

1 **Age-dependent cognitive inflexibility in great apes**

2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

Héctor Marín Manrique<sup>1,2</sup> and Josep Call<sup>1</sup>

1 Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology, Deutscher Platz 6, D-04103,  
Leipzig, Germany

2 University of the Balearic Islands, Ctra Valldemossa KM 7.5, 07122, Palma de  
Mallorca, Spain

Correspondence:

Héctor Marín Manrique

Departament de Psicologia Bàsica. University of the Balearic Islands

Edifici Guillem Cifre de Colonya, Ctra Valldemossa KM 7.5, 07122, Palma de Mallorca, Spain

e-mail: [hector.marin@uib.es](mailto:hector.marin@uib.es); phone: +34 971259899; fax: +34 971173190

Word count : 4114 (references not included)

24

25           The ability to suppress and/or change behaviour on the basis of negative feedback, often  
26 conceptualised as cognitive flexibility, has rarely been investigated in nonhuman great apes  
27 across a broad age range. Twenty-five chimpanzees, eight bonobos, seven orang-utans and three  
28 gorillas, whose ages ranged from five to forty-eight years, were presented with a transparent  
29 Plexiglas rectangular box horizontally attached to their cage mesh. A squared container 7.5 cm<sup>2</sup>  
30 fixed inside the apparatus contained a food reward (i.e. grape). While the container rested on its  
31 central position the grape was not accessible. To retrieve the grape the subjects needed to grasp  
32 the handle connected to the reward container and displace it sideways to reach one of the lateral  
33 access windows. Subjects were intensively trained to displace the handle to a specific side (right  
34 or left, depending on the group) to later reverse the rewarded side during the test. Performance in  
35 this reversal task did not significantly differ between species. However, a U-shape relation  
36 between age and perseverative responding (i.e. moves to the previously rewarded side) was  
37 observed, extending findings with humans to their closest living primate relatives.

38

39 Keywords: aging, cognitive flexibility, great apes, perseverative responding, reversal task.

40

41           The ability to suppress and/or change behaviour on the basis of negative feedback is  
42 essential to adapt in a changing environment. This ability, conceptualised as cognitive flexibility,  
43 belongs to the so-called executive control function and relies on the integrity of the prefrontal  
44 cortex (Miller, 2000). One of the most used tasks to study cognitive flexibility in humans is the  
45 Wisconsin Card Sorting Test (WCST) (Anderson, Damasio, Jones, & Tranel, 1991; Berg, 1948;  
46 Milner, 1963; Nagahama et al., 1996). The WCST measures the ability to learn to focus on a  
47 particular stimulus dimension (e.g., colour) and shift to another dimension (e.g., shape) as a  
48 function of changes in the reward contingencies. Proficiency in this task also requires generating  
49 hypothesis and replacing them as soon as they no longer predict reward delivery.

50           Cognitive flexibility in humans is negatively affected by aging (Albert & Moss, 1999;  
51 Haaland, Vranes, Goodwin, & Garry, 1986; Libon, Malamut, Swenson, Sands, & Cloud, 1994;  
52 Raz, Gunning-Dixon, Head, Dupuis, & Acker, 1998). A sample of 95 elderly healthy subjects  
53 was investigated by Haaland et al. (1986) using a modified version of the WCST. The oldest  
54 group (80 to 87 years) formed fewer categories and accumulated more errors than their younger  
55 counterparts (i.e. 64 to 68 years). Moreover, shrinkage of the prefrontal cortex has been  
56 associated with age-related increases in perseveration (Raz et al., 1998), which could provide a  
57 neural substrate for the deficits observed in elderly people.

58           Although numerous studies have tested cognitive flexibility in nonhuman primates (e.g.,  
59 Amici, Aureli, & Call, 2008; Izquierdo, Newman, Higley, & Murray, 2007; Rygula, Walker,  
60 Clarke, Robbins, & Roberts, 2010), only a handful of studies have investigated its age-related  
61 deficits. This paucity of results is particularly surprising given that frontal cortical development  
62 follows a similar developmental pattern in human and nonhuman primates (Goldman-Rakic,  
63 1987) and some models of human frontal cortical dysfunction have been evaluated and tested on  
64 nonhuman primates (Decamp and Schneider, 2004; Lewis, Hayes, Lund, & Oeth, 1992). Moore  
65 ,Killiany, Herndon, Rosene, and Moss (2005) developed the Conceptual Set Shifting Task  
66 (CSST), a test analogous to the WCST, to explore age-related cognitive deficits in rhesus  
67 monkeys. In the CSST the monkeys face a touch screen in which three stimuli appear that differ

68 along two dimensions, their colour (red, green, and blue) and their shape (triangle, star, and  
69 circle). In some trials the target dimension is the colour (i.e. red) and subjects are rewarded for  
70 touching the appropriate colour. After 10 consecutive correct responses to the colour, the  
71 rewarded dimension, changes to shape (i.e. triangle). In order to succeed subjects need to form a  
72 conceptual set (colour) and then shift to a new conceptual set (shape) on the basis of feedback  
73 alone. Aged adult monkeys evidenced more problems both when forming the initial concept and  
74 later shifting to a different concept than young adults (Moore et al., 2003, 2005, 2006). Bonté,  
75 Flemming, and Fagot (2011) used a virtually identical task and reported similar findings in  
76 baboons. However, the onset age of the deficits greatly differed from one species to the other.  
77 While rhesus displayed an increase in perseverative responding at the age of twelve, baboons  
78 showed comparable levels of perseverative responding by eight years of age.

79 Weed, Bryant, and Perry (2008) also studied rhesus monkeys' cognitive flexibility in  
80 relation to age. They used an adaptation of the Cambridge Neuropsychological Test Automated  
81 Battery (CANTAB) measuring attentional set-shifting and perseverative responding to compare  
82 performance of juvenile (mean age 2.3 years) and adult (mean age 10.3 years) monkeys.  
83 Monkeys were trained to respond to one of two stimuli simultaneously presented on a touch  
84 screen. Once they mastered this simple discrimination they were required to reverse their initial  
85 response and choose the alternative non-reinforced stimulus exemplar (simple reversal) or else to  
86 identify which new stimulus from an array of different stimuli was predictive of reward delivery.  
87 The new stimulus sharing a dimension with the previous reinforced stimulus (intra-dimensional  
88 shift, IDS), or belonging to a new dimension (extra-dimensional shift, EDS). Juvenile macaques'  
89 performed worse than adults in the simple reversal task as well as in the tasks requiring an IDS,  
90 an IDS reversal, or an EDS.

91 Thus, contrary to the other two studies, Weed et al. (2008) found that younger individuals  
92 performed worse than older individuals. These two sets of studies, however, are not the only  
93 ones that have produced mixed results as a function of age. Picq (2007) tested lemurs in a Set  
94 Shifting Task using an apparatus with 6 corridors connected to a chamber containing a food

95 reward. In any single trial only one corridor led to the reward. The authors measured lemurs'  
96 reversal discrimination based on spatial cues by changing the location of the corridor that had  
97 been associated with the reward (IDS). Additionally, Picq (2007) measured lemurs' ability to  
98 switch corridors on the basis of a visual cue (i.e. light) (EDS). Aged subjects committed more  
99 perseverative errors than younger subjects in the EDS and IDS tasks, although it did not reach  
100 statistical significance in the latter task. In contrast, Trouche, Maurice, Rouland, Verdier, and  
101 Mestre-Frances (2010) found that young adult lemurs made significantly more perseverative  
102 errors than older individuals in a three-panel runaway maze after the original rewarded location  
103 was no longer rewarded. Trouche et al. (2010) argued that young adult lemurs' higher levels of  
104 anxiety compared to older individuals translated into a significantly larger number of attempts at  
105 opening the wrong gate.

106         Although methodological differences between the studies reviewed above may contribute  
107 to explain the mixed results (e.g., some tests relied more heavily on a memory component than  
108 others), another plausible explanation might be that the relationship between age and cognitive  
109 flexibility is non-linear. To shed more light on the topic of the effects of age on cognitive  
110 flexibility in nonhuman primates we developed a reversal task with a strong motor component  
111 and a minimum contribution of complex perceptual information and memory loads. The task  
112 consisted of, displacing laterally an encapsulated baited box until reaching a window where the  
113 bait inside could be extracted. The baited box was fixed inside a rectangular transparent  
114 apparatus attached horizontally to the subjects' cage. Subjects were intensively trained to move  
115 the handle in one direction (i.e. right) to gain access to a grape to later change the rewarded side  
116 during the test. We administered this task to a relatively large sample of great apes belonging to  
117 all species ranging in age from 5 to 48 years. Despite the existence of a slight maturational  
118 *decalage* between species (with gorillas and orangutans being the fastest and slowest to mature,  
119 respectively), they all share similar developmental and life history trajectories characterized by a  
120 slow development and a long lifespan (Parker, 1999). More specifically, all ape species possess  
121 a long period of immaturity and maternal dependency followed by a reproductive period

122 beginning at about 8 years of age in females and a lifespan of 40 to 50 years. Such similarities  
123 between species justify our decision to pool together all the species to obtain a reasonable large  
124 sample with a continuous age distribution that can be used to examine in detail the relation  
125 between age and motor control.

## 126 Methods

### 127 *Subjects*

128 Twenty-five chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*), eight bonobos (*Pan paniscus*), three gorillas  
129 (*Gorilla gorilla*) and seven orangutans (*Pongo abelii*) housed at the Wolfgang Köhler Primate  
130 Research Center (WKPRC) in the Leipzig Zoo participated in the study (see Table 1 for details).  
131 There were 11 males and 32 females ranging in age from 5 to 48 years. Subjects were housed in  
132 social groups of 6-18 individuals and spent the day in indoor (175-430 m<sup>2</sup>) or outdoor enclosures  
133 (1400-4000 m<sup>2</sup>), depending on the season. Both enclosures were spacious and naturally designed,  
134 equipped with climbing structures and enrichment devices to foster extractive foraging activity.  
135 All tests were conducted in special testing cages (5.1-7.3 m<sup>2</sup>) interconnected by lockable doors.  
136 Subjects were provided with fresh fruits, vegetables, eggs, cereals, leaves and meat (once a  
137 week) distributed in three main meals (7.30 am, 1.30 pm and 5 pm). Some more food was  
138 dispensed between 7.30 am and 1.30 pm (mainly fresh fruit) and at 3.30 pm, as part of the  
139 enrichment program. Our experiments never interfered with the daily feeding routine. Water was  
140 available *ad libitum* during the experiments.

141 *Ethical Note:* Tests adhered to ethical principles for non-invasive research in compliance with  
142 the European and World Associations of Zoos and Aquariums (EAZA and WAZA) ethical  
143 guidelines. The zoo keepers called in the apes right before starting the test and they entered the  
144 testing room through a door connected with their indoor enclosure. Subjects were separated from  
145 the rest of their group only for the duration of the test, and were allowed to abandon the  
146 experiment at any sign of distress. When infants were tested their mothers were always sitting  
147 next to them in an adjacent cage, where visual as well as partial physical contact was still  
148 possible.

149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175

-----

Table 1

-----

*Apparatus*

The apparatus consisted of a transparent Plexiglas rectangular box (63 cm long x 9 cm side length) horizontally attached to the subjects' cage mesh. A squared container 7.5 cm<sup>2</sup> fixed inside the apparatus contained a food reward (i.e., grape). While the container rested on its central starting position the grape was visible but not accessible. To retrieve the grape the subject needed to grasp the handle connected to the reward container (see Figure 1) and displace it sideways 24 cm to reach one of the lateral access windows (Ø=4.3 cm), where the grape became accessible. A locking device situated 5.6 cm from each of the lateral windows permitted the experimenter to block and unblock each solution. A black painted surface (8.7 x 6.5 cm) prevented the apes from seeing the locking mechanism. When in place, this locking device stopped the sliding container before reaching the access window.

-----

Figure 1

-----

*Procedure*

Subjects were assigned to one of two groups in the training phase. One group was trained to displace the handle rightwards (right-then-left: N=23) and the other group was trained to displace the handle leftwards (left-then-right: N=20). In order to complete training, subjects had to displace the handle to the correct side for a total of 100 trials. The apes could accumulate a maximum of 15 grapes in 20-minute daily sessions. Thus, a minimum of 7 sessions was always required to reach the training criterion. Once this criterion was reached, subjects advanced to the test phase in which they had to displace the handle in the opposite direction of training to obtain the grape. Subjects received a maximum of two 20-min sessions in which they could accumulate up to 10 grapes. Throughout the experiment, the experimenter removed the grape every time the

176 reward container became blocked (i.e. after false moves) and waited a few seconds before re-  
177 baiting the apparatus for the next trial. This was done to make mistakes more salient for the  
178 subjects. However, this procedure could not be followed in some cases because subjects became  
179 mildly agitated due to the removal of the reward.

180

### 181 *Data scoring and analysis*

182 All trials were videotaped. To assess inter-observer reliability, an observer who was  
183 unaware of the study's hypothesis scored whether the subject moved the handle to the left or to  
184 the right for 20% of the trials. Inter-observer reliability was excellent (Cohen's kappa=1,  
185 N=168). Our main dependent measure was the number of errors during the training and test  
186 phase. We distinguished between pre- and post-solution errors. Pre-solution errors consisted of  
187 the number of incorrect trials before the occurrence of the first correct trial. Post-solution errors  
188 consisted of the number of incorrect trials after the first successful trial. Due to the different  
189 number of trials administered during training and testing (100 vs. 10) and to enable a fair  
190 comparison between phases, we only considered the number of post-solution errors until subjects  
191 accumulated 10 correct trials.

192 Our independent variables were experimental phase (training, test), species, and  
193 chronological age (measured in years). We analysed the data using two-tailed non-parametric  
194 statistics. The binomial test was employed to detect side biases in moving handle. Wilcoxon test  
195 allowed us to assess the difference between phases and the Kruskal-Wallis test was run to  
196 investigate differences in performance between species.

197

### Results

198 Prior to training subjects failed to displace the handle towards the correct side above  
199 chance levels (Binomial test:  $P=0.55$ ,  $N=43$ ). Moreover, they showed no preference for  
200 displacing the handle toward a particular side (Binomial test:  $P=0.36$ ,  $N=43$ ). Subjects required  
201 an average of 103.5 (SEM=0.8, Median=102) trials to reach the training criterion of 100 correct  
202 trials.



203 Figure 2 presents the number of pre- and post-solution errors during the training and  
204 testing phases. Subjects committed significantly more pre-solution errors during testing  
205 compared to training (Wilcoxon test:  $z=5.34$ ,  $P<0.001$ ,  $N(1 \text{ tie})=42$ , Figure 2a). In contrast,  
206 there was only a trend for post-solution errors (Wilcoxon test:  $z=1.92$ ,  $P=0.054$ ,  $N(19 \text{ ties})=18$ ,  
207 Figure 2b). Three young orang-utans (Suaq, Tanah, Raaja) and three adult chimpanzees (Corrie,  
208 Natascha, Jeudi) were not included in this last analysis because they failed to solve the task after  
209 the reversal.

210 -----

211 Figure 2

212 -----

213 Overall, there were no significant differences between species in the frequency of pre-  
214 solution errors during training (Kruskal-Wallis test:  $\chi^2_3=2.82$ ,  $P=0.42$ ,  $N=43$ ) or testing (Kruskal-  
215 Wallis test:  $\chi^2_3=0.39$ ,  $P=0.94$ ,  $N=43$ ). Similarly, there were no significant differences between  
216 species in the frequency of post-solution errors during training (Kruskal-Wallis test:  $\chi^2_3=6.60$ ,  
217  $P=0.086$ ,  $N=43$ ) or testing (Kruskal-Wallis test:  $\chi^2_3=1.82$ ,  $P=0.61$ ,  $N=37$ ). Therefore, we pooled  
218 all species together in subsequent analyses.

219 Figure 3 presents the number of pre- and post-solution errors during testing as a function  
220 of age. There was a significant U-shaped relation between pre-solution errors and age  
221 ( $R^2=0.162$ ,  $F_{2,40}=3.86$ ,  $P=0.029$ ,  $\hat{Y}=0.0221*\text{age}^2 - 0.8178*\text{age} + 17.08$ , Figure 3a). The same  
222 relation still held after subtracting the number of errors during training from pre-solution errors  
223 during testing (as a way to control for general error proneness during training) ( $R^2=0.155$ ,  
224  $F_{2,40}=3.66$ ,  $P=0.035$ ,  $\hat{Y}=0.0301*\text{age}^2 - 1.2708*\text{age} + 18.04$ ). In contrast, there was no relation  
225 between post-solution errors and age before ( $F_{2,34}=0.43$ ,  $P=0.655$ , Figure 3b) or after controlling  
226 for training errors ( $F_{2,34}=2.11$ ,  $P=0.136$ ). Similarly, there was no relation between pre- or post-  
227 solution errors during the training and age ( $F_{2,40}<1.34$ ,  $P>0.28$ ).

228 -----

229 Figure 3

230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256

-----

## Discussion

The number of pre-solution errors during the test phase was particularly high in the youngest and oldest individuals of our sample. Thus, age was a reliable predictor of perseverative responding. The highest frequencies of errors pre-solution were observed in a 5-year-old male chimpanzee (Kofi) and a 30-year-old female chimpanzee (Natascha), with 33 and 31 errors, respectively. Moreover, the only subjects who failed the test (after the reversal) were either younger than 7 or older than 27 years of age. In contrast, age did not predict post-solution errors in the test phase (and neither pre- or post-solution errors during training), with all of them being much less frequent than pre-solution errors during test across the entire age range. We found no evidence of species differences in pre- or post-solution errors during the training or the testing phase.

Results of the present study fit well with previous findings in monkeys (Bonté et al., 2011; Moore et al., 2003, 2005, 2006; Picq, 2007; Weed et al., 2008; Zeamer et al., 2011). Aged subjects committed more pre-solution errors than their young adult counterparts. Additionally, they mirrored Weed’s et al. (2008) findings showing that the youngest subjects were also impaired in their ability to inhibit a previously rewarded response compared to young adults. However, we have to be cautious before drawing general conclusions as the tasks used differed between studies. While Weed et al. (2008) and Zeamer et al. (2011) presented subjects with a simple discrimination reversal task equivalent to the one used in the current study, the remaining authors employed shift response set tasks (i.e. extra-dimensional shift). As we discuss next, performing these two types of task seems to recruit different areas of the prefrontal cortex.

Wise, Murray, and Gerfen (1996) proposed a model that links different types of cognitive/behavioural flexibility to different prefrontal cortical areas of the monkey’s brain. The model distinguishes two types of processing: a lower-order processing, allowing for a shift in response within a dimension (intra-dimensional shift) and a higher-order processing, allowing shifts in response from one stimulus’s dimension to another (extra-dimensional shift; i.e., from colour to shape). The former stimulus processing would simply assign a positive or negative

257 valence to the whole stimulus. The second type of processing, however, would imply treating the  
258 different dimensions of a stimulus separately, and assigning a positive or negative valence to  
259 each of these dimensions also separately.

260 To solve the reversal task employed in the current study subjects had to assign a positive  
261 or negative valence to the whole response (i.e. moving the handle right or left). No rules or  
262 categories needed to be formed. According to Wise's model, this task would fall into the lower-  
263 order processing category. Since subjects hardly made any regressive (post-solution) error during  
264 the reversal, the perseverative responding observed here seems due to incapacity to stop a  
265 previously rewarded response, rather than to inability to produce a new alternate behaviour. It is  
266 conceivable, however, that a more complex behavioural change would throw different results, in  
267 the form of more regressive (post-solution) errors.

268 The idea of two different types of processing responsible for the intra-dimensional  
269 (reversal learning) and extra-dimensional response shifts has received some empirical support.  
270 Studies with monkeys indicate that different prefrontal cortex sub-regions are involved in  
271 different types of cognitive flexibility (Dias, Robbins, & Roberts, 1996, 1997). The dorsolateral  
272 prefrontal cortex would be responsible for the response shifts from one stimulus dimension to a  
273 different stimulus dimension, as lesions of this brain structure impair set-shifting but spare the  
274 capacity to learn a simple reversal. On the other hand, lesions of the orbital prefrontal cortex  
275 (OFC) hinder the learning of a reversal (intra-dimensional shift) but spare the extra-dimensional  
276 shifts of response (Dias et al., 1996, 1997). Lesion studies with rats support the same functional  
277 and structural distinction. Thus, if the damage produced by the lesions is limited to the prelimbic  
278 area the rodents can still learn and reverse their learning, but fail in extra-dimensional shifts. The  
279 opposite is true for damage to the orbitofrontal cortex, which impairs reversal learning but spares  
280 extra-dimensional response shifts (see Ragozzino, 2007 for a review). It is important to note that  
281 lesions of these brain structures do not affect acquisition, but specifically impair the shifts of  
282 response from one dimension to another, or from one stimulus exemplar to another along the

283 same dimension. In other words, errors occur when there are changes in the relation value  
284 established between stimulus-response-outcome (Ragozzino, 2007).

285         There are at least two other studies that investigated how nonhuman ape species  
286 overcome prepotent responses. The first study employed the classical Piagetian A-not-B error  
287 task, in which subjects were rewarded for finding a food item hidden under one of three cups on  
288 three consecutive trials and then the food item was moved to a different cup in full view of the  
289 subject (e.g., Barth & Call, 2006, see also MacLean et al., 2014). One can see the similarity  
290 between this task and the current one as in both cases the response became prepotent after being  
291 rewarded multiple times. Just like in the current study, the four great ape species performed at a  
292 similar level. Reaching directly for a food item placed behind a transparent barrier also  
293 constitutes a prepotent response that does not require any formal training. Vlamings, Hare, and  
294 Call (2010) took advantage of this reaching prepotent response and presented a task in which  
295 subjects had to inhibit reaching directly for the food from the front and instead make a detour to  
296 grab the food from behind. Unlike the results of the present study, Vlamings et al. (2010) found  
297 that orang-utans outperformed all the other great ape species. One possible explanation for this  
298 difference is that these two tasks tap onto different aspects of inhibitory control. While the  
299 detour reaching tasks does not require any formal training to reveal its effects, the A-not-B error  
300 task is initially neutral and requires several trials to create the prepotent response. The label  
301 “inhibitory control” is associated with a variety of tasks in the literature that may rely on  
302 different cognitive processes and possibly different brain substrates. Thus, equating the  
303 behavioural results obtained through them might be misleading and future studies are needed to  
304 map out the relations between various tasks that are considered to measure inhibitory control.

305         The most relevant finding of the present study is perhaps that juvenile subjects committed  
306 more pre-solution errors during the test (but not during training) than young adults. To our  
307 knowledge, there is only one other study with primates reporting similar findings (Weed et al.,  
308 2008). Human and nonhuman primate prefrontal cortical maturation seems to follow a similar  
309 pattern (Goldman-Rakic, 1987). Frontal lobe maturation in human progresses in a back-to-front

310 direction, beginning in the primary motor cortex and ending in the prefrontal cortex, that does  
311 not reach full maturity until early adulthood (Gogtay, et al., 2004). Paralleling this maturational  
312 pattern, adolescent performance in several tasks relying on the prefrontal cortex is not yet at  
313 adult levels (Anderson, Anderson, Northam, Jacobs, & Catroppa, 2001). Also, an inverted U-  
314 shape relation between age and inhibitory control has been reported in humans (Dempster,  
315 1992). Therefore, it is not surprising that juveniles in our sample had more problems than the  
316 young adults to learn the reversal.

317         To our knowledge, this is the first study to address how aging affects cognitive  
318 inflexibility in nonhuman apes. The strength of our results resides in the simplicity of the task  
319 employed, virtually devoid of memory demands; and the sample size, large enough to avoid  
320 forming age clusters that could bias or superimpose a specific shape to our results. By pooling  
321 the data from the four great ape species for statistical analysis we assumed that the life cycle of  
322 the four ape species was similar. This assumption, however, is based on only a handful of  
323 available studies. Wobber, Wrangham, and Hare (2010) reported slight differences in the  
324 ontogeny of inhibitory social control between chimpanzees and bonobos. More specifically, pre-  
325 weaning bonobos had more difficulty to refrain from begging from a particular experimenter  
326 compared to both post-weaning bonobos and pre-weaning chimpanzees. Moreover, Wobber et  
327 al. (2010) also found a positive relationship between age and performance in a social reversal  
328 task in bonobos but not in chimpanzees. Taken together these findings suggest that social  
329 inhibitory control might develop earlier in chimpanzees compared to bonobos. Future studies are  
330 needed to investigate the developmental trajectories and the relationship between social and non-  
331 social inhibitory control.

332         Several studies have assigned similar longevity about 60 years to chimpanzees and  
333 orangutans (Hakeem, Sandoval, Jones, & Allman, 1996; Herndon, Tigges, Anderson, Klumpp, &  
334 McClure, 1999; Wich et al. 2004), although it is true that orangutans seem to have a slower life  
335 history and hence, a little advantage over the chimpanzees. As for the gorillas few data are  
336 available but they seem to have the shortest life span (close to 50 years), which fits well with the

337 idea of leaf-eaters having shorter life spans compared to fruit-eaters (Hakeem et al., 1996). No  
338 reliable data were found for the bonobos. We are aware that this constitutes a limitation of our  
339 study and we encourage our colleagues to run similar studies with apes that include subjects of  
340 all ages. Together, these data might allow us to produce a function that accurately predicts  
341 subjects' performance on the basis of age.  
342

343 Acknowledgements

344 We would like to thank Pilar Andrés for her comments on the manuscript and Lou Haux for  
345 reliability coding.

346 References

- 347 Albert, M., & Moss, M.B. (1999). Cognitive profiles of normal aging. In: A. Peters, & J.  
348 Morrison (Eds.), *Cerebral cortex*, (pp 1-20). Plenum Press: New York.
- 349 Amici, F., Aureli, F., & Call, J. (2008). Fission-Fusion Dynamics, Behavioral Flexibility, and  
350 Inhibitory Control in Primates. *Current Biology*, *18*, 1415-1419.
- 351 Anderson, S.W., Damasio, H., Jones, R.D., & Tranel, D. (1991). Wisconsin Card Sorting Test  
352 performance as a measure of frontal lobe damage. *Journal of Clinical and Experimental*  
353 *Neuropsychology*, *13*, 909-922.
- 354 Anderson, V.A., Anderson, P., Northam, E., Jacobs, R., & Catroppa, C. (2001). Development of  
355 executive functions through late childhood and adolescence in an Australian sample.  
356 *Developmental Neuropsychology*, *20*, 385-406.
- 357 Barth, J., & Call, J. (2006). Tracking the Displacement of Objects: A series of tasks with great  
358 apes (*Pan troglodytes*, *Pan paniscus*, *Gorilla gorilla*, and *Pongo pygmaeus*) and young  
359 children (*Homo sapiens*). *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, *32*(3), 239-252.
- 360 Berg, E.A. (1948). A simple objective test for measuring flexibility in thinking. *Journal of*  
361 *General Psychology*, *39*, 15-22.
- 362 Bonté, E., Flemming, T., & Fagot, J. (2011). Executive control of perceptual features and  
363 abstract relations by baboons (*Papio papio*). *Behavioral Brain Research*, *222*, 176-182.
- 364 Decamp, E., & Schneider, J.S. (2004). Attention and executive function deficits in chronic low-  
365 dose MPTP-treated non-human primates. *European Journal of Neuroscience*, *20*(5),  
366 1371-1378.
- 367 Dempster, F. N. (1992). The rise and fall of the inhibitory mechanism: Toward a unified theory  
368 of cognitive development and aging. *Developmental Review*, *12*, 45-75
- 369 Dias, R., Robbins, T.W., & Roberts, A.C. (1996). Dissociation in prefrontal cortex of affective  
370 and attentional shifts. *Nature*, *380*, 69-72.
- 371 Dias, R., Robbins, T.W., & Roberts, A.C. (1997). Dissociable forms of inhibitory control within  
372 prefrontal cortex with an analog of the Wisconsin Card Sorting Test: restriction to novel



373 situations and independence from “on-line” information. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 17,  
374 9265–9297.

375 Gogtay, N., Giedd, J.N., Lusk, L., Hayashi, K.M., Greenstein, D., & Vaituzis, A.C., et al. (2004).  
376 Dynamic mapping of human cortical development during childhood through early  
377 adulthood. *Journal of Neuroscience*, 101(21), 8174-8179.

378 Goldman-Rakic, P.S. (1987). Circuitry of primate prefrontal cortex and regulation of behaviour  
379 by representational memory. In P.F. Mouncastle (Eds.), *Handbook of physiology*(pp 373–  
380 417). Washington, DC: The American Physiological Society.

381 Hakeem, A., Sandoval, G.R., Jones, M., & Allman, J. (1996). Brain and life span in primates. In  
382 J.E. Birren, & K.W. Schaie (Eds.), *Handbook of the psychology of aging* (pp 78-104).  
383 San Diego: Academic Press.

384 Haaland, K.Y., Vranes, L.F., Goodwin, J.S., & Garry, P.J. (1986). Wisconsin Card Sort Test  
385 performance in a healthy elderly population. *Journal of Gerontology*, 42(3), 345-346.

386 Herndon, J.G., Tigges, J., Anderson, D.C., Klumpp, S.A., & McClure, H.M. (1999). Brain  
387 weight throughout the life span of the chimpanzee. *Journal of Comparative Neurology*,  
388 409(4), 567 – 572.

389 Izquierdo, A., Newman, T.K., Higley, J.D., & Murray, E.A. (2007). Genetic modulation of  
390 cognitive flexibility and socioemotional behavior in rhesus monkeys. *Proceedings of the*  
391 *National Academy of Sciences*, 104(35), 14128-14133.

392 Lewis, D.A., Hayes, T.S., Lund, J.S., & Oeth, K.M. (1992). Dopamine and the neural circuitry of  
393 primate prefrontal cortex: implications for schizophrenia research.  
394 *Neuropsychopharmacology*, 6(2), 127-34.

395 Libon, D.J., Malamut, B.L., Swenson, R., Sands, L.P., & Cloud, B.S. (1994). Age, executive  
396 functions, and visuospatial functioning in healthy older adults. *Neuropsychology*, 8, 38-  
397 43.

398 Milner, B. (1963). Effects of different brain lesions on card sorting. *Archives of Neurology*, 9, 90  
399 –100

400 Miller, E.K. (2000). The prefrontal cortex and cognitive control. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience*,  
401 *1*, 59–65.

402 MacLean, E.L., Hare, B., Nunn, C.L., Addessi, E., Amici, F., Anderson, R.C., ...Zhao, Y.  
403 (2014). The evolution of self-control. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*,  
404 *111*, E2140-E2148.

405 Moore, T. L., Killiany, R. J., Herndon, J. G., Rosene, D. L., & Moss, M. B. (2003). Impairment  
406 in abstraction and set shifting in aged rhesus monkey. *Neurobiology of Aging*, *24*, 125–  
407 134.

408 Moore, T. L., Killiany, R. J., Herndon, J. G., Rosene, D. L., & Moss, M. B. (2005). A non-  
409 human primate test of abstraction and set shifting: An automated adaptation of the  
410 Wisconsin Card Sorting Test. *Journal of Neuroscience Methods*, *146*, 165–173.

411 Moore, T. L., Killiany, R. J., Herndon, J. G., Rosene, D. L., & Moss, M. B. (2006). Executive  
412 system dysfunction occurs as early as middle-age in the rhesus monkey. *Neurobiology of*  
413 *Aging*, *27*, 1484-1493.

414 Nagahama, Y., Fukuyama, H., Yamauchi, H., Matsuzaki, S., Konishi, J., Shibasaki, H., &  
415 Kimura, J. (1996). Cerebral activation during performance of a card sorting test. *Brain*,  
416 *119*, 1667–1675.

417 Parker, S.T. (1999). The life history and development of great apes in comparative perspective.  
418 In S.T. Parker, R.W. Mitchell, & H.L. Miles (Eds.), *The mentalities of gorillas and*  
419 *orang-utans* (pp 43-69). New York: Cambridge University Press.

420 Picq, J.L. (2007). Aging affects executive functions and memory in mouse lemur primates.  
421 *Experimental Gerontology*, *42*, 223-232

422 Ragozzino, M.E. (2007). The contribution of the medial prefrontal cortex, orbitofrontal cortex  
423 and dorsomedial striatum to behavioral flexibility. *Annals of the New York Academy of*  
424 *Sciences*, *1121*, 355-375

425 Raz, N., Gunning-Dixon, F.M., Head, D., Dupuis, J.H., & Acker, J.D. (1998). Neuroanatomical  
426 correlates of cognitive aging: evidence from structural magnetic resonance imaging.  
427 *Neuropsychology, 12*(1), 91-114.

428 Rygula, R., Walker, S.C., Clarke, H.F., Robbins, T.W., & Roberts, A.C. (2010). Differential  
429 contributions of the primate ventrolateral prefrontal and orbitofrontal cortex to serial  
430 reversal learning. *Journal of Neuroscience, 30*(43)-14552-14559.

431 Trouche, S.G., Maurice, T., Rouland, S., Verdier, J.M., & Mestre-Frances, N. (2010). The three-  
432 panel runway maze adapted to *Microcebus murinus* reveals age-related differences in  
433 memory and perseverance performances. *Neurobiology of Learning and Memory, 94*,  
434 100–106.

435 Vlamings, P.H.J.M., Hare, B., & Call, J. (2010). Reaching around barriers: the performance of  
436 the great apes and 3-5 year-old children. *Animal Cogniton, 13*, 273-285.

437 Weed, M.R., Bryant, R., & Perry, S. (2008). Cognitive development in macaques: Attentional  
438 set-shifting in juvenile and adult rhesus monkeys. *Neuroscience, 157*, 22-28.

439 Wich, S. A., Utami-Atmoko, S. S., Mitra Setia, T., Rijksen, H. R., Schürmann, C., van Hooff, J.  
440 A. R. A. M., & van Schaik, C. P. (2004). Life history of wild Sumatran orangutans  
441 (*Pongo abelii*). *Journal of Human Evolution, 47*, 385–398.

442 Wise, S.P., Murray E.A., & Gerfen, C.R. (1996). The frontal cortex—basal ganglia system in  
443 primates. *Critical Reviews in Neurobiology, 10*, 317–356.

444 Wobber, V., Wrangham, R. & Hare, B. (2010). Bonobos exhibit delayed development of social  
445 behavior and cognition relative to chimpanzees. *Current Biology, 20*, 226–230.

446 Zeamer, A., Decamp, E., & Clark, K. (2011). Attention, executive functioning and memory in  
447 normal aged rhesus monkeys. *Behavioural Brain Research, 219*(1), 23-30.

448

449 Table 1. Subjects included in the study.

Subject	Species	Gender	Age (years)	Rearing history	Experimental group
Ulla	Chimpanzee	Female	33	Nursery	Right-Left
Pia	Chimpanzee	Female	10	Mother	Left-Right
Annet	Chimpanzee	Female	9	Nursery	Left-Right
Riet	Chimpanzee	Female	33	Nursery	Left-Right
Natascha	Chimpanzee	Female	30	Nursery	Left-Right
Corrie	Chimpanzee	Female	34	Nursery	Left-Right
Sandra	Chimpanzee	Female	17	Mother	Left-Right
Lome	Chimpanzee	Male	8	Mother	Right-Left
Patrick	Chimpanzee	Male	12	Mother	Right-Left
Kara	Chimpanzee	Female	5	Mother	Right-Left
Kofi	Chimpanzee	Male	5	Mother	Right-Left
Robert	Chimpanzee	Male	35	Nursery	Right-Left
Fraukje	Chimpanzee	Female	34	Nursery	Right-Left
Dorien	Chimpanzee	Female	30	Nursery	Right-Left
Tai	Chimpanzee	Female	8	Mother	Left-Right
Frodo	Chimpanzee	Male	16	Mother	Left-Right
Fifi	Chimpanzee	Female	16	Mother	Right-Left
Alexandra	Chimpanzee	Female	9	Nursery	Left-Right
Alex	Chimpanzee	Male	8	Nursery	Right-Left
Jahaga	Chimpanzee	Female	16	Mother	Left-Right
Gertruida	Chimpanzee	Female	16	Mother	Right-Left
Jeudi	Chimpanzee	Female	28	Mother	Left-Right
Frederike	Chimpanzee	Female	40	Mother	Right-Left
Brigitta	Chimpanzee	Female	48	Mother	Right-Left

Daza	Chimpanzee	Female	28	Unknown	Left-Right
Joey	Bonobo	Male	26	Nursery	Left-Right
Kuno	Bonobo	Male	12	Nursery	Right-Left
Yasa	Bonobo	Female	11	Mother	Right-Left
Luisa	Bonobo	Female	5	Mother	Right-Left
Gemena	Bonobo	Female	9	Mother	Right-Left
Fimi	Bonobo	Female	6	Mother	Left-Right
Lexi	Bonobo	Female	15	Nursery	Right-Left
Jasongo	Bonobo	Male	24	Mother	Left-Right
Dokana	Orang-utan	Female	18	Mother	Left-Right
Padana	Orang-utan	Female	11	Mother	Left-Right
Pini	Orang-utan	Female	20	Mother	Right-Left
Kila	Orang-utan	Female	8	Mother	Right-Left
Raaja	Orang-utan	Female	7	Mother	Right-Left
Suaq	Orang-utan	Male	5	Mother	Right-Left
Tanah	Orang-utan	Female	5	Mother	Left-Right
Kibara	Gorilla	Female	6	Mother	Left-Right
Abeeku	Gorilla	Male	15	Mother	Left-Right
Kumili	Gorilla	Female	10	Mother	Right-Left

---

450

451

452 *Figure captions*

453 Fig 1. Apparatus from the apes' perspective. The white arrow at the centre signals the grasping  
454 handle. Black arrows left and right signal the windows where the grapes can be retrieved.  
455 Black stripes lateral to each window prevent the ape from detecting the lockable device in  
456 the reversal of the task.

457 Fig 2. Frequency of errors pre-solution (a) and (b) post-solution in the training and test phases.  
458 The line represents the median, the bottom and top of each box represents the 25<sup>th</sup> and  
459 75<sup>th</sup> percentile, the whiskers show the minimum and maximum values that are not  
460 considered outliers (i.e., values  $> 1.5 \cdot \text{IQR}$  from the 25<sup>th</sup> or 75<sup>th</sup> percentile) which are in  
461 turn represented by circles.

462 Fig 3. Frequency of errors pre-solution (a) and (b) post-solution as a function of age.

463

464