

Anatomically modern human dispersals into Europe during MIS 3: Climate stability, paleogeography and habitat suitability

Simon Paquin, Benjamin Albouy, Masa Kageyama, Mathieu Vrac, Ariane

Burke

To cite this version:

Simon Paquin, Benjamin Albouy, Masa Kageyama, Mathieu Vrac, Ariane Burke. Anatomically modern human dispersals into Europe during MIS 3: Climate stability, paleogeography and habitat suitability. Quaternary Science Reviews, 2024, 330, pp.108596. $10.1016/j.$ quascirev.2024.108596. hal-04510787

HAL Id: hal-04510787 <https://hal.science/hal-04510787v1>

Submitted on 21 Oct 2024

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.

Anatomically Modern Human dispersals into Europe during MIS 3: climate stability, paleogeography and habitat suitability.

Simon Paquin¹, Benjamin Albouy¹, Masa Kageyama², Mathieu Vrac² & Ariane Burke¹

¹Département d'anthropologie, Université de Montréal Pavillon Lionel-Groulx, 3150 Jean-Brillant, Montréal, QC, H3T 1N8, Canada [\(simon.paquin@umontreal.ca\)](mailto:simon.paquin@umontreal.ca)* Corresponding author [\(benjamin.albouy@umontreal.ca\)](mailto:benjamin.albouy@umontreal.ca) [\(a.burke@umontreal.ca\)](mailto:a.burke@umontreal.ca)

2 Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environnement (LSCE-IPSL), Centre d'Études de Saclay, Orme des Merisiers, Bat. 714, 91191 Gif-sur-Yvette, France [\(masa.kageyama@lsce.ipsl.fr\)](mailto:masa.kageyama@lsce.ipsl.fr) [\(Mathieu.vrac@lsce.ipsl.fr\)](mailto:Mathieu.vrac@lsce.ipsl.fr)

 Keywords: Aurignacian technocomplex, MIS3, Habitat Suitability, Climate Change, Paleogeography, Human dispersal, Europe

 Abstract: The initial large-scale dispersal of Anatomically Modern Humans (AMHs) into Europe, associated with the Aurignacian technocomplex, occurred during Marine Isotope Stage 3 (MIS 3), a critically unstable climatic period. The impact of climate change (millennial-scale Dansgaard-Oeschger events) and climate variability (annual and seasonal variation) on the mobility and initial dispersal of AMHs on the continent is not fully demonstrated. Here we show that both climate change and variability affected the spatial behavior of Aurignacian groups and structured their arrival on the continent. Using Random Forest, a machine learning algorithm, we produced habitat suitability (HS) models for AMHs under stadial (GS) and interstadial (GI) climate conditions. These models demonstrate that climate variability was a key factor governing the spatial behavior of human groups across MIS 3. They also illustrate that the structure and distribution of suitable habitat in Europe were affected by climatic conditions, with implications in terms of our species' adaptability and behavioral plasticity. Finally, our results support the suggestion that initial dispersals followed a Mediterranean coastal route, likely under interstadial conditions.

18 1 Introduction

 Dispersal events are a defining feature of human history and adaptation. As our species, *Homo sapiens*, spread into new landscapes during the Late Pleistocene it faced a variety of new and challenging situations, including coexistence with other human groups such as the Neanderthals and Denisovans, and novel and at times rapidly changing environmental contexts. Dispersals may also act as triggers for the biological evolution of the genus Homo (Timmermann et al., 2022). Of particular interest here is the dispersal of Aurignacian populations into Europe during Marine Isotopic Stage 3 (MIS 3) possibly following initial AMHs entry circa. 55,000 years go (55 ka) (Slimak et al., 2022). Despite the documented climate instability of MIS 3 AMHs successfully settled the European continent while Neanderthal populations declined (Banks et al., 2013a, 2013b, 2008; d'Errico and Sánchez Goñi, 2003; Gamble et al., 2004; Higham et al., 2014; Hublin, 2015; Klein et al. 2023; Mellars, 2006, 2011; Müller et al., 2011; Paquin et al., 2023; Timmermann, 2020; Tzedakis et al., 2007; Zilhão and d'Errico, 1999). This is obviously a condensed outline of a far more complex process for which scientific investigation is incomplete. Environmental change, landscape transformation and human dispersal interconnect and play out over long-time scales, determining the course of human evolution. The relationship between these variables is central to understanding the Paleolithic period, and especially crucial when comparing the fate of different human groups. The main goal of this research is to better understand the impact of millennial-scale climate variation and climate instability on the pattern of dispersal of AMHs into Europe during MIS3.

40 Computational archaeology has come a long way since the $20th$ century and modelling techniques are now widely used for studying human/environment interactions (e.g., Banks et al., 2008, 2013a; Burke et al., 2014, 2017; Klein et al., 2021, 2023; Ludwig et al., 2018; Maier et al., 2016; Schmidt et al., 2012; Shao et al., 2021; Tallavaara et al., 2015; Timmermann, 2020; Tsakanikou & McNabb, 2023; Weniger et al., 2019). We use HS modelling to define and map the distribution of suitable habitat for Aurignacian groups entering Europe during MIS 3 stadial (GS) and interstadial (GI) events. Comparing the HS models allows us to measure the impact of these contrasting climate events on the distribution of AMH populations. As part of the modelling process, we also identify key environmental variables to which AMHs responded during MIS 3.

50 1.1 Climate change and Dispersal

 Mobility is a central component of the human adaptative system. Multiple dispersal events have occurred since the evolution of our species in Africa. Uncovering the environmental parameters that facilitated or hindered these phenomena is instrumental to understanding them. The initial AMH dispersal into the Levant from Africa *ca.* 200-120 Kyr BP is hypothetically linked to a geographical extension of their habitat, composed of riverine woodlands or grasslands, during interstadial cycles (Hershkovitz et al., 2018; Vaks et al., 2007). Later dispersal events out of the African continent *ca*. 60-50 ka BP are also hypothetically linked to the development of humid climates in the eastern Mediterranean during GI-14 and GI-13, acting as a *pull* factor (Müller et al., 2011). Potentially triggered by the Heinrich 5 event *ca*. 48 ka BP, the shift from desert-steppe environments to open woodlands in Europe and the contraction of Neanderthal populations in Europe could have paved the way for the entry of AMHs into the continent (Müller et al., 2011). The impact of Heinrich events in Africa may also have acted as a *push* factor (Carto et al. 2009). Thus, climate change may be one of the main drivers of human dispersal.

