion dynamics

33

34

35 **Significance Statement**

36 Vigilance for monitoring group members is common in primate species. We examined whether the quality of social
37 relationships with subgroup members and neighbors modulates vigilance in wild spider monkeys. We used three
38 components of relationship quality (reflecting the levels of compatibility, value and security) and predicted each
39 component would affect vigilance depending on whether vigilance was directed to extra-group threats or risky group
40 members. We found no evidence that compatibility and value affected vigilance. However, an increase in vigilance
41 occurred when spider monkeys had a less secure relationship with 1) the subgroup member with the lowest level of
42 security and 2) the average neighbor. Our results show monitoring risky group members is an important component of
43 vigilance, especially in species facing low predation pressure.

44

45

46 **Introduction**

47 The majority of studies focusing on vigilance in group-living species tested the “many-eyes hypothesis” (Powell 1974;
48 van Schaik and van Hooff 1983) and the “dilution effect” (Dehl 1990), examining the relationship between group size
49 and the time individuals spent vigilant (Lima 1995; Beauchamp 2008, 2015). Many birds and mammals showed a
50 negative group-size effect on vigilance (Pulliam 1973; Elgar 1989; but see Beauchamp 2008). Although some
51 researchers found the same negative relationship in primate species (e.g., chacma baboons, *Papio cynocephalus ursinus*,
52 Hill and Cowlshaw 2002, Japanese macaques, *Macaca fuscata*, Kazahari and Agetzuma 2010, common marmosets,
53 *Callithrix jacchus*, Gosselin-Ildari and Koenig 2012), other studies found no group-size effect (e.g., chacma baboons,
54 Cowlshaw 1998; black howler monkeys, *Alouatta pigra*, Treves et al. 2001) or a positive group-size effect on vigilance
55 (e.g., mustached tamarins, *Saguinus mystax*, and saddleback tamarins, *S. fuscicollis*, Stojan-Dolar and Heymann 2010;
56 ursine colobus monkeys, *Colobus vellerosus*, Teichroeb and Sicotte 2012).

57 The inconsistency in the relationship between group size and vigilance in primate species may be due to two
58 main reasons. First, anti-predator vigilance might be shared among specific individuals and not among all group
59 members. For example, neighbors can be considered as another scale of individual association (Treves 2000) and
60 several studies showed a decrease in vigilance when the number of neighbors increases (e.g. redbellied monkeys,
61 *Cercopithecus ascanius schmidtii*, and red colobus monkeys, *Procolobus badius tephrosceles*, Treves 1998; black
62 howler monkeys, Treves et al. 2001; blue monkeys, *Cercopithecus mitis*, Gaynor and Cords 2012; Geoffroy’s spider
63 monkeys, *Ateles geoffroyi*, Busia et al. 2016). Second, the decrease of anti-predator vigilance due to large group size
64 might be counterbalanced by an increase of vigilance to monitor other group members (e.g. redbellied and red colobus
65 monkeys, Treves 1999). The need to monitor other group members could also be a reason why in some primate species
66 there is a positive relationship between number of neighbors and vigilance (e.g., brown capuchin monkeys, *Cebus*

67 *apella*, Hirsch 2002; chimpanzees, *Pan troglodytes*, Kutsukake 2006, 2007). Furthermore, biases due to different
68 definitions and methods used to study vigilance in primate species (see Allan and Hill 2018 for a detailed discussion)
69 may play a role in the inconsistency in the relationship between group size and vigilance. There are differences in
70 vigilance targets (focus on anti-predator vigilance only, excluding vigilance towards conspecifics e.g. white-faced
71 capuchin monkeys, *Cebus capucinus*, Campos and Fedigan, 2014) and vigilance time requirements across studies (e.g.
72 Gosselin-Ildari and Koenig 2012). In addition, some researchers collected vigilance data using focal sampling (of
73 different length, see Table 6 of Allan and Hill 2018), whereas others used instantaneous sampling (e.g. Hill and
74 Cowlshaw 2002) or one-zero sampling (e.g. Gosselin-Ildari and Koenig 2012). It is not clear, however, whether and
75 how differences in definitions and methods may affect the relationship between group size and vigilance in primate
76 species. In the only study on primates that compared different sampling methods no differences in vigilance were found
77 (Rose 2000, but see Hirschler et al., 2016 for the same comparison in a non-primate species).

78 Although vigilance of group members may serve to monitor potential breeding partners (e.g., chacma baboons,
79 Cowlshaw 1998), competitors (e.g., Beauchamp 2001) or update social knowledge (e.g., mandrills, *Mandrillus sphinx*,
80 Schino and Sciarretta 2016), it is often associated with the risk posed by group members (Treves 2000). Three main
81 elements, potentially associated with risk, could possibly affect vigilance. The first element is dominance rank, as
82 proximity with higher-ranking individuals is associated with an increase in vigilance (e.g., Kutsukake 2006; Gaynor and
83 Cords 2012). The second element is familiarity, given that vigilance increases when in proximity to less familiar
84 individuals (e.g., ursine black and white colobus monkeys, *Colobus vellerosus*, Macintosh and Sicotte 2009). The third
85 element can be relationship quality, as individuals are more vigilant when they are in proximity with group members
86 with whom they exchange more aggressive interactions (e.g., mountain gorillas, *Gorilla gorilla beringei*, Watts 1998;
87 brown capuchin monkeys, *C. apella*, Pannozzo et al. 2007).

