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Abstract

Dietary reconstruction via stable isotope analysis is an important part of the study of past populations, but can raise issues in many parts of the world where human remains are scarce, absent, or restricted due to ethical concerns. Given these issues, some researchers have used domesticated dogs as human dietary proxies via the Canine Surrogacy Approach (CSA). We performed carbon and nitrogen stable isotope analysis on the hair of 304 humans and 57 dogs from 45 households in two contemporary indigenous communities in Nicaragua’s Bosawas Biosphere Reserve to explore whether dogs function as dietary proxies for their human owners in this Neotropical horticulturalist context. While CSA is broadly viable at these study sites, on a more precise scale the diets of dogs do not reflect the diets of their owners. This raises questions about the applicability of CSA to archaeological contexts, suggesting that relying on dogs as dietary proxies may overlook key variation in past human diets.
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1. Introduction

Dietary reconstruction is an important part of the study of past populations and stable isotope analysis has become a widely used tool to interpret past diet. While it is a well-established archaeological method, there are many regions of the world where access to human remains for any destructive analysis is prohibited due to concerns about ancestral and ethical treatment of the dead (Katzenberg 2001, Hublin et al. 2008). The use of dogs as dietary proxies for humans may circumvent the need for human tissue samples, especially in cases of important, scarce, or absent remains. This method is based on the premise that dogs are scavenging or being provisioned by owners with food from the local human diet, therefore exhibiting dietary isotope results that mirror contemporaneous human populations. Dogs are increasingly being used as human dietary proxies in archaeological contexts and recently this methodology was outlined and reviewed by Guiry (2012, 2013), who labeled it the Canine Surrogacy Approach (CSA).


To evaluate how well dog diets reflect human diets, here we apply CSA to all humans and dogs from 45 households in two neighboring rural Nicaraguan villages, providing a complete picture of human-dog dietary breadth across two communities. To our knowledge, this study represents the first broad application of CSA to ethnographic data (see Van der Merwe et al. 2000 and Tankersley and Koster 2009 for previous ethnoarchaeological CSA applications). Testing CSA in communities with known
socioeconomic and subsistence information allows us to contextualize the implications of the isotope results and their interpretations. In this study we employ both a broad species-level (human/dog) application of CSA (e.g., Noe-Nygaard 1988, Cannon et al. 1999, West and France 2015, Edwards et al. 2017) and a household-level application between individual dogs and their human owners (e.g., Tifental 2016). Household-level studies have been less common in the archaeological literature due to the difficulty of linking a particular dog to a specific household. Our method allows for the incorporation of predictor variables, including household wealth and the age and sex of both humans and their dogs. This permits us to determine how well dog diets perform as a human dietary proxy at our sites. We examined dog-human diet association at both the species and household levels, while isolating important variables that may affect this relationship. Our results, combined with detailed ethnographic data, provide a foundation for understanding “living assemblage” human-dog dietary relationships and inform future CSA applications.

2. Study sites

Fieldwork for this study took place in two indigenous communities in Nicaragua’s Bosawas Biosphere Reserve, part of the largest tract of unbroken neotropical rain forest north of Amazonia (Figure 1). The communities, Arang Dak and Suma Pipi, are inhabited by indigenous Mayangna and Miskito horticulturalists (Koster et al. 2013). Their primary crops include manioc, bananas and plantains, beans, and rice. Maize is also cultivated but is less common than beans and rice, and compared to other locations in Central America (e.g., Pacheco-Cobos and Winterhalder 2015), maize is less important as a staple crop. The residents of these communities also keep domestic animals, including cows, pigs, and fowl. However, cattle are rarely consumed and kept primarily as a store of wealth that can be sold when there is a need for cash. Much of the dietary protein in this setting is from harvested fish and game (Koster 2007; Koster and Leckie 2014). Although fishing hooks are useful during the rainy season, there are few sediments in the freshwater river during the dry season, which then permits fishermen to use bows and homemade harpoons. Fishing productivity therefore increases greatly from February through April (Koster et al. 2016). Villagers also have access to some processed packaged foods imported from outside the reserve, which may have an effect on their dietary isotopes (Somerville et al. 2017).

![Figure 1. Map of the study communities.](image_url)
While dogs are a regular part of the Suma Pipi and Arang Dak communities, only two-thirds of households own them. Most dog-owning households have three or fewer (the average is 1.7), but one has four dogs and another household – the wealthiest household in this sample – owns five. Mayangana and Miskito hunters largely rely on their dogs to locate game animals, particularly focusing on terrestrial mammals such as tapirs, agoutis, pacas, nine-banded armadillos, and collared peccaries (Koster 2006; Koster 2008a; Koster 2008b). Dogs vary considerably in their hunting ability, and male dogs seem to exhibit moderately greater performance (Koster and Tankersley 2012). Dogs also improve as they age, and few dogs under three years old are able to chase and corral collared peccaries. Yet, although some dogs help to harvest hundreds of kilograms of meat per year, others provide essentially no benefits as hunting companions and they rarely join their owners on excursions into the forest (Koster and Noss 2014). However, despite widespread ethnographic reports that talented hunting dogs receive favorable treatment and provisioning from their owners (Koster 2009; see Supplemental Figure 1), there is little isotopic evidence that the diets of dogs in this setting vary as a function of their hunting ability (Koster and Tankersley 2012).

Dogs in the study communities are fed by their owners, and it is common to observe women spooning rice or cooked bananas onto the porch for the dogs to consume. It is less common to observe dogs being fed purchased foods or meat. Dogs rarely range alone beyond the boundaries of the community or attempt to provision themselves (Koster and Noss 2014; see also Lupo 2012) and feeding dogs that belong to other households is rare. Despite the provisioning from owners, veterinary examinations of the dogs indicate that most are malnourished, which is exacerbated by high parasitic loads, disease burden, anemia, and dehydration (Fiorello et al. 2017). Although dogs in other settings regularly consume human feces (Tankersley and Koster 2009), the presence of latrines in these communities largely precludes this possibility for the dogs in this study. Overall, the annual mortality rate of the dog population is high, approximately 50%, and leading sources of mortality include attacks by jaguars, snakebites, and unspecified illnesses.

The study communities are characterized by considerable wealth inequality. During the 2013 study period, the household-level Gini coefficient (where 0 represents perfect equality and 1 represents maximal inequality; Gini 1912, Tucker et al. 2015) was 0.60. There is evidence that wealthier households consume healthier diets than those of poorer households, as children in wealthier households exhibit higher height-for-age and weight-for-age measurements (Winking and Koster 2015). Wealthier households are also more likely to purchase locally harvested meats and processed foods that are imported from outside the reserve, such as cookies, crackers, soup mixes, canned sardines, powdered drink mixes, and carbonated soft drinks (Cooper et al. 2018). Despite considerable household-level heterogeneity in wealth and hunting productivity, food sharing between families reduces some of the variation in diets across families (Koster 2011).

3. Factors affecting comparative dimensions of CSA

Guiry (2012) set out a framework for the application of CSA, noting that it is a “theory through which dogs can be viewed as a form of dietary analogy for contemporaneous humans” (2012: 352). CSA applications make two assumptions: firstly, that dogs have access to human food (presumably in roughly the same proportions as humans) and secondly that humans and dogs metabolize and incorporate their food in similar ways to produce similar isotope results. While noting that many CSA applications found general similarities (within 2-3‰ in both δ13C and δ15N) between human and dog isotope results, Guiry also referenced “disagreement in the literature with regards to what constitutes stable isotope value similarities that are “close enough” for dogs to provide credible information on human dietary activities” (2012: 359). This debate remains unresolved, but Guiry suggested dividing CSA applications into direct (e.g., dog diets transposed onto human diets) and indirect (e.g., dog diets indicating the use of special
foods, like maize) analogies. He also outlined the biological, behavioral, cultural and environmental factors that may influence how dog diets can be used to proxy human diets. Following Wylie (2002: 147), Guiry (2012: 362) noted that “these factors can be neutral (that is they are unlikely to influence dog diet relative to human diet), negative (they are likely to skew dog diet such that it is less isotopically consistent with human diet), or positive (they are likely to contribute to a convergence of dog and human diet).” The benefit of our study as the first broad ethnoarchaeological application of CSA is that we can directly test this CSA framework to a known population, controlling for the variables which may affect a human-dog dietary proxy relationship.

Following Guiry’s (2012: 362-368) framework on a point-by-point basis, here we individually outline the potential influencing factors affecting the degree to which dog diets are analogous to human diets at our Nicaraguan sites.

**Life Span and Bone Remodeling**

Guiry (2012: 363) outlines the potential problems associated with comparisons of human and dog bone experiencing differential remodeling rates. Given that we sampled only human and dog hair for this study, we do not address the issues associated with bone growth and remodeling which may affect stable isotope composition from bone collagen studies.

**Domestic, Wild, or Hybrid**

Guiry (2012: 363) raises potential issues associated with the archaeological sampling of canids which may not be domesticated dogs or representing hybrid individuals. The only other canids in Nicaragua are the gray fox (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus*) and the coyote (*Canis latrans*). Coyotes have only been present in Nicaragua since the 16th century (Hidalgo-Mihart et al. 2004) and are uncommon, especially in the denser tropical forest regions. There have been no reported coyotes or gray foxes at or near our sites and there is no reported hybridization between either foxes or coyotes and dogs in Nicaragua. All of our sample come from non-hybridized domesticated dogs.

**Caecotrophy Among Dogs**

Guiry (2012: 364) makes an important comment on the extent to which caecotrophy, the consumption of feces, in dogs may affect their $\delta^{15}$N values, noting it is unclear whether the values would increase or decrease. The Miskito and Mayangna villages have latrines, so dogs have little access to human feces. In contrast, domestic livestock in the villages include cattle, pigs, and fowl (chickens, ducks, and turkeys), and these animals freely defecate in and around the villages and dogs have the opportunity to consume the feces. Dogs also sometimes eat the feces of wild animals while on hunting trips. Cattle freely graze within the village and surrounding “pasture,” while pigs, the ownership of which is widespread, are provisioned with maize and manioc.

**Dog Worship**

Guiry (2022: 364-365) notes that some dogs may be fed restricted diets due to spiritual or ritual reasons, leading to dietary signatures unlike those of humans from the site. In contrast to some archaeological evidence for ritual uses of dogs in the Neotropics that could lead to significant isotopic variation (White et al. 2001, White 2004, White et al. 2006), Miskito and Mayangna dogs are not part of any ritual context that results in some dogs being provisioned differently.
Guiry (2012: 365) observes that the consumption of dogs by humans would result in slightly elevated human $\delta^{15}N$ values, given similar diets in both humans and dogs, due to the trophic level effect. Villagers at our sites do not consume dogs, so this does not affect our analysis.

**Separate Treatment of Differing Dog Breeds**

Guiry (2012: 365-366) hypothesizes that dogs bred for different roles within a group (e.g., for hunting or consumption) may have differential diets related to those roles, which were not analogous to human diets. At Arang Dak and Suma Pipi, dogs are rarely a true breed (Koster 2007). Like other village dogs in the Neotropics, they are mostly short-haired, small to medium-sized mutts (Oberg 1949, Wagley 1977, Lauer 2005, Kohn 2007) and not intentionally bred for any particular role.

**Technological Change**

Similar to dogs used for ritual purposes or breeds that fill specialized roles, Guiry (2012: 366) notes that some dogs representing technological changes (e.g., for traction or guarding, cf. Serpell 1995) may also be fed specific diets which do not reflect the diets of their human keepers. Aside from hunting (discussed below), dogs in these communities are not used as technology, though they do provide some measure of protection for homes against burglary (Koster 2007:129).

**Economic Transactions**

Guiry (2012: 366) and others (Gosden and Pavlides 1994, Eriksson and Zagorska 2003) have raised issues with the use of isolated dog elements, like teeth, in CSA applications. These elements may be traded between groups with different dietary regimes, thus they may not reflect the diet of the local community and should be analyzed with caution. Dog elements are not used or traded in any way in the villages we studied, so should have no reason to end up anywhere outside the villages.