 Depending on the timeframe and the region into which they dispersed AMHs developed different climatic and environmental preferences, within the wider climatic tolerances that characterize the species. To clarify these concepts, climatic tolerance acts as a limit to human adaptation while climatic preference designates optimal conditions for the species (Davies and Gollop, 2003). Habitat suitability models reflect the probability of encountering a species and can be used to explore environmental tolerances and define preferences. Dispersals may reflect the expansion or contraction of suitable habitat (by "niche tracking") or conversely, they may reflect plasticity and broader climate preferences.

 The ecological niche of AMHs, in Europe and across the globe, has been recently described as "generalist specialist" highlighting the plasticity of our species which has adapted to radically different environmental settings, becoming locally specialized in the process (Roberts and Stewart, 2018). This highlights the necessity of adopting a regional approach when studying the environmental context of AMH groups in order to disentangle local and regional scales of adaptation.

80 1.2 Climate variability and risk

 A mark of the behavioral plasticity of human hunter-gatherers is their ability to develop new strategies to counter resource scarcity and unpredictability (Kelly, 2013). This may involve changing settlement patterns, changes in diet, technological innovations, maintaining reliable and spatially extended social networks, and changes in mobility. Resource abundance varies seasonally and annually, which is to be expected, and hunter- gatherers can anticipate these variations and alter their spatial behavior accordingly, thus ensuring their long-term survival. On the other hand, whether resource availability can be predicted or not constitutes a true ecological risk for foragers, especially in the case of key resources (Burke et al., 2017; Winterhalder et al., 1999). There is also a risk associated with mobility itself, as information about conditions at long distance locales might be deficient (Winterhalder et al., 1999). This is especially the case for dispersing populations

 such as the Aurignacians who could not have extensive generational knowledge of the landscapes they encountered during dispersal.

 While existing predictive models for the Aurignacian (Klein et al., 2023; Shao et al., 2021) do not discuss the impact of ecological risk, studies focused on the Last Glacial Maximum (LGM) highlight its importance in explaining site distribution, mobility, the regionalization of lithic industries and patterns of gene exchange (Burke et al., 2017; Ludwig et al., 2018; Schmidt et al., 2012; Weniger et al., 2019; Wren and Burke, 2019).

 Apart from annual and seasonal climate variability and its inherent risks, the initial large-scale dispersal of AMH populations in Europe occurs during a period of important climate instability. During this timeframe several Dansgaard-Oeschger (D-O) events succeeded one another. D-O events are millennial-scale changes in atmospheric and oceanic conditions that oscillate between cold and dry conditions, correlated with Greenland Stadials (GSs), and warmer, wetter periods associated with Greenland Interstadials (GIs) (Dansgaard et al., 1982). D-O events vary in duration from a century to millennia and may be accompanied by rapid climate fluctuations that affect oceanic and atmospheric dynamics (Rasmussen et al., 2014). These fluctuations were accompanied by large-scale variations in resource production, affecting the nature and distribution of suitable human habitats (Van Andel et al., 2003). In this research we consider the impact of climate change (as structured by the millennial-scale D-O events) and climate variability (seasonal and annual) as variables of interest and discuss both scales of analysis.

112 1.3 The Aurignacian as proxy for AMH dispersals

 In the search for the initial AMH populations to successfully disperse into Europe, we are faced with the limits of the archaeological record. The presence of hominin fossils within a layer bearing an archaeological industry is generally considered to establish the identity of its makers but technological and stylistic elements in the Chatelperronian industry and the Uluzzian industry testify to a less clear-cut association between specific biological groups and material culture (d'Errico et al., 1998; Villa et al., 2018). The multi- millennial European coexistence of AMHs and Neanderthals clearly paved the way for contacts and exchanges, and groups composed of individuals from both species as well as hybrids could also have existed and still be archaeologically invisible (Sterling, 2015). The limited quantity of human fossils available is a problem, nevertheless the Aurignacian is generally accepted to signal the appearance of *H. sapiens* (Benazzi et al., 2015; Formicola, 1989; Hublin, 2015).

 This clear association allows us to use the distribution of the Aurignacian technocomplex as a proxy for modern human dispersal and mobility in Europe. In contrast, transitional industries that predate it, like the Uluzzian, the Neronian, and the Bachokirian, lack a clear association with AMHs, are mostly short-lived and lack the body of data available to discuss millennial changes on the European scale. Genetic studies show that the populations associated with the Aurignacian persisted in western European, becoming Gravettian, Solutrean and Magdalenian populations (Posth et al., 2023). We thus have data supporting the long-term success of the Aurignacian dispersal.

 Some prior predictive modelling work on the Aurignacian technocomplex (Banks et al., 2013a, 2013b) was designed with the following *a priori*: the Early Aurignacian and Proto-Aurignacian are chronologically distinct, the former emerging from the latter. This view is strongly critiqued nowadays, and the chronological and geographical coexistence of the two facies is now accepted (Barshay-Szmidt et al., 2018; Riel-Salvatore and Negrino, 2018). Based on this overlapping chronology and new technological insights highlighting a less monolithic nature to both industries (Bataille et al., 2018; Falcucci et al., 2017; Riel- Salvatore and Negrino, 2018), we made the argument elsewhere (Paquin et al., 2023) to consider both facies as part of a unified archaeological manifestation when investigating AMHs populations millennial-scale dynamics and changes in Europe.

 From the archaeological evidence presented elsewhere (Paquin et al., 2023), it appears that a major AMH dispersal including the Protoaurignacian and the Early Aurignacian began around GI-12 and GS-12. The expansion phase continued through GS- 10, and then slowed down with a more widespread established population all through GS- 7. These observations are also coherent with the two-phase dispersal model suggested by Davies (2001, 2007) for the Aurignacian technocomplex arrival: a pioneer colonization phase characterized by low site density, low demography, and a focus on coastal locales followed by a developed phase marked by a denser site distribution, a more important demography, and settlements in a wider variety of landscapes.

 In this exploration of the initial large-scale dispersal of AMHs into Europe, we ask the following research questions: a) What was the suitable habitat of AMHs during MIS 3 cold and warm phases?; b) Did climate change (D-O events) control the timing and pattern of AMH population dispersal and their expansion into Europe?; And c) Were AMHs sensitive to ecological risk, which we define as unpredictability, and does it help inform us about patterns of dispersal? We answer these questions using HS modelling, i.e., the analysis of species distribution as a function of explanatory variables including climate conditions (temperature, precipitation), indices of climate variability and geography, and by comparing and contrasting HS models for AMHs during stadial and interstadial events.

 Europe is an obvious choice for this study due to its well-documented archaeological record and a vast body of research that seeks to explain the successful dispersal of AMHs at the end of the Last Glacial. Furthermore, the scale and richness of available environmental data allow for a more rigorous characterization of AMHs adaptative plasticity. In this research the Aurignacian technocomplex is a proxy for the large-scale dispersal of AMHs into Europe. Our analysis is based on a chronologically secure archaeological database of Upper Paleolithic sites (Paquin et al., 2023). We rely on this database to isolate well dated species-occurrence data for *Homo sapiens* for use in our predictive modelling. This research also makes use of high-resolution paleoclimate data obtained through a collaboration with the *Laboratoire des Sciences du Climat et de l'Environement* (UMR 8212), at the *Institut Simon Laplace* (IPSL).

2 Materials and Methods

 We produced a series of habitat suitability models for the Aurignacian technocomplex in Europe using *Random Forest* (Breiman, 2001) a machine learning algorithm. The methodology applied in the present paper is based on the protocol described more fully in Burke et al. (2017). All analyses were performed using R Statistical Software (v4.2.3; R Core Team 2023).

178 2.1 Archaeological data

 The location data constituting the *presences* used in the RF models are discrete European archaeological sites containing dated, uncontested Aurignacian assemblages compiled in a previously published archaeological database (Paquin et al., 2023). Paleoenvironmental and chronological data compiled in this database are used to classify Aurignacian layers into stadial/interstadial periods. Since the environmental impact of climate conditions would not have been homogeneous across Europe, chronological data are given priority in the classification process (see Paquin et al. 2023 for more technical details). We excluded sites with chronological data that were either contested, not circumscribed enough to make a Bayesian assessment (*Amodel* index under 60, see Paquin et al., 2023), or missing. To obtain a comparable number of *presences* for the warm models, we included sites with imprecise chronological data (*Amodel* index under 60) but *in situ* paleoenvironmental data signaling warm conditions.

 The result is a selection of sites divided into two groups (Table 1):1) stadial 192 occupations ($N = 37$) and 2) interstadial occupations ($N = 27$). Some sites with multiple Aurignacian occupation layers are part of both groups, e.g., Hohle Fels, Mitoc-Malu-Galben and Les Cottés.

Warm classification

Cold classification

 Table 1. Sites, occupation layers and their locational data used as presences in RF models. Coordinates are rounded to two decimals (roughly 1.1 km). The selection of sites and their coordinates were extracted from Paquin et al. (2023).

198 2.2 Climate simulations and downscaling

 We used the Atmosphere-Ocean General Circulation Model (AOGCM) IPSL-200 CM5A-LR (Dufresne et al., 2013) at a \sim 1.9° latitude and 3.75° longitude spatial resolution to run two global climate simulations, one representing a typical MIS 3 stadial and the other a typical MIS 3 interstadial. The boundary conditions (i.e. the distribution of land, ocean and ice sheets, topography and bathymetry) are the same for both simulations and are described in Woillez et al. (2014), Le Mézo et al. (2017) and Lézine et al. (2023). These include smaller ice sheets than for the LGM (ICE_6G-C 16 kyr BP ice sheet reconstructions from Peltier et al. (2015) available at the time of running, which corresponded to the same global sea level as MIS 3). Atmospheric greenhouse 208 concentrations are set to 205 ppm for $CO₂$, 500 ppb for CH₄ and 260 ppb for N₂O, as documented by ice cores, i.e. between the levels known for the pre-industrial period and for the LGM. Astronomical forcing (precession, obliquity, eccentricity) is set with values for 46 kyr BP. The MIS 3 interstadial simulation is characterized by an active Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation, with values ranging from 20 to 26 Sv, while the MIS 3 stadial simulation has been forced to slow down by imposing a 0.2 Sv fresh water flux at the surface of the North Atlantic Ocean, and is characterized by an AMOC ranging from 8.5 to 11 Sv.

 The stadial simulation starts from the interstadial one and is run for 250 years, which is enough for the AMOC to strongly decrease. This simple set up was chosen to obtain distinct climate states for Europe, representative of a stadial and an interstadial state, with the AMOC state being the sole driver of the differences between these states. The latest protocol for Dansgaard-Oeschger modelling studies (Malmierca-Vallet, 2023) recommends a more recent ice sheet reconstruction, but does not modify ice sheet topography or contour, or the configuration of the coastlines as they are hard to delineate due to the lack of strong chronological constraints.

 From these simulations, we extracted data in the form of 50-year time series for monthly averages of sea level pressure, air temperature at 2 m above surface, relative humidity, surface wind and cloud cover. Using this data, we carried out a statistical downscaling model (GAM) (Vrac et al., 2007) to obtain precipitation and temperature at a 15 x 15 km spatial scale for MIS 3 warm and cold conditions. This statistical downscaling 229 was only applied to a defined European study domain: longitudes between 11.57°W and 24.74 °E and latitudes between 32.72 °N and 59.86 °N.

 A GAM (Generalized Additive Model) is a statistical model used for modelling relationships between a response variable and some predictor variables, allowing for non- linear and complex associations. GAMs extend the concept of linear models by allowing each predictor to have a non-linear relationship with the response. Here, the predictors are the large-scale climate information described above and the response variable (also called "predictand") is either the temperature or the precipitation at high spatial resolution (see previous paragraph). GAM assumes that the relationship between the response variable and predictors is additive. Instead of a single linear equation, it then uses separate functions for each predictor. These functions are typically smooth and, here, we use spline functions to capture non-linear patterns. The parameters for each predictor's spline are estimated to

 minimize the difference between predicted and observed values. All theoretical and technical details can be found in Vrac et al. (2007) or Latombe et al. (2018).

 Using this statistical downscaling approach produces fields at the high spatial resolution needed for our analysis at a reasonable computing cost. By construction, it also corrects for the biases of the large-scale model. On the other hand, the method does not yield successive daily states of the atmosphere and land surface, as a Dynamical Regional Model would. In the present case, using the statistical method provided suitable climatic data at the adequate resolution. A comparison to similar information obtained via a Dynamical Regional Model is beyond the scope of the present study.

250 2.3 Candidate predictors

 Variables used as candidate predictors (Table 2) of Aurignacian sites location are composed of three categories: climate variables, climate variability indices and topographical variables. All non-topographic variables were calculated separately for MIS 3 cold and warm conditions. For the climate variables, we used the outputs of the downscaled climatology to compute monthly, seasonal, and yearly averages, minima and maxima for precipitation and temperature.

 For the climate variability indices, we used the downscaled outputs of the 50-year time series to calculate the standard deviation (SD) of monthly temperature averages and the coefficient of variation (CV; ratio of the standard deviation to the mean) for monthly precipitation averages at seasonal and yearly scales. Precipitation trends do not follow Gaussian distributions so the CV is a more robust choice of variability index. Other climate variability indices include the Standardized Precipitation Index (SPI) (Guttman, 1999; Hayes, 2000; McKee et al., 1993) and the Standardized Temperature Index (STI). Those two indices display the number of months for which monthly average precipitation or temperature follow the normal trend. We calculated the SPI using the "SPEI" R package (Vicente-Serrano et al., 2010), with values standardized using a 12-month interval. We calculated the STI using the "STI" R package (Fasel, 2014). Finally, elevation and slope, the two topographic variables included as predictors,

269 were derived from the SRTM 90 m digital elevation model which we sampled at a 1 x 1 km

270 scale using ArcGIS (10.8.1). The final set of candidate predictors $(N = 40)$ is listed in

²⁷¹ Table 2.

Predictor	Type	Derivation	Description
elev	Topographic	DEM	elevation (m asl)
slope	Topographic	DEM	slope (reclassified) (degree)
p_avg_aut	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation average, autumn (mm)
p_avg_spr	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation average, spring (mm)
p_avg_sum	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation average, summer (mm)
p_avg_win	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation average, winter (mm)
p_avg_y	Climatology	Climate simulation	Annual precipitation average (mm)
p_max_aut	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation maximum, autumn (mm)
p_max_spr	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation maximum, spring (mm)
p_max_sum	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation maximum, summer (mm)
p max win	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation maximum, winter (mm)
p_min_aut	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation minimum, autumn (mm)
p_min_spr	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation minimum, spring (mm)
p_min_sum	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation minimum, summer (mm)
p_min_win	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation minimum, winter (mm)
p_var_aut	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation, coeff. var., autumn
p_var_spr	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation, coeff. var., spring
p_var_sum	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation, coeff. var., summer
p var win	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation, coeff. var., winter
p var y	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Seasonal precipitation, coeff. var., yearly
spi_norm	Climate variability	Climate simulation	N months within normal (predicted) precipitation range
sti norm	Climate variability	Climate simulation	N months within normal (predicted) temperature range
t_avg_aut	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature average, autumn (°C/10)
t_avg_spr	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature average, spring (°C/10)
t_avg_sum	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature average, summer (°C/10)
t_avg_win	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature average, winter (°C/10)
t_avg_y	Climatology	Climate simulation	Yearly temperature average (°C/10)
t max aut	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature maximum, autumn (°C/10)
t_max_spr	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature maximum, spring (°C/10)
t max sum	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature maximum, summer (°C/10)
t max win	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature maximum, winter (°C/10)
t_min_aut	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature minimum, winter (°C/10)
t min spr	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature minimum, spring (°C/10)
t_min_sum	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature minimum, summer (°C/10)
t min win	Climatology	Climate simulation	Seasonal temperature minimum, winter (°C/10)
t sd aut	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Standard deviation, seasonal temperature, autumn
t_sd_spr	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Standard deviation, seasonal temperature, spring
t_sd_sum	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Standard deviation, seasonal temperature, summer
t sd win	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Standard deviation, seasonal temperature, winter
t_sd_y	Climate variability	Climate simulation	Standard deviation, temperature, yearly

Table 2. List of predictors included in the modelling process.

273 2.4 Data preparation

 In addition to the selection of archaeological sites to act as presences (see above) the modelling process requires a library of pseudo-absences from which to draw upon. To this end, the climate data issued from the statistical downscaling were interpolated using the "natural neighbor interpolation" tool and resampled to create 1 km resolution rasters for each of the 40 variables from both the warm and cold paleoclimatic conditions. Next, we produced two point feature classes with 1 x 1 km spacing, one for stadial conditions and one for interstadial conditions, and extracted predictor values from the rasters to the points. The point feature classes were then clipped using masks of the current coastline configuration and the extent of the LGM ice sheets (Ehlers et al., 2011). Additionally, 10 km radius buffers were created around archaeological sites included in the study. This serves to exclude the more immediate foraging territory of Aurignacian occupations from the *pseudo-absence* datasets.

 Presences were generated by loading the georeferenced archaeological sites into point feature classes and extracting the predictor values from the rasters, as described above. To minimize the chances of overfitting, we created 1 km radius buffers around each site and checked for overlaps. Sites with overlapping buffers were deemed too close to one another and were counted as a single *presence*.

 Finally, for both the warm and cold datasets, the *presence* and the *pseudo-absence* point feature classes were merged into two discrete feature classes and the attribute tables exported into csv files for use in the next step.

2.5 Random Forest parameterization and model fitting

 Random forest (RF) is a nonparametric algorithm for regression and variable selection that uses decision trees (Breiman, 2001). We used RF to build habitat suitability models for the Aurignacian under stadial and interstadial conditions. We chose this algorithm for its ability to handle non-linear relationships, large numbers of predictors and small datasets of *presence* observations (Genuer et al., 2010; Grömping, 2009).

 First, we identified highly correlated predictor variables within the datasets using the *findCorrelation* function in the "caret" R package with a cut-off value of 0.8. Once correlated pairs were identified, the variable with the higher mean correlation with all other variables was removed. We supervised the process, prioritizing seasonal variables over yearly averages, such as spring temperatures (Kim et al., 2014) which has a demonstrated impact on vegetation productivity. This process resulted in the retention of 25 uncorrelated variables for the warm dataset and 23 for the cold dataset (see SI.3).

 The filtered lists of variables were then used as candidate predictors in an iterative variable selection process using RF (Fig. 1). The most robust performances for RF are obtained by averaging multiple runs of a model combined with a relatively low number of *pseudo-absences* (Barbet-Massin et al., 2012). Using the *RF* function from the "caret" R package, we ran each model for 100 runs with 10-fold cross-validation and equal numbers 312 of randomly selected *pseudo-absences* and *presences* ($N = 37$ for the cold models and $N =$ 27 for the warm models) (Barbet-Massin et al., 2012). We used default values for the *n-tree* (N = 500; the number of trees to grow for each model) and an *m-try* value of \sqrt{p} (p = number of predictors; *m-try* designates the number of randomly selected predictors interrogated at each split or node) (Díaz-Uriarte and Alvarez de Andrés, 2006). Model accuracy was calculated using the area under the Receiver Operating Curve (ROC). Accuracy, the Out-of-the-Bag (OOB) error rate and the Variable Importance indices (VI) were calculated for each run and averaged to assess model performance for each iteration (the script is included in supplementary information).

Figure 1. Random Forest iterative variable selection process.

 The iterative variable selection process used the VI metric to identify the least important predictors (the bottom 20%) which were removed before the next iteration of 100 runs, and so on. OOB and model accuracy were then used conjointly to identify which run produced the model with the most robust results while being the most parsimonious. The HS scores from the selected RF models were then mapped.

 The list of predictors from the best models were then tested using a Generalized Linear Model (GLM) to identify which predictors have linear relationships with the dependent variable (see SI.2 for results). This test was done using the *GLM* function in the "caret" R package with 10 times as many *pseudo-absences* as *presences* as suggested by Wisz & Guisan (2009). Once again, we ran the model 100 times before averaging the results.

3 Results

 For the warm and cold datasets, the final models are illustrated in Fig. 2 & Fig. 3 and the RF predictions produced at each step of the variable selection process are illustrated in the supplementary information (SI.4). The variable importance index (VI), which measures the relative importance of the predictors, is presented in Table 3 and Table 4 for each iteration. Model performance (OOB and accuracy) is presented in Table 5 and 6 and illustrated in Fig. 4.

 For the warm dataset, associated with GI conditions, the best model performance was obtained with the model *6var*, containing 6 predictors. For the cold dataset, associated with GS conditions, the best model performance was obtained with the model *6var*, also containing 6 predictors. Both these models are also the most parsimonious choices since they had the lowest OOB of their groups and no simpler model produced an OOB situated within 1 standard error of their respective scores (Fig. 4). As for the accuracy, both are within 1 standard error of the highest accuracy of their respective series. Because of this, they were chosen as the final *habitat suitability* models. Results for the additional GLM tests of these 2 winning models are included in the supplementary information (see SI.2).

 For the warm HS model, the predictors included (Table 3; Fig. 5 & 7), in order of importance (VI), are: *slope*, *p_var_spr* (coefficient of variability for spring precipitation), *t_avg_aut* (averaged monthly temperatures for Autumn), *p_max_spr* (maximum monthly average precipitations for spring), *p_var_win* (coefficient of variability for winter precipitation) and *elevation*.

 For the cold HS model, the predictors included (Table 4; Fig. 6 & 8), in order of importance (VI), are: *p_min_aut* (minimum monthly average precipitations for autumn), *slope*, *t_sd_aut* (standard deviation in average monthly temperatures in autumn), *p_min_sum* (minimum monthly average precipitations for summer), *t_sd_sum* (standard deviation in average monthly temperatures in summer) and *elevation*.

 Figure 2. Final warm model 6var. The sites used as presences are displayed over the Habitat Suitability (HS) index. The LGM ice sheets are downloaded from Ehlers et al., 2011 and simplified to remove holes in the Alps. The submerged landscapes areas were produced by Albouy et al., 2023.

 Figure 3. Final cold model 6var. The sites used as presences are displayed over the Habitat Suitability (HS) index. The LGM ice sheets are downloaded from Ehlers et al. 2011. The

paleoshorelines were produced by Albouy et al., 2023.

370 **Table 3.** Variable Importance (VI) of the variables tested for each of the warm conditions models.

371

372 **Table 4.** Variable Importance (VI) of the variables tested for each of the cold conditions models.

373

374 **Figure 4.** OOB and accuracy graphs for warm and cold models at each step. The grayed

375 areas represent 1 standard error (SE) over and under the lowest OOB score or the highest

376 accuracy score for each series.

Models	OOB	accuracy	N predictors
25var	0,367	0,621	25
20var	0,349	0,646	20
16var	0,346	0,677	16
13var	0,352	0,663	13
10var	0,334	0,678	10
8var	0,332	0,693	8
6var	0,314	0,696	6
5var	0,342	0,699	5
4var	0,329	0,669	4
3var	0,353	0,658	3
2var	0.374	0.647	$\overline{2}$

377 **Table 5.** Performances of the warm models at each step.

Models	OOB	accuracy	N predictors
23var	0,274	0,731	23
19var	0,259	0,727	19
16var	0,256	0,741	16
13var	0,250	0,740	13
10var	0,245	0,741	10
8var	0,239	0,762	8
6var	0,234	0,775	6
5var	0,277	0,730	5
4var	0,260	0,748	4
3var	0,273	0,727	3
2var	0,293	0,722	2

378 **Table 6.** Performances of the cold models at each step.

Figure 5. Predictors included in the warm model 6var mapped according to GI conditions.

381 The unit for p_var_spr & p_var_win is the coefficient of variation.

Figure 6. Predictors included in the cold model 6var mapped according to GS conditions.

384 The unit for t_sd_aut & t_sd_sum is the standard deviation.

 Figure 7. Density plots (presences and pseudo-absences) for the predictors included in the warm habitat suitability model 6var. Variables are presented in order of importance (VI) from left to right starting with the first row.

 Figure 8. Density plots (presences and pseudo-absences) for the predictors included in the cold habitat suitability model 6var. Variables are presented in order of importance (VI) from left to right starting with the first row.

4 Discussion

4.1 Habitat Suitability predictive models

 HS is a proxy for the carrying capacity of the landscape, and the HS index indicates the probability of encountering humans on the landscape. In other words, it is to be expected that the number of archaeological sites will be reduced or absent from areas with low HS values. The final predictive models for GIs and GSs display distinct spatial 399 structures of suitable habitat (Fig. $2 \& 3$). The warm model produces a geographically larger area of suitable habitat in Europe while the cold model indicates a considerably more restricted one. Figure 9 illustrates this expansion of suitable habitat during GIs; the

 percentage of the European domain associated with higher HS scores for the warm model is greater than the cold model. The cold model shows that higher values of HS are concentrated in South-West France and the Northern Iberian peninsula, but also in the Danube watershed West of the Carpathian Basin (Fig. 3). High values of HS during GIs expand from these landscapes towards other regions, such as Brittany, the Iberian Peninsula, Italy and the Balkans (Fig. 2).

 Figure 9. Percentage bar plot comparing the habitat suitability outputs produced by the warm and the cold models and their spatial extent.

 Despite a relatively smaller area of suitable habitat, there are more sites during GSs. This doesn't necessarily mean that site densities are greater, however, because the stadial events represent a longer interval of time than the interstadials. In a prior study, we took the third dimension (time) into account and calculated a chronological density index for Aurignacian occupations during stadials and interstadials (Paquin et al., 2023). This index controls for the duration of these climatic phases. We highlighted that GSs generally have a higher chronological density of Aurignacian occupations than GIs. We argued that an intensified pattern of residential mobility during GSs could explain this phenomenon, rather than an increase in population density. The contraction of suitable habitat during GSs, observed above, supports this idea if we consider that populations contracted their ranges.

 For the warm model, the lowest HS scores associated with Aurignacian sites within our dataset all occur in Eastern Europe: *Mitoc-Malu-Galben* (0.63), *Pes-kő* (0.63) and *Bacho Kiro* (0.65) and *klissoura* (0.67) (Fig. 2). The picture is more geographically diverse for the cold model, highlighting relatively worse climatic conditions across the continent during stadials. The archaeological sample could be playing a causal role here: the Aurignacian technocomplex is documented in numerous sites in Eastern Europe, particularly in the Carpathian Basin (Floss et al., 2016; Hauck et al., 2018) but very few of these sites, other than *Pes-kő* and *Mitoc-Malu-Galben,* offer chronological and/or paleoenvironmental data precise or robust enough to classify occupations as pertaining to cold or warm conditions. Most of the eastern European sites are thus not included in our database. These scores could also reflect relatively poorer conditions in Eastern Europe during warm phases. While HS is visibly worse in Eastern Europe than it is in the West during stadials (Fig. 3), the warm model maps show generally good HS values in the east, but still lower than Western Europe (Fig. 2).

 The Aurignacian technocomplex is relatively well represented in the archaeological record of northwestern France, e.g. multiple sites exist in Brittany, such as *Beg-ar-C'hastel* and *Îlot des Agneaux* (Hinguant and Monnier, 2013). Even further north, on the British Isles, the Aurignacian is documented at sites such as *Kent's Cavern*, although occupation of the territory is believed to have been punctual and sporadic (Dinnis, 2012). The model indicates that Britanny was a highly suitable landscape for Aurignacian people during GIs. This is interesting because, due to the lack of robust chronological data, we did not use Aurignacian sites from this region to train the model. Most of the Breton sites are coastal and fall within relatively good HS indices according to the warm model. Lacking archaeological knowledge pertaining to submerged landscapes under the Channel considerably limits our understanding of Aurignacian mobility in this region. It is plausible that conditions were suitable during GIs on both sides of the Channel.

 The warm model indicates that the HS index is quite high in most of the Iberian Peninsula even though few sites in our database, apart from those in the Northern coastal region, attest to an Aurignacian presence. The two sites in our dataset that are further south of the Peninsula are *Lapa do Picareiro* and *Les Mallaetes*, the former of which could have 452 been occupied as early as GI-11 with a terminus post quem of $41.9 - 41.1$ cal ka BP (Haws et al., 2020). *Les Mallaetes* is occupied much later by Aurignacian groups around GI-8 and GS-7 (Paquin et al., 2023; Villaverde et al., 2021). Our models indicate that Iberian landscapes were generally suitable for AMH settlement during the warm phases of MIS 3. These results could be consistent with the Ebro River hypothesis, which predicts that the presence of Neanderthal populations South of the Ebro slowed the dispersal of AMHs into central and southern Iberia (Zilhão, 2000). Evidence for an Early Aurignacian presence at *Lapa do Picareiro* recently cast doubt on the Ebro river hypothesis (Haws et al., 2020), however, but the debate is ongoing (Zilhão, 2021).

4.2 Predictors

 RF classification allows for the identification of strong predictors among a large series of variables for explaining site location. Nevertheless, as it considers interactions

 between variables, a drawback of the method is the difficulty interpreting the impact of individual predictors. We applied a mixed approach to address this issue, using the variables included in the best RF models to produce GLM models (see SI.2). This made it possible to identify predictors that have a linear relationship with the dependent variable: site location. Topographic variables for elevation and slope display a linear relationship with site location in both models. Otherwise, the only other variable with a linear relationship is the minimum precipitation rate for Summer in the cold model. All other predictors included present non-linear relationships with the dependent variable and are only interpretable in conjunction with other variables.

 Therefore, we use density graphs produced during the RF runs to interpret the relationship of the predictors with HS values. Some trends are visible in the density graphs (Fig. 7 & 8). Slope values for both GI and GS suggest a preference for slightly sloping, rather than flat ground, which would potentially be floodplains. Even if slope explains site location in a linear fashion (see SI.2), there is an apparent upper threshold at 10 degrees. Sites tend to be located under 700 m elevation, although there is a peak around 1500 m during GIs that could indicate movement to highland regions during warm phases.

 Cells with lower variability in precipitation rates during spring and winter are disproportionately represented during GIs, although this effect is less pronounced in winter (Fig. 7). This implies that predictable patterns of precipitation influenced human spatial decisions, particularly in spring. Additionally for the GIs, higher than average temperatures in autumn are over-represented, as are slightly lower maximum spring precipitation rates.

 There's a notable trend towards a selection for lower variance in autumn temperatures during stadials (Fig.8). This makes sense in terms of the human perception of ecological risk and risk management; locales with predictable autumn temperatures could ensure access to and availability of needed resources before the winter months. Variance in temperature gravitates towards higher values during summer. It could be that variance in summer temperature is linked to other variables included in the model. This predictor also has a relatively high correlation coefficient with autumn temperature variance: *t sd aut* and *t sd sum* are inversely correlated by a coefficient of -0.74, just under the 0.8 cut-off used in the modelling process. Minimum precipitation rates trend towards higher values for both autumn and summer, extending the growing season, but especially in autumn when, as noted above, lower temperature variance is selected for.

4.3 Addressing climate risk and dispersal routes

 One of the main advantages of the paleoclimatic reconstructions on which the models are built is the ability to calculate inter- and intra-annual variability in temperature and precipitation. This information allows us to test human sensitivity to climate variability at different scales and opens the door to a discussion on ecological risk. Both final HS models include predictors pertaining to climate variability which we consider an element of ecological risk (and see Burke et al., 2017) indicating that the predictable distribution of resources was clearly a factor in habitat suitability.

 The lowest HS scores associated with Aurignacian sites included in the models highlight differences between GIs and GSs. The lowest site for the GIs is associated with an HS index of 0.63 while the 4 lowest scores associated with GS sites are all lower than this: *Mitoc-Malu-Galben* (0.52), *Serino* (0.56), *Les Cottés* (0.59) and *Friedrichsdorf- Seulberg* (0.6). The threshold at which cells with low HS values are really occupied is thus considerably lower during GSs. Two of these sites include multiple Aurignacian levels;

 Mitoc-Malu-Galben is occupied during different interstadials and stadials from GI-8 to GS- 5.2 while Les Cottés comprises three Aurignacian layers associated with GI-9 and GS-9. The lower HS threshold during stadials could mean that humans would have continued to occupy known sites even if conditions were not ideal.

 The lower HS threshold during GSs, added to the observation that the proportion of habitable landmass shrank (Fig. 9), could indicate that human populations had to adjust to sub-optimal conditions, highlighting the ecological stresses to which they had to adapt. The cold model can thus illustrate the climate tolerance of early European AMHs. With a wider choice of regions in which humans could settle, as underlined by the higher proportion of the habitable landmass (Fig. 9) and a higher HS threshold, the warm model indicates the climate preference of Aurignacian groups. If populations were trying to maintain themselves during stadials without densely populating highly suitable zones, they would have inevitably ended up in less suitable areas, hence the lower GS threshold.

 It is also relevant to note that conditions were not homogeneous across Europe during specific climatic phases. Some sites with occupations classified as stadial due to chronological data, like Covalejos in Northern Spain or the Grotte du Renne, in France, display paleoenvironmental data indicating somewhat warm conditions (see Paquin et al., 2023 for additional examples). For instance, Covalejos level C/3 faunal assemblage exhibits a mosaic of deer, horse and bos (Yravedra et al., 2016; Jones et al., 2019) while palynology indicates both steppe and temperate species (Ruiz-Zapata & Gil, 2005). Both cold and warm conditions are signaled by this kind of pattern, which could indicate some resource or niche tracking by Aurignacian populations during GS periods as a form of risk reduction strategy.

 As mentioned above, our results show that AMHs were affected by climate variability and climate change during the MIS 3 and adapted by altering their range. Fitness related innovations also explain AMH adaptive capacity to climate change. Specialized cold climate clothing, for example, was potentially made and worn by Aurignacian groups (Collard et al., 2016). A broadening of the AMH diet by the intensification of small prey exploitation during the Aurignacian (Llovera et al., 2016) is also a good example of such adaptations. Technical and behavioral adaptations, such as those mentioned here, probably participated in making AMHs the sole hominin species to survive the unstable climate of MIS 3 and the onset of the LGM in the long run. The question of Neanderthal's disappearance is not the focus of the present study and depends on many factors, including the possibility of competitive exclusion (Timmermann, 2020). Decreasing available biomass (Vidal-Cordasco et al., 2022) or a repeated fragmentation and reduction of the habitable landmass before the arrival of AMH populations (Melchionna et al.,2018; Klein et al., 2023) are also aspects to take into consideration.

 In our previous paper we presented data suggesting an initial dispersal phase (approximately between GI-12 and GI-10) marked by the quick expansion of Aurignacian groups, indicated by a steadily increasing chronological density of archaeological occupations, followed by an established population phase starting around GS-10 with a more widespread occupation of Europe (Paquin et al., 2023). During the initial dispersal phase, Aurignacian sites are mainly located in coastal environments, principally the Mediterranean coast, with some occupations in the Danube valley, in Germany and Austria. The question remains as to whether there was a single entry point, or multiple entry points

 for initial Aurignacian dispersal into Europe and the two main migration routes proposed are along the Mediterranean coastline and the Danube valley (Mellars 2011).

 The models produced in this study show contrasting patterns of habitat suitability on the Mediterranean coast between cold and warm cycles (Fig. 2 & 3). During GSs, suitable habitats along the Mediterranean coast exist as discontinuous patches. Otherwise, coastal regions are mainly composed of medium and low HS values. During GIs, the HS values along the coast are higher and form a continuous corridor of suitable habitat. For the Danube valley route, both models show favorable habitat in the western portion of the route but from the Carpathian Basin eastward, HS values are low (especially for GS) and only a few chronologically controlled Aurignacian sites are known (Fig. 2 & 3). As mentioned earlier, however, our database is incomplete in Eastern Europe and the HS models suggest that both routes would have been plausible entry points during GIs, with the Mediterranean coast being relatively more favorable. Submerged landscapes which are invisible in our data could very well have extended this putative dispersal route (Fig. 2).

 Still, the Danube valley, mainly for the region north of the Alps, could have been a corridor of mobility in continental Europe during GSs, considering the relatively high HS values and the persistent presence of Upper Paleolithic occupations in the region. Our models could support certain aspects of the *Kulturpumpe* hypothesis, therefore (Conard and Bolus, 2003). We are not suggesting that the Early Aurignacian emerges from this region, but that, once settled, it could have acted as a cultural core area during most of MIS 3. The Rhone Valley, another important biogeographic corridor linking the Mediterranean coastline to Central Europe, is equally suitable during warm or cold conditions (Fig. 2 & 3).

578 4.4 Comparison with other published models

 Other studies have integrated archaeological site location data and paleoclimate reconstructions to evaluate the Aurignacian habitat in Europe (e.g., Banks et al., 2013a, b; Shao et al., 2021; Timmermann, 2020; Klein et al., 2023). Our results agree with these (and other) studies which conclude that climate change had an impact on human populations and spatial behavior during MIS 3, since our results clearly indicate that suitable habitat contracted considerably during GSs.

 Continental-scale models (Shao et al., 2021), as well as modelling focused on the Iberian Peninsula (Klein et al., 2023) also incorporate climate variability predictors in computing the human existence potential (HEP) for the Aurignacian, an index which is conceptually equivalent to the habitat suitability score we use here. Nevertheless, they only include as predictors the annual means for temperature and precipitation variability, which limits the scope at which they can discuss the concept of ecological risk. The inclusion of seasonal variability predictors in our study allows interpretable results regarding this research theme. Klein et al.'s (2023) model highlights the importance of the Franco- Cantabrian region across GI/GS cycles, which is consistent with our results. But Shao et al.'s (2021) models show a GS contraction of the HEP area towards the Mediterranean region, leaving two of the core areas of Aurignacian occupations, Franco-Cantabria and the Danube valley North of the Alps, with low HEP values. Our cold conditions model shows contrasting results, with a contraction of the habitat centered around these archaeologically important regions during stadials.

 Another recent study models Neanderthals and AMHs dispersals using climate forcing to evaluate the impact of interbreeding, competitive exclusion and D-O oscillations on the disappearance of the former species (Timmermann, 2020). This research concludes that Neanderthal extinction cannot be understood simply by climate change, and that a more realistic scenario should include arriving AMH populations with higher degrees of plasticity, mobility and fecundity. Our study supports this idea by demonstrating that AMHs adapted to the rapid climate changes of the MIS 3 and could manage ecological risk, which would have played a major role in outcompeting Neanderthal populations.

 We believe research design including site selection, choice of climate model, choice of model type (RF, logistic regression, etc.), the use of machine learning, and different research goals explain the differences between our modelling results and previously published material. As explained above, sites used in our models, while less numerous than for other published models, contain Aurignacian layers that can confidently be ascribed to interstadial or stadial periods (Paquin et al., 2023). The datasets produced are thus specifically curated to model the suitable habitat during both GI and GS conditions. Furthermore, the Random Forest algorithm is useful in making use of variables that have non-linear relationship with the dependent variable compared to general linear models (Genuer et al., 2010; Grömping, 2009) and a recent benchmark study confirms that it has good average prediction performance compared with other approaches (Couronné et al. 2018).

5 Conclusion

 The predictive models produced in this research highlight variables that constituted suitable habitat for AMHs during cold and warm phases of MIS 3 and underline the impact of climate change and the importance of considering intra-annual climate variability.

 Climate variables included in the models indicate that seasonal, rather than annual, temperature and precipitation rates are important. Higher average temperatures in autumn and less variability in spring precipitation rates would have been critical during GIs, while less temperature variance in autumn and higher minimum monthly precipitation rates during summer and autumn were critical during GSs.

 Our results show that millennial-scale climate change and contrasting patterns of climate variability affects the size of suitable habitat during stadial/interstadial events. The timing and shape of the initial Aurignacian dispersal into Europe would have been structured by millennial-scale climate change as a result. GSs display an irregular and discontinuous suitable habitat across the two putative main routes of dispersal, the Mediterranean coast and the Danube corridor, while GIs show a considerably more extended and continuous suitable habitat along the coastal path. Our models agree with the hypothesis that initial population dispersal into Europe was likely triggered by warm cycles and their impacts on the environment (e.g., Badino et al., 2020; Müller et al., 2011), probably around GI-12. The models also agree that the Danube valley West of the Carpathians was a potential corridor of mobility throughout MIS 3, which agrees with certain aspects of the *Kulturpumpe* hypothesis (Conard and Bolus, 2003).

 The presence of climate variability predictors in the final models show that inter- annual or seasonal variability also influenced human mobility during GIs and GSs, and that ecological risk was therefore a significant factor governing dispersals. In this sense, the low HS threshold observed during GSs can be interpreted as a mark of behavioral plasticity on the part of early European populations which were able to deviate from their environmental preferences and adapt to suboptimal climatic contexts in order to maintain

- a larger vital space, which is coherent with the "generalist specialist" niche suggested by
- Roberts & Stewart (2018). It could also be taken to support the variability hypothesis of
- human evolution (Potts, 2013; Potts and Faith, 2015).
- Supplementary Information
- SI.1 Modelling script (RF & GLM)
- 651 SI.2 Modelling results (RF & GLM)
- SI.3 Variable correlation test and selection
- SI.4 Maps of each model

Data Availability

- The archaeological data used in this study comes from a published database (Paquin et
- al., 2023) which can be downloaded at the following URL:
- http://www.hominindispersals.net/datasets

Acknowledgements

- This work was supported by the Fonds de Recherche du Québec Société et
- Culture [2019-SE3-254686] and the Joseph-Armand Bombardier Canada Graduate
- Scholarships from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada [767-
- 2017-1126]. Thanks are also due to Samuel Seuru and Catharina Igrejas Lopes Martins
- Costa for their precious help in the data compilation.

References

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.quaint.2017.10.020

- Zilhão, J., d'Errico, F., 1999. The Chronology and Taphonomy of the Earliest
- Aurignacian and Its Implications for the Understanding of Neandertal Extinction.
- J. World Prehistory 13, 1–68.