88 Although a single interaction type is often used to measure the quality of the relationship between two
89 individuals, social relationships depend on the interchange of multiple types of interactions over time (Hinde 1979;
90 Aureli et al. 2012). While quantifying social interactions is relatively simple, inferring the quality of a social
91 relationship is not as straightforward. According to Cords and Aureli (2000), there are at least three components of
92 relationship quality: value, compatibility and security. Value is a measure of benefits that an individual gains from the
93 relationship with the partner. Compatibility refers to the general tenor of social interactions and reflects overall degree
94 of tolerance between two individuals. Security is a measure of the consistency of partners' responses during social
95 interactions over time. Several studies identified these or similar components when evaluating the quality of social
96 relationship between group members (chimpanzees, Fraser et al. 2008; ravens, *Corvus corax*, Fraser and Bugnyar 2010;
97 Japanese macaques, Majolo et al. 2010; Barbary macaques, *M. sylvanus*, McFarland and Majolo 2011; bonobos, *P.*
98 *paniscus*, Stevens et al. 2015; Geoffroy's spider monkeys, Rebecchini et al. 2011, Busia et al. 2017). These three

99 components may affect individual vigilance. If so, compatibility and value with group members are expected to have a
100 negative effect on vigilance, as more compatible and more valuable individuals are the ideal partners with whom to
101 share vigilance of any threat (Treves 1998). We can also expect a negative effect of security on vigilance but for a
102 different reason, i.e. because security reflects the degree of predictability and risk posed by others.

103 Spider monkeys (*Ateles* spp.) represent an excellent model to study the effect of relationship quality on an
104 individual's vigilance behavior for several reasons. First, spider monkeys' high degree of fission-fusion dynamics
105 results in social environment (i.e., subgroup composition) changing several times a day (Aureli and Schaffner 2008).
106 Thus, it is possible to evaluate potential changes in individual vigilance depending on subgroup composition. Second,
107 spider monkeys are known to have low predation pressure (black spider monkeys, *A. chamek*, Symington 1987; Di
108 Fiore 2002), based in part on their large body size, arboreal nature and having a low likelihood of predator encounters
109 (Hill and Dunbar 1998), making it an excellent species to better understand vigilance directed to monitor group
110 members. Third, although dominance is not a prominent feature because competition is reduced through fission
111 (Asensio et al. 2008; Aureli and Schaffner 2008), spider monkeys have differentiated social relationships depending on
112 sex (e.g. relationships between males are stronger than relationships between females: Fedigan and Baxter 1984;
113 Chapman et al. 1989; Aureli and Schaffner 2008; Slater et al. 2009) and individual identity (e.g. Rebecchini et al. 2011;
114 Busia et al. 2017). Thus, it is possible to test whether differences in individual vigilance may be due to differences in
115 social relationships with subgroup members and neighbors. Fourth, we carried out a previous study in which we
116 identified three components of social relationships (Busia et al. 2017) that fit the components hypothesized by Cords
117 and Aureli (2000). We can then evaluate which components may affect vigilance.

118 The main goal of our study was to examine whether the quality of the relationships with subgroup members
119 and close neighbors (i.e., subgroup members within 5 m; hereafter "neighbors") affects vigilance in wild Geoffroy's
120 spider monkeys. Using compatibility, value and security as components of relationship quality (Busia et al. 2017; c.f.
121 Cords and Aureli 2000), we tested three predictions. As the subgroup is the basic association unit for species with a high
122 degree of fission-fusion dynamics, our first prediction was that individuals are likely to spend more time vigilant when
123 they have, on average, a relationship characterized by lower levels of a) compatibility, b) value and c) security with
124 subgroup members (Predictions 1a, 1b and 1c, respectively). Predictions 1a and 1b are based on the concept that
125 individuals would share vigilance with compatible and valuable subgroup members (Treves 1998), whereas Prediction
126 1c focuses on monitoring risky group members. Vigilance may however be affected by the presence of specific
127 individuals in the subgroup, rather than the average relationship quality with all subgroup members. Thus, our second
128 prediction was that the time individuals spend vigilant is negatively associated with the lowest level of a) compatibility,
129 b) value and c) security with any subgroup member (Predictions 2a, 2b and 2c). As neighbors can be considered as
130 another association type (Treves, 1998), our third prediction was that individuals are likely to spend more time vigilant

131 when they have, on average, a relationship characterized by lower levels of a) compatibility, b) value and c) security
132 with their neighbors (Predictions 3a, 3b and 3c). We summarized our predictions in Table 1.

133

134 **Methods**

135 *Field site and study subjects*

136 The field site is located in the forest surrounding the Punta Laguna lake, within the natural protected area of Otoch
137 Ma'ax Yetel Kooch, Yucatan Peninsula, Mexico (20°38' N, 87°38' W). The natural protected area covers 5367 ha and
138 includes a mosaic of old-growth, semi-evergreen medium forest, with trees up to 25 m in height, and 30–50-year-old
139 successional forest (Ramos-Fernandez and Ayala-Orozco 2003).

140 We studied 22 adult and subadult individuals of a community of Geoffroy's spider monkeys living in the
141 protected area (6 adult males, 10 adult females, 1 subadult male, 5 subadult females). During the study period,
142 community size varied between 34 and 37 individuals, due to birth, immigration and emigration events. The study
143 community is part of a continuous long-term project since 1997 (Ramos-Fernandez et al. 2018) and all community
144 monkeys are fully habituated to human presence (i.e. researchers are completely ignored). We therefore assumed
145 researcher presence had no influence on monkey vigilance. We recognized each monkey individually by facial features
146 and differences in fur coloration. We classified individuals as adults if they were more than 8 years of age and as
147 subadults if they were 5-8 years old. As the age was not known for immigrant females, we classified them as subadults
148 until they gave birth for the first time (Shimooka et al. 2008).

149

150

151 *Data Collection*

152 We collected data using focal animal sampling (Altmann, 1974) from January 2013 to September 2014 by using a
153 digital voice recorder. The first author and a well-trained field assistant collected 1001 15-minute focal samples (mean \pm
154 SE: 45.1 \pm 18.9 per subject; inter-observer reliability was high: intra-class correlation coefficients >0.9 , see
155 Supplementary information). Focal animals were chosen based on an *a priori* list in order to have a similar number of
156 focal samples across subjects whenever possible. No animal was sampled more than once per hour.

157 During focal samples, we collected all occurrences and duration of vigilance and social interactions involving
158 the focal animal, recording the identity of the partner. We defined vigilance as the visual monitoring of the surrounding
159 area beyond arm's reach and not in the direction of food while foraging (Treves 2000). Our definition shares the main
160 elements with that of Allan and Hill (2018, p.14), which includes "open eyes and the vision line extended beyond its
161 hand and the substrate, animal or object the individual is in contact with". We also recorded the time when the focal

162 animal was out of view or when the visibility was too poor to reliably observe vigilance. As it is difficult to identify
163 vigilance targets, we made no attempt to distinguish between vigilance of the surroundings and vigilance of other
164 subgroup members. During the focal samples, we recorded the following social interactions: grooming (manipulation of
165 another individual's fur with hands or mouth); co-feeding (feeding on the same fruit species within 1 m from each
166 other); embrace (putting one or two arms around the other's body while facing each other). Every 2 min, we recorded
167 the identity of individuals within 5 m from the focal animal (i.e., neighbors) as neighbors are expected to be more
168 preferred as partners than the other subgroup members. We also recorded aggressive interactions, including conspicuous
169 vocalizations, chases and physical contact, with all-occurrence sampling (Altmann 1974) and whether other individuals
170 provided support to the aggressor (no case of support in favor of the victim was witnessed). Whereas only adults and
171 subadults were subjects of focal samples, juveniles were also considered as subgroup members and neighbors.

172 Subgroup membership was continuously updated as we recorded the identity of every member of the initially
173 encountered subgroup and all changes due to fission and fusion events. An individual was considered part of the
174 followed subgroup if it was <30 m from a subgroup member according to a chain rule established for this study site
175 (Ramos-Fernandez 2005; see Croft et al. 2008 for the concept of the chain rule). Fission was defined as individuals
176 from the followed subgroup separating from one another in different subgroups and was recorded when one or more
177 individuals were not seen within 30 m from any member of the followed subgroup for 30 min. Fusion was defined as
178 individuals from two subgroups joining one another to form a larger subgroup and was recorded when one or more
179 individuals came within 30 m from any member of the followed subgroup (Rebecchini et al. 2011).

180

181 *Data analyses*

182 In a simultaneous study, we calculated seven indices based on social interactions between individuals (see
183 Busia et al. 2017 for details) and we included them in a principal component analysis. We obtained three components.
184 The first component reflected compatibility as it had high loadings of grooming and proximity. The second component
185 reflected value as it had high loadings of support during aggressive interactions and cofeeding. The third component
186 reflected security as it had high loadings of aggressive interactions and inconsistency in subgroup association over time
187 (Busia et al. 2017). Each dyad was therefore characterized by its own measure of compatibility, its own measure of
188 value and its own measure of security (Busia et al. 2017).

189 Beta-distribution models were used to examine the effect of relationship quality components on the proportion
190 of time individuals spent vigilant. The dependent variable was the proportion of time the subject spent vigilant in each
191 focal sample. To calculate this proportion, the duration the subject spent vigilant was divided by the duration of the
192 focal sample minus the time the subject was out of view or visibility was too poor to reliably observe vigilance. To test
193 Prediction 1a, 1b and 1c, we used the mean of the compatibility measure, the mean of the value measure and the mean

194 of the security measure the focal animal had with the subgroup members as independent predictor variables. To test
195 Prediction 2a, 2b and 2c, we considered the lowest measure of compatibility, value and security between the focal
196 animal and any subgroup member as independent predictor variables. In 86% of the 1001 focal samples the subgroup
197 composition did not change during the 15-minute sample. In each of the 136 focal samples during which subgroup
198 composition changed due to fission and fusion events, we used the subgroup composition occurring during the majority
199 of the 15-minute sample. As results did not change when we ran the analyses excluding those 136 focals, here we
200 presented results using the whole dataset. To test Prediction 3a, 3b and 3c, we used the mean of the compatibility
201 measure, the mean of the value measure and the mean of the security measure the focal animals had with the neighbors
202 (i.e., individuals that were within 5 m from the focal animal in at least one 2-minute scan during the focal samples) as
203 independent predictor variables. There was no collinearity among the predictor variables because they were derived
204 from the three components obtained through the principal component analysis. In all models, we included the mean
205 number of neighbors as well as the age and the sex of the focal individual as control variables, and the individual ID as
206 random factor. We did not include subgroup size as an additional control variable because we did not find that it
207 affected vigilance in this monkey community (Busia et al. 2016).

208 We ran the beta-distribution models using the “glmmTMB” package [Magnusson et al. 2019] in R (version
209 3.6.0, R Core Team, 2019). We compared full models with null models, which included only the control variables (i.e.
210 sex and age of the focal individual, and the mean number of neighbors) and the random factor, using a likelihood ratio
211 test with the function ANOVA (Dobson and Barlett 2008). We set an alpha level of 0.05 for all tests. We checked the
212 model's adequacy through Q-Q plots (normality of the residuals) and residual vs. fitted graphs (homoscedasticity), and
213 the assumptions were satisfied. Plots were created using the “effects” package (Fox and Weisberg 2019), which allows
214 the visual representation of the model results.

215 **Data availability:** the datasets generated during and/or analysed during the current study are not publicly available but
216 are available from the corresponding author on reasonable request.

217

218 **Results**

219 Predictions 1a, 1b and 1c that the time individuals spent vigilant would be higher when they have, on average, a
220 relationship characterized by lower levels of compatibility, value and security with subgroup members were not
221 supported, as the model was not different from the null model ($N=838$, $\chi^2=4.7286$, $p=0.1928$). Predictions 2a and 2b,
222 that individual's vigilance is negatively affected by the lowest level of compatibility and value with any subgroup
223 member, were not supported. However, Prediction 2c was supported, as individual's vigilance was negatively affected
224 by the lowest level of security with any subgroup member. (Table 2, Fig. 1).

225

226 Similarly, Predictions 3a and 3b, that individuals would spend more time vigilant when they have, on average, a
227 relationship characterized by lower levels of compatibility and value with their average neighbor, were not supported.
228 However, Prediction 3c was supported, as individuals were more vigilant when they had a lower level of security with
229 their average neighbor (Table 3, Fig. 2).

230

231

232

233 **Discussion**

234 Our overall findings showed that spider monkeys' vigilance is affected by a component of the relationship with other
235 community members. Indeed, among the three components of relationship quality we considered, only security played a
236 role in influencing the amount of time an individual spent vigilant. Whereas spider monkey vigilance was not affected
237 by relationship quality with the average subgroup member, individuals were more vigilant the lower the level of
238 security with at least one subgroup member (Prediction 2c). In addition, spider monkeys spent more time vigilant when
239 the relationship with the average neighbor was less secure (Prediction 3c).

240 Despite the high variation in subgroup composition due to the high degree of fission-fusion dynamics of the
241 species, Predictions 1a, 1b and 1c, that individuals would spend more time vigilant when they share lower levels of
242 compatibility, value and security with the average subgroup member, were not supported. At the subgroup level, it may
243 be possible that calculating the mean of each component of the relationship quality the focal animal share with other
244 individuals masked the effect that relationship quality can have on vigilance. This might be due to two main reasons.
245 First, changes in individual's vigilance may depend on the presence of specific individuals. This possibility is supported
246 by our findings that spider monkeys are more vigilant when community members with whom they have a highly
247 insecure relationship were in the same subgroup (Prediction 2c). Similarly, mountain gorilla females monitored
248 approaching males longer than approaching females, especially when males gave a display, and monitored females with
249 whom they had an antagonist relationship for longer than females with whom they had an affiliative relationship (Watts
250 1998).

251 Second, the quality of relationship with the average individual may affect vigilance at a different scale of
252 association (e.g. neighbors, Treves 1998) rather than at the subgroup level. This possibility is supported by our findings
253 that spider monkeys spent more time vigilant when they had a less secure relationship with the average neighbor

254 (Prediction 3c). It is plausible that a more precise measure of proximity (neighbor vs. subgroup membership) was more
255 effective in revealing the role of risk, which characterizes insecure relationships. Further support comes from studies
256 that found an effect of the type of social interactions exchanged with neighbors on vigilance (e.g., mountain gorillas,
257 Watts 1998; chimpanzees, Kutsukake 2006; brown capuchin monkeys, PannoZZo et al. 2007; blue monkeys, Gaynor and
258 Cords 2012). Concerning the role of neighbors, several primate studies focused on the number (e.g., chacma baboons,
259 Cowlishaw 1998; redtail and red colobus monkeys, Treves 1998; black howler monkeys, Treves et al. 2001;
260 chimpanzees, Kutsukake 2006, 2007; ursine colobus monkeys, Teichroeb and Sicotte 2012), the sex (e.g. brown
261 capuchin monkeys and white-fronted capuchin monkeys, *C. albifrons*, van Schaik and van Noordwijk 1989; Thomas's
262 langurs, *Presbytis thomasi*, Steenbeek et al. 1999), and the dominance rank (e.g. blue monkeys, Gaynor and Cords
263 2012) as neighbor characteristics affecting individual vigilance. As we previously found that spider monkeys decrease
264 the time spent vigilant when they have a higher number of neighbors (Busia et al. 2016), we controlled for the number
265 of neighbors while examining the effect of the quality of social relationships with neighbors on vigilance. Thus, our
266 finding of the effect of the level of security with neighbors on vigilance is independent from any effect the number of
267 neighbors may have.

268 Despite more compatible and more valuable individuals being the ideal partners with whom to share vigilance
269 of any threat (Treves 2000), we did not find evidence for quality components labeled compatibility and value to play a
270 role in modulating vigilance in our study. This result could be because vigilance may not need to be shared with specific
271 partners in spider monkeys. Although predation events were observed in the study area as part of a long-term project
272 (Busia et al. 2018), spider monkeys experience an overall low predation rate (Di Fiore 2002). It is then plausible that
273 anti-predator behavior does not require specific individuals (e.g., highly compatible and valuable partners) with whom
274 to share vigilance. Whereas sharing vigilance for external threats (e.g. threats from other spider monkey communities)
275 was supported by a previous study on the same monkeys (Busia et al. 2016), the need to share vigilance for within-
276 group threats that are partner-specific (e.g., community members with whom one has highly insecure relationships) may
277 be limited. Thus, there is no reason to share vigilance with community members with specific characteristics (i.e., high
278 compatibility and high value) to monitor within-group threats.

279 There are many factors affecting vigilance, such as the animal's spatial position within the group, its distance to
280 neighbors, its height in the canopy and the overall visibility (Allan and Hill 2018). Here we focused on social
281 relationships. Overall, our study contributed to the understanding the role relationship quality plays on the time
282 individuals spend being vigilant. Although several studies already showed the influence of single social interactions on
283 vigilance (blue monkeys, Gaynor and Cords 2012; brown capuchin monkeys, PannoZZo et al. 2007; mountain gorillas,
284 Watts 1998; chimpanzees, Kutsukake 2006), our study goes one step further considering multiple interactions to
285 characterize how components of relationship quality affect vigilance. Security modulated the time spider monkeys

286 dedicated to vigilance when considering the relationships with specific subgroup members (Prediction 2c) and the
287 average neighbor (Prediction 3c), whereas compatibility and value had no effect. In a previous paper (Busia et al. 2017),
288 the component of social relationship labeled as “security” had negative loadings with two indexes of social interactions:
289 rate of aggressive interactions and inconsistency of subgroup association. Thus, more time was spent to be vigilant
290 when there were companions that were usually more aggressive and less predictable. Our result on the modulating role
291 of the quality of the relationships with neighbors on vigilance gives insights into the apparent contrasting findings of
292 time spent vigilant decreasing (i.e., sharing vigilance with neighbors: redtail and red colobus monkeys , Treves 1998;
293 Geoffroy’s spider monkeys, Busia et al. 2016) and increasing with a larger number of neighbors (i.e., vigilance to
294 monitor risky neighbors: e.g., chimpanzees, Kutsukake 2006, 2007). Sharing vigilance with neighbors would usually
295 reduce costs, but if an insecure relationship exists with them, spending more time being vigilant may be cost effective.

296

297 **Acknowledgements**

298 We thank Anthony R. Denice for his outstanding contribution in data collection, Augusto Canul, Eulogio Canul, Juan
299 Canul and Macedonio Canul for their valuable assistance during fieldwork and Sandra Smith for her overall support and
300 early discussion on vigilance and social relationships. We are grateful to Gabriel Ramos-Fernández and Laura G. Vick
301 for sharing the management of the long-term project. We are also grateful to Theo C.M. Bakker, Maria van Noordwijk
302 and four anonymous reviewers whose comments and suggestions greatly improved a previous version of this
303 manuscript. We thank Chester Zoo and The National Geographic Society for financially supporting the long-term
304 project, and the Consejo Nacional por la Ciencia y la Tecnología (CONACyT) for LB’s PhD studentship (CVU n°
305 490429) and for equipment (n°I0101/152/2014 C-133/2014).

306

307 **Compliance with ethical standards**

308 **Funding:** This study was funded by Consejo Nacional por la Ciencia y la Tecnología (CONACyT), Mexico (LB's PhD
309 studentship: CVU n° 490429 and equipment: n°I0101/152/2014 C-133/2014).

310 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

311 **Ethical approval:** this study was conducted with the approval from CONANP and SEMARNAT
312 (SGPA/DGVS/00910/13 and SGPA/DGVS/02716/14).

313

314 **References**

315

316 Allan AT, Hill RA (2018) What have we been looking at? A call for consistency in studies of primate vigilance. *Am J*
317 *Phys Anthropol* 165:4-22.

- 318 Altmann J (1974) Observational studies of behavior: Sampling methods. *Behaviour* 49:227–267.
- 319 Asensio N, Korstjens AH, Schaffner CM, Aureli F (2008) Intragroup aggression, fission-fusion dynamics and
320 feeding competition in spider monkeys. *Behaviour* 145:983-1001
- 321 Aureli F, Fraser ON, Schaffner CM, Schino G (2012) The regulation of social relationships. In: Mitani J, Call J,
322 Kappeler P, Palombit R, Silk J (Eds.), *Evolution of primate societies*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, pp
323 531-551.
- 324 Aureli F, Schaffner CM (2008) Social interactions, social relationships and the social system of spider monkeys. In:
325 Campbell CJ (Ed.), *Spider Monkeys: Behavior, Ecology and Evolution of the Genus Ateles*. Cambridge
326 University Press, Cambridge, pp. 236-265.
- 327 Beauchamp G (2001) Should vigilance always decrease with group size? *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 51:47-52.
- 328 Beauchamp G (2008) What is the magnitude of the group-size effect on vigilance? *Behav Ecol* 19:1361-1368.
- 329 Beauchamp G (2015) *Animal vigilance: monitoring predators and competitors*. Academic Press, Oxford.
- 330 Busia L, Schaffner CM, Aureli F (2016) Watch out or relax: Conspecifics affect vigilance in wild spider monkeys
331 (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Behaviour* 153:107–124.
- 332 Busia L, Schaffner CM, Aureli F (2017) Relationship quality affects fission decisions in wild spider monkeys (*Ateles*
333 *geoffroyi*). *Ethology* 123:405-411.
- 334 Busia L, Smith-Aguilar S, Aureli F, Schaffner CM, Ramos-Fernandez G (2018) Predation attacks on wild spider
335 monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Folia Primatol* 89:341-346.
- 336 Campos FA, Fedigan LM (2014). Spatial ecology of perceived predation risk and vigilance behavior in white-
337 faced capuchins. *Behav Ecol* 25:477-486.
- 338 Chapman CA, Fedigan LM, Fedigan L, Chapman LJ (1989) Post-weaning resource competition and sex ratios in spider
339 monkeys. *Oikos* 54:315–319.
- 340 Cords M, Aureli F (2000) Reconciliation and relationship quality. In: Aureli F, de Waal FBM (Eds.), *Natural conflict*
341 *resolution*. University of California Press, Berkeley, pp 177- 198.
- 342 Cowlshaw G (1998) The role of vigilance in the survival and reproductive strategies of Desert Baboons. *Behaviour*,
343 135:431-452.
- 344 Croft DP, James R, Krause J (2008) *Exploring animal social networks*. Princeton University Press, Princeton.
- 345 De Ruiter JR (1986) The influence of group size on predator scanning and foraging behaviour of
346 wedged-capped capuchin monkeys (*Cebus olivaceus*). *Behaviour* 98:240-258.
- 347 Di Fiore A (2002) Predator sensitive foraging in ateline primates. In: Miller LE (Ed.), *Eat or be eaten: predator sensitive*
348 *foraging among primates*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 242-267.
- 349 Dobson AJ, Barnett AG (2008) *An introduction to generalized linear models*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, Boca Raton.

- 350 Elgar MA (1989) Predator vigilance and group size in mammals and birds: a critical review of the empirical evidence.
351 Biol Rev 64:13-33.
- 352 Fedigan LM, Baxter MJ (1984) Sex difference and social organization in free-ranging spider monkeys (*Ateles*
353 *geoffroyi*). Primates 25:279–294.
- 354 Forstmeier W, Schielzeth H (2011) Cryptic multiple hypotheses testing in linear models: Overestimated effect sizes and
355 the winner’s curse. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 65:47–55.
- 356 Fox J, Weisberg S (2019) An R companion to applied regression, Third Edition Sage Publications, Los Angeles.
- 357 Fraser ON, Bugnyar T (2010) The quality of social relationships in ravens. Anim Behav 79:927–933.
- 358 Fraser ON, Schino G, Aureli F (2008) Components of relationship quality in chimpanzees. Ethology 114:834–843.
- 359 Gaynor KM, Cords M (2012) Antipredator and social monitoring functions of vigilance behaviour in blue monkeys.
360 Anim Behav 84:531–537.
- 361 Gosselin-ildari AD, Koenig A (2012) The effects of group size and reproductive status on vigilance in captive
362 *Callithrix jacchus*. Am J Primatol 74:613-621.
- 363 Hill RA, Cowlshaw G (2002). Foraging female baboons exhibit similar patterns of antipredator vigilance across two
364 populations. In: Miller LE (Ed.), Eat or be eaten: predator sensitive foraging among primates. Cambridge
365 University Press, Cambridge, pp 187-204.
- 366 Hill RA, Dunbar RI (1998) An evaluation of the roles of predation rate and predation risk as selective pressures on
367 primate grouping behaviour. Behaviour 135:411-430.
- 368 Hinde RA (1979) Towards understanding relationships. London Academic Press, London.
- 369 Hirsch BT (2002) Social monitoring and vigilance behavior in brown capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*). Behav Ecol
370 Sociobiol 52:458-464.
- 371 Hirschler IM, Gedert JL, Majors J, Townsend T, Hoogland JL (2016) What is the best way to estimate vigilance? A
372 comparison of two methods for Gunnison's prairie dogs, *Cynomys gunnisoni*. Anim Behav 121:117-122.
- 373 Kazahari, N., & Agetsuma, N. (2010). Mechanisms determining relationships between feeding group size and foraging
374 success in food patch use by Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata*). Behaviour 147:1481– 1500.
- 375 Kutsukake N (2006) The context and quality of social relationships affect vigilance behaviour in wild chimpanzees.
376 Ethology 112:581–591.
- 377 Kutsukake N (2007) Conspecific influences on vigilance behavior in wild chimpanzees. Int J Primatol 28:907–918.
- 378 Lima SL (1995) Collective detection of predatory attack by social foragers: fraught with ambiguity? Anim Behav
379 50:1097-1108.
- 380 MacIntosh AJ, Sicotte P (2009) Vigilance in ursine black and white colobus monkeys (*Colobus vellerosus*): an
381 examination of the effects of conspecific threat and predation. Am J Primatol 71:919-927.

382 Magnusson A, Skaug H, Nielsen A, Berg C, Kristensen K, Maechler M, van Bentham K, Sadat N, Bolker B, Brooks M
383 (2019) Package “glmmTMB”. Generalized Linear Mixed Models using Template Model Builder. CRAN:
384 <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/glmmTMB/glmmTMB.pdf>.

385 Majolo B, Ventura R, Schino G (2010) Asymmetry and dimensions of relationship quality in the Japanese macaque
386 (*Macaca fuscata yakui*). Int J Primatol 31:736–750.

387 McFarland R, Majolo B (2011) Exploring the components, asymmetry and distribution of relationship quality in wild
388 Barbary macaques (*Macaca sylvanus*). PLoS One 6:e28826.

389 Pannozzo PL, Phillips KA, Haas ME, Mintz EM (2007) Social monitoring reflects dominance relationships in a small
390 captive group of brown capuchin monkeys (*Cebus apella*). Ethology 113:881–888.

391 Pinheiro J, Bates D, DebRoy S, Sarkar D, R Core Team (2014) nlme: linear and nonlinear mixed effects models. R
392 package version 3.1–117. <http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/nlme/index.html>.

393 Powell GVN (1974) Experimental analysis of the social value of flocking by starlings (*Sturnus vulgaris*) in relation to
394 predation and foraging. Anim Behav 22:501-505.

395 Pulliam H (1973) On the advantages of flocking. J Theor Biol 38: 419-422.

396 Ramos-Fernandez G (2005) Vocal communication in a fission–fusion society: do spider monkeys stay in touch with
397 close associates? Int J Primatol 26:1077-1092.

398 Ramos-Fernández G, Aureli F, Schaffner CM, Vick LG. (2018). Ecología, comportamiento y conservación de los monos
399 araña (*Ateles geoffroyi*): 20 años de estudio. In: Urbani B, Kowalewski M, Teixeira da Cunha RG, de la Torre
400 S, Cortés-Ortiz L (Eds.), La primatología en Latinoamérica 2 / A primatologia na America Latina 2. Instituto
401 Venezolano de Investigaciones Científicas, Altos de Pipe, pp. 531-543.

402 Ramos-Fernandez G, Ayala Orozco B (2003) Population size and habitat use of spider monkeys at Punta Laguna,
403 Mexico. In: Marsh LK (Ed.), Primates in fragments. Kluwer Academic/Plenum Press, New York, pp 191-209.

404 Rebecchini L, Schaffner CM, Aureli F (2011) Risk is a component of social relationships in spider monkeys. Ethology
405 117:691–699.

406 Rose L (2000) Behavioral sampling in the field: continuous focal versus focal interval sampling. Behaviour 137: 153-
407 180.

408 Schino G, Sciarretta M (2016) Patterns of social attention in mandrills, *Mandrillus sphinx*. Int J Primatol 37:752-761.

409 Shimooka Y, Campbell CJ, Di Fiore A, Felton AM, Izawa K, Link A, Nishimura A, Ramos-Fernandez G, Wallace R
410 (2008) Demography and group composition of *Ateles*. In: Campbell CJ (Ed.), Spider monkeys: behavior,
411 ecology & evolution of the genus *Ateles*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, pp 329-348.

412 Slater KY, Schaffner CM, Aureli F (2009) Sex differences in the social behavior of wild spider monkeys (*Ateles*
413 *geoffroyi yucatanensis*). Am J Primatol 71:21–29.

414 Steenbeek R, Piek RC, van Buul M, van Hooff JARAM (1999) Vigilance in wild Thomas's langurs (*Presbytis thomasi*):
415 the importance of infanticide risk. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 45:137-150.

416 Stevens JM, de Groot E, Staes N (2015) Relationship quality in captive bonobo groups. Behaviour 152:259-283

417 Stojan-Dolar M, Heymann EW (2010) Vigilance in a cooperatively breeding primate. Int J Primatol 31:95-116.

418 Symington MM (1987) Ecological and social correlates of party size in the black spider monkeys, *Ateles paniscus*
419 *chamek*. Dissertation, Princeton University.

420 Teichroeb JA, Sicotte P (2012) Cost-free vigilance during feeding in folivorous primates? Examining the effect of
421 predation risk, scramble competition, and infanticide threat on vigilance in ursine colobus monkeys (*Colobus*
422 *vellerosus*). Behav Ecol Sociobiol 66:453-466.

423 Treves A (1998) The influence of group size and neighbours on vigilance in two species of arboreal monkeys.
424 Behaviour 135:453-481.

425 Treves A (1999) Within-group vigilance in red colobus and redbellied monkeys. Am J Primatol 48:113-126.

426 Treves A (2000) Theory and method in studies of vigilance and aggregation. Anim Behav 60:711-722.

427 Treves A, Drescher A, Ingrisano N (2001) Vigilance and aggregation in black howler monkeys (*Alouatta pigra*). Behav
428 Ecol Sociobiol 50:90-95.

429 van Schaik CP, van Hooff JARAM (1983) On the ultimate causes of primate social systems. Behaviour 85:91-117.

430 van Schaik CP, van Noordwijk MA (1989) The special role of male *Cebus* monkeys in predation avoidance and its
431 effect on group composition. Behav Ecol Sociobiol 24:265-276.

432 van Schaik CP, van Noordwijk MA, Warsono B, Sutriyono E (1983) Party size and early detection of predators. Primates
433 24:211-221.

434 Watts DP (1998) A preliminary study of selective visual attention in female mountain gorillas (*Gorilla gorilla beringei*).
435 Primates 39:71-78.

436

437

438

439

440

441

442

443

444 *Table 1: Details of the relationship components and their measures used to test each prediction of the three hypotheses.*

Component	Indexes with high loading	Predictions	Measure for Hypothesis 1	Measure for Hypothesis 2	Measure for Hypothesis 3
Compatibility	Grooming, Proximity	a	Mean of all subgroup members	Lowest value of all subgroup members	Mean of all neighbors
Value	Support during aggression, Cofeeding	b			
Security	Aggression, Inconsistency in subgroup association	c			

445

Table 2. Results of the beta-distribution model showing the association between time spent vigilant and the level of compatibility, value and security the focal individual shared with the subgroup member with the lowest levels.

	Estimate	Std. Error	z	p
(Intercept)	-1.04844	0.08956	-11.707	< 0.0001 ***
Compatibility	-0.02301	0.04235	-0.543	0.587
Value	0.05364	0.04194	1.279	0.2009
Security	-0.09605	0.03756	-2.557	0.0106 *
Neighbors	0.02447	0.03627	0.675	0.5000
Age	0.21103	0.1404	1.503	0.1328
Sex	-0.12263	0.12972	-0.945	0.3445

446 The model was statistically different from the null model (likelihood ratio test: N=849, $\chi^2=8.5603$, p=0.036).
 447 * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p< 0.001
 448

Table 3. Results of the beta-distribution model showing the association between time spent vigilant and the levels of compatibility, value and security the focal individual shared with the average neighbor.

	Estimate	Std. Error	z	p
(Intercept)	-1.01245	0.114890	-8.820	< 0.0001 ***
Compatibility	-0.05272	0.04894	-1.077	0.2814
Value	0.06133	0.04572	1.341	0.1798
Security	-0.1517	0.05510	-2.753	0.0059 **
Neighbors	0.03357	0.04748	0.707	0.4795
Age	0.29579	0.14084	2.100	0.0357*
Sex	-0.16127	0.12844	-1.256	0.2093

449 The model was statistically different from the null model (likelihood ratio test: N=485, $\chi^2=9.353$, p=0.025).
 450 * = p<0.05; ** = p<0.01; *** = p< 0.001
 451

452

453 **Figure legends**

454

455 **Figure 1:** Illustration of the proportion of time spent vigilant depending on the lowest level of compatibility, value and
 456 security shared with the subgroup members.

457

458 **Figure 2:** Illustration of the proportion of time spent vigilant depending on the average level of compatibility, value and
 459 security shared with the neighbors.