**Dependence on Dog Services**

Guiry (2012:367) suggests reliance on dogs for services, such as transport, may lead to human provisioning and a potentially positive CSA application, especially in the northern latitudes. Contrary to this, some ethnographic sources suggest northern pack dogs are provisioned with a diet different from that of humans (Macpherson and Manning 1961, Zagoskin 1967, Savelle 1984, Andersen 1992), often with a substantial reliance on fish, which is seen as a high-quality, low-cost food, being easily caught and dried or frozen. A similar marine-based dog diet, in contrast to a more varied human faunal assemblage, has been documented at coastal archaeological sites (e.g., Ames et al. 2015).

The importance of a dog in hunting or other economic activities is not necessarily tied to a different or improved diet. While some hunting dogs are provisioned with special items like a pregnant prey’s fetus (Sponsel 1981, Forline 1997) or internal organs (Montiel Ortega et al. 1999) of captured prey animals, there are many examples of hunting dogs being underfed. Some ethnographers report hunting dogs that survive by scavenging food scraps, refuse, or human excrement (Bergman 1980, Dumont and Hurlich 1981, Werner 1984).

At Arang Dak and Suma Pipi, not all dogs are considered hunting dogs, and some dogs exist only as pets or “house dogs”. Although there is a high level of agreement among villagers about which hunting dogs are good, and these dogs generally appear to receive better care (Koster 2007), Koster and Tankersley (2012) previously found no correlation between an improved diet and hunting dog ability at the sites. While some researchers note hunting dogs may be purposely kept hungry to improve hunting motivation and effectiveness (Metzger and Morey 1983, Crocker 1990, Holt et al. 2004), Miskito and Mayangna hunters do not appear to subscribe to this philosophy and may give their hunting dogs small amounts of meat when an animal is killed or cooked (Koster 2007, Koster and Tankersley 2012).
There is often an assumption that dog burials are a more reliable proxy for human diets, as these dogs were revered in some way by humans (e.g., Hogue 2002). Conversely, previous stable isotope analysis of dog burials at Arang Dak and Suma Pipi found broad ranges in both $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta^{15}$N values, with some $\delta^{13}$C values that reflect maize consumption (-11.6‰) and others that do not (-22.2‰) (Tankersley and Koster 2009). Also, active hunting dogs are more likely to die during hunts and are buried in the forest, while other dogs are more commonly buried in the village, raising the question of bias in the archaeological sampling of village-buried dogs.

Isolation

Guiry (2012: 367) documented a problem among some groups in trading dogs to nearby neighbors, only to have the loyal dogs return (Mandelbaum 1979:66). As a result some groups traded dogs only with distant neighbors or passing travelers. Some researchers have documented significant movement and exchange of dogs in various cultural contexts (Howard 2001, Mans 2012, Laffoon et al. 2017), raising potential issues in the dietary relationship between humans and their non-native dogs.

There is a long history of dogs being purchased or traded in the ethnographic literature of the Neotropics (Schomburgk 1922, Descola 1996, Koshear 1995, Howard 2001), including near the Bosawas Reserve (Belt 1911). Many Neotropics village dogs have been imported from nearby cities (Fiorello et al. 2006, Kohn 2007), potentially leading to significant differences in dietary intake. The Miskito and Mayangna in our study live in a fairly isolated location and dogs are usually acquired as puppies, whether purchased, received as gifts, or kept from a litter. Only dogs beyond weaning age were used in our study. Sometimes older dogs are sold, particularly those with a good reputation for hunting, but most sales are to other members of the community (Koster 2007). However, if local dogs were traded to outside locations, such as villages of intensive agriculturalists, and then died shortly after arrival, they would reflect the more terrestrial diet of Arang Dak and Suma Pipi as opposed to the maize-based diet of their new owners. Archaeologically, in regions where dogs may have been traded between hunting and farming communities, or to passing travelers, this variation would prove problematic for CSA applications. This may be addressed by utilizing stable isotopes that reflect mobility, such as strontium (Bentley 2006, Laffoon et al. 2017), but raises important questions about the natal origins of dogs being used in these applications.

4. Materials and methods

In February and March of 2013, hair samples were obtained from all residents and dogs who were present in the communities during data collection of anthropometric measurements on the human residents. Although we sampled infants and suckling puppies, we exclude them from this study due to the trophic effects of breastfeeding and weaning (Tsutaya and Yoneda 2015). For long-haired humans, we attempted to collect samples of hair that were close to the scalp. All dogs at these field sites have short hair, and samples were obtained from the base of the tail. In total, we analyzed 304 humans and 57 dogs between both communities.

A census from the same field season provides demographic information, particularly age and sex, on the humans and the dogs and the wealth of their respective households ($n=45$). Wealth is calculated as the cumulative value of key household possessions, such as livestock, firearms, portable radios, and flashlights (Winking and Koster 2015).

Hair has been shown to record dietary information in the form of stable carbon and nitrogen isotope ratios (DeNiro and Epstein 1978, 1981), including significant differences in dietary regimes between individuals (O’Connell and Hedges 1999, Petzke et al. 2005, Somerville et al. 2017). Due to its fast rate of growth, stable chemistry after formation, and ability to be sampled non-invasively from living individuals, it makes an ideal material for studying living populations (LeBeau et al. 2011, White et al.
2011). While human hair grows at a rate of about 1 cm per month (Valković 1977), research on dog hair growth seems to vary based on the individual, breed, body location of the hair, and season of the year, though it also averages around 1 cm per month (Al-Bagdadi 1977, Gunaratnam and Wilkinson 1983, Diaz et al. 2004). Previous comparative studies of human and dog hair stable isotopes have assumed a 1 cm per month growth rate for both (Bol and Pfleger 2002). The dogs at our site are mostly short-haired mutts. Hairs were collected in February and March, which falls in the hot, dry season. There is some evidence that short-haired dog hair in the tropics grows less and sheds more in the hot season (Favarato and Conceição 2007), but similar seasonal shedding has been observed in humans (Williams et al. 2011). Given this, we assume similar rates of seasonal hair growth and shedding in humans and dogs at the sites.

Carbon isotope analysis of hair keratin compares the ratio of $^{13}\text{C} / ^{12}\text{C}$ (expressed as $\delta^{13}\text{C}$) resulting primarily from differential consumption of $C_3$ and $C_4$ plants. $C_3$ plants have lower $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values (averaging -27.0‰; Kohn 2010; O’Leary 1988; Smith and Epstein 1971) and include bananas and plantains, manioc, beans, and rice as part of traditional Miskito and Mayangna diets. $C_4$ plants have higher $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values (averaging -12.5‰; O’Leary 1988; Smith and Epstein 1971) and include maize and some imported packaged foods at our sites. The $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values in hair keratin are approximately 4‰–5‰ higher than dietary $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ values (Hedges, Rush, and Aalbersberg 2009, Yoshinaga et al. 1996).

Nitrogen isotope analysis of hair keratin compares the ratio of $^{15}\text{N} / ^{14}\text{N}$ (expressed as $\delta^{15}\text{N}$), used to determine the individual’s trophic level based on a ~3‰–5‰ $^{15}\text{N}$ enrichment in tissues at each increasing position on the food chain (Minagawa and Wada 1984, Schoeninger and DeNiro 1984, Lee-Thorp 2008). Because of this relationship, higher $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values are associated with carnivory and the frequent consumption of foods coming from increased $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ marine systems (Schoeninger et al. 1983). The offset between dietary protein and hair keratin $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ is about 4‰–5‰ (Hedges, Rush, and Aalbersberg 2009; Yoshinaga et al. 1996).

Human hair samples were prepared for isotope analysis and measured at the Department of Anthropology, University of British Columbia (Vancouver, Canada). Dog hair samples were prepared for isotope analysis and measured at the Department of Human Evolution, Max Planck Institute for Evolutionary Anthropology (Leipzig, Germany), following the same protocols. All hair samples were weighed, individually labeled, and prepared for analysis using standard protocols to degrease and clean samples (O’Connell and Hedges 1999, O’Connell et al. 2001, Hedges et al. 2005). Samples were rinsed twice in deionized water to remove debris, sonicated for 10 minutes during each rinse, then soaked in a 2:1 methanol/chloroform solution (30 min; 3x). Following these soaks, the samples were rinsed four times with deionized water, then dried overnight at 30°C. Once dried, each sample was cut into 1cm-long segments, randomized and packaged into tin weigh boats for analysis.

Carbon and nitrogen isotope analyses were carried out using a MicroCube elemental analyzer coupled to an Isoprime isotope ration-mass spectrometer (EA-IRMS). All isotope data were calibrated using USGS 40 ($\delta^{13}\text{C} = -26.39$, $\delta^{15}\text{N} = -4.52$) and USGS 41 ($\delta^{13}\text{C} = 37.63$, $\delta^{15}\text{N} = 47.57$). Data was scaled to Vienna Pee Dee Belemnite (V-PDB) for carbon and the ambient inhalable reservoir (AIR) for nitrogen. Internal and international standards were used, including USGS 42 ($\delta^{13}\text{C} = -21.09$, $\delta^{15}\text{N} = 8.05$), USGS 43, ($\delta^{13}\text{C} = -21.28$, $\delta^{15}\text{N} = 8.44$), Methionine (internal accepted $\delta^{13}\text{C} = -28.57$, $\delta^{15}\text{N} = -5.01$), and SUBC 1 (internal collagen standard with accepted $\delta^{13}\text{C} = -13.73$, $\delta^{15}\text{N} = 17.39$). Measurement error on the $\delta^{13}\text{C}$ and $\delta^{15}\text{N}$ values was calculated from the repeat measurements of internal and international standards and was ± 0.2% (1σ) or better.

5. Analysis
Following Guiry’s (2012) outline of the Canine Surrogacy Approach (CSA), we begin by making two related predictions about the isotope values of dogs relative to humans. First, we examine across-species differences at the level of the community:

**Prediction 1:** There are differences in the average isotope values of human samples and dogs’ samples at this site. A lack of statistical support for this prediction would be consistent with the CSA.

We also advance a household-level CSA:

**Prediction 2:** At the level of the household, there are positive correlations between the values of the human residents and the dogs they own.

In addition to broad predictions about the similarities between the isotope signatures of dogs and human, we also draw on research that shows how dietary variation reflects heterogeneity in wealth (Somerville et al. 2013, Stantis et al. 2015, Waterman et al. 2016). That research leads us to advance an additional prediction about household-level heterogeneity:

**Prediction 3:** For both humans and dogs, isotope values reflect variation in households’ wealth.

Finally, although we had no *a priori* hypotheses about the interaction effects of household wealth and individuals’ ages, our exploratory plots of the data suggested that the effect of wealth on human nitrogen values seems to be moderated by the individuals’ age. This exploratory analysis therefore leads us to advance the following prediction about isotope variation among humans:

**Prediction 4:** Older, wealthier individuals have higher nitrogen values than others.

Given our interest in household-level isotopic variation, we employ a multilevel modeling approach for reasons described by McElreath (2015). Whereas anthropologists have recently used multilevel modeling to account for repeated isotope measurements of the same individuals (Fahy et al. 2014) or repeated measurements of the same species (Oelze et al. 2014), this analysis extends the approach to household-level clustering. Furthermore, an evidently novel aspect of our modeling approach is that we model the $\delta^{13}C$ and $\delta^{15}N$ values as the dependent variables in a Gaussian bivariate response model, allowing for correlated random effects across the two functions. In addition, we include binary fixed effects to distinguish the dogs from the humans in the sample, and we allow both the intercepts and these fixed effects for dogs to vary by household (random intercepts and random coefficients, respectively). Assuming Gaussian distributions of the response variables, our base models can be formally notated as follows:
\[ 13C_{ijk} = o_{ijk} + \gamma(dog_{ijk}) + u_{o,jk} + u_{2,jk}(dog_{ijk}) + e_{oijk} \]

\[ 15N_{ijk} = l_{ijk} + \gamma(dog_{ijk}) + u_{l,jk} + u_{3,jk}(dog_{ijk}) + e_{lijk} \]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  u_{o,jk} \\
  u_{l,jk} \\
  u_{2,jk} \\
  u_{3,jk}
\end{bmatrix} \sim N(0, \Sigma) : \\
\begin{bmatrix}
  2 & 0 \\
  0 & 2 \\
  0 & 2 \\
  0 & 2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
  e_{oijk} \\
  e_{lijk}
\end{bmatrix} \sim N(0, \Sigma) : \\
\begin{bmatrix}
  2 & 0 \\
  0 & 2
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where we model the isotope values of the individuals and dogs in the sample. In this notation, \( k \) represents an index for either of the two responses, \( \delta^{13}C \) or \( \delta^{15}N \), \( i \) is an index for individual \( i \) \( (i = 1, \ldots, N) \) in household \( j \) \( (j = 1, \ldots, N) \). Each equation has an intercept term \( (\beta_{oijk} \text{ and } \beta_{l,ijk}) \), a binary fixed effect variable to distinguish dogs from humans in the sample \( (\beta_{2} \text{ and } \beta_{3}) \), a random intercept to account for individuals from different household \( (u_{o,jk} \text{ and } u_{l,jk}) \), a random coefficient that allows the response to vary for dogs from different households \( (u_{2,jk} \text{ and } u_{3,jk}) \), and a residual error term \( (e_{oijk} \text{ and } e_{l,ijk}) \). The household-level random effects are assumed to be multivariate normally distributed with zero means and a homogenous \( 4 \times 4 \) variance-covariance matrix. Similarly, the residual variances are assumed to be normally distributed around means of zero and homogenous \( 2 \times 2 \) variance-covariance matrix.\(^1\)

The base model presented above does not include fixed effect covariates beyond the intercept terms or the binary variable that distinguishes dogs, but the model can readily be extended to include additional predictor variables, whether defined at the level of the household or the individual. The inclusion of additional parameters alters the predicted values for individuals in the sample and therefore the estimated random effects and their correlations are impacted as well.

The covariates in our models are \( \text{sex}, \text{age}, \) and \( \text{wealth} \). See Table 1 for descriptive statistics on individual-level variables. The former is a straightforward binary variable, coded as 1 for males. In order to put the ages of people and dogs on similar scales, the original values for each individual were divided by a value that represents the age of an elderly individual of that respective species, namely 80 for humans and 10 for dogs. After this standardization, for example, an 8-year-old human would have a value of 0.1 whereas an 8-year-old dog would have a value of 0.8.\(^2\) Because of the weaning effect (Schurr 1998), we limit our analysis to humans who are at least 4 years old, the age at which greater than 95% of the children in this setting have reportedly been weaned. We include dogs of all ages while noting that puppies seldom suckle past two months of age.

\(^1\) Note that our model assumes homoscedastic variance across humans and dogs. We used Levene’s test to test for unequal variances across species for both the \( \delta^{13}C \) and \( \delta^{15}N \) values, and the respective tests did not reveal unequal variances.

\(^2\) The distributions of ages are positively skewed for both humans and dogs, reflecting the high proportion of juveniles and young adults in each population. As a robustness check, we estimated models in which we square-root transformed the variable for age. These models resulted in similar inferences as the ones we present.
### Table 1. Descriptive statistics for the individual-level response variables and covariates, organized by species. We present sample means or proportions with standard deviations in parentheses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Humans ((n = 304))</th>
<th>Dogs ((n = 57))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(\delta^{13})C</td>
<td>(-22.5 (0.8))</td>
<td>(-22.4 (0.9))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\delta^{15})N</td>
<td>(9.5 (0.6))</td>
<td>(9.5 (0.5))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (standardized)</td>
<td>(0.2615 (0.19))</td>
<td>(0.2269 (0.18))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>(0.50)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To account for the positive skew that characterizes household wealth, we log-transform this variable. Following this transformation, the variable ranges from 3.04 to 5.72 with a mean of 4.49 and a standard deviation of 0.5.

In addition to our base model, we specify three additional models, one that includes demographic variables as control variables and two further models that test the aforementioned predictions. In all of these models, we specify interaction terms that allow the main effects to be moderated by the binary variable for species. Our final model, which tests our fourth prediction, includes a three-way interaction of the covariates for *species*, *age*, and *wealth* along with the corresponding two-way interaction terms. To compare models, we report the Watanabe-Akaike Information Criterion (WAIC), with lower values indicating preferred models that effectively balance over-parameterization against model fit.

To conduct probabilistic inference of our models’ parameters (see Otárola-Castillo and Torquato 2018 for similar archaeological applications) we use Markov chain Monte Carlo (MCMC) methods, as implemented in the BRMS package (Bürkner 2017). We used the package’s suggested weