



HAL
open science

What if animal agency could improve behavioral and neuroscience research?

Cédric Sueur, Sarah Zanaz, Marie Pelé

► **To cite this version:**

Cédric Sueur, Sarah Zanaz, Marie Pelé. What if animal agency could improve behavioral and neuroscience research?. 2022. hal-03299505v4

HAL Id: hal-03299505

<https://hal.science/hal-03299505v4>

Preprint submitted on 1 Jun 2022 (v4), last revised 14 Sep 2022 (v5)

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 **What if animal agency could improve behavioral and neuroscience research?**

2 Cédric Sueur^{1,2,3}, Sarah Zanaz^{1,4}, and Marie Pelé⁵.

3 1 Université de Strasbourg, CNRS, IPHC UMR 7178, Strasbourg, France.

4 2 Institut Universitaire de France, Paris, France.

5 3 CEERE Centre Européen d'Enseignement et de Recherche en Ethique, Strasbourg, France.

6 4 Benemérita Universidad Autónoma de Puebla, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Puebla

7 5 Anthro-po-Lab, ETHICS EA7446, Lille Catholic University.

8

9 The authors declare no competing interests.

10

11 Correspondence to Cédric Sueur: cedric.sueur@iphc.cnrs.fr

12

13

14 **Abstract**

15 Despite increasing numbers of publications showing that many animals possess the neural
16 substrates involved in emotions and consciousness, many animals are still restrained and
17 forced to take part in applied or fundamental research. However, these restraints stress
18 animals and may result in false negatives or false positives. A change is needed in
19 researchers' work paradigm with animals to progress in behavioral and neuroscience
20 research and thus gain access to hitherto inaccessible yet important scientific results.
21 Animals interact with the world in their own ways, and researchers need to adopt these
22 ways, i.e. their agency, to perform better research and develop a better understanding of
23 how the brain and behavior evolve. This paper discusses how animal agency can not only be
24 the key to more wide-ranging and improved research in existing domains, but can also lead
25 to new research questions resulting from a non-anthropocentric view.

26

27 **Keywords:** 3Rs, animal research, ethology, ethics, sentience.

28 **Introduction**

29 By definition, animal research requires the involvement of animals. Although researchers
30 have made great progress and improved experimental conditions for animals through the
31 application of the 3R (Replace, Reduce, Refine) rules, some behavioral experiments showed
32 that animals are still restrained through different methods, such as the use of throw nets,
33 restraint chairs, cages, or by food deprivation (Ben-Ami Bartal, Decety, & Mason, 2011;
34 Chang et al., 2021; He et al., 2020; McMillan, Bloomsmith, & Prescott, 2017; Prescott &
35 Buchanan-Smith, 2003; Slater et al., 2016). According to McMillan et al. (2017), too many
36 researchers continue to use methods that entail negative reinforcement (when the
37 individual has to perform an action to remove a stressor), whilst procedures using restraint
38 chairs could comprise positive reinforcement methods (when the individual receives a
39 reward after entering in the chair and then getting its head out from the chair) (McMillan et
40 al., 2017). These protocols are realized to obtain results in behavioral or neuroscience
41 research but may also lead to different issues. Beyond the ethical issues of such restraints
42 for animals, these examples of experimental setups lead us to consider which possibilities
43 and results have yet to be investigated and more importantly, whether such compulsory
44 protocols could lead to false negatives or false positives (Chang, Zhang, Poo, & Gong, 2017;
45 Huttunen, Adams, & Platt, 2017; Liu, Liu, & Huang, 2017). False negatives or false positives
46 mean that studies show respectively negative (not expected, H₀) or positive results
47 (expected, H₁) but these results are not due to the tested condition (e.g. a drug, a gene, an
48 environmental condition) but to uncontrolled factors (e.g. stress, personality). Indeed, stress
49 and contention (i.e., the animal is immobilized and restrained in an apparatus, such as a
50 chair or a box) can not only modify some animal behaviors but also entirely prevent others
51 from being displayed (Lecorps, Weary, & von Keyserlingk, 2021; Mason et al., 2019; Prescott,
52 2016). Some authors, such as Patter, Blattner, Matsuzawa, King B. J., and McMillan, consider
53 that the current 3R framework is not sufficient to ensure that animals are meaningful
54 participants in experiments, which is crucial to guarantee that scientific results are not
55 altered by stress or personality of animals (King, 2021; Matsuzawa, 2016a; McMillan,
56 Perlman, Galvan, Wichmann, & Bloomsmith, 2014; Van Patter & Blattner, 2020). Studies
57 carried out on animals under restraints offer few meaningful opportunities for them to show
58 their full behavioral and cognitive capacities, and in this way to exercise agency with their

59 environment and in their relationships, both between each other and with humans (Blattner,
60 Donaldson, & Wilcox, 2020). Gillespie (2019) wrote that ‘there is a long tradition of studying
61 nonhuman animals in spaces of animal use and exploitation, where researchers and teachers
62 in effect become complicit through passive participation in violence against nonhuman
63 animals...’ (p. 19). According to Blattner et al. (2020), who worked on animal agency in
64 rehomed farm animals and from which this paper is inspired, ‘longstanding ideological
65 blinders and anthropocentric bias frame animals as limited beings whose lives unfold
66 according to fixed genetic or species-specific scripts, rather than as complex subjects who
67 act with intention and purpose, both individually and collectively’ (p. 1). Restraint-based
68 experiments are severely limited in terms of what researchers can learn from animals, in
69 individual and group contexts. On the contrary, letting animals express their behavior, will,
70 intentions, or even imagination could bring new advances in research and human-animal
71 cooperation. The use of animal agency must now be considered a central and strong point of
72 the protocols put in place, particularly when applying for funding. In any case, we do not
73 pretend to sermonize researchers, we only seek to provide them with arguments in favor of
74 such new leads of investigation when working with animals.

75 Indeed, increasing numbers of publications show that many animals (mammals, birds, and
76 other creatures including octopuses) possess the neural substrates involved in emotions and
77 consciousness (Ben-Haim et al., 2021; Low et al., 2012). Rats, primates, and pigeons are
78 capable of metacognition, i.e., knowing if they are wrong or right in a test (Le Neindre et al.,
79 2017, 2018). Cetaceans and apes are conscious of their own existence, and that of others
80 (Gallup, Anderson, & Shillito, 2002). Self-awareness was also found in cleaner fishes (de
81 Waal, 2019; Kohda et al., 2019). Apes know what their conspecifics know (Kaminski, Call, &
82 Tomasello, 2008) and believe (Krupenye, Kano, Hirata, Call, & Tomasello, 2016). Empathy
83 has been observed in apes (De Waal, 2012) and rats (Ben-Ami Bartal et al., 2011). Finally,
84 some apes have a sense of morality (De Waal, 2006; Jensen, Call, & Tomasello, 2007;
85 Tomasello & Vaish, 2013). Of course, there remains some debate on how to interpret
86 behavioral studies when it comes to the cognitive capacities we listed below (Bekoff & Allen,
87 1997; Buckner, 2011; Sober, 2009), and we need to be careful about how to interpret these
88 results since animals minds are still black boxes in multiple ways (Janson & Byrne, 2007;
89 Péron, 2012). There may be evidence of these capacities, but it is by no means a settled

90 matter that, for instance, all fish on Earth are self-conscious. Whilst some individuals show
91 capacities, such as the theory of mind, anticipation, or metacognition in some experiments,
92 other members of the same species fail in other setups or replications (Boyle, 2021; Voelkl et
93 al., 2020, 2021), thus proving, if still necessary, the importance of comparative methods
94 (Krasheninnikova, Berardi, Lind, O'Neill, & von Bayern, 2019; Schmitt, Pankau, & Fischer,
95 2012). Moreover, there is perhaps no need to have these specific cognitive capacities to be
96 an agent, certainly not according to some views of agency. More and more, researchers
97 showed that animals may have cognitive capacities similar to or close to the ones of human
98 beings by changing their way of thinking from an anthropocentric approach (Birch, Schnell, &
99 Clayton, 2020) to an acceptance of anthropomorphism as a way to explain animal behavior
100 (Griffin, 2013) but also by hypothesizing that animals can think in a way different from how
101 humans do (Andrews, 2020b; Birch et al., 2020; De Waal, 2016). For instance, self-awareness
102 was not found in some species when the mirror test (Gallup et al., 2002) was used, but it was
103 found when researchers used the senses of animals, such as the sense of smell for dogs
104 (Cazzolla Gatti, 2016) or vocalizations in gibbons (D'Agostino, Pasetta, & Reichard, 2017).
105 Merleau-Ponty had already noted this problem in his *Causeries* back in 1948: researchers
106 usually do not try to understand animals in their singularity, *as they are*, but rather in
107 comparison with human beings, projecting what are essentially human characteristics onto
108 animals (Merleau-Ponty, 2017). However, this is a means to measure the distance between
109 human beings and other animals rather than a tool allowing a real understanding of how
110 animals live and express a subjective existence (Sueur, Forin-Wiart, & Pelé, 2020; Sueur &
111 Pelé, 2017; Tokuyama et al., 2012). Studied in the light of human normative references,
112 animals always lack something (Merleau-Ponty, 2017). Moreover, most studies on
113 comparative cognition are carried out on captive animals, not only because we lack field
114 technology to make these studies on wild ones, but also because it is easier for researchers
115 to experiment in controlled conditions. Of course, captivity may limit the potentiality of
116 animals to display natural behaviors and then, to prove the ecological validity of the
117 protocols. For as long as animals are studied from a human perspective and are tested in
118 terms of human problems (capacity to count, to draw, to speak a human language) instead
119 of their own questions and problems, they will always respond 'as they can' (Canguilhem,
120 1992), without ever being able to fully express their agency. However, there have been
121 philosophical and anthropological attempts to blur the boundaries between humans and

122 other animals (Andrews, 2020b; Böhnert & Hilbert, 2018; Daly Bezerra de Melo, 2012; Daly,
123 2018; De Waal, 2016; Langlitz, 2020; Wendler, 2020). Animals interact with the world in their
124 own ways and these ways, i.e. their agency, are precisely the view that researchers need to
125 adopt to perform better research and develop a better understanding of how the brain and
126 behavior evolve.

127 **Animal agency**

128 Agency is the capacity of an actor to act in a given environment. In the broadest sense,
129 agency is the ability to have an influence or an effect on something. In this sense, agency is
130 possessed not only by all humans and animals, but also by inanimate objects, such as
131 viruses, stones, or tornadoes, as explained by Blattner et al. (2020). However, its focus might
132 be narrower when agency is considered as the expression or manifestation of a subjective
133 existence; agency implies affecting the world in ways that reflect a subject's desires or will
134 (Krause, 2013). It refers to an individual pursuing its own good in its own way (Taylor, 2011).
135 In the book *Fellow Creatures: Our Obligations to the Other Animals*, Korsgaard (2018) revised
136 Kant's argument of the value of humanity and raised three claims: humans need to join
137 other autonomous beings with reciprocal moral rules, humans need to care about every
138 sentient animal and human beings are not more important than other animals. Blattner et
139 al. (2020) investigate animal agency in a sanctuary for rehomed farm animals, considering
140 how a careful exploration of dimensions of agency in this setting might inform ideas of
141 interspecies interactions (work, research, politics, etc.) and ethics. Their study focused on
142 multispecific animals living in a sanctuary. For the owners of the sanctuary and the
143 researchers, the sanctuary is an 'integrated multispecies community or society whose
144 members shape spaces and practices together, take on recognized social roles, and create
145 and transmit social norms across species lines'. Blattner et al. (2020), De Waal (2016), Le
146 Neindre et al. (2017, 2018), Meijer (2019) affirm that researchers need to spend time in
147 community with animals, learn from them, and be prepared to respond and adjust scientific
148 learning process through relationships with them. This means that animals should no longer
149 be considered as the subjects of scientific experiments, but rather as participants. As
150 Andrews (2020) notes, it is important to treat animals as sentient research participants who
151 exist within their own context and with whom researchers will be in a relationship. She
152 defends a range of scientific benefits than come from forming relationships with animal

153 research subjects and that we develop below. For example, when it comes to assessing
154 animal intelligence, the researchers' focus should encompass goals that are meaningful,
155 useful, and of interest to animals instead of focusing on goals that are only relevant to the
156 human scientist (Pepperberg, 2006). Animals should no longer be seen as objects of
157 knowledge, or mere matter for the act of the human knower, but should rather be granted
158 status as an *agent* in the production of knowledge (Haraway, 1989). Interaction and
159 communication have to go in both directions. Researchers need to make themselves
160 understandable to animals as many species are able to understand our facial expressions
161 and emotions (Bhattacharjee et al., 2019; Good, Sterzinger, & Lavigne, 2018; Hoffman,
162 Creevy, Franks, O'Neill, & Promislow, 2018; Patterson & Cohn, 1990; Pedersen, 2020;
163 Savage-Rumbaugh & Lewin, 1994). Researchers need to extend their circle from species with
164 whom they are used to or with whom it is easier to communicate, such as apes, monkeys,
165 parrots, or cetaceans, as some other species are surely able to understand their intentions as
166 behavioral or even neuroscientific experiments, particularly in rats and mice being the most
167 used animals in laboratories but having a sense of empathy (Ben-Ami Bartal et al., 2011;
168 Klein & Gogolla, 2021; Venniro & Golden, 2020) and feeling human intention (i.e. the
169 Pygmalion effect – Good et al., 2018). Even species phylogenetically distant from humans,
170 such as cephalopods, show evidence of complex cognition but more research is needed to
171 understand their sense of self (Birch et al., 2020; Schnell, Amodio, Boeckle, & Clayton, 2021;
172 Schnell & Clayton, 2019). Now, the cognitive abilities of many species are not recognized for
173 their true value, whereas accepting their abilities to interact with researchers and
174 understand their will could advance our understanding of mind evolution. For instance,
175 applying the same agency and research protocols in horses as it was done in primates led to
176 advances in equine cognition and comparative cognition (Matsuzawa, 2017). The first study
177 on horses using computer touch panels was realized recently in 2015 (Tomonaga et al.,
178 2015). When researchers allow too little room for the animals' own forms of agency, the
179 true abilities of these individuals are obscured (McFarland & Hediger, 2009).

180 Blattner et al. (2020) analyzed in their paper what freedoms of actions may result in the
181 expression of agency in animals as well as how humans take up these freedoms. Their
182 observational analysis coming from multispecies ethnography and based on a number of

183 methodological and ethical questions on animal-human and animal-animal relationships led
184 them to divide animal agency into four schemes (Figure 1):

185 *1. Agency through space and time:*

186 Animals are mobile and explore/exploit their environments. This exploration and
187 exploitation can be used to better understand the behaviors of animals but also their
188 preferences in terms of habitats, sleeping areas, and social relationships and conduct to new
189 disciplines as animal geographies (Buller, 2014) or animal mobilities (Hodgetts & Lorimer,
190 2020). Whilst this form of agency seems obvious to many researchers and the criteria are
191 often applied to livestock and farmed animals (Bouissou, Boissy, Le Neindre, & Veissier,
192 2001; Scanes, 2018; Sosa et al., 2019), it is rarely applied in comparative psychology or
193 neuroscience. Specifically, modifications of the environment can be used to shape animal
194 decisions and can remove some of the negative reinforcement that is still applied to animals.
195 Animals could experience less stress in some parts of their environment than others, and
196 carrying out experiments in these places could increase their motivation to participate and
197 decrease the risk of false negatives (Coe & Hoy, 2020; Matsuzawa, 2020a). Of course, this
198 statement implies that the housing of animals should be redesigned in some manner. Size
199 and enrichment of cages of lab-rodents for instance are often insufficient, leading to high
200 mortality and high morbidity (Cait, Cait, Scott, Winder, & Mason, 2022). A consortium of
201 researchers called for including social housing information in biomedical research as the
202 social setting of subjects influenced results in biomedical research (Pomerantz et al., 2022).
203 Boundaries and fences cannot be only considered as barriers and limitations of freedoms but
204 also as security and communication touchstones as suggested by Blattner et al. (2020).
205 Humans should create barriers and fence placements according to the behavior of animals.
206 Similarly, for behavioral experiment apparatus, animals should not be forcibly brought to
207 where researchers want to test them but researchers should observe animals in the best
208 position to settle the devices. For approximately ten years, urban design is thought to be
209 adapted to human behavior in order to increase health, decrease stress, and the costs of
210 urban refurbishment (Park & Evans, 2016; Pereira, Nogueira, & Padez, 2019). A similar way
211 of thinking could be applied to animals. More and more in “modern” zoos animals of
212 different species begin to be mixed in larger enclosures, with still the possibility for each
213 species to be isolated from other animals. This is a way to apply the concept of nudge

214 (Thaler, 2008) to captive animals studies, as has already been done for species conservation
215 (Czap, Czap, Lynne, & Burbach, 2015; Eberle, 2021; Reddy et al., 2017). The Primate
216 Research Institute (Kyoto University) applied this concept with the WISH cages, a set of
217 enclosures connecting habitats and also equipped with a computer-controlled touch panel
218 system for cognitive tests. This framework increases the fission-fusion dynamics of
219 chimpanzees, i.e. their social agency, and their cognitive agency (Matsuzawa, 2020a).

220 *2. Agency through practice and routine:*

221 Animals have habits, even in the wild. Social animals collectively organize their day in order
222 to meet their requirements and maintain the advantages of living in groups (Sueur, 2011).
223 Rather than forcing animals to participate in experiments, accepting that animals can accept
224 or refuse to participate according to their routine would increase the robustness and
225 viability of the results. Any animal that wants to be tested seeks to use tablets or other
226 interactive apparatus, such as artificial fruits (Whiten, Custance, Gomez, Teixidor, & Bard,
227 1996) or opening boxes with food inside (Aplin et al., 2015), that are based on technologies
228 like RFID (Radio Frequency IDentification) (Claidière, Gullstrand, Latouche, & Fagot, 2017;
229 Matsuzawa, 2013); these tools respect their habits and routines as animals are allowed to
230 come and to stay to do the tests at the time they want and for the duration they want.
231 Medical aspects, such as health checks or medical procedures that require restraints, should
232 also be based on these routines in order to decrease animal stress and injuries, as already
233 shown in their use by zoos (e.g., the Great Ape Heart Project, Murphy et al., 2018). Whilst
234 experimentalists working with primates already invoke a form of consent to work with
235 animals (Fenton, 2014), this protocol could be applied to many other species, such as
236 rodents. To our knowledge, there are no testing devices that can be used in the cages of rats
237 with which they can play when they want and for the duration they want. This kind of
238 system should be extended to all species involved in behavioral neuroscience. Routines for
239 social animals are a well-known process where social and dominance relationships can be
240 observed in instances, such as when a group is exiting its night enclosure or going back to it
241 at the end of the day (Grasso, De Rosa, Napolitano, Di Francia, & Bordi, 2007; Reinhardt,
242 1964, 1992). Knowing this routine or observing why the routine of an animal is different
243 from others or for a day allows us to better understand their behavior without the need to
244 disturb them by subjecting them to experiments or health checks. Moreover, modifying the

245 routines of animals is a way to measure their behavioral flexibility, personality, and group
246 cohesiveness.

247 *3. Agency through social roles:*


248 A social role is the behavior expected of an individual who occupies a given social position or
249 status. Individuals understand the place that conspecifics hold in their society (Borgeaud,
250 Sosa, Bshary, Sueur, & van de Waal, 2016; Levé, Sueur, Petit, Matsuzawa, & Hirata, 2016).
251 The adoption of roles that are recognized and acknowledged by others, and indeed mutually
252 constructed with conspecifics, is an important dimension of relational agency and a means
253 by which researchers can effectively affirm their subjective existence within a community.
254 This role can be intraspecific or interspecific. Roles of individuals inside their group have
255 been amply described in terms of dominance (policing behaviors, protecting groups),
256 kinship, and maternal relationships (Krause & Ruxton, 2002). Individuals also develop strong
257 relationships when they share similar attributes, such as sex or age (Abeyesinghe, Drewe,
258 Asher, Wathes, & Collins, 2013; Massen & Koski, 2014; Rault, 2012; Silk, 2002; Tsuji,
259 Shimoda-Ishiguro, Ohnishi, & Takatsuki, 2007). Knowing the relationships of individuals is
260 important to researchers when transferring animals, rehabilitating lab subjects, or forming a
261 new group. Pairs of affiliated animals have to be managed until observing stability in terms
262 of a few agonistic events and low stress. Moreover, when doing tests, researchers also know
263 which pairs of individuals can easily be tested together or not. Group members influence
264 each other, and share knowledge (Duboscq, Romano, MacIntosh, & Sueur, 2016). Dominant
265 or old individuals can transmit important information to others (Grampp, Sueur, van de
266 Waal, & Botting, 2019), and this social transmission can be used to make animals learn how
267 to use experimental apparatus or spaces (Biro, Sousa, & Matsuzawa, 2006; Whiten, 2011).
268 This biased attention of group members towards dominant or older individuals (Grampp et
269 al., 2019) might be used by researchers to make animals more rapidly and more efficiently
270 learn a new behavior. These individuals can consequently become leaders and by influencing
271 these leaders, through which researchers can manage the movements of an entire group
272 (Ramos et al., 2018, 2021). Multispecific and positive interactions or associations are also
273 found naturally in the wild in situations, such as multispecies group protection, interspecies
274 grooming, and predator alerts (Buchanan-Smith, Griciute, Daoudi, Leonardi, & Whiten, 2013;
275 Fitzgibbon, 1990; Goodale & Kotagama, 2005; Koda, 2012; Krebs, 1973; Pearson, Davis, &

276 Litchfield, 2010; Peres, 1993; Stensland, Angerbjörn, & Berggren, 2003), even if negative
277 interactions (cheating, predating, competition) are also observed. Blattner et al. (2020)
278 described multispecies interactions in the sanctuary for formerly farmed animals. Individuals
279 of specific species adopt different roles with geese, cows, or dogs acting as guardians and
280 policers, cows teaching sheep, and multispecies friendship and parenting. Multispecific
281 leadership is also described in different reports with geese leading ducks and chickens, and
282 goats leading sheep (Baratay, 2011, 2017; Baratay, 2012). Parenting or adopting an orphan is
283 also a role that some animals can manage, either in an intra- or inter-species context (Pelé &
284 Petit, 2015).

285 *4. Agency through social norms:*

286 Social norms are the customary rules that govern behavior in groups and societies (Bicchieri
287 & Muldoon, 2011). The previous example of learners and teachers brings us to the subject of
288 social norms. Behavioral rules and social systems are partly genetic in animals but are also
289 transmitted by cultures (Brent et al., 2013; Krause & Ruxton, 2002; Sinha, 2005; Sueur, 2015;
290 Ward & Webster, 2016). Many traditions of tool use and social habits have been described in
291 chimpanzees or macaques (Laland & Hoppitt, 2003). There is a debate as to whether animals
292 have social norms, and in this debate, Bicchieri (2016) is taken to require theory of mind for
293 social norms, which some think is too demanding to permit animal social norms (Schlingloff
294 & Moore, 2018). Other theorists (Andrews, 2020a; Fitzpatrick, 2020) have argued that some
295 animals do have social norms. On no account of social norms are cultural traditions sufficient
296 for norms, because social norms are thought by all theorists to require a social maintenance
297 constraint, such that other group members care whether an individual follows the pattern or
298 not. This might be the case in animal collective decisions (Sueur, Bousquet, Espinosa, &
299 Deneubourg, 2021). Although collective decision processes are species-specific, variations
300 are observed between groups and individuals of the same species. The roles played by
301 individuals can lead to a strong leadership or the development of a more democratic
302 process, such as voting (King & Sueur, 2011). Voting systems (Pennisi & Giallongo, 2018), are
303 described in many species, with intentional behaviors and perceptions of the mental states
304 of conspecifics indicating some theory of mind and reinforcing the idea of agency. A sense of
305 community (Blattner et al., 2020) seems to exist in chimpanzees and cetaceans, and indeed
306 many other animals know exactly who belongs or does not belong to their group by

307 recognizing the faces or voices of group members. Interestingly, even in primate species,
 308 olfactory cues about various physiological factors, for instance, parasite load, exist and
 309 influence social relationships and grooming rate (Poirotte et al., 2017; Romano, MacIntosh,
 310 & Sueur, 2020).



311
 312 Figure 1: The four schemes of animal agency (squares) and the environmental factors
 313 affecting them (circles)

314
 315 These different instances show that animals have agency over their spatial, temporal, and
 316 social environment. Animals can therefore be viewed as *agents*; their choice to act has direct
 317 consequences on their environment, or they can also resist conditions that do not please
 318 them and act accordingly to change them (Carter & Charles, 2013). The behavior that
 319 animals show, the facial expressions they display, and the places they occupy are cues to
 320 indicate their willingness. Researchers could use this agency to increase animal welfare and
 321 obtain more viable and robust results whilst extending the scope of behavioral and

322 neuroscience research. Indeed, the great difficulty today is to measure the behaviors or the
323 neuronal activities of sentient animals whilst seeking to do so in natural conditions: the
324 results of many experiments have been criticized, as the associated captivity, animal
325 microbiota, and genetic or behavioral variance of animals has made it impossible to allow
326 reproducing or generalizing any results that were unaffected by false negatives or false
327 positives (Barbee & Turner, 2019; Rader, 2004; Voelkl et al., 2020). Often, in the research
328 process, many of the limitations shown by the animals to date are actually the limitations of
329 the scientific methods, rather than the animals themselves (Savage-Rumbaugh, Rumbaugh,
330 & Fields, 2006). Similarly, De Waal (2006) argues: 'All that most experiments have done thus
331 far is testing the ape's theory of the human mind. We would do better to focus on the ape's
332 theory of the ape mind', (p. 70). Following the concept of animal agency, this paper proposes
333 a future research framework to work with animals and progress in research.

334 **Future research framework**

335 Some years ago, applying the use of touchscreens in macaques, or studying mouse
336 personality was almost unimaginable in neuroscience. Yet today, these projects have
337 become reality. Touchscreens or joysticks are used to understand cognition and self-agency
338 (Kaneko & Tomonaga, 2011) in a wide range of species (pigs, macaques, baboons,
339 marmosets, goats, horses, rats, mice, etc.) (Belsey, Nicholas, and Yttri (2020); Calapai,
340 Cabrera-Moreno, Moser, and Jeschke (2022); Claidière et al. (2017); Croney and Boysen
341 (2021); Jacobson, Kwiatt, Ross, and Cronin (2019); Tomonaga et al. (2015); Washburn, Rulon,
342 and Gullledge (2004); Yang et al. (2022); Zeagler, Gilliland, Freil, Starner, and Jackson (2014)).
343 However, this use is still limited given its potential even though more and more
344 neuroscience studies have been using it in mice or rats (Bussey et al., 1997, 2008; Delotterie
345 et al., 2015; Slutzky, Jordan, Bauman, & Miller, 2010). So, touchscreens and joystick
346 apparatuses promote animal agency, even though it is in a limited artificial environment.
347 Testing these same species in more natural and more complex captive habitats or even in
348 the wild could enhance the possibility of them expressing their agency. Other factors
349 influence this agency: there is a substantial amount of literature describing how animal
350 personality and microbiota can influence results (Bergvall, Schäpers, Kjellander, & Weiss,
351 2011; Bousquet, Petit, Arrivé, Robin, & Sueur, 2015; Brosnan et al., 2015; Carere & Locurto,
352 2011; Davidson, Raulo, & Knowles, 2020; Dougherty & Guillette, 2018; Galland, 2014; Griffin,

353 Guillette, & Healy, 2015; Kirchoff, Udell, & Sharpton, 2019; Montiel-Castro, González-
354 Cervantes, Bravo-Ruiseco, & Pacheco-López, 2013; Robinson & Cameron, 2020). This success
355 demonstrates the importance of not limiting scientific imagination about how researchers
356 could work with animals to obtain new results in biological sciences. Animals may show
357 imagination and pretense (Matsuzawa, 2020b; Mitchell, 2007; Picciuto & Carruthers, 2016),
358 which are important for agency, but researchers have to give animals the possibility to
359 express their agency with adequate testing conditions.

360 First, researchers need to change their way of thinking to a perspective of working *with*
361 animals rather than *on* animals. Animals are agents endowed with intentions that transcend
362 traditional subject-object relations. Researchers need to trust their capabilities (Nielsen,
363 2018; Nielsen, 2020) in order to increase research possibilities. Experimental setups, such as
364 restraint chairs or food privation, cause stress to animals and prevent them (both physically
365 and mentally) from fully expressing their agency. This challenge may certainly take time but
366 would be hugely beneficial. Patter and Blattner (Van Patter & Blattner, 2020) suggest core
367 principles to follow with animals: non-maleficence, beneficence, and voluntary participation
368 (Webb, Woodford, & Huchard, 2019). Positive methods exist and have proved to be efficient
369 (Laule, Bloomsmith, & Schapiro, 2003; Prescott et al., 2010; Prescott, 2016; Prescott &
370 Buchanan-Smith, 2003; Prescott & Buchanan-Smith, 2007; Schapiro, Bloomsmith, & Laule,
371 2003). The readiness of chimpanzees (which are no longer used for invasive experiments –
372 Matsuzawa, 2016b) to voluntarily participate in interactions or allow humans to observe
373 them can facilitate the measurement of embryo development and brain activities in
374 unanesthetized and unrestrained individuals (Figure 2 - Matsuzawa (2013); Sakai et al. (2011,
375 2012); Ueno et al. 2010). Unrestrained or minimally restrained and voluntary animals can be
376 trained to put their head in a mask (Slater et al., 2016) and be tested whilst receiving fruit
377 juice. This allows the measurement of different metrics with eye tracking (apes: Kano &
378 Tomonaga, 2009; Krupenye et al., 2016; monkeys: Machado and Nelson (2011); Ryan et al.
379 2019) and non-invasive neuroimaging (Basso et al., 2021) (Figure 3.A). Basso et al. (2021)
380 report the non-invasive neuroimaging from anesthetized monkeys and restrictions were
381 required for the neuroimaging of awake monkeys. Moreover, magnetic resonance imaging
382 (MRI) requires the restraining of the subject during the scan. However, neuroimaging studies

383 in dogs showed that they can be trained to remain still during fMRIs without any restriction.
384 Surely, this cooperation can be done in other species.

385

386




387
388 Figure 2: (A) Developmental neuroscience. Fetal brain development in chimpanzees was
389 measured by a non-invasive ultrasound technique. (B) EEG recordings in a chimpanzee. The
390 chimpanzee quietly sat on the chair and allowed the experimenter to put electrode patches
391 on the skin of her forehead and the top of her head. Photos provided courtesy of Satoshi
392 Hirata.

393

394 Some traditional approaches involve bringing animals into a lab and restraining them while
395 they perform tasks in order to ensure stable gaze-tracking and neural recordings. However,
396 this unnatural setting does not permit the study of brain activity during natural, social, and
397 complex behaviors. Different studies highlight the importance of studying animals in the wild
398 instead of in the laboratory (Cauchoix, Hermer, Chaine, & Morand-Ferron, 2017; Janmaat,
399 2019; Kumpan, Smeltzer, & Teichroeb, 2020; Verhaeghen, Martin, & Sędek, 2012) not
400 bringing different results but more interpretable ones. Specific ethical guidelines exist now
401 for research in the wild (Costello et al., 2016; Soulsbury et al., 2020). The likely benefits and
402 possible negative effects of researchers' presence and field methods on study subjects, their
403 environment, and the local human community should, of course, be considered (MacKinnon

404 & Riley, 2010). New technologies allow us to bring science into the wild and test
405 unrestrained animals in their natural environment, thus removing any experimental source
406 of stress (as they would come by themselves to be tested) and measuring their entire
407 behavioral repertoire. This allows the study of behavioral responses and brain activity during
408 natural, social, and complex behaviors. This field works are possible in many species
409 including rodents (Evans, Liechti, Boatman, & König, 2020; Lopes & König, 2020; Raulo et al.,
410 2021). The animals studied can be identified using RFID techniques (Fehlmann & King, 2016)
411 but also via artificial intelligence with the recognition of individuals by video tracking
412 (Ferreira et al., 2020; Poirotte & Charpentier, 2020; Schofield et al., 2019). The latter
413 removes the need to capture animals. A location can then be defined where different
414 touchscreens deliver food, with activation only for certain species and individuals.
415 Researchers can imagine going beyond the use of touchscreens with the implementation of
416 eye-tracking and neuroimaging apparatus in the wild (Figure 3B). This could open up new
417 research avenues in species that are in danger of extinction or cannot be easily maintained
418 in captivity. Some automatic devices already exist to make some playback experiments as
419 BoomBox: An Automated Behavioral Response (ABR) camera trap module for wildlife
420 experiments (Palmer et al., 2022). Artificial fruit or tool boxes exist in the field (van de Waal,
421 Borgeaud, & Whiten, 2013) and robots are increasingly used with wild animals (Grémillet,
422 Puech, Garçon, Boulinier, & Maho, 2012; Le Maho et al., 2014). Indeed, it is hard to imagine
423 a wild primate entering a closed box, but once habituated to the box, animals may be
424 vulnerable to poaching or capture. However, research possibilities in this domain are huge,
425 and we need to judge how best to build some of these systems while avoiding the potential
426 drawbacks, while ensuring the health and security of studied animals. Training procedures
427 should be devised to encourage animals into entering such boxes. Once one animal becomes
428 accustomed to it, social learning should make encourage other animals to enter these boxes
429 (Duboscq et al., 2016; Hoppitt & Laland, 2013). As Schaefer and Claridge-Chang (2012)
430 wrote, 'the new automation is not just faster: it is also allowing new kinds of experiments,
431 many of which erase the boundaries of the traditional neuroscience disciplines (psychology,
432 ethology, and physiology) while producing insight into problems that were otherwise
433 opaque' (p. 170).



434

435 Figure 3: (A) Non-invasive neuroimaging and eye-tracking system with voluntary experience
 436 in the lab. (B) Non-invasive touchscreen system with voluntary engagement and individual
 437 identification in the wild. In setup A, the subject would show better agency than if it was
 438 restrained in a chair. However, the same subject in setup B would show greater agency than
 439 in setup A, as it is free to express its entire behavioral repertoire in natural and wild
 440 conditions. This figure was realized using FAVPNG.com and Biorender.

441

442 Some studies, especially in the biomedical or physiological/cellular domains, cannot be
 443 performed outside the laboratory. It is important for these experiments to respect the 3Rs
 444 but also to think about the Bateson cube (Bout, Fentener van Vlissingen, & Karssing, 2014),
 445 meaning that scientists need to evaluate the ethical acceptability of their research for
 446 society as a whole, including animals. The 3Rs can be extended by testing animals in viable
 447 conditions. Overly standardized lab conditions, for instance, decrease the replicability of
 448 studies by decreasing the behavioral variability (this is commonly known as the
 449 standardization fallacy – Voelkl et al., 2021 (Würbel, 2000)). Indeed, lab conditions were
 450 standardized for many years in terms of animal genetics, husbandry, food for study
 451 comparison, and repeatability. However, this way of conducting research is criticized today
 452 as animals are now considered agents interacting with their world, and the lab conditions in
 453 which they live have a strong effect on them, and thus on the scientific results. Moreover, it
 454 is difficult to replicate similar conditions in the laboratory, specifically in comparative
 455 cognition (Boyle, 2021), as even animals that are genetically similar and live in similar
 456 environments develop different personalities (Bierbach, Laskowski, & Wolf, 2017).
 457 Moreover, even if animals are living in similar conditions, similar food and litter sources

458 affect their microbiota (Bradford, Tordoff, Eggers, Jones, & Newington, 2002; McCoy,
459 Geuking, & Ronchi, 2017; Xiang et al., 2019) and their behaviors differently (Montiel-Castro
460 et al., 2013). Animal sociality was long forgotten in neuroscience or biomedical research, but
461 it is an important part of animal agency (Blattner et al., 2020). Indeed, sociality has an
462 important impact on the health of animals, and a large number of publications highlight the
463 link between sociality and health aging (Boyer, Jaouen, Ibrahim, & Gascon, 2019; Lacreuse,
464 Raz, Schmidtke, Hopkins, & Herndon, 2020; Rosati et al., 2020). Making use of the sociality of
465 animals, i.e., their agency, can even reverse cognitive decline and extend longevity (Baker,
466 Wolschin, & Amdam, 2012; Richardson et al., 2020; Wild et al., 2021). Progress has to be
467 made to first avoid the restraining of animals in a captive environment and second, to
468 conduct tests on animals in more natural conditions. Such processes are applied today to not
469 only different primate species (Huebner Franziska et al., 2018; Schofield et al., 2019; van de
470 Waal et al., 2013) but also to horses (Maeda et al., 2021; Maeda et al., 2021; Matsuzawa,
471 2017), birds (Aplin et al., 2015; Shaw, 2017), or even bees (Muth, Cooper, Bonilla, & Leonard,
472 2018). These studies, conducted on different species all showed that testing in the wild is
473 more productive than testing in the labs in terms of ecological and even social cognition
474 (Janmaat, 2019; Pritchard, Hurly, Tello-Ramos, & Healy, 2016). An intermediate method
475 would be research in zoos, as research in zoos in collaboration with research institutes
476 seems to allow animals to express their agency through more adequate living conditions and
477 more technology devices than research in laboratories (McEwen et al., 2022), which may
478 result from the domain of the studies (behavioral versus neuroscience research) and except
479 for great apes research (Matsuzawa, 2016b).

480 **Conclusion**

481 Great efforts have been made toward enabling the agency of animals in behavioral research
482 but there is still much progress to be made to obtain a more compassionate, less stressful,
483 and more robust animal research model. This requires training and teaching researchers,
484 through MOOC (Massive Open Online Course; MacKay et al., 2016; Watson, Kim, & Watson,
485 2016), books (Dawkins, 2021; De Waal, 2016; King, 2021; Nielsen, 2020), or workshops, to
486 adopt new methods including animal agency and change their view of the role animals play
487 in research. As Jacques Derrida wrote in *The Animal That Therefore I Am*, the traditional
488 scientific and philosophical discourse on animals observes and speaks of non-human animals

489 but never really engages with, experiments *with*, or gains experience with the latter
490 (Derrida, 2008): this type of discourse can therefore only position animals as mere passive
491 objects of the theoretical knowledge these disciplines build. Such methods are completely
492 blind to the animals' own processes of interacting with their world (Derrida, 2008), and are
493 completely blind to their agency. Culture, ontology, political leaning, as well as university
494 courses influence how a person considers animals as objects (Bègue & Vezirian, 2021;
495 Furnham & Heyes, 1993; Miele, Tingley, Kimball, & Broida, 1993). It would be interesting to
496 look at the textbooks of comparative cognition to find evidence that students are being
497 taught to think of animals as objects; that is the method (Andrews, 2020b) used to defend
498 the claim that comparative cognition eschews the study of consciousness. This view of
499 animals as objects is not limited to research but is also found in different aspects of everyday
500 life (food, work, clothing, etc.). Researchers worldwide must have the conviction that ethical
501 animal research must consider individuals as subjects of their own lives and of their own
502 world, and as co-creators of knowledge. Co-creation means that animals participate and
503 contribute actively to our experience, their behavior appeals to cognition, and as this animal
504 species-specific cognition being different from the human one, unexpected behavior can
505 raise from experiments. For instance, the slime mold (*Physarum polycephalum*) simulated a
506 more efficient rail network of Tokyo than that which was constructed by humans (Tero et al.,
507 2010). Methods used by ants to find resources are used as an algorithm for the salesman
508 travel problem (Dorigo & Gambardella, 1997a, 1997b). In both illustrations, the organisms
509 are not only an inspiration for researchers to resolve a problem, they resolved it with their
510 own capacities in their own world. In that sense, both can be considered as co-creators of
511 the new knowledge, even if they are not aware of it. After all in humans, though important
512 discoveries have been the fruit of serendipity, it does not mean that they do not have
513 creators. Accepting this paradigm of co-creation of knowledge can create new research
514 questions that are different from those made under an anthropocentric view, as animal
515 consciousness dimensions are different from ours (Birch et al., 2020). Animals are agents in
516 scientific research. They are active in the research process and some researchers have even
517 gone so far as to add them in the acknowledgments or even list them as co-authors (Savage-
518 Rumbaugh, Wamba, Wamba, & Wamba, 2007; Van Patter & Blattner, 2020). This recognition
519 of animals as agents rather than objects is not approved by some researchers, who consider
520 that this is tantamount to removing animal agency, committing over-anthropomorphism,

521 and overstepping the will of animals to cooperate. Indeed, listing someone as a co-author
522 without their consent raises ethical questions (see Bradshaw, 2010; Sueur et al., 2022 for
523 discussion). However, acknowledging animal agency could facilitate social acceptance of
524 animal research (Webb et al., 2019) and be of benefit to the animals concerned (well-being
525 through learning, creating, and participating – Franks et al., 2020). The consideration of
526 animals as agents could be extended from research to other domains: a new ontology
527 considering non-human animals as agents can have political, ethical, and legal
528 consequences. Moreover, accepting and letting animals express their animal agency would
529 increase the validity of experiments but also their ecological validity as agency is also the
530 expression of more natural behavior. It will also make behavioral and neuroscience research
531 more efficient by accelerating data collection in the long term. Of course, at the beginning of
532 this new paradigm of research, understanding and training animals according to their agency
533 will be time-consuming, but when this is done, many more protocols could be carried out
534 and tests would be realized faster and more efficiently by animals. For instance, the use of a
535 touchscreen was initially difficult but after years of labor, conducted tests of new concepts
536 faster than tests without touchscreens in chimpanzees (Gao & Su, 2016; Inoue &
537 Matsuzawa, 2007; Martinet et al., 2021) and macaques (Ballesta et al., 2021; Ferrucci,
538 Nougaret, & Genovesio, 2019; Huskisson, Doelling, Ross, & Hopper, 2021). In the same vein,
539 it took time for naïve capuchin, macaques, and even apes to understand a food for food
540 exchange task (Dufour et al., 2007; Pelé et al., 2009; Pelé et al., 2010; Ramseyer et al., 2006),
541 but once the behavior was acquired, it is easily transmitted from adults to their young (Pelé,
542 personal observation). Considering the agency of the animals we work with is clearly a time
543 investment that ultimately pays off for more time-efficient data collection in the long term,
544 this time investment in animal agency should be highlighted and recognized as promoting
545 the animal welfare when readying a proposal for financial support (in the same way as for
546 rehoming lab animals for instance). Thereafter, the concept of capital applied to animals
547 needs to be extended to social capital, ecological capital, and cultural capital (Pelé, Georges,
548 Matsuzawa, & Sueur, 2020): citizens and not only researchers can learn from animals, and
549 animals can be part of human societies (Dakouré, Pelé, & Georges, 2022; Donaldson &
550 Kymlicka, 2011). This new way of viewing animal agency can therefore raise critical ethical
551 questions in regard to the treatment of animals in research and to the place humans grant
552 them politically in the human social world.

553

554 **Author Contributions Statement**

555 Conceptualization: CS and MP; Project administration: CS and MP; Writing original draft: CS;
556 Review and editions: all authors.

557

558 **Acknowledgments**

559 We thank the three reviewers who accepted to revise our manuscript for their helpful
560 comments.

561

562 **References**

563 Abeyesinghe, S. M., Drewe, J. A., Asher, L., Wathes, C. M., & Collins, L. M. (2013). Do hens have
564 friends? *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *143*(1), 61–66.

565 doi:[10.1016/j.applanim.2012.12.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2012.12.003)

566 Andrews, K. (2020a). Naïve normativity: The social foundation of moral cognition. *Journal of the*
567 *American Philosophical Association*, *6*(1), 36–56. doi:[10.1017/apa.2019.30](https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2019.30)

568 Andrews, K. (2020b). How to study animal minds. Retrieved from

569 [https://www.cambridge.org/core/elements/how-to-study-animal-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/elements/how-to-study-animal-minds/FC90846C50ED2E992CA2AC51D7C249AC)

570 [minds/FC90846C50ED2E992CA2AC51D7C249AC](https://www.cambridge.org/core/elements/how-to-study-animal-minds/FC90846C50ED2E992CA2AC51D7C249AC). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

571 Aplin, L. M., Farine, D. R., Morand-Ferron, J., Cockburn, A., Thornton, A., & Sheldon, B. C. (2015).

572 Experimentally induced innovations lead to persistent culture via conformity in wild birds.

573 *Nature*, *518*(7540), 538–541. doi:[10.1038/nature13998](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature13998)

574 Baker, N., Wolschin, F., & Amdam, G. V. (2012). Age-related learning deficits can be reversible in
575 honeybees *Apis mellifera*. *Experimental Gerontology*, *47*(10), 764–772.

576 doi:[10.1016/j.exger.2012.05.011](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2012.05.011)

577 Ballesta, S., Sadoughi, B., Miss, F., Whitehouse, J., Aguenounon, G., & Meunier, H. (2021). Assessing

578 the reliability of an automated method for measuring dominance hierarchy in non-human

579 primates. *Primates; Journal of Primatology*, 62(4), 595–607. doi:[10.1007/s10329-021-00909-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-021-00909-7)
580 [7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-021-00909-7)

581 Baratay, E. (2011). Bêtes de somme-Des animaux au service des hommes, *Points*.

582 Baratay, É. (2012). Pour une histoire éthologique et une éthologie historique. *Études Rurales*,
583 189(189), 91–106. doi:[10.4000/etudesrurales.9596](https://doi.org/10.4000/etudesrurales.9596)

584 Baratay, E. (2017), *Biographies animales. Des vies retrouvées*. Le Seuil.

585 Barbee, R. W., & Turner, P. V. (2019). Incorporating laboratory animal science into responsible
586 biomedical research. *ILAR Journal*, 60(1), 9–16. doi:[10.1093/ilar/ilz017](https://doi.org/10.1093/ilar/ilz017)

587 Basso, M. A., Frey, S., Guerriero, K. A., Jarraya, B., Kastner, S., Koyano, K. W., . . . Uhrig, L. (2021).
588 Using non-invasive neuroimaging to enhance the care, well-being and experimental
589 outcomes of laboratory non-human primates (monkeys). *NeuroImage*, 228, 117667.
590 doi:[10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117667](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117667)

591 Bègue, L., & Vezirian, K. (2021). Sacrificing animals in the name of scientific authority: The
592 relationship between pro-scientific mindset and the lethal use of animals in biomedical
593 experimentation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1461672211039413.
594 doi:[10.1177/01461672211039413](https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672211039413)

595 Bekoff, M., & Allen, C. (1997). Cognitive ethology: Slayers, skeptics, and proponents. In R. Mitchell, N.
596 S. Thompson & H. L. Miles (Eds.), *Anthropomorphism, anecdotes, and animals* (pp. 313–334).
597 Suny Press.

598 Belsey, P. P., Nicholas, M. A., & Yttri, E. A. (2020). Open-source joystick Manipulandum for decision-
599 making, reaching, and motor control studies in mice. *eNeuro*, 7(2), 0523–19.2020.
600 doi:[10.1523/ENEURO.0523-19.2020](https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0523-19.2020)

601 Ben-Ami Bartal, I. B.-A., Decety, J., & Mason, P. (2011). Empathy and pro-social behavior in rats.
602 *Science*, 334(6061), 1427–1430. doi:[10.1126/science.1210789](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1210789)

603 Ben-Haim, M. S., Dal Monte, O. D., Fagan, N. A., Dunham, Y., Hassin, R. R., Chang, S. W. C., & Santos,
604 L. R. (2021). Disentangling perceptual awareness from nonconscious processing in rhesus

605 monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United*
606 *States of America*, 118(15). doi:[10.1073/pnas.2017543118](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2017543118)

607 Bergvall, U. A., Schäpers, A., Kjellander, P., & Weiss, A. (2011). Personality and foraging decisions in
608 fallow deer, *Dama*. *Animal Behaviour*, 81(1), 101–112. doi:[10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.09.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.09.018)

609 Bhattacharjee, D., Mandal, S., Shit, P., Varghese, M. G., Vishnoi, A., & Bhadra, A. (2019). Free-ranging
610 dogs are capable of utilizing complex human pointing cues. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 2818.
611 doi:[10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02818](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02818)

612 Bicchieri, C. (2016), *Norms in the wild: How to diagnose, measure, and change social norms*. Oxford:
613 Oxford University Press.

614 Bicchieri, C., & Muldoon, R. (2011), *Social norms*.

615 Bierbach, D., Laskowski, K. L., & Wolf, M. (2017). Behavioural individuality in clonal fish arises despite
616 near-identical rearing conditions. *Nature Communications*, 8, 15361.
617 doi:[10.1038/ncomms15361](https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15361)

618 Birch, J., Schnell, A. K., & Clayton, N. S. (2020). Dimensions of animal consciousness. *Trends in*
619 *Cognitive Sciences*, 24(10), 789–801. doi:[10.1016/j.tics.2020.07.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.07.007)

620 Biro, D., Sousa, C., & Matsuzawa, T. (2006). Ontogeny and cultural propagation of tool use by wild
621 chimpanzees at Bossou, Guinea: Case studies in nut cracking and leaf folding. In *Cognitive*
622 *development in chimpanzees* (pp. 476–508). Berlin: Springer.

623 Blattner, C. E., Donaldson, S., & Wilcox, R. (2020). Animal agency in community. *Politics and Animals*,
624 6, 1–22.

625 Böhnert, M., & Hilbert, C. (2018). Other minds than ours”: A controversial discussion on the limits
626 and possibilities of comparative psychology in the light of C. Lloyd Morgan’s work. *History*
627 *and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, 40(3), 44. doi:[10.1007/s40656-018-0211-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s40656-018-0211-4)

628 Borgeaud, C., Sosa, S., Bshary, R., Sueur, C., & van de Waal, E. (2016). Intergroup variation of social
629 relationships in wild vervet monkeys: A dynamic network approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
630 7, 915. doi:[10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00915](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00915)

631 Bouissou, M.-F., Boissy, A., Le Neindre, P., & Veissier, I. (2001). The social behaviour of cattle. *Social*
632 *Behaviour in Farm Animals*, 113–145.

633 Bousquet, C. A. H., Petit, O., Arrivé, M., Robin, J.-P., & Sueur, C. (2015). Personality tests predict
634 responses to a spatial-learning task in mallards, *Anas platyrhynchos*. *Animal Behaviour*, 110,
635 145–154. doi:[10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.09.024](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2015.09.024)

636 Bout, H. J., Fentener van Vlissingen, J. M. F., & Karssing, E. D. (2014). Evaluating the ethical
637 acceptability of animal research. *Lab Animal*, 43(11), 411–414. doi:[10.1038/labam.572](https://doi.org/10.1038/labam.572)

638 Boyer, F., Jaouen, F., Ibrahim, E. C., & Gascon, E. (2019). Deficits in social behavior precede cognitive
639 decline in middle-aged mice. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 13, 55.
640 doi:[10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00055](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00055)

641 Boyle, A. (2021). Replication, uncertainty and progress in comparative cognition. *Animal Behavior*
642 *and Cognition*, 8(2), 296–304. doi:[10.26451/abc.08.02.15.2021](https://doi.org/10.26451/abc.08.02.15.2021)

643 Bradford, M. A., Tordoff, G. M., Eggers, T., Jones, T. H., & Newington, J. E. (2002). Microbiota, fauna,
644 and mesh size interactions in litter decomposition. *Oikos*, 99(2), 317–323.
645 doi:[10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.990212.x](https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.990212.x)

646 Bradshaw, G. A. (2010). An ape among many: Animal co-authorship and trans-species epistemic
647 authority. *Configurations*, 18(1–2), 15–30. doi:[10.1353/con.2010.0003](https://doi.org/10.1353/con.2010.0003)

648 Brent, L. J. N., Heilbronner, S. R., Horvath, J. E., Gonzalez-Martinez, J., Ruiz-Lambides, A., Robinson, A.
649 G., . . . Platt, M. L. (2013). Genetic origins of social networks in rhesus macaques. *Scientific*
650 *Reports*, 3, 1042. doi:[10.1038/srep01042](https://doi.org/10.1038/srep01042)

651 Brosnan, S. F., Hopper, L. M., Richey, S., Freeman, H. D., Talbot, C. F., Gosling, S. D., . . . Schapiro, S. J.
652 (2015). Personality influences responses to inequity and contrast in chimpanzees. *Animal*
653 *Behaviour*, 101, 75–87. doi:[10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.12.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anbehav.2014.12.019)

654 Buchanan-Smith, H. M., Gričič, J., Daoudi, S., Leonardi, R., & Whiten, A. (2013). Interspecific
655 interactions and welfare implications in mixed species communities of capuchin (< i> Sapajus

656 apella) and squirrel monkeys (< i> Saimiri sciureus) over 3 years. *Applied Animal Behaviour*
657 *Science*, 147(3), 324–333.

658 Buckner, C. (2011). Two approaches to the distinction between cognition and “mere association.”
659 *International Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 24(1), 1–35.

660 Buller, H. (2014). Animal geographies I. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(2), 308–318.
661 doi:[10.1177/0309132513479295](https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132513479295)

662 Bussey, T. J., Muir, J. L., Everitt, B. J., & Robbins, T. W. (1997). Triple dissociation of anterior cingulate,
663 posterior cingulate, and medial frontal cortices on visual discrimination tasks using a
664 touchscreen testing procedure for the rat. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 111(5), 920–936.
665 doi:[10.1037//0735-7044.111.5.920](https://doi.org/10.1037//0735-7044.111.5.920)

666 Bussey, T. J., Padain, T. L., Skillings, E. A., Winters, B. D., Morton, A. J., & Saksida, L. M. (2008). The
667 touchscreen cognitive testing method for rodents: How to get the best out of your rat.
668 *Learning and Memory*, 15(7), 516–523. doi:[10.1101/lm.987808](https://doi.org/10.1101/lm.987808)

669 Cait, J., Cait, A., Scott, R. W., Winder, C. B., & Mason, G. J. (2022). Conventional laboratory housing
670 increases morbidity and mortality in research rodents: Results of a meta-analysis. *BMC*
671 *Biology*, 20(1), 15. doi:[10.1186/s12915-021-01184-0](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-021-01184-0)

672 Calapai, A., Cabrera-Moreno, J., Moser, T., & Jeschke, M. (2022). Flexible auditory training,
673 psychophysics, and enrichment of common marmosets with an automated, touchscreen-
674 based system. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 1648. doi:[10.1038/s41467-022-29185-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022-29185-9)

675 Canguilhem, G. (1992). La connaissance de la vie, *Vrin*.

676 Carere, C., & Locurto, C. (2011). Interaction between animal personality and animal cognition.
677 *Current Zoology*, 57(4), 491–498. doi:[10.1093/czoolo/57.4.491](https://doi.org/10.1093/czoolo/57.4.491)

678 Carter, B., & Charles, N. (2013). Animals, agency and resistance. *Journal for the Theory of Social*
679 *Behaviour*, 43(3), 322–340. doi:[10.1111/jtsb.12019](https://doi.org/10.1111/jtsb.12019)

680 Cauchoix, M., Hermer, E., Chaine, A. S., & Morand-Ferron, J. (2017). Cognition in the field:
681 Comparison of reversal learning performance in captive and wild passerines. *Scientific*
682 *Reports*, 7(1), 12945. doi:[10.1038/s41598-017-13179-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-13179-5)

683 Cazzolla Gatti, R. (2016). Self-consciousness: Beyond the looking-glass and what dogs found there.
684 *Ethology Ecology and Evolution*, 28(2), 1–9. doi:[10.1080/03949370.2015.1102777](https://doi.org/10.1080/03949370.2015.1102777)

685 Chang, L., Fang, Q., Zhang, S., Poo, M. M., & Gong, N. (ND). (2015). Mirror-induced self-directed
686 behaviors in rhesus monkeys after visual-somatosensory training. *Current Biology*, 25(2),
687 212–217. doi:[10.1016/j.cub.2014.11.016](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2014.11.016)

688 Chang, L., Zhang, S., Poo, M. M., & Gong, N. (2017). Spontaneous expression of mirror self-
689 recognition in monkeys after learning precise visual-proprioceptive association for mirror
690 images. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*,
691 114(12), 3258–3263. doi:[10.1073/pnas.1620764114](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1620764114)

692 Claidière, N., Gullstrand, J., Latouche, A., & Fagot, J. (2017). Using Automated Learning Devices for
693 Monkeys (ALDM) to study social networks. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(1), 24–34.
694 doi:[10.3758/s13428-015-0686-9](https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0686-9)

695 Coe, J., & Hoy, J. (2020). Choice, control and computers: Empowering wildlife in human care.
696 *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 4(4), 92. doi:[10.3390/mti4040092](https://doi.org/10.3390/mti4040092)

697 Costello, M. J., Beard, K. H., Corlett, R. T., Cumming, G. S., Devictor, V., Loyola, R., . . . Primack, R. B.
698 (2016). Field work ethics in biological research. *Biological Conservation*, 203, 268–271.
699 doi:[10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.008)

700 Croney, C. C., & Boysen, S. T. (2021). Acquisition of a joystick-operated video task by pigs (*Sus scrofa*).
701 *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 631755. doi:[10.3389/fpsyg.2021.631755](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.631755)

702 Czap, N. V., Czap, H. J., Lynne, G. D., & Burbach, M. E. (2015). Walk in my shoes: Nudging for empathy
703 conservation. *Ecological Economics*, 118, 147–158. doi:[10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.07.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.07.010)

704 D’Agostino, J., Pasetta, C., & Reichard, U. (2017). Preliminary results of a vocal self-recognition test in
705 northern white-cheeked gibbons (*Nomascus leucogenys*), 162, 157–157.

706 Dakouré, A., Pelé, M., & Georges, J.-Y. (2022). Reconsidérer les modes d'habiter humains et non
707 humains dans l'ère urbaine post-COVID 19, *Géographie et cultures*.

708 Daly Bezerra de Melo, G. (2012). Nature and culture intertwined or redefined? On the challenges of
709 cultural primatology and sociocultural anthropology. *Revue de Primatologie*, 4(4), article 4.
710 doi:[10.4000/primatologie.1020](https://doi.org/10.4000/primatologie.1020)

711 Daly, G. B. de M. (2018). Drawing and blurring boundaries between species: An etho-ethnography of
712 human-chimpanzee social relations at the Primate Research Institute of Kyoto University.
713 Retrieved from <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-02171263> [Phdthesis, Université Paris
714 sciences et lettres].

715 Davidson, G. L., Raulo, A., & Knowles, S. C. L. (2020). Identifying microbiome-mediated behaviour in
716 wild vertebrates. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 35(11), 972–980.
717 doi:[10.1016/j.tree.2020.06.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.06.014)

718 Dawkins, M. S. (2021), *The science of animal welfare: Understanding what animals want*. Oxford:
719 Oxford University Press.

720 De Waal, F. (2006). Morally evolved. *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*, 1–80.

721 De Waal, F. (2016). Are we smart enough to know how smart animals are?, *WW Norton & Company*.

722 De Waal, F. B. (2012). The antiquity of empathy. *Science*, 336(6083), 874–876.
723 doi:[10.1126/science.1220999](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1220999)

724 de Waal, F. B. M. (2019). Fish, mirrors, and a gradualist perspective on self-awareness. *PLOS Biology*,
725 17(2), e3000112. doi:[10.1371/journal.pbio.3000112](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000112)

726 Delotterie, D. F., Mathis, C., Cassel, J. C., Rosenbrock, H., Dorner-Ciossek, C., & Marti, A. (2015).
727 Touchscreen tasks in mice to demonstrate differences between hippocampal and striatal
728 functions. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, 120, 16–27.
729 doi:[10.1016/j.nlm.2015.02.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2015.02.007)

730 Derrida, J. (2008), *The animal that therefore I am*. Fordham University Press.

731 Donaldson, S., & Kymlicka, W. (2011), *Zoopolis: A political theory of animal rights*. Oxford: Oxford
732 University Press.

733 Dorigo, M., & Gambardella, L. M. (1997a). Ant colony system: A cooperative learning approach to the
734 traveling salesman problem. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 1(1), 53–66.
735 doi:[10.1109/4235.585892](https://doi.org/10.1109/4235.585892)

736 Dorigo, M., & Gambardella, L. M. (1997b). Ant colonies for the travelling salesman problem.
737 *Biosystems*, 43(2), 73–81. doi:[10.1016/S0303-2647\(97\)01708-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0303-2647(97)01708-5)

738 Dougherty, L. R., & Guillette, L. M. (2018). Linking personality and cognition: A meta-analysis.
739 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London Series B*, 373(1756).
740 doi:[10.1098/rstb.2017.0282](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0282), [20170282](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0282)

741 Duboscq, J., Romano, V., MacIntosh, A., & Sueur, C. (2016). Social information transmission in
742 animals: Lessons from studies of diffusion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1147.
743 doi:[10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01147](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.01147)

744 Eberle, U. (2021). Nudging nature. *New Scientist*, 250(3340), 42–45. doi:[10.1016/S0262-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0262-4079(21)01109-X)
745 [4079\(21\)01109-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0262-4079(21)01109-X)

746 Evans, J. C., Liechti, J. I., Boatman, B., & König, B. (2020). A natural catastrophic turnover event:
747 Individual sociality matters despite community resilience in wild house mice. *Proceedings*.
748 *Biological Sciences*, 287(1926), 20192880. doi:[10.1098/rspb.2019.2880](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.2880)

749 Fehlmann, G., & King, A. J. (2016). Bio-logging. *Current Biology*, 26(18), R830–R831.
750 doi:[10.1016/j.cub.2016.05.033](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2016.05.033)

751 Fenton, A. (2014). Can a chimp say “no”? Reenvisioning chimpanzee dissent in harmful research.
752 *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, 23(2), 130–139. doi:[10.1017/S0963180113000662](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0963180113000662)

753 Ferreira, A. C., Silva, L. R., Renna, F., Brandl, H. B., Renoult, J. P., Farine, D. R., . . . Doutrelant, C.
754 (2020). Deep learning-based methods for individual recognition in small birds. *Methods in*
755 *Ecology and Evolution*, 11(9), 1072–1085. doi:[10.1111/2041-210X.13436](https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13436)

756 Ferrucci, L., Nougaret, S., & Genovesio, A. (2019). Macaque monkeys learn by observation in the
757 ghost display condition in the object-in-place task with differential reward to the observer.
758 *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 401. doi:[10.1038/s41598-018-36803-4](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36803-4)

759 Fitzgibbon, C. D. (1990). Mixed-species grouping in Thomson's and Grant's gazelles: The antipredator
760 benefits. *Animal Behaviour*, 39(6), 1116–1126. doi:[10.1016/S0003-3472\(05\)80784-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-3472(05)80784-5)

761 Fitzpatrick, S. (2020). Chimpanzee normativity: Evidence and objections. *Biology and Philosophy*,
762 35(4), 45. doi:[10.1007/s10539-020-09763-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-020-09763-1)

763 Franks, B., Webb, C., Gagliano, M., & Smuts, B. (2020). Conventional science will not do justice to
764 nonhuman interests: A fresh approach is required. *Animal Sentience*, 4(27), 17.
765 doi:[10.51291/2377-7478.1552](https://doi.org/10.51291/2377-7478.1552)

766 Furnham, A., & Heyes, C. (1993). Psychology students' beliefs about animals and animal
767 experimentation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 15(1), 1–10. doi:[10.1016/0191-
768 8869\(93\)90036-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(93)90036-3)

769 Galland, L. (2014). The gut microbiome and the brain. *Journal of Medicinal Food*, 17(12), 1261–1272.
770 doi:[10.1089/jmf.2014.7000](https://doi.org/10.1089/jmf.2014.7000)

771 Gallup, Jr., G. G., Anderson, J. R., & Shillito, D. J. (2002). The mirror test. *Cognitive Animal: Empirical
772 and Theoretical Perspectives on Animal Cognition*, 325–333.

773 Gao, J., & Su, Y. (2016). The rock-paper-scissors game in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *靈長類研究
774 Supplement*. 雅己友永, & 哲郎松沢, 32, 44–44. doi:[10.14907/primate.32.0_44_2](https://doi.org/10.14907/primate.32.0_44_2)

775 Good, T. L., Sterzinger, N., & Lavigne, A. (2018). Expectation effects: Pygmalion and the initial 20
776 years of research. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 24(3–5), 99–123.
777 doi:[10.1080/13803611.2018.1548817](https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2018.1548817)

778 Goodale, E., & Kotagama, S. W. (2005). Alarm calling in Sri Lankan mixed-species bird flocks. *Auk*,
779 122(1), 108–120. doi:[10.1093/auk/122.1.108](https://doi.org/10.1093/auk/122.1.108)

780 Grampp, M., Sueur, C., van de Waal, E., & Botting, J. (2019). Social attention biases in juvenile wild
781 vervet monkeys: Implications for socialisation and social learning processes. *Primates;*
782 *Journal of Primatology*, 60(3), 261–275. doi:[10.1007/s10329-019-00721-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-019-00721-4)

783 Grasso, F., De Rosa, G., Napolitano, F., Di Francia, A., & Bordi, A. (2007). Entrance order and side
784 preference of dairy cows in the milking parlour. *Italian Journal of Animal Science*, 6(2), 187–
785 194. doi:[10.4081/ijas.2007.187](https://doi.org/10.4081/ijas.2007.187)

786 Grémillet, D., Puech, W., Garçon, V., Boulinier, T., & Maho, Y. L. (2012). Robots in Ecology: Welcome
787 to the machine. *Open Journal of Ecology*, 02(2), 49–57. doi:[10.4236/oje.2012.22006](https://doi.org/10.4236/oje.2012.22006)

788 Griffin, A. S., Guillette, L. M., & Healy, S. D. (2015). Cognition and personality: An analysis of an
789 emerging field. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 30(4), 207–214.
790 doi:[10.1016/j.tree.2015.01.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.01.012)

791 Griffin, D. R. (2013), *Animal minds: Beyond cognition to consciousness*. University of Chicago Press.

792 Haraway, D. J. (1989), *Primate visions: Gender, race, and nature in the world of modern science*.
793 Psychology Press.

794 He, L. W., Zeng, L., Tian, N., Li, Y., He, T., Tan, D. M., . . . Tan, Y. (2020). Optimization of food
795 deprivation and sucrose preference test in SD rat model undergoing chronic unpredictable
796 mild stress. *Animal Models and Experimental Medicine*, 3(1), 69–78.
797 doi:[10.1002/ame2.12107](https://doi.org/10.1002/ame2.12107)

798 Hodgetts, T., & Lorimer, J. (2020). Animals' mobilities. *Progress in Human Geography*, 44(1), 4–26.
799 doi:[10.1177/0309132518817829](https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518817829)

800 Hoffman, J. M., Creevy, K. E., Franks, A., O'Neill, D. G., & Promislow, D. E. L. (2018). The companion
801 dog as a model for human aging and mortality. *Aging Cell*, 17(3), e12737.
802 doi:[10.1111/accel.12737](https://doi.org/10.1111/accel.12737)

803 Hoppitt, W., & Laland, K. N. (2013), *Social learning: An introduction to mechanisms, methods, and*
804 *models*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

805 Huebner, F., Fichtel, C., & Kappeler, P. M. (2018). Linking cognition with fitness in a wild primate:
806 Fitness correlates of problem-solving performance and spatial learning ability. *Philosophical*
807 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 373(1756).
808 doi:[10.1098/rstb.2017.0295](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0295)'

809 Huskisson, S. M., Doelling, C. R., Ross, S. R., & Hopper, L. M. (2021). Assessing the potential impact of
810 zoo visitors on the welfare and cognitive performance of Japanese macaques. *Applied Animal*
811 *Behaviour Science*, 243. doi:[10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105453](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105453), [105453](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105453)

812 Huttunen, A. W., Adams, G. K., & Platt, M. L. (2017). Can self-awareness be taught? Monkeys pass the
813 mirror test—again. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of*
814 *America*, 114(13), 3281–3283. doi:[10.1073/pnas.1701676114](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1701676114)

815 Inoue, S., & Matsuzawa, T. (2007). Working memory of numerals in chimpanzees. *Current Biology*,
816 17(23), R1004–R1005. doi:[10.1016/j.cub.2007.10.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.10.027)

817 Jacobson, S. L., Kwiatt, A. C., Ross, S. R., & Cronin, K. A. (2019). The effects of cognitive testing on the
818 welfare of zoo-housed Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata*). *Applied Animal Behaviour*
819 *Science*, 212, 90–97. doi:[10.1016/j.applanim.2018.12.014](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2018.12.014)

820 Janmaat, K. R. L. (2019). What animals do not do or fail to find: A novel observational approach for
821 studying cognition in the wild. *Evolutionary Anthropology*, 28(6), 303–320.
822 doi:[10.1002/evan.21794](https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21794)

823 Janson, C. H., & Byrne, R. (2007). What wild primates know about resources: Opening up the black
824 box. *Animal Cognition*, 10(3), 357–367. doi:[10.1007/s10071-007-0080-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-007-0080-9)

825 Jensen, K., Call, J., & Tomasello, M. (2007). Chimpanzees are vengeful but not spiteful. *Proceedings of*
826 *the National Academy of Sciences*, 104(32), 13046–13050. doi:[10.1073/pnas.0705555104](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0705555104)

827 Kaminski, J., Call, J., & Tomasello, M. (2008). Chimpanzees know what others know, but not what
828 they believe. *Cognition*, 109(2), 224–234. doi:[10.1016/j.cognition.2008.08.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2008.08.010)

829 Kaneko, T., & Tomonaga, M. (2011). The perception of self-agency in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*).
830 *Proceedings. Biological Sciences*, 278(1725), 3694–3702. doi:[10.1098/rspb.2011.0611](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.0611)

831 Kano, F., & Tomonaga, M. (2009). How chimpanzees look at pictures: A comparative eye-tracking
832 study. *Proceedings. Biological Sciences*, 276(1664), 1949–1955. doi:[10.1098/rspb.2008.1811](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1811)

833 King, A. J., & Sueur, C. (2011). Where next? Group coordination and collective decision making by
834 primates. *International Journal of Primatology*, 32(6), 1245–1267. doi:[10.1007/s10764-011-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-011-9526-7)
835 [9526-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-011-9526-7)

836 King, B. J. (2021). Animals’ best friends: Putting compassion to work for animals in captivity and in
837 the wild. Retrieved from
838 <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/A/bo33375440.html>. University of
839 Chicago Press.

840 Kirchoff, N. S., Udell, M. A. R., & Sharpton, T. J. (2019). The gut microbiome correlates with
841 conspecific aggression in a small population of rescued dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *PeerJ*, 7,
842 e6103. doi:[10.7717/peerj.6103](https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.6103)

843 Klein, A. S., & Gogolla, N. (2021). How mice feel each other’s pain or fear. *Science*, 371(6525), 122–
844 123. doi:[10.1126/science.abf5940](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf5940)

845 Koda, H. (2012). Possible use of heterospecific food-associated calls of macaques by sika deer for
846 foraging efficiency. *Behavioural Processes*, 91(1), 30–34. doi:[10.1016/j.beproc.2012.05.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2012.05.006)

847 Kohda, M., Hotta, T., Takeyama, T., Awata, S., Tanaka, H., Asai, J. Y., & Jordan, A. L. (2019). If a fish
848 can pass the mark test, what are the implications for consciousness and self-awareness
849 testing in animals? *PLOS Biology*, 17(2), e3000021. doi:[10.1371/journal.pbio.3000021](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000021)

850 Korsgaard, C. M. (2018), *Fellow creatures: Our obligations to the other animals*.
851 doi:[10.1093/oso/9780198753858.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198753858.001.0001). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

852 Krasheninnikova, A., Berardi, R., Lind, M.-A., O’Neill, L., & von Bayern, A. M. P. (2019). Primate
853 cognition test battery in parrots. *Behaviour*, 156(5–8), 721–761. doi:[10.1163/1568539X-](https://doi.org/10.1163/1568539X-0003549)
854 [0003549](https://doi.org/10.1163/1568539X-0003549)

855 Krause, J., & Ruxton, G. D. (2002), *Living in groups*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

856 Krause, S. R. (2013). Beyond non-domination: Agency, inequality and the meaning of freedom.
857 *Philosophy and Social Criticism*, 39(2), 187–208. doi:[10.1177/0191453712470360](https://doi.org/10.1177/0191453712470360)

858 Krebs, J. R. (1973). Social learning and the significance of mixed-species flocks of chickadees (*Parus*
859 spp.). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 51(12), 1275–1288. doi:[10.1139/z73-181](https://doi.org/10.1139/z73-181)

860 Krupenye, C., Kano, F., Hirata, S., Call, J., & Tomasello, M. (2016). Great apes anticipate that other
861 individuals will act according to false beliefs. *Science*, 354(6308), 110–114.
862 doi:[10.1126/science.aaf8110](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaf8110)

863 Kumpan, L. T., Smeltzer, E. A., & Teichroeb, J. A. (2020). Animal cognition in the field: Performance of
864 wild vervet monkeys (*Chlorocebus pygerythrus*) on a reversal learning task. *Animal Cognition*,
865 23(3), 523–534. doi:[10.1007/s10071-020-01356-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-020-01356-5)

866 Lacreuse, A., Raz, N., Schmidtke, D., Hopkins, W. D., & Herndon, J. G. (2020). Age-related decline in
867 executive function as a hallmark of cognitive ageing in primates: An overview of cognitive
868 and neurobiological studies. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series*
869 *B, Biological Sciences*, 375(1811), 20190618. doi:[10.1098/rstb.2019.0618](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0618)

870 Laland, K. N., & Hoppitt, W. (2003). Do animals have culture? *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues*,
871 *News, and Reviews*, 12(3), 150–159. doi:[10.1002/evan.10111](https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.10111)

872 Langlitz, N. (2020). Chimpanzee culture wars: Rethinking human nature alongside Japanese,
873 European, and American cultural primatologists. In *Chimpanzee culture wars*.
874 doi:[10.1515/9780691204260](https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691204260). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

875 Laule, G. E., Bloomsmith, M. A., & Schapiro, S. J. (2003). The use of positive reinforcement training
876 techniques to enhance the care, management, and welfare of primates in the laboratory.
877 *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 6(3), 163–173.
878 doi:[10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_02](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_02)

879 Le Maho, Y., Whittington, J. D., Hanuise, N., Pereira, L., Boureau, M., Brucker, M., . . . Le Bohec, C.
880 (2014). Rovers minimize human disturbance in research on wild animals. *Nature Methods*,
881 11(12), 1242–1244. doi:[10.1038/nmeth.3173](https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3173)

882 Le Neindre, P., Bernard, E., Boissy, A., Boivin, X., Calandreau, L., Delon, N., . . . Faivre, N. (2017),
883 *Animal consciousness. Summary of the multidisciplinary assessment.*

884 Le Neindre, P., Dunier, M., Larrère, R., & Prunet, P. (2018). La conscience des animaux. *Éditions Quæ.*
885 Quæ. Retrieved from <https://www.quae.com/produit/1520/9782759228713/la-conscience->
886 [des-animaux.](https://www.quae.com/produit/1520/9782759228713/la-conscience-)

887 Lecorps, B., Weary, D. M., & von Keyserlingk, M. A. G. (2021). Captivity-induced depression in
888 animals. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 25(7), 539–541. doi:[10.1016/j.tics.2021.03.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.03.010)

889 Levé, M., Sueur, C., Petit, O., Matsuzawa, T., & Hirata, S. (2016). Social grooming network in captive
890 chimpanzees: Does the wild or captive origin of group members affect sociality? *Primates*
891 *Journal of Primatology*, 57(1), 73–82. doi:[10.1007/s10329-015-0494-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-015-0494-y)

892 Liu, X., Liu, T., & Huang, X. (2017). Commentary: Spontaneous expression of mirror self-recognition in
893 monkeys after learning precise visual-proprioceptive association for mirror images. *Frontiers*
894 *in Psychology*, 8, 1151. doi:[10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01151](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01151)

895 Lopes, P. C., & König, B. (2020). Wild mice with different social network sizes vary in brain gene
896 expression. *BMC Genomics*, 21(1), 506. doi:[10.1186/s12864-020-06911-5](https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-020-06911-5)

897 Low, P., Panksepp, J., Reiss, D., Edelman, D., Van Swinderen, B., & Koch, C. (2012). *Cambridge*
898 *Declaration on Consciousness*. 1–2.

899 Machado, C. J., & Nelson, E. E. (2011). Eye-tracking with nonhuman primates is now more accessible
900 than ever before. *American Journal of Primatology*, 73(6), 562–569. doi:[10.1002/ajp.20928](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.20928)

901 MacKay, J. R. D., Langford, F., & Waran, N. (2016). Massive open online courses as a tool for global
902 animal welfare education. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, 43(3), 287–301.
903 doi:[10.3138/jvme.0415-054R2](https://doi.org/10.3138/jvme.0415-054R2)

904 MacKinnon, K. C., & Riley, E. P. (2010). Field primatology of today: Current ethical issues. *American*
905 *Journal of Primatology*, 72(9), 749–753. doi:[10.1002/ajp.20836](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.20836)

906 Maeda, T., Ochi, S., Ringhofer, M., Sosa, S., Sueur, C., Hirata, S., & Yamamoto, S. (2021). Aerial drone
907 observations identified a multilevel society in feral horses. *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 71.
908 doi:[10.1038/s41598-020-79790-1](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-79790-1)

909 Maeda, T., Sueur, C., Hirata, S., & Yamamoto, S. (2021). Behavioural synchronization in a multilevel
910 society of feral horses. *PLOS ONE*, *16*(10), e0258944. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0258944](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258944)

911 Martinet, L., Sueur, C., Hirata, S., Hosselet, J., Matsuzawa, T., & Pelé, M. (2021). New indices to
912 characterize drawing behavior in humans (*Homo sapiens*) and chimpanzees (*Pan*
913 *troglodytes*). *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 3860. doi:[10.1038/s41598-021-83043-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-83043-0)

914 Mason, S., Premereur, E., Pelekanos, V., Emberton, A., Honess, P., & Mitchell, A. S. (2019). Effective
915 chair training methods for neuroscience research involving rhesus macaques (*Macaca*
916 *mulatta*). *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *317*, 82–93. doi:[10.1016/j.jneumeth.2019.02.001](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2019.02.001)

917 Massen, J. J. M., & Koski, S. E. (2014). Chimps of a feather sit together: Chimpanzee friendships are
918 based on homophily in personality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *35*(1), 1–8.
919 doi:[10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.08.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2013.08.008)

920 Matsuzawa, T. (2013). Evolution of the brain and social behavior in chimpanzees. *Current Opinion in*
921 *Neurobiology*, *23*(3), 443–449. doi:[10.1016/j.conb.2013.01.012](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.conb.2013.01.012)

922 Matsuzawa, T. (2016a). Euthanasia is not an option: 10 years' care of a chimpanzee with acute
923 tetraparesis. *Primates*, *57*(3), 291–293. doi:[10.1007/s10329-016-0548-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-016-0548-9)

924 Matsuzawa, T. (2016b). Saga and GAIN for great apes. *Primates; Journal of Primatology*, *57*(1), 1–2.
925 doi:[10.1007/s10329-015-0504-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-015-0504-0)

926 Matsuzawa, T. (2017). Horse cognition and behavior from the perspective of primatology. *Primates;*
927 *Journal of Primatology*, *58*(4), 473–477. doi:[10.1007/s10329-017-0632-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-017-0632-9)

928 Matsuzawa, T. (2020a). WISH cages: Constructing multiple habitats for captive chimpanzees.
929 *Primates; Journal of Primatology*, *61*(2), 139–148. doi:[10.1007/s10329-020-00806-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-020-00806-5)

930 Matsuzawa, T. (2020b). Pretense in chimpanzees. *Primates; Journal of Primatology*, *61*(4), 543–555.
931 doi:[10.1007/s10329-020-00836-z](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-020-00836-z)

932 McCoy, K. D., Geuking, M. B., & Ronchi, F. (2017). Gut microbiome standardization in control and
933 experimental mice. *Current Protocols in Immunology*, 117(1), 23.1.1–23.1.13.
934 doi:[10.1002/cpim.25](https://doi.org/10.1002/cpim.25)

935 McEwen, E. S., Warren, E., Tenpas, S., Jones, B., Durdevic, K., Rapport Munro, E., & Call, J. (2022).
936 Primate cognition in zoos: Reviewing the impact of zoo-based research over 15 years.
937 *American Journal of Primatology*, e23369. doi:[10.1002/ajp.23369](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.23369)

938 McFarland, S. E., & Hediger, R. (2009), *Animals and agency: An interdisciplinary exploration*, 8. Brill.

939 McMillan, J. L., Bloomsmith, M. A., & Prescott, M. J. (2017). An international survey of approaches to
940 chair restraint of nonhuman primates. *Comparative Medicine*, 67(5), 442–451.

941 McMillan, J. L., Perlman, J. E., Galvan, A., Wichmann, T., & Bloomsmith, M. A. (2014). Refining the
942 pole-and-collar method of restraint: Emphasizing the use of positive training techniques with
943 rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*). *Journal of the American Association for Laboratory*
944 *Animal Science*, 53(1), 61–68.

945 Meijer, E. (2019), *When animals speak: Toward an interspecies democracy*. New York University
946 Press.

947 Merleau-Ponty, M. (2017). Causeries 1948, *Média diffusion*.

948 Miele, J., Tingley, L., Kimball, R., & Broida, J. (1993). Personality differences between pro- and
949 antivivisectionists. *Society and Animals*, 1(2), 129–144. doi:[10.1163/156853093X00037](https://doi.org/10.1163/156853093X00037)

950 Mitchell, R. W. (2007). Pretense in animals: The continuing relevance of children’s pretense. *Play and*
951 *Development: Evolutionary, Sociocultural and Functional Perspectives*, 51–75.

952 Montiel-Castro, A. J., González-Cervantes, R. M., Bravo-Ruiseco, G., & Pacheco-López, G. (2013). The
953 microbiota-gut-brain axis: Neurobehavioral correlates, health and sociality. *Frontiers in*
954 *Integrative Neuroscience*, 7, 70. doi:[10.3389/fnint.2013.00070](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnint.2013.00070)

955 Murphy, H. W., Danforth, M. D., & Clyde, V. L. (2018). The great ape heart project. *International Zoo*
956 *Yearbook*, 52(1), 103–112. doi:[10.1111/izy.12180](https://doi.org/10.1111/izy.12180)

957 Muth, F., Cooper, T. R., Bonilla, R. F., & Leonard, A. S. (2018). A novel protocol for studying bee
958 cognition in the wild. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, *9*(1), 78–87. doi:[10.1111/2041-
959 210X.12852](https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12852)

960 Nielsen, B. (2020), *Asking animals: An introduction to animal behaviour testing*. CABI Publishing.

961 Nielsen, B. L. (2018). Making sense of it all: The importance of taking into account the sensory
962 abilities of animals in their housing and management. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, *205*,
963 175–180. doi:[10.1016/j.applanim.2018.04.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2018.04.013)

964 Park, G., & Evans, G. W. (2016). Environmental stressors, urban design and planning: Implications for
965 human behaviour and health. *Journal of Urban Design*, *21*(4), 453–470.
966 doi:[10.1080/13574809.2016.1194189](https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2016.1194189)

967 Patterson, F. G. P., & Cohn, R. H. (1990). Language acquisition by a lowland gorilla: Koko's first ten
968 years of vocabulary development. *WORD*, *41*(2), 97–143.
969 doi:[10.1080/00437956.1990.11435816](https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1990.11435816)

970 Pearson, E. L., Davis, J. M., & Litchfield, C. A. (2010). A case study of orangutan and siamang behavior
971 within a mixed-species zoo exhibit. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, *13*(4), 330–
972 346. doi:[10.1080/10888705.2010.507125](https://doi.org/10.1080/10888705.2010.507125)

973 Pedersen, J. (2020). Nonhuman primates and language: Primates raised by humans. In *The*
974 *international encyclopedia of linguistic anthropology* (pp. 1–9). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
975 doi:[10.1002/9781118786093.iela0289](https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0289).

976 Pelé, M., Georges, J. Y., Matsuzawa, T., & Sueur, C. (2020) (Editorial). Editorial: Perceptions of human-
977 animal relationships and their impacts on animal ethics, law and research. *Frontiers in*
978 *Psychology*, *11*, 631238. doi:[10.3389/fpsyg.2020.631238](https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.631238)

979 Pelé, M., & Petit, O. (2015). Equal care for own versus adopted infant in tufted capuchins (*Sapajus*
980 spp.). *Primates; Journal of Primatology*, *56*(2), 201–206. doi:[10.1007/s10329-015-0463-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-015-0463-5)

981 Pennisi, A., & Giallongo, L. (2018). Animal biopolitics: How animals vote. *International Journal for the*
982 *Semiotics of Law - Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, 31(3), 491–499.
983 doi:[10.1007/s11196-018-9560-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11196-018-9560-2)

984 Pepperberg, I. M. (2006). *Intelligence and rationality in parrots*.

985 Pereira, M., Nogueira, H., & Padez, C. (2019). The role of urban design in childhood obesity: A case
986 study in Lisbon, Portugal. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 31(3), e23220.
987 doi:[10.1002/ajhb.23220](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23220)

988 Peres, C. A. (1993). Anti-predation benefits in a mixed-species group of Amazonian tamarins. *Folia*
989 *Primatologica; International Journal of Primatology*, 61(2), 61–76. doi:[10.1159/000156732](https://doi.org/10.1159/000156732)

990 Péron, F. (2012). Language-trained animals: A window to the “black box.” *International Journal of*
991 *Intelligence Science*, 2(4A), 149–159. doi:[10.4236/ijis.2012.224020](https://doi.org/10.4236/ijis.2012.224020)

992 Picciuto, E., & Carruthers, P. (2016). Imagination and pretense. In *The Routledge handbook of*
993 *philosophy of imagination*. Routledge.

994 Poirotte, C., & Charpentier, M. J. E. (2020). Unconditional care from close maternal kin in the face of
995 parasites. *Biology Letters*, 16(2), 20190869. doi:[10.1098/rsbl.2019.0869](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2019.0869)

996 Poirotte, C., Massol, F., Herbert, A., Willaume, E., Bomo, P. M., Kappeler, P. M., & Charpentier, M. J.
997 E. (2017). Mandrills use olfaction to socially avoid parasitized conspecifics. *Science Advances*,
998 3(4), e1601721. doi:[10.1126/sciadv.1601721](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1601721)

999 Pomerantz, O., Baker, K. C., Bellanca, R. U., Bloomsmith, M. A., Coleman, K., Hutchinson, E. K., . . .
1000 Consortium, N. P. R. C. B. M. (2022). Improving transparency—A call to include social housing
1001 information in biomedical research articles involving nonhuman primates. *American Journal*
1002 *of Primatology*, e23378. doi:[10.1002/ajp.23378](https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.23378)

1003 Prescott, M. J. (2016). Online resources for improving the care and use of non-human primates in
1004 research. *Primate Biology*, 3(2), 33–40. doi:[10.5194/pb-3-33-2016](https://doi.org/10.5194/pb-3-33-2016)

1005 Prescott, M. J., Brown, V. J., Flecknell, P. A., Gaffan, D., Garrod, K., Lemon, R. N. (2010). Refinement of
1006 the use of food and fluid control as motivational tools for macaques used in behavioural

1007 neuroscience research: Report of a Working Group of the NC3Rs. *Journal of Neuroscience*
1008 *Methods*, 193(2), 167–188. doi:[10.1016/j.jneumeth.2010.09.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2010.09.003)

1009 Prescott, M. J., & Buchanan-Smith, H. M. (2003). Training nonhuman primates using positive
1010 reinforcement techniques. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 6(3), 157–161.
1011 doi:[10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_01](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_01)

1012 Prescott, M., & Buchanan-Smith, H. (2007). Training laboratory-housed non-human primates, part I: a
1013 UK survey. *Animal welfare-Potters Bar then WHEATHAMPSTEAD*, 16(1), 21.

1014 Pritchard, D. J., Hurly, T. A., Tello-Ramos, M. C., & Healy, S. D. (2016). Why study cognition in the wild
1015 (and how to test it)? *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 105(1), 41–55.
1016 doi:[10.1002/jeab.195](https://doi.org/10.1002/jeab.195)

1017 Rader, K. (2004), *Making mice: Standardizing animals for American biomedical research, 1900–1955*.
1018 Princeton: Princeton University Press.

1019 Ramos, A., Bousquet, C. A. H., & Sueur, C. (2021). How leadership could be used to manage domestic
1020 and wild ungulate herds. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 239.
1021 doi:[10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105326](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105326), [105326](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105326)

1022 Ramos, A., Manizan, L., Rodriguez, E., Kemp, Y. J. M., & Sueur, C. (2018). How can leadership
1023 processes in European bison be used to improve the management of free-roaming herds.
1024 *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 64(2). doi:[10.1007/s10344-018-1175-0](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-018-1175-0)

1025 Raulo, A., Allen, B. E., Troitsky, T., Husby, A., Firth, J. A., Coulson, T., & Knowles, S. C. L. (2021). Social
1026 networks strongly predict the gut microbiota of wild mice. *ISME Journal*, 15(9), 2601–2613.
1027 doi:[10.1038/s41396-021-00949-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-021-00949-3)

1028 Rault, J.-L. (2012). Friends with benefits: Social support and its relevance for farm animal welfare.
1029 *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 136(1), 1–14. doi:[10.1016/j.applanim.2011.10.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2011.10.002)

1030 Reddy, S. M. W., Montambault, J., Masuda, Y. J., Keenan, E., Butler, W., Fisher, J. R. B., . . . Gneezy, A.
1031 (2017). Advancing conservation by understanding and influencing human behavior.
1032 *Conservation Letters*, 10(2), 248–256. doi:[10.1111/conl.12252](https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12252)

1033 Reinhardt, V. (1964). Movement orders and leadership in a semi-wild cattle herd. *Behaviour*, 83(3–4),
1034 251–264. doi:[10.1163/156853983X00183](https://doi.org/10.1163/156853983X00183)

1035 Reinhardt, V. (1992). Voluntary progression order in captive rhesus macaques. *Zoo Biology*, 11(1),
1036 61–66. doi:[10.1002/zoo.1430110108](https://doi.org/10.1002/zoo.1430110108)

1037 Richardson, T. O., Kay, T., Braunschweig, R., Journeau, O., Ruegg, M., McGregor, S., . . . Keller, L.
1038 (2020). Ant behavioral maturation is mediated by a stochastic transition between two
1039 fundamental states. *Current Biology*, 31(10), 2253–2260.e3. doi:[10.1016/j.cub.2020.05.038](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.05.038)

1040 Robinson, J. M., & Cameron, R. (2020). The holobiont blind spot: Relating Host-Microbiome
1041 Interactions to Cognitive Biases and the Concept of the “Umwelt.” *Frontiers in Psychology*.
1042 Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.591071>, 11.

1043 Romano, V., MacIntosh, A. J. J., & Sueur, C. (2020). Stemming the flow: Information, infection, and
1044 social evolution. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*, 35(10), 849–853.
1045 doi:[10.1016/j.tree.2020.07.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.07.004)

1046 Rosati, A. G., Hagberg, L., Enigk, D. K., Otali, E., Emery Thompson, M. E., Muller, M. N., . . . Machanda,
1047 Z. P. (2020). Social selectivity in aging wild chimpanzees. *Science*, 370(6515), 473–476.
1048 doi:[10.1126/science.aaz9129](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz9129)

1049 Ryan, A. M., Freeman, S. M., Murai, T., Lau, A. R., Palumbo, M. C., Hogrefe, C. E., . . . Bauman, M. D.
1050 (2019). Non-invasive eye tracking methods for New World and Old World monkeys. *Frontiers*
1051 *in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 13, 39. doi:[10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00039](https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00039)

1052 Sakai, T., Hirata, S., Fuwa, K., Sugama, K., Kusunoki, K., Makishima, H., . . . Takeshita, H. (2012). Fetal
1053 brain development in chimpanzees versus humans. *Current Biology*, 22(18), R791–R792.
1054 doi:[10.1016/j.cub.2012.06.062](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2012.06.062)

1055 Sakai, T., Mikami, A., Tomonaga, M., Matsui, M., Suzuki, J., Hamada, Y. (2011). Differential prefrontal
1056 white matter development in chimpanzees and humans. *Current Biology*, 21(16), 1397–1402.
1057 doi:[10.1016/j.cub.2011.07.019](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2011.07.019)

1058 Savage-Rumbaugh, E. S., & Lewin, R. (1994), *Kanzi: The ape at the brink of the human mind*.
1059 Chichester: Wiley.

1060 Savage-Rumbaugh, E. S., Rumbaugh, D. M., & Fields, W. M. (2006), *Language as a window on*
1061 *rationality*.

1062 Savage-Rumbaugh, S., Wamba, K., Wamba, P., & Wamba, N. (2007). Welfare of apes in captive
1063 environments: Comments on, and by, a Specific Group of apes. *Journal of Applied Animal*
1064 *Welfare Science*, 10(1), 7–19. doi:[10.1080/10888700701277261](https://doi.org/10.1080/10888700701277261)

1065 Scanes, C. G. (2018). Animal agriculture: Livestock, poultry, and fish aquaculture. In *Animals and*
1066 *human society* (p. 179). Elsevier Inc.. doi:[10.1016/b978-0-12-805247-1.00007-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-805247-1.00007-1).

1067 Schapiro, S. J., Bloomsmith, M. A., & Laule, G. E. (2003). Positive reinforcement training as a
1068 technique to alter nonhuman primate behavior: Quantitative assessments of effectiveness.
1069 *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 6(3), 175–187.
1070 doi:[10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_03](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_03)

1071 Schlingloff, L., & Moore, R. (2018), *Do chimpanzees conform to social norms?*

1072 Schmitt, V., Pankau, B., & Fischer, J. (2012). Old World monkeys compare to apes in the primate
1073 cognition test battery. *PLOS ONE*, 7(4), e32024. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0032024](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0032024)

1074 Schnell, A. K., Amodio, P., Boeckle, M., & Clayton, N. S. (2021). How intelligent is a cephalopod?
1075 Lessons from comparative cognition. *Biological Reviews of the Cambridge Philosophical*
1076 *Society*, 96(1), 162–178. doi:[10.1111/brv.12651](https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12651)

1077 Schnell, A. K., & Clayton, N. S. (2019). Cephalopod cognition. *Current Biology*, 29(15), R726–R732.
1078 doi:[10.1016/j.cub.2019.06.049](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.06.049)

1079 Schofield, D., Nagrani, A., Zisserman, A., Hayashi, M., Matsuzawa, T., Biro, D., & Carvalho, S. (2019).
1080 Chimpanzee face recognition from videos in the wild using deep learning. *Science Advances*,
1081 5(9), eaaw0736. doi:[10.1126/sciadv.aaw0736](https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw0736)

- 1082 Shaw, R. C. (2017). Testing cognition in the wild: Factors affecting performance and individual
1083 consistency in two measures of avian cognition. *Behavioural Processes*, *134*, 31–36.
1084 doi:[10.1016/j.beproc.2016.06.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2016.06.004)
- 1085 Silk, J. B. (2002). Females, food, family, and friendship. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and*
1086 *Reviews*, *11*(3), 85–87. doi:[10.1002/evan.10011](https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.10011)
- 1087 Sinha, A. (2005). Not in their genes: Phenotypic flexibility, behavioural traditions and cultural
1088 evolution in wild bonnet macaques. *Journal of Biosciences*, *30*(1), 51–64.
1089 doi:[10.1007/BF02705150](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02705150)
- 1090 Slater, H., Milne, A. E., Wilson, B., Muers, R. S., Balezeau, F., Hunter, D., . . . Petkov, C. I. (2016).
1091 Individually customisable non-invasive head immobilisation system for non-human primates
1092 with an option for voluntary engagement. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *269*, 46–60.
1093 doi:[10.1016/j.jneumeth.2016.05.009](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2016.05.009)
- 1094 Slutzky, M. W., Jordan, L. R., Bauman, M. J., & Miller, L. E. (2010). A new rodent behavioral paradigm
1095 for studying forelimb movement. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *192*(2), 228–232.
1096 doi:[10.1016/j.jneumeth.2010.07.040](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2010.07.040)
- 1097 Sober, E. (2009). Parsimony and models of animal minds. In R. W. Lurz (Ed.), *The philosophy of animal*
1098 *minds* (p. 237). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 1099 Sosa, S. O., Pelé, M., Debergue, É., Kuntz, C., Keller, B., Robic, F., . . . Sueur, C. (2019). Impact of group
1100 management and transfer on individual sociality in Highland cattle (*Bos taurus*). *Frontiers in*
1101 *Veterinary Science*, *6*, 183. doi:[10.3389/fvets.2019.00183](https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2019.00183)
- 1102 Soulsbury, C. D., Gray, H. E., Smith, L. M., Braithwaite, V., Cotter, S. C., Elwood, R. W., . . . Collins, L.
1103 M. (2020). The welfare and ethics of research involving wild animals: A primer. *Methods in*
1104 *Ecology and Evolution*, *11*(10), 1164–1181. doi:[10.1111/2041-210X.13435](https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13435)
- 1105 Stensland, E., Angerbjörn, A., & Berggren, P. (2003). Mixed species groups in mammals. *Mammal*
1106 *Review*, *33*(3–4), 205–223. doi:[10.1046/j.1365-2907.2003.00022.x](https://doi.org/10.1046/j.1365-2907.2003.00022.x)

- 1107 Sueur, C. (2011). A non-Lévy random walk in chacma baboons: What does it mean? *PLOS ONE*, 6(1),
1108 e16131. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0016131](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016131)
- 1109 Sueur, C. (2015), *Analyse des réseaux sociaux appliquée à l'éthologie et l'écologie*.
1110 doi:[10.13140/RG.2.1.4100.5601](https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4100.5601). Editions Matériologiques, Paris.
- 1111 Sueur, C., Beltzung, B., & Pelé, M. (2022). Vers une création picturale non humaine: Quel degré
1112 d'auteurisation pour les animaux et les machines? *Polygraphe(s)*, 4.
- 1113 Sueur, C., Bousquet, C., Espinosa, R., & Deneubourg, J.-L. (2021). Improving human collective
1114 decision-making through animal and artificial intelligence. Retrieved from
1115 <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03299087>. *Peer Community Journal*, 1.
1116 doi:[10.24072/pcjournal.31](https://doi.org/10.24072/pcjournal.31)
- 1117 Sueur, C., Forin-Wiart, M.-A., & Pelé, M. (2020). Do they really try to save their buddy?
1118 *Anthropomorphism About Animal Epimeletic Behaviours*.
1119 doi:[10.20944/preprints202008.0711.v1](https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202008.0711.v1)
- 1120 Sueur, C., & Pelé, M. (2017) (Editorial). Anthropomorphism, between merits and demerits. [*Lettre du*
1121 *CEERE, centre européen d'enseignement et de recherche en Ethique*, 107, 1].
- 1122 Taylor, P. W. (2011), *Respect for nature: A theory of environmental ethics*. Princeton: Princeton
1123 University Press.
- 1124 Tero, A., Takagi, S., Saigusa, T., Ito, K., Bebber, D. P., Fricker, M. D., . . . Nakagaki, T. (2010). Rules for
1125 biologically inspired adaptive network design. *Science*, 327(5964), 439–442.
1126 doi:[10.1126/science.1177894](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1177894)
- 1127 Thaler, R. H. (2008), *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. New Haven
1128 and London: Yale University Press.
- 1129 Tokuyama, N., Emikey, B., Bafike, B., Isolumbo, B., Iyokango, B., Mulavwa, M. N., & Furuichi, T.
1130 (2012). Bonobos apparently search for a lost member injured by a snare. *Primates; Journal of*
1131 *Primateology*, 53(3), 215–219. doi:[10.1007/s10329-012-0298-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-012-0298-2)

- 1132 Tomasello, M., & Vaish, A. (2013). Origins of human cooperation and morality. *Annual Review of*
1133 *Psychology*, 64, 231–255. doi:[10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143812](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-113011-143812)
- 1134 Tomonaga, M., Kumazaki, K., Camus, F., Nicod, S., Pereira, C., & Matsuzawa, T. (2015). A horse's eye
1135 view: Size and shape discrimination compared with other mammals. *Biology Letters*, 11(11).
1136 doi:[10.1098/rsbl.2015.0701](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0701), [26601679](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0701)
- 1137 Tsuji, Y., Shimoda-Ishiguro, M., Ohnishi, N., & Takatsuki, S. (2007). A friend in need is a friend indeed:
1138 Feeding association between Japanese macaques and sika deer. *Acta Theriologica*, 52(4),
1139 427–434. doi:[10.1007/BF03194240](https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03194240)
- 1140 Ueno, A., Hirata, S., Fuwa, K., Sugama, K., Kusunoki, K., Matsuda, G., . . . Hasegawa, T. (2010). Brain
1141 activity in an awake chimpanzee in response to the sound of her own name. *Biology Letters*,
1142 6(3), 311–313. doi:[10.1098/rsbl.2009.0864](https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2009.0864)
- 1143 van de Waal, E., Borgeaud, C., & Whiten, A. (2013). Potent social learning and conformity shape a
1144 wild primate's foraging decisions. *Science*, 340(6131), 483–485. doi:[10.1126/science.1232769](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1232769)
- 1145 Van Patter, L. E. V., & Blattner, C. (2020). Advancing ethical principles for non-invasive, respectful
1146 research with nonhuman animal participants. *Society and Animals*, 28(2), 171–190.
1147 doi:[10.1163/15685306-00001810](https://doi.org/10.1163/15685306-00001810)
- 1148 Venniro, M., & Golden, S. A. (2020). Taking action: Empathy and social interaction in rats.
1149 *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 45(7), 1081–1082. doi:[10.1038/s41386-019-0596-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-019-0596-0)
- 1150 Verhaeghen, P., Martin, M., & Sędek, G. (2012). Reconnecting cognition in the lab and cognition in
1151 real life: The role of compensatory social and motivational factors in explaining how
1152 cognition ages in the wild. *Neuropsychology, Development, and Cognition. Section B, Aging,*
1153 *Neuropsychology and Cognition*, 19(1–2), 1–12. doi:[10.1080/13825585.2011.645009](https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2011.645009)
- 1154 Voelkl, B., Altman, N. S., Forsman, A., Forstmeier, W., Gurevitch, J., Jaric, I., . . . Würbel, H. (2020).
1155 Reproducibility of animal research in light of biological variation. *Nature Reviews.*
1156 *Neuroscience*, 21(7), 384–393. doi:[10.1038/s41583-020-0313-3](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-020-0313-3)

1157 Voelkl, B., Würbel, H., Krzywinski, M., & Altman, N. (2021). The standardization fallacy. *Nature*
1158 *Methods*, 18(1), 5–7. doi:[10.1038/s41592-020-01036-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-020-01036-9)

1159 Ward, A. J. W., & Webster, M. (2016), *Sociality: The behaviour of group-living animals*. Berlin:
1160 Springer.

1161 Washburn, D. A., Rulon, M. J., & Gulledge, J. P. (2004). A new breed of computer users: Rats control a
1162 cursor via joystick manipulation. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, and Computers*,
1163 36(2), 173–179. doi:[10.3758/BF03195562](https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03195562)

1164 Watson, W. R., Kim, W., & Watson, S. L. (2016). Learning outcomes of a MOOC designed for
1165 attitudinal change: A case study of an Animal Behavior and Welfare MOOC. *Computers and*
1166 *Education*, 96, 83–93. doi:[10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.013)

1167 Webb, C. E., Woodford, P., & Huchard, E. (2019). Animal ethics and behavioral science: An overdue
1168 discussion. *BioScience*. *BioScience*, 69(10), 778–788. doi:[10.1093/biosci/biz082](https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biz082)

1169 Wendler, H. (2020). Philosophical primatology: Reflections on theses of anthropological difference,
1170 the logic of anthropomorphism and Anthropodenial, and the self-other category mistake
1171 within the scope of cognitive primate research. *Biological Theory*, 15(2), 61–82.
1172 doi:[10.1007/s13752-019-00337-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13752-019-00337-3)

1173 Whiten, A. (2011). The scope of culture in chimpanzees, humans and ancestral apes. *Philosophical*
1174 *Transactions of the Royal Society of London. Series B, Biological Sciences*, 366(1567), 997–
1175 1007. doi:[10.1098/rstb.2010.0334](https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2010.0334)

1176 Whiten, A., Custance, D. M., Gomez, J. C., Teixidor, P., & Bard, K. A. (1996). Imitative learning of
1177 artificial fruit processing in children (*Homo sapiens*) and chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*).
1178 *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, 110(1), 3–14. doi:[10.1037/0735-7036.110.1.3](https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7036.110.1.3)

1179 Wild, B., Dormagen, D. M., Zachariae, A., Smith, M. L., Traynor, K. S., Brockmann, D., . . . Landgraf, T.
1180 (2021). Social networks predict the life and death of honey bees. *Nature Communications*,
1181 12(1), 1110. doi:[10.1038/s41467-021-21212-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21212-5)

1182 Würbel, H. (2000). Behaviour and the standardization fallacy. *Nature Genetics*, 26(3), 263–263.
1183 doi:[10.1038/81541](https://doi.org/10.1038/81541)

1184 Xiang, Q., Zhu, D., Chen, Q. L., Delgado-Baquerizo, M., Su, J. Q., Qiao, M., . . . Zhu, Y. G. (2019). Effects
1185 of diet on gut microbiota of soil collembolans. *Science of the Total Environment*, 676, 197–
1186 205. doi:[10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.04.104](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.04.104)

1187 Yang, Q., Lin, Z., Zhang, W., Li, J., Chen, X., Zhang, J., & Yang, T. (2022). Monkey plays Pac-Man with
1188 compositional strategies and hierarchical decision-making. *eLife*, 11, e74500.
1189 doi:[10.7554/eLife.74500](https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.74500)

1190 Zeagler, C., Gilliland, S., Freil, L., Starner, T., & Jackson, M. (2014), *Going to the dogs: Towards an*
1191 *interactive touchscreen interface for working dogs* (pp. 497–507).

1192

1193

1194

1195 Abeyesinghe, S. M., Drewe, J. A., Asher, L., Wathes, C. M., & Collins, L. M. (2013). Do hens have
1196 friends? *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 143(1), 61–66.
1197 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2012.12.003>

1198 Andrews, K. (2020a). Naïve Normativity: The Social Foundation of Moral Cognition. *Journal of the*
1199 *American Philosophical Association*, 6(1), 36–56. <https://doi.org/10.1017/apa.2019.30>

1200 Andrews, K. (2020b). *How to Study Animal Minds*. Cambridge University Press.
1201 [https://www.cambridge.org/core/elements/how-to-study-animal-](https://www.cambridge.org/core/elements/how-to-study-animal-minds/FC90846C50ED2E992CA2AC51D7C249AC)
1202 [minds/FC90846C50ED2E992CA2AC51D7C249AC](https://www.cambridge.org/core/elements/how-to-study-animal-minds/FC90846C50ED2E992CA2AC51D7C249AC)

1203 Aplin, L. M., Farine, D. R., Morand-Ferron, J., Cockburn, A., Thornton, A., & Sheldon, B. C. (2015).
1204 Experimentally induced innovations lead to persistent culture via conformity in wild birds.
1205 *Nature*, 518(7540), 538.

- 1206 Baker, N., Wolschin, F., & Amdam, G. V. (2012). Age-related learning deficits can be reversible in
1207 honeybees *Apis mellifera*. *Experimental Gerontology*, 47(10), 764–772.
1208 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exger.2012.05.011>
- 1209 Ballesta, S., Sadoughi, B., Miss, F., Whitehouse, J., Aguenounon, G., & Meunier, H. (2021). Assessing
1210 the reliability of an automated method for measuring dominance hierarchy in non-human
1211 primates. *Primates*, 62(4), 595–607. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-021-00909-7>
- 1212 Baratay, E. (2011). Bêtes de somme-Des animaux au service des hommes. *Points*.
- 1213 Baratay, É. (2012). Pour une histoire éthologique et une éthologie historique. *Etudes Rurales*, 189(1),
1214 91–106. <https://doi.org/10.4000/etudesrurales.9596>
- 1215 Baratay, E. (2017). *Biographies animales. Des vies retrouvées*. Le Seuil.
- 1216 Barbee, R. W., & Turner, P. V. (2019). Incorporating Laboratory Animal Science into Responsible
1217 Biomedical Research. *ILAR Journal*, 60(1), 9–16. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ilar/ilz017>
- 1218 Basso, M. A., Frey, S., Guerriero, K. A., Jarraya, B., Kastner, S., Koyano, K. W., Leopold, D. A., Murphy,
1219 K., Poirier, C., Pope, W., Silva, A. C., Tansey, G., & Uhrig, L. (2021). Using non-invasive
1220 neuroimaging to enhance the care, well-being and experimental outcomes of laboratory non-
1221 human primates (monkeys). *NeuroImage*, 228, 117667.
1222 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2020.117667>
- 1223 Bègue, L., & Vezirian, K. (2021). Sacrificing Animals in the Name of Scientific Authority: The
1224 Relationship Between Pro-Scientific Mindset and the Lethal Use of Animals in Biomedical
1225 Experimentation. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1461672211039413.
1226 <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672211039413>
- 1227 Bekoff, M., & Allen, C. (1997). Cognitive Ethology: Slayers, Skeptics, and Proponents. In R. Mitchell, N.
1228 S. Thompson, & H. L. Miles (Eds.), *Anthropomorphism, Anecdotes, and Animals* (pp. 313–
1229 334). Suny Press.

- 1230 Belsey, P. P., Nicholas, M. A., & Yttri, E. A. (2020). Open-Source Joystick Manipulandum for Decision-
1231 Making, Reaching, and Motor Control Studies in Mice. *ENeuro*, *7*(2), ENEURO.0523-19.2020.
1232 <https://doi.org/10.1523/ENEURO.0523-19.2020>
- 1233 Bartal, I. B.-A., Decety, J., & Mason, P. (2011). Empathy and pro-social behavior in rats. *Science*,
1234 *334*(6061), 1427–1430.
- 1235 Ben-Haim, M. S., Monte, O. D., Fagan, N. A., Dunham, Y., Hassin, R. R., Chang, S. W. C., & Santos, L. R.
1236 (2021). Disentangling perceptual awareness from nonconscious processing in rhesus
1237 monkeys (*Macaca mulatta*). *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*(15).
1238 <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2017543118>
- 1239 Bergvall, U. A., Schapers, A., Kjellander, P., & Weiss, A. (2011). Personality and foraging decisions in
1240 fallow deer, *Dama dama*. *Animal Behaviour*, *81*(1), 101–112. [https://doi.org/doi: DOI:](https://doi.org/doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.09.018)
1241 [10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.09.018](https://doi.org/doi: DOI: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2010.09.018)
- 1242 Bhattacharjee, D., Mandal, S., Shit, P., Varghese, M. G., Vishnoi, A., & Bhadra, A. (2020). Free-Ranging
1243 Dogs Are Capable of Utilizing Complex Human Pointing Cues. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *10*.
1244 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02818>
- 1245 Bicchieri, C. (2016). *Norms in the wild: How to diagnose, measure, and change social norms*. Oxford
1246 University Press.
- 1247 Bicchieri, C., & Muldoon, R. (2011). *Social norms*.
- 1248 Bierbach, D., Laskowski, K. L., & Wolf, M. (2017). Behavioural individuality in clonal fish arises despite
1249 near-identical rearing conditions. *Nature Communications*, *8*, 15361.
1250 <https://doi.org/10.1038/ncomms15361>
- 1251 Birch, J., Schnell, A. K., & Clayton, N. S. (2020). Dimensions of animal consciousness. *Trends in*
1252 *Cognitive Sciences*.
- 1253 Biro, D., Sousa, C., & Matsuzawa, T. (2006). Ontogeny and cultural propagation of tool use by wild
1254 chimpanzees at Bossou, Guinea: Case studies in nut cracking and leaf folding. In *Cognitive*
1255 *development in chimpanzees* (pp. 476–508). Springer.

- 1256 Blattner, C. E., Donaldson, S., & Wilcox, R. (2020). Animal Agency in Community. *Politics and Animals*,
1257 6, 1–22.
- 1258 Böhnert, M., & Hilbert, C. (2018). 'Other Minds Than Ours?': A Controversial Discussion on the Limits
1259 and Possibilities of Comparative Psychology in the Light of C. Lloyd Morgan's Work. *History*
1260 *and Philosophy of the Life Sciences*, 40(3), 44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40656-018-0211-4>
- 1261 Borgeaud, C., Sosa, S., Bshary, R., Sueur, C., & van de Waal, E. (2016). Intergroup Variation of Social
1262 Relationships in Wild Vervet Monkeys: A Dynamic Network Approach. *Frontiers in*
1263 *Psychology*, 7, 915. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00915>
- 1264 Bouissou, M.-F., Boissy, A., Le Neindre, P., & Veissier, I. (2001). The social behaviour of cattle. *Social*
1265 *Behaviour in Farm Animals*, 113–145.
- 1266 Bousquet, C. A. H., Petit, O., Arrivé, M., Robin, J.-P., & Sueur, C. (2015). Personality tests predict
1267 responses to a spatial-learning task in mallards, *Anas platyrhynchos*. *Animal Behaviour*, 110,
1268 145–154.
- 1269 Bout, H. J., van Vlissingen, J. M. F., & Karssing, E. D. (2014). Evaluating the ethical acceptability of
1270 animal research. *Lab Animal*, 43(11), 411–414. <https://doi.org/10.1038/lablan.572>
- 1271 Boyer, F., Jaouen, F., & El Chérif Ibrahim, E. G. (2019). Deficits in social behavior precede cognitive
1272 decline in middle-aged mice. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, 13.
- 1273 Boyle, A. (2021). Replication, Uncertainty and Progress in Comparative Cognition. *Animal Behaviour*
1274 *and Cognition*, 8(2), 296–304.
- 1275 Bradford, M. A., Tordoff, G. M., Eggers, T., Jones, T. H., & Newington, J. E. (2002). Microbiota, fauna,
1276 and mesh size interactions in litter decomposition. *Oikos*, 99(2), 317–323.
1277 <https://doi.org/10.1034/j.1600-0706.2002.990212.x>
- 1278 Bradshaw, G. A. (2010). An ape among many: Animal co-authorship and trans-species epistemic
1279 authority. *Configurations*, 18(1), 15–30.

1280 Brent, L. J. N., Heilbronner, S. R., Horvath, J. E., Gonzalez-Martinez, J., Ruiz-Lambides, A., Robinson, A.
1281 G., Skene, J. H. P., & Platt, M. L. (2013). Genetic origins of social networks in rhesus
1282 macaques. *Scientific Reports*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep01042>

1283 Brosnan, S. F., Hopper, L. M., Richey, S., Freeman, H. D., Talbot, C. F., Gosling, S. D., Lambeth, S. P., &
1284 Schapiro, S. J. (2015). Personality influences responses to inequity and contrast in
1285 chimpanzees. *Animal Behaviour*, 101, 75–87.

1286 Buchanan-Smith, H. M., Griciute, J., Daoudi, S., Leonardi, R., & Whiten, A. (2013). Interspecific
1287 interactions and welfare implications in mixed species communities of capuchin (< i> Sapajus
1288 apella) and squirrel monkeys (< i> Saimiri sciureus) over 3 years. *Applied Animal Behaviour
1289 Science*, 147(3), 324–333.

1290 Buckner, C. (2011). Two Approaches to the Distinction Between Cognition and “Mere Association.”
1291 *International Journal for Comparative Psychology*, 24(1), 1–35.

1292 Buller, H. (2014). Animal geographies I. *Progress in Human Geography*, 38(2), 308–318.

1293 Bussey, T. J., Muir, J. L., Everitt, B. J., & Robbins, T. W. (1997). Triple dissociation of anterior cingulate,
1294 posterior cingulate, and medial frontal cortices on visual discrimination tasks using a
1295 touchscreen testing procedure for the rat. *Behavioral Neuroscience*, 111(5), 920–936.
1296 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7044.111.5.920>

1297 Bussey, T. J., Padain, T. L., Skillings, E. A., Winters, B. D., Morton, A. J., & Saksida, L. M. (2008). The
1298 touchscreen cognitive testing method for rodents: How to get the best out of your rat.
1299 *Learning & Memory*, 15(7), 516–523. <https://doi.org/10.1101/lm.987808>

1300 Cait, J., Cait, A., Scott, R. W., Winder, C. B., & Mason, G. J. (2022). Conventional laboratory housing
1301 increases morbidity and mortality in research rodents: Results of a meta-analysis. *BMC
1302 Biology*, 20(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12915-021-01184-0>

1303 Calapai, A., Cabrera-Moreno, J., Moser, T., & Jeschke, M. (2022). Flexible auditory training,
1304 psychophysics, and enrichment of common marmosets with an automated, touchscreen-

1305 based system. *Nature Communications*, 13(1), 1648. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-022->
1306 29185-9

1307 Canguilhem, G. (1992). La connaissance de la vie. *Vrin*.

1308 Carere, C., & Locurto, C. (2011). Interaction between animal personality and animal cognition.
1309 *Current Zoology*, 57(4), 491–498.

1310 Carter, B., & Charles, N. (2013). Animals, agency and resistance. *Journal for the Theory of Social*
1311 *Behaviour*, 43(3), 322–340.

1312 Cauchoix, M., Hermer, E., Chaine, A. S., & Morand-Ferron, J. (2017). Cognition in the field:
1313 Comparison of reversal learning performance in captive and wild passerines. *Scientific*
1314 *Reports*, 7(1), 12945. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-13179-5>

1315 Cazzolla Gatti, R. (2016). Self-consciousness: Beyond the looking-glass and what dogs found there.
1316 *Ethology Ecology & Evolution*, 28(2), 232–240.

1317 Chang, L., Fang, Q., Zhang, S., Poo, M., & Gong, N. (n.d.). Mirror-Induced Self-Directed Behaviors in
1318 Rhesus Monkeys after Visual-Somatosensory Training. *Current Biology*, 0(0).
1319 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2014.11.016>

1320 Chang, L., Zhang, S., Poo, M., & Gong, N. (2017). Spontaneous expression of mirror self-recognition in
1321 monkeys after learning precise visual-proprioceptive association for mirror images.
1322 *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 114(12), 3258–3263.

1323 Claidière, N., Gullstrand, J., Latouche, A., & Fagot, J. (2017). Using Automated Learning Devices for
1324 Monkeys (ALDM) to study social networks. *Behavior Research Methods*, 49(1), 24–34.
1325 <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0686-9>

1326 Coe, J., & Hoy, J. (2020). Choice, control and computers: Empowering wildlife in human care.
1327 *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 4(4), 92.

1328 Costello, M., Beard, K. H., Corlett, R. T., Cumming, G. S., Devictor, V., Loyola, R., Maas, B., Miller-
1329 Rushing, A. J., Pakeman, R., & Primack, R. B. (2016). Field work ethics in biological research.

- 1330 Croney, C. C., & Boysen, S. T. (2021). Acquisition of a Joystick-Operated Video Task by Pigs (*Sus*
1331 *scrofa*). *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.631755>
- 1332 Czap, N. V., Czap, H. J., Lynne, G. D., & Burbach, M. E. (2015). Walk in my shoes: Nudging for empathy
1333 conservation. *Ecological Economics*, *118*, 147–158.
1334 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2015.07.010>
- 1335 D’Agostino, J., Pasetta, C., & Reichard, U. (2017). Preliminary results of a vocal self-recognition test in
1336 northern white-cheeked gibbons (*Nomascus leucogenys*). *162*, 157–157.
- 1337 Dakouré, A., Pelé, M., & Georges, J.-Y. (2022). Reconsidérer les modes d’habiter humains et non
1338 humains dans l’ère urbaine post-COVID 19. *Géographie et Cultures*.
- 1339 Daly Bezerra de Melo, G. (2012). Nature and culture intertwined or redefined? On the challenges of
1340 cultural primatology and sociocultural anthropology. *Revue de Primatologie*, *4*, Article 4.
1341 <https://doi.org/10.4000/primatologie.1020>
- 1342 Daly, G. B. de M. (2018). Drawing and blurring boundaries between species: An etho-ethnography of
1343 human-chimpanzee social relations at the Primate research institute of Kyoto university
1344 [Phdthesis, Université Paris sciences et lettres]. <https://tel.archives-ouvertes.fr/tel-02171263>
- 1345 Davidson, G. L., Raulo, A., & Knowles, S. C. L. (2020). Identifying Microbiome-Mediated Behaviour in
1346 Wild Vertebrates. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *35*(11), 972–980.
1347 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.06.014>
- 1348 Dawkins, M. S. (2021). *The Science of Animal Welfare: Understanding What Animals Want*. Oxford
1349 University Press.
- 1350 De Waal, F. (2006). „Morally Evolved.“. *Primates and Philosophers: How Morality Evolved*, 1–80.
- 1351 De Waal, F. (2016). *Are we smart enough to know how smart animals are?* WW Norton & Company.
- 1352 De Waal, F. B. (2012). The antiquity of empathy. *Science*, *336*(6083), 874–876.
- 1353 de Waal, F. B. (2019). Fish, mirrors, and a gradualist perspective on self-awareness. *PLoS Biology*,
1354 *17*(2), e3000112.

- 1355 Delotterie, D. F., Mathis, C., Cassel, J.-C., Rosenbrock, H., Dorner-Ciossek, C., & Marti, A. (2015).
1356 Touchscreen tasks in mice to demonstrate differences between hippocampal and striatal
1357 functions. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory*, *120*, 16–27.
1358 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nlm.2015.02.007>
- 1359 Derrida, J. (2008). *The animal that therefore I am*. Fordham Univ Press.
- 1360 Donaldson, S., & Kymlicka, W. (2011). *Zoopolis: A political theory of animal rights*. Oxford University
1361 Press.
- 1362 Dorigo, M., & Gambardella, L. M. (1997a). Ant colony system: A cooperative learning approach to the
1363 traveling salesman problem. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, *1*(1), 53–66.
1364 <https://doi.org/10.1109/4235.585892>
- 1365 Dorigo, M., & Gambardella, L. M. (1997b). Ant colonies for the travelling salesman problem.
1366 *Biosystems*, *43*(2), 73–81. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0303-2647\(97\)01708-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0303-2647(97)01708-5)
- 1367 Dougherty, L. R., & Guillette, L. M. (2018). Linking personality and cognition: A meta-analysis.
1368 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *373*(1756), 20170282.
1369 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0282>
- 1370 Duboscq, J., Romano, V., MacIntosh, A., & Sueur, C. (2016). Social Information Transmission in
1371 Animals: Lessons from Studies of Diffusion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *7*.
- 1372 Eberle, U. (2021). Nudging nature. *New Scientist*, *250*(3340), 42–45. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0262-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0262-4079(21)01109-X)
1373 [4079\(21\)01109-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0262-4079(21)01109-X)
- 1374 Evans, J. C., Liechti, J. I., Boatman, B., & König, B. (2020). A natural catastrophic turnover event:
1375 Individual sociality matters despite community resilience in wild house mice. *Proceedings of*
1376 *the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *287*(1926), 20192880.
1377 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2019.2880>
- 1378 Fehlmann, G., & King, A. J. (2016). Bio-logging. *Current Biology*, *26*(18), R830–R831.
- 1379 Fenton, A. (2014). Can a chimp say “no”? Reenvisioning chimpanzee dissent in harmful research.
1380 *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics*, *23*(2), 130–139.

- 1381 Ferreira, A. C., Silva, L. R., Renna, F., Brandl, H. B., Renoult, J. P., Farine, D. R., Covas, R., & Doutrelant,
1382 C. (2020). Deep learning-based methods for individual recognition in small birds. *Methods in*
1383 *Ecology and Evolution*, 11(9), 1072–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13436>
- 1384 Ferrucci, L., Nougaret, S., & Genovesio, A. (2019). Macaque monkeys learn by observation in the
1385 ghost display condition in the object-in-place task with differential reward to the observer.
1386 *Scientific Reports*, 9(1), 401. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-36803-4>
- 1387 Fitzgibbon, C. D. (1990). Mixed-species grouping in Thomson’s and Grant’s gazelles: The antipredator
1388 benefits. *Animal Behaviour*, 39(6), 1116–1126.
- 1389 Fitzpatrick, S. (2020). Chimpanzee normativity: Evidence and objections. *Biology & Philosophy*, 35(4),
1390 45. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-020-09763-1>
- 1391 Franks, B., Webb, C., Gagliano, M., & Smuts, B. (2020). Conventional science will not do justice to
1392 nonhuman interests: A fresh approach is required. *Animal Sentience*, 4(27), 17.
- 1393 Huebner Franziska, Fichtel Claudia, & Kappeler Peter M. (2018). Linking cognition with fitness in a
1394 wild primate: Fitness correlates of problem-solving performance and spatial learning ability.
1395 *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 373(1756), 20170295.
1396 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2017.0295>
- 1397 Furnham, A., & Heyes, C. (1993). Psychology students’ beliefs about animals and animal
1398 experimentation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 15(1), 1–10.
1399 [https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(93\)90036-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(93)90036-3)
- 1400 Galland, L. (2014). The Gut Microbiome and the Brain. *Journal of Medicinal Food*, 17(12), 1261–1272.
1401 <https://doi.org/10.1089/jmf.2014.7000>
- 1402 Gallup Jr, G. G., Anderson, J. R., & Shillito, D. J. (2002). The mirror test. *The Cognitive Animal:*
1403 *Empirical and Theoretical Perspectives on Animal Cognition*, 325–333.
- 1404 Gao, J., Su, Y., 雅己友永, & 哲郎松沢. (2016). The rock-paper-scissors game in chimpanzees (*Pan*
1405 *troglydytes*). *靈長類研究 Supplement*, 32, 44–44.
1406 https://doi.org/10.14907/primate.32.0_44_2

- 1407 Good, T. L., Sterzinger, N., & Lavigne, A. (2018). Expectation effects: Pygmalion and the initial 20
1408 years of research. *Educational Research and Evaluation*, 24(3–5), 99–123.
1409 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13803611.2018.1548817>
- 1410 Goodale, E., & Kotagama, S. W. (2005). Alarm calling in Sri Lankan mixed-species bird flocks. *The Auk*,
1411 122(1), 108–120.
- 1412 Grampp, M., Sueur, C., van de Waal, E., & Botting, J. (2019). Social attention biases in juvenile wild
1413 vervet monkeys: Implications for socialisation and social learning processes. *Primates*, 60(3),
1414 261–275.
- 1415 Grasso, F., Rosa, G. D., Napolitano, F., Francia, A. D., & Bordi, A. (2007). Entrance order and side
1416 preference of dairy cows in the milking parlour. *Italian Journal of Animal Science*, 6(2), 187–
1417 194. <https://doi.org/10.4081/ijas.2007.187>
- 1418 David, G., William, P., Véronique, G., Thierry, B., & Yvon Le, M. (2012). Robots in Ecology: Welcome
1419 to the machine. *Open Journal of Ecology*, 2012. <https://doi.org/10.4236/oje.2012.22006>
- 1420 Griffin, A. S., Guillette, L. M., & Healy, S. D. (2015). Cognition and personality: An analysis of an
1421 emerging field. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 30(4), 207–214.
1422 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.01.012>
- 1423 Griffin, D. R. (2013). *Animal minds: Beyond cognition to consciousness*. University of Chicago Press.
- 1424 Haraway, D. J. (1989). *Primate visions: Gender, race, and nature in the world of modern science*.
1425 Psychology Press.
- 1426 He, L.-W., Zeng, L., Tian, N., Li, Y., He, T., Tan, D.-M., Zhang, Q., & Tan, Y. (2020). Optimization of food
1427 deprivation and sucrose preference test in SD rat model undergoing chronic unpredictable
1428 mild stress. *Animal Models and Experimental Medicine*, 3(1), 69–78.
1429 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ame2.12107>
- 1430 Hodgetts, T., & Lorimer, J. (2020). Animals' mobilities. *Progress in Human Geography*, 44(1), 4–26.
1431 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132518817829>

- 1432 Hoffman, J. M., Creevy, K. E., Franks, A., O'Neill, D. G., & Promislow, D. E. L. (2018). The companion
1433 dog as a model for human aging and mortality. *Aging Cell*, *17*(3), e12737.
1434 <https://doi.org/10.1111/ace1.12737>
- 1435 Hoppitt, W., & Laland, K. N. (2013). *Social learning: An introduction to mechanisms, methods, and*
1436 *models*. Princeton University Press.
- 1437 Huskisson, S. M., Doelling, C. R., Ross, S. R., & Hopper, L. M. (2021). Assessing the potential impact of
1438 zoo visitors on the welfare and cognitive performance of Japanese macaques. *Applied Animal*
1439 *Behaviour Science*, *243*, 105453. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105453>
- 1440 Huttunen, A. W., Adams, G. K., & Platt, M. L. (2017). Can self-awareness be taught? Monkeys pass the
1441 mirror test—Again. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *114*(13), 3281–3283.
- 1442 Inoue, S., & Matsuzawa, T. (2007). Working memory of numerals in chimpanzees. *Current Biology*,
1443 *17*(23), R1004–R1005. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2007.10.027>
- 1444 Jacobson, S. L., Kwiatt, A. C., Ross, S. R., & Cronin, K. A. (2019). The effects of cognitive testing on the
1445 welfare of zoo-housed Japanese macaques (*Macaca fuscata*). *Applied Animal Behaviour*
1446 *Science*, *212*, 90–97. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2018.12.014>
- 1447 Janmaat, K. R. L. (2019). What animals do not do or fail to find: A novel observational approach for
1448 studying cognition in the wild. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and Reviews*, *28*(6),
1449 303–320. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.21794>
- 1450 Janson, C., & Byrne, R. (2007). What wild primates know about resources: Opening up the black box.
1451 *Animal Cognition*, *10*(3), 357–367. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-007-0080-9>
- 1452 Jensen, K., Call, J., & Tomasello, M. (2007). Chimpanzees are vengeful but not spiteful. *Proceedings of*
1453 *the National Academy of Sciences*, *104*(32), 13046–13050.
- 1454 Kaminski, J., Call, J., & Tomasello, M. (2008). Chimpanzees know what others know, but not what
1455 they believe. *Cognition*, *109*(2), 224–234.

- 1456 Kaneko, T., & Tomonaga, M. (2011). The perception of self-agency in chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*).
1457 *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 278(1725), 3694–3702.
1458 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2011.0611>
- 1459 Kano, F., & Tomonaga, M. (2009). How chimpanzees look at pictures: A comparative eye-tracking
1460 study. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 276(1664), 1949–1955.
1461 <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2008.1811>
- 1462 King, A. J., & Sueur, C. (2011). Where Next? Group Coordination and Collective Decision Making by
1463 Primates. *International Journal of Primatology*, 32(6), 1245–1267.
1464 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10764-011-9526-7>
- 1465 King, B. J. (2021). *Animals' Best Friends: Putting Compassion to Work for Animals in Captivity and in*
1466 *the Wild*. University of Chicago Press.
1467 <https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/A/bo33375440.html>
- 1468 Kirchoff, N. S., Udell, M. A., & Sharpton, T. J. (2019). The gut microbiome correlates with conspecific
1469 aggression in a small population of rescued dogs (*Canis familiaris*). *PeerJ*, 7, e6103.
- 1470 Klein, A. S., & Gogolla, N. (2021). How mice feel each other's pain or fear. *Science*, 371(6525), 122–
1471 123. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abf5940>
- 1472 Koda, H. (2012). Possible use of heterospecific food-associated calls of macaques by sika deer for
1473 foraging efficiency. *Behavioural Processes*, 91(1), 30–34.
- 1474 Kohda, M., Hotta, T., Takeyama, T., Awata, S., Tanaka, H., Asai, J., & Jordan, A. L. (2019). If a fish can
1475 pass the mark test, what are the implications for consciousness and self-awareness testing in
1476 animals? *PLoS Biology*, 17(2), e3000021.
- 1477 Korsgaard, C. M. (2018). *Fellow Creatures: Our Obligations to the Other Animals*. Oxford University
1478 Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198753858.001.0001>
- 1479 Krasheninnikova, A., Berardi, R., Lind, M.-A., O'Neill, L., & von Bayern, A. M. (2019). Primate cognition
1480 test battery in parrots. *Behaviour*, 156(5–8), 721–761.
- 1481 Krause, J., & Ruxton, G. D. (2002). *Living in groups*. Oxford University Press.

- 1482 Krause, S. R. (2013). Beyond non-domination: Agency, inequality and the meaning of freedom.
1483 *Philosophy & Social Criticism*, 39(2), 187–208.
- 1484 Krebs, J. R. (1973). Social learning and the significance of mixed-species flocks of chickadees (*Parus*
1485 spp.). *Canadian Journal of Zoology*, 51(12), 1275–1288.
- 1486 Krupenye, C., Kano, F., Hirata, S., Call, J., & Tomasello, M. (2016). Great apes anticipate that other
1487 individuals will act according to false beliefs. *Science*, 354(6308), 110–114.
- 1488 Kumpan, L. T., Smeltzer, E. A., & Teichroeb, J. A. (2020). Animal cognition in the field: Performance of
1489 wild vervet monkeys (*Chlorocebus pygerythrus*) on a reversal learning task. *Animal Cognition*,
1490 23(3), 523–534. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10071-020-01356-5>
- 1491 Lacreuse, A., Raz, N., Schmidtke, D., Hopkins, W. D., & Herndon, J. G. (2020). Age-related decline in
1492 executive function as a hallmark of cognitive ageing in primates: An overview of cognitive
1493 and neurobiological studies. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological*
1494 *Sciences*, 375(1811), 20190618. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rstb.2019.0618>
- 1495 Laland, K. N., & Hoppitt, W. (2003). Do animals have culture? *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues*,
1496 *News, and Reviews*, 12(3), 150–159. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.10111>
- 1497 Langlitz, N. (2020). Chimpanzee Culture Wars: Rethinking Human Nature alongside Japanese,
1498 European, and American Cultural Primatologists. In *Chimpanzee Culture Wars*. Princeton
1499 University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691204260>
- 1500 Laule, G. E., Bloomsmith, M. A., & Schapiro, S. J. (2003). The Use of Positive Reinforcement Training
1501 Techniques to Enhance the Care, Management, and Welfare of Primates in the Laboratory.
1502 *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 6(3), 163.
1503 https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_02
- 1504 Le Maho, Y., Whittington, J. D., Hanuise, N., Pereira, L., Boureau, M., Brucker, M., Chatelain, N.,
1505 Courtecuisse, J., Crenner, F., Friess, B., Grosbellet, E., Kernaléguen, L., Olivier, F., Saraux, C.,
1506 Vetter, N., Viblanc, V. A., Thierry, B., Tremblay, P., Groscolas, R., & Le Bohec, C. (2014).

1507 Rovers minimize human disturbance in research on wild animals. *Nature Methods*, 11(12),
1508 1242–1244. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nmeth.3173>

1509 Le Neindre, P., Bernard, E., Boissy, A., Boivin, X., Calandreau, L., Delon, N., Deputte, B., Desmoulin-
1510 canselier, S., Dunier, M., & Faivre, N. (2017). *Animal consciousness. Summary of the*
1511 *multidisciplinary assesment*.

1512 Le Neindre, P., Dunier, M., Larrère, R., & Prunet, P. (2018). La conscience des animaux (*Éditions*
1513 *Quæ*). Quæ. [https://www.quae.com/produit/1520/9782759228713/la-conscience-des-](https://www.quae.com/produit/1520/9782759228713/la-conscience-des-animaux)
1514 animaux

1515 Lecorps, B., Weary, D. M., & von Keyserlingk, M. A. G. (2021). Captivity-Induced Depression in
1516 Animals. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2021.03.010>

1517 Levé, M., Sueur, C., Petit, O., Matsuzawa, T., & Hirata, S. (2016). Social grooming network in captive
1518 chimpanzees: Does the wild or captive origin of group members affect sociality? *Primates;*
1519 *Journal of Primatology*, 57(1), 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-015-0494-y>

1520 Liu, X., Liu, T., & Huang, X. (2017). Commentary: Spontaneous expression of mirror self-recognition in
1521 monkeys after learning precise visual-proprioceptive association for mirror images. *Frontiers*
1522 *in Psychology*, 8, 1151.

1523 Lopes, P. C., & König, B. (2020). Wild mice with different social network sizes vary in brain gene
1524 expression. *BMC Genomics*, 21(1), 506. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12864-020-06911-5>

1525 Low, P., Panksepp, J., Reiss, D., Edelman, D., Van Swinderen, B., & Koch, C. (2012). *The Cambridge*
1526 *declaration on consciousness*. 1–2.

1527 Machado, C. J., & Nelson, E. E. (2011). Eye-tracking with nonhuman primates is now more accessible
1528 than ever before. *American Journal of Primatology*, 73(6), 562–569.
1529 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.20928>

1530 MacKay, J. R. D., Langford, F., & Waran, N. (2016). Massive Open Online Courses as a Tool for Global
1531 Animal Welfare Education. *Journal of Veterinary Medical Education*, 43(3), 287–301.
1532 <https://doi.org/10.3138/jvme.0415-054R2>

- 1533 MacKinnon, K. C., & Riley, E. P. (2010). Field primatology of today: Current ethical issues.
- 1534 Maeda, T., Ochi, S., Ringhofer, M., Sosa, S., Sueur, C., Hirata, S., & Yamamoto, S. (2021). Aerial drone
1535 observations identified a multilevel society in feral horses. *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 71.
1536 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-79790-1>
- 1537 Maeda, T., Sueur, C., Hirata, S., & Yamamoto, S. (2021). Behavioural synchronization in a multilevel
1538 society of feral horses. *PLOS ONE*, *16*(10), e0258944.
1539 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0258944>
- 1540 Martinet, L., Sueur, C., Hirata, S., Hosselet, J., Matsuzawa, T., & Pelé, M. (2021). New indices to
1541 characterize drawing behavior in humans (*Homo sapiens*) and chimpanzees (*Pan*
1542 *troglodytes*). *Scientific Reports*, *11*(1), 3860. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-83043-0>
- 1543 Mason, S., Premereur, E., Pelekanos, V., Emberton, A., Honess, P., & Mitchell, A. S. (2019). Effective
1544 chair training methods for neuroscience research involving rhesus macaques (*Macaca*
1545 *mulatta*). *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *317*, 82–93.
1546 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2019.02.001>
- 1547 Massen, J. J., & Koski, S. E. (2014). Chimps of a feather sit together: Chimpanzee friendships are
1548 based on homophily in personality. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *35*(1), 1–8.
- 1549 Matsuzawa, T. (2013). Evolution of the brain and social behavior in chimpanzees. *Current Opinion in*
1550 *Neurobiology*, *23*(3), 443–449.
- 1551 Matsuzawa, T. (2016a). Euthanasia is not an option: 10 years' care of a chimpanzee with acute
1552 tetraparesis.
- 1553 Matsuzawa, T. (2016b). SAGA and GAIN for great apes.
- 1554 Matsuzawa, T. (2017). Horse cognition and behavior from the perspective of primatology. *Primates*,
1555 *58*(4), 473–477. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-017-0632-9>
- 1556 Matsuzawa, T. (2020a). WISH cages: Constructing multiple habitats for captive chimpanzees.
1557 *Primates*, *61*(2), 139–148. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-020-00806-5>

- 1558 Matsuzawa, T. (2020b). Pretense in chimpanzees. *Primates*, 61(4), 543–555.
1559 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-020-00836-z>
- 1560 McCoy, K. D., Geuking, M. B., & Ronchi, F. (2017). Gut Microbiome Standardization in Control and
1561 Experimental Mice. *Current Protocols in Immunology*, 117(1), 23.1.1-23.1.13.
1562 <https://doi.org/10.1002/cpim.25>
- 1563 McEwen, E. S., Warren, E., Tenpas, S., Jones, B., Durdevic, K., Rapport Munro, E., & Call, J. (2022).
1564 Primate cognition in zoos: Reviewing the impact of zoo-based research over 15 years.
1565 *American Journal of Primatology*, n/a(n/a), e23369. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.23369>
- 1566 McFarland, S. E., & Hediger, R. (2009). *Animals and agency: An interdisciplinary exploration (Vol. 8)*.
1567 Brill.
- 1568 McMillan, J. L., Bloomsmith, M. A., & Prescott, M. J. (2017). An International Survey of Approaches to
1569 Chair Restraint of Nonhuman Primates. *Comparative Medicine*, 67(5), 442–451.
- 1570 McMillan, J. L., Perlman, J. E., Galvan, A., Wichmann, T., & Bloomsmith, M. A. (2014). Refining the
1571 pole-and-collar method of restraint: Emphasizing the use of positive training techniques with
1572 rhesus macaques (*Macaca mulatta*). *Journal of the American Association for Laboratory*
1573 *Animal Science*, 53(1), 61–68.
- 1574 Meijer, E. (2019). *When Animals Speak: Toward an Interspecies Democracy*. NYU Press.
- 1575 Merleau-Ponty, M. (2017). *Causeries 1948. Média Diffusion*.
- 1576 Miele, J., Tingley, L., Kimball, R., & Broida, J. (1993). Personality Differences between Pro- and
1577 Antivivisectionists. *Society & Animals*, 1(2), 129–144.
1578 <https://doi.org/10.1163/156853093X00037>
- 1579 Mitchell, R. W. (2007). Pretense in animals: The continuing relevance of children’s pretense. *Play and*
1580 *Development: Evolutionary, Sociocultural, and Functional Perspectives*, 51–75.
- 1581 Montiel-Castro, A. J., González-Cervantes, R. M., Bravo-Ruiseco, G., & Pacheco-López, G. (2013). The
1582 microbiota-gut-brain axis: Neurobehavioral correlates, health and sociality. *Frontiers in*
1583 *Integrative Neuroscience*, 7, 70.

- 1584 Murphy, H. W., Danforth, M. D., & Clyde, V. L. (2018). The Great Ape Heart Project. *International Zoo*
1585 *Yearbook*, 52(1), 103–112. <https://doi.org/10.1111/izy.12180>
- 1586 Muth, F., Cooper, T. R., Bonilla, R. F., & Leonard, A. S. (2018). A novel protocol for studying bee
1587 cognition in the wild. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 9(1), 78–87.
1588 <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12852>
- 1589 Nielsen, B. (2020). *Asking Animals: An Introduction to Animal Behaviour Testing*. CABI.
- 1590 Nielsen, B. L. (2018). Making sense of it all: The importance of taking into account the sensory
1591 abilities of animals in their housing and management. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 205,
1592 175–180. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2018.04.013>
- 1593 Park, G., & Evans, G. W. (2016). Environmental stressors, urban design and planning: Implications for
1594 human behaviour and health. *Journal of Urban Design*, 21(4), 453–470.
1595 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2016.1194189>
- 1596 Patterson, F. G. P., & Cohn, R. H. (1990). Language acquisition by a lowland gorilla: Koko's first ten
1597 years of vocabulary development. *WORD*, 41(2), 97–143.
1598 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00437956.1990.11435816>
- 1599 Pearson, E. L., Davis, J. M., & Litchfield, C. A. (2010). A Case Study of Orangutan and Siamang
1600 Behavior Within a Mixed-Species Zoo Exhibit. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*,
1601 13(4), 330–346.
- 1602 Pedersen, J. (2020). Nonhuman Primates and Language: Primates Raised by Humans. In *The*
1603 *International Encyclopedia of Linguistic Anthropology* (pp. 1–9). John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
1604 <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786093.iela0289>
- 1605 Pelé, M., Georges, J.-Y., Matsuzawa, T., & Sueur, C. (2021). Editorial: Perceptions of Human-Animal
1606 Relationships and Their Impacts on Animal Ethics, Law and Research. *Frontiers in Psychology*,
1607 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.631238>
- 1608 Pelé, M., & Petit, O. (2015). Equal care for own versus adopted infant in tufted capuchins (*Sapajus*
1609 *spp.*). *Primates*, 56(2), 201–206.

1610 Pennisi, A., & Giallongo, L. (2018). Animal Biopolitics: How Animals Vote. *International Journal for the*
1611 *Semiotics of Law-Revue Internationale de Sémiotique Juridique*, 31(3), 491–499.

1612 Pepperberg, I. M. (2006). *Intelligence and rationality in parrots*.

1613 Pereira, M., Nogueira, H., & Padez, C. (2019). The role of urban design in childhood obesity: A case
1614 study in Lisbon, Portugal. *American Journal of Human Biology*, 31(3), e23220.
1615 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajhb.23220>

1616 Peres, C. A. (1993). Anti-predation benefits in a mixed-species group of Amazonian tamarins. *Folia*
1617 *Primatologica*, 61(2), 61–76.

1618 Péron, F. (2012). Language-trained animals: A window to the “black box.” *International Journal of*
1619 *Intelligence Science*, 2(4A), 149–159. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ijis.2012.224020>

1620 Picciuto, E., & Carruthers, P. (2016). Imagination and pretense. In *The Routledge Handbook of*
1621 *Philosophy of Imagination*. Routledge.

1622 Poirotte, C., & Charpentier, M. J. E. (2020). Unconditional care from close maternal kin in the face of
1623 parasites. *Biology Letters*, 16(2), 20190869. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2019.0869>

1624 Poirotte, C., Massol, F., Herbert, A., Willaume, E., Bomo, P. M., Kappeler, P. M., & Charpentier, M. J.
1625 (2017). Mandrills use olfaction to socially avoid parasitized conspecifics. *Science Advances*,
1626 3(4), e1601721.

1627 Pomerantz, O., Baker, K. C., Bellanca, R. U., Bloomsmith, M. A., Coleman, K., Hutchinson, E. K., Pierre,
1628 P. J., Weed, J. L., & Consortium, N. P. R. C. B. M. (2022). Improving transparency—A call to
1629 include social housing information in biomedical research articles involving nonhuman
1630 primates. *American Journal of Primatology*, n/a(n/a), e23378.
1631 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajp.23378>

1632 Prescott, M. J. (2016). Online resources for improving the care and use of non-human primates in
1633 research. *Primate Biology*, 3(2), 33.

1634 Prescott, M. J., Brown, V. J., Flecknell, P. A., Gaffan, D., Garrod, K., Lemon, R. N., Parker, A. J., Ryder,
1635 K., Schultz, W., & Scott, L. (2010). Refinement of the use of food and fluid control as

1636 motivational tools for macaques used in behavioural neuroscience research: Report of a
1637 Working Group of the NC3Rs. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 193(2), 167–188.

1638 Prescott, M. J., & Buchanan-Smith, H. M. (2003). Training nonhuman primates using positive
1639 reinforcement techniques. *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 6(3), 157–161.

1640 Prescott, M., & Buchanan-Smith, H. (2007). Training laboratory-housed non-human primates, part I: a
1641 UK survey. *ANIMAL WELFARE-POTTERS BAR THEN WHEATHAMPSTEAD-*, 16(1), 21.

1642 Pritchard, D. J., Hurly, T. A., Tello-Ramos, M. C., & Healy, S. D. (2016). Why study cognition in the wild
1643 (and how to test it)? *Journal of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior*, 105(1), 41–55.
1644 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jeab.195>

1645 Rader, K. (2004). *Making Mice: Standardizing Animals for American Biomedical Research, 1900-1955*.
1646 Princeton University Press.

1647 Ramos, A., Bousquet, C. A. H., & Sueur, C. (2021). How leadership could be used to manage domestic
1648 and wild ungulate herds. *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 239, 105326.
1649 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2021.105326>

1650 Ramos, A., Manizan, L., Rodriguez, E., Kemp, Y. J. M., & Sueur, C. (2018). How can leadership
1651 processes in European bison be used to improve the management of free-roaming herds.
1652 *European Journal of Wildlife Research*, 64(2). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10344-018-1175-0>

1653 Raulo, A., Allen, B. E., Troitsky, T., Husby, A., Firth, J. A., Coulson, T., & Knowles, S. C. L. (2021). Social
1654 networks strongly predict the gut microbiota of wild mice. *The ISME Journal*, 15(9), 2601–
1655 2613. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41396-021-00949-3>

1656 Rault, J.-L. (2012). Friends with benefits: Social support and its relevance for farm animal welfare.
1657 *Applied Animal Behaviour Science*, 136(1), 1–14.

1658 Reddy, S. M. W., Montambault, J., Masuda, Y. J., Keenan, E., Butler, W., Fisher, J. R. B., Asah, S. T., &
1659 Gneezy, A. (2017). Advancing Conservation by Understanding and Influencing Human
1660 Behavior. *Conservation Letters*, 10(2), 248–256. <https://doi.org/10.1111/conl.12252>

1661 Reinhardt, V. (1964). Movement orders and leadership in a semi-wild cattle herd.

- 1662 Reinhardt, V. (1992). Voluntary progression order in captive rhesus macaques. *Zoo Biology*, *11*(1),
1663 61–66.
- 1664 Richardson, T. O., Kay, T., Braunschweig, R., Journeau, O., Ruegg, M., McGregor, S., De Los Rios, P., &
1665 Keller, L. (2020). Ant Behavioral Maturation Is Mediated by a Stochastic Transition between
1666 Two Fundamental States. *Current Biology*, *30*, 1–8.
1667 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2020.05.038>
- 1668 Robinson, J. M., & Cameron, R. (2020). The Holobiont Blindspot: Relating Host-Microbiome
1669 Interactions to Cognitive Biases and the Concept of the “Umwelt.” *Frontiers in Psychology*,
1670 *11*. <https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.591071>
- 1671 Romano, V., MacIntosh, A. J. J., & Sueur, C. (2020). Stemming the Flow: Information, Infection, and
1672 Social Evolution. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, *35*(10), 849–853.
1673 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2020.07.004>
- 1674 Rosati, A. G., Hagberg, L., Enigk, D. K., Otali, E., Thompson, M. E., Muller, M. N., Wrangham, R. W., &
1675 Machanda, Z. P. (2020). Social selectivity in aging wild chimpanzees. *Science*, *370*(6515), 473–
1676 476. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaz9129>
- 1677 Ryan, A. M., Freeman, S. M., Murai, T., Lau, A. R., Palumbo, M. C., Hogrefe, C. E., Bales, K. L., &
1678 Bauman, M. D. (2019). Non-invasive Eye Tracking Methods for New World and Old World
1679 Monkeys. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience*, *13*.
1680 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fnbeh.2019.00039>
- 1681 Sakai, T., Hirata, S., Fuwa, K., Sugama, K., Kusunoki, K., Makishima, H., Eguchi, T., Yamada, S., Ogihara,
1682 N., & Takeshita, H. (2012). Fetal brain development in chimpanzees versus humans. *Current*
1683 *Biology*, *22*(18), R791–R792.
- 1684 Sakai, T., Mikami, A., Tomonaga, M., Matsui, M., Suzuki, J., Hamada, Y., Tanaka, M., Miyabe-
1685 Nishiwaki, T., Makishima, H., & Nakatsukasa, M. (2011). Differential prefrontal white matter
1686 development in chimpanzees and humans. *Current Biology*, *21*(16), 1397–1402.
- 1687 Savage-Rumbaugh, E. S., & Lewin, R. (1994). *Kanzi: The ape at the brink of the human mind*. Wiley.

- 1688 Savage-Rumbaugh, E. S., Rumbaugh, D. M., & Fields, W. M. (2006). *Language as a window on*
1689 *rationality.*
- 1690 Savage-Rumbaugh, S., Wamba, K., Wamba, P., & Wamba, N. (2007). Welfare of Apes in Captive
1691 Environments: Comments On, and By, a Specific Group of Apes. *Journal of Applied Animal*
1692 *Welfare Science*, 10(1), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888700701277261>
- 1693 Scanes, C. G. (2018). Animal Agriculture: Livestock, Poultry, and Fish Aquaculture. In *Animals and*
1694 *Human Society* (p. 179). Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-805247-1.00007-1>
- 1695 Schapiro, S. J., Bloomsmith, M. A., & Laule, G. E. (2003). Positive Reinforcement Training As a
1696 Technique to Alter Nonhuman Primate Behavior: Quantitative Assessments of Effectiveness.
1697 *Journal of Applied Animal Welfare Science*, 6(3), 175.
1698 https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_03
- 1699 Schlingloff, L., & Moore, R. (2018). *Do chimpanzees conform to social norms?*
- 1700 Schmitt, V., Pankau, B., & Fischer, J. (2012). Old World Monkeys Compare to Apes in the Primate
1701 Cognition Test Battery. *PLOS ONE*, 7(4), e32024.
1702 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0032024>
- 1703 Schnell, A. K., Amodio, P., Boeckle, M., & Clayton, N. S. (2021). How intelligent is a cephalopod?
1704 Lessons from comparative cognition. *Biological Reviews*, 96(1), 162–178.
1705 <https://doi.org/10.1111/brv.12651>
- 1706 Schnell, A. K., & Clayton, N. S. (2019). Cephalopod cognition. *Current Biology*, 29(15), R726–R732.
1707 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2019.06.049>
- 1708 Schofield, D., Nagrani, A., Zisserman, A., Hayashi, M., Matsuzawa, T., Biro, D., & Carvalho, S. (2019).
1709 Chimpanzee face recognition from videos in the wild using deep learning. *Science Advances*,
1710 5(9), eaaw0736. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw0736>
- 1711 Shaw, R. C. (2017). Testing cognition in the wild: Factors affecting performance and individual
1712 consistency in two measures of avian cognition. *Behavioural Processes*, 134, 31–36.
1713 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beproc.2016.06.004>

1714 Silk, J. B. (2002). Females, food, family, and friendship. *Evolutionary Anthropology: Issues, News, and*
1715 *Reviews*, 11(3), 85–87. <https://doi.org/10.1002/evan.10011>

1716 Sinha, A. (2005). Not in their genes: Phenotypic flexibility, behavioural traditions and cultural
1717 evolution in wild bonnet macaques. *Journal of Biosciences*, 30(1), 51–64.
1718 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02705150>

1719 Slater, H., Milne, A. E., Wilson, B., Muers, R. S., Balezeau, F., Hunter, D., Thiele, A., Griffiths, T. D., &
1720 Petkov, C. I. (2016). Individually customisable non-invasive head immobilisation system for
1721 non-human primates with an option for voluntary engagement. *Journal of Neuroscience*
1722 *Methods*, 269, 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2016.05.009>

1723 Slutzky, M. W., Jordan, L. R., Bauman, M. J., & Miller, L. E. (2010). A new rodent behavioral paradigm
1724 for studying forelimb movement. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, 192(2), 228–232.
1725 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jneumeth.2010.07.040>

1726 Sober, E. (2009). Parsimony and Models of Animal Minds. In R. W. Lurz (Ed.), *The Philosophy of*
1727 *Animal Minds* (p. 237). Cambridge University Press.

1728 Sosa, S. O., Pelé, M., Debergue, É., Kuntz, C., Keller, B., Robic, F., Siegwalt-Baudin, F., Richer, C.,
1729 Ramos, A., & Sueur, C. (2019). Impact of Group Management and Transfer on Individual
1730 Sociality in Highland Cattle (*Bos taurus*). *Frontiers in Veterinary Science*, 6, 183.
1731 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2019.00183>

1732 Soulsbury, C. D., Gray, H. E., Smith, L. M., Braithwaite, V., Cotter, S. C., Elwood, R. W., Wilkinson, A., &
1733 Collins, L. M. (2020). The welfare and ethics of research involving wild animals: A primer.
1734 *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*, 11(10), 1164–1181.

1735 Stensland, E., Angerbjörn, A., & Berggren, P. (2003). Mixed species groups in mammals. *Mammal*
1736 *Review*, 33(3-4), 205–223.

1737 Sueur, C. (2011). A Non-Lévy Random Walk in Chacma Baboons: What Does It Mean? *PLoS ONE*, 6(1),
1738 e16131. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0016131>

1739 SUEUR, C. (2015). *Analyse des réseaux sociaux appliquée à l'éthologie et l'écologie*. Editions
1740 Matériologiques. <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.1.4100.5601>

1741 Sueur, C., Beltzung, B., & Pelé, M. (2022). Vers une création picturale non humaine: Quel degré
1742 d'auteurisation pour les animaux et les machines ? *Polygraphe(s)*, 4.

1743 Sueur, C., Bousquet, C., Espinosa, R., & Deneubourg, J.-L. (2021). Improving human collective
1744 decision-making through animal and artificial intelligence. [https://hal.archives-](https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03299087)
1745 [ouvertes.fr/hal-03299087](https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-03299087)

1746 Sueur, C., Forin-Wiart, M.-A., & Pelé, M. (2020). Do They Really Try to Save Their Buddy?
1747 *Anthropomorphism about Animal Epimeletic Behaviours*.
1748 <https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202008.0711.v1>

1749 Sueur, C., & Pelé, M. (2017). Editorial: Anthropomorphism, between merits and demerits. *Lettre Du*
1750 *CEERE, Centre Européen d'Enseignement et de Recherche En Ethique*, 107, 1.

1751 Taylor, P. W. (2011). *Respect for nature: A theory of environmental ethics*. Princeton University Press.

1752 Tero, A., Takagi, S., Saigusa, T., Ito, K., Bebbler, D. P., Fricker, M. D., Yumiki, K., Kobayashi, R., &
1753 Nakagaki, T. (2010). Rules for Biologically Inspired Adaptive Network Design. *Science*,
1754 327(5964), 439–442. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1177894>

1755 Thaler, R. H. (2008). *Nudge: Improving decisions about health, wealth, and happiness*. Yale University
1756 Press New Haven & London.

1757 Tokuyama, N., Emikey, B., Bafike, B., Isolumbo, B., Iyokango, B., Mulavwa, M. N., & Furuichi, T.
1758 (2012). Bonobos apparently search for a lost member injured by a snare. *Primates*, 53(3),
1759 215–219. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10329-012-0298-2>

1760 Tomasello, M., & Vaish, A. (2013). Origins of human cooperation and morality. *Annual Review of*
1761 *Psychology*, 64, 231–255.

1762 Tomonaga, M., Kumazaki, K., Camus, F., Nicod, S., Pereira, C., & Matsuzawa, T. (2015). A horse's eye
1763 view: Size and shape discrimination compared with other mammals. *Biology Letters*, 11(11),
1764 20150701. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsbl.2015.0701>

- 1765 Tsuji, Y., Shimoda-Ishiguro, M., Ohnishi, N., & Takatsuki, S. (2007). A friend in need is a friend indeed:
1766 Feeding association between Japanese macaques and sika deer. *Acta Theriologica*, *52*(4),
1767 427–434.
- 1768 Ueno, A., Hirata, S., Fuwa, K., Sugama, K., Kusunoki, K., Matsuda, G., Fukushima, H., Hiraki, K.,
1769 Tomonaga, M., & Hasegawa, T. (2010). Brain activity in an awake chimpanzee in response to
1770 the sound of her own name. *Biology Letters*, *6*(3), 311–313.
- 1771 van de Waal, E., Borgeaud, C., & Whiten, A. (2013). Potent social learning and conformity shape a
1772 wild primate's foraging decisions. *Science*, *340*(6131), 483–485.
- 1773 Patter, L. E. V., & Blattner, C. (2020). Advancing Ethical Principles for Non-Invasive, Respectful
1774 Research with Nonhuman Animal Participants. *Society & Animals*, *28*(2), 171–190.
1775 <https://doi.org/10.1163/15685306-00001810>
- 1776 Venniro, M., & Golden, S. A. (2020). Taking action: Empathy and social interaction in rats.
1777 *Neuropsychopharmacology*, *45*(7), 1081–1082. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41386-019-0596-0>
- 1778 Verhaeghen, P., Martin, M., & Sędek, G. (2012). Reconnecting cognition in the lab and cognition in
1779 real life: The role of compensatory social and motivational factors in explaining how
1780 cognition ages in the wild. *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition*, *19*(1–2), 1–12.
1781 <https://doi.org/10.1080/13825585.2011.645009>
- 1782 Voelkl, B., Altman, N. S., Forsman, A., Forstmeier, W., Gurevitch, J., Jaric, I., Karp, N. A., Kas, M. J.,
1783 Schielzeth, H., Van de Castele, T., & Würbel, H. (2020). Reproducibility of animal research in
1784 light of biological variation. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*, *21*(7), 384–393.
1785 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41583-020-0313-3>
- 1786 Voelkl, B., Würbel, H., Krzywinski, M., & Altman, N. (2021). The standardization fallacy. *Nature*
1787 *Methods*, *18*(1), 5–7. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41592-020-01036-9>
- 1788 Ward, A. J. W., & Webster, M. (2016). *Sociality: The behaviour of group-living animals*. Springer.

1789 Washburn, D. A., Rulon, M. J., & Gulledge, J. P. (2004). A new breed of computer users: Rats control a
1790 cursor via joystick manipulation. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*,
1791 *36*(2), 173–179. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03195562>

1792 Watson, W. R., Kim, W., & Watson, S. L. (2016). Learning outcomes of a MOOC designed for
1793 attitudinal change: A case study of an Animal Behavior and Welfare MOOC. *Computers &*
1794 *Education*, *96*, 83–93. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2016.01.013>

1795 Webb, C. E., Woodford, P., & Huchard, E. (2019). Animal ethics and behavioral science: An overdue
1796 discussion. *BioScience*, *69*(10), 778–788.

1797 Wendler, H. (2020). Philosophical Primatology: Reflections on Theses of Anthropological Difference,
1798 the Logic of Anthropomorphism and Anthropodenial, and the Self-Other Category Mistake
1799 Within the Scope of Cognitive Primate Research. *Biological Theory*, *15*(2), 61–82.
1800 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13752-019-00337-3>

1801 Whiten, A. (2011). The scope of culture in chimpanzees, humans and ancestral apes. *Philosophical*
1802 *Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, *366*(1567), 997–1007.

1803 Whiten, A., Custance, D. M., Gomez, J.-C., Teixidor, P., & Bard, K. A. (1996). Imitative learning of
1804 artificial fruit processing in children (*Homo sapiens*) and chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*).
1805 *Journal of Comparative Psychology*, *110*(1), 3–14. [https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-](https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7036.110.1.3)
1806 [7036.110.1.3](https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7036.110.1.3)

1807 Wild, B., Dormagen, D. M., Zachariae, A., Smith, M. L., Traynor, K. S., Brockmann, D., Couzin, I. D., &
1808 Landgraf, T. (2021). Social networks predict the life and death of honey bees. *Nature*
1809 *Communications*, *12*(1), 1110. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-21212-5>

1810 Würbel, H. (2000). Behaviour and the standardization fallacy. *Nature Genetics*, *26*(3), 263–263.
1811 <https://doi.org/10.1038/81541>

1812 Xiang, Q., Zhu, D., Chen, Q.-L., Delgado-Baquerizo, M., Su, J.-Q., Qiao, M., Yang, X.-R., & Zhu, Y.-G.
1813 (2019). Effects of diet on gut microbiota of soil collembolans. *Science of The Total*
1814 *Environment*, *676*, 197–205. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2019.04.104>

- 1815 Yang, Q., Lin, Z., Zhang, W., Li, J., Chen, X., Zhang, J., & Yang, T. (2022). Monkey plays Pac-Man with
1816 compositional strategies and hierarchical decision-making. *ELife*, *11*, e74500.
1817 <https://doi.org/10.7554/eLife.74500>
- 1818 Zeagler, C., Gilliland, S., Freil, L., Starner, T., & Jackson, M. (2014). *Going to the dogs: Towards an*
1819 *interactive touchscreen interface for working dogs*. 497–507).
- 1820
- 1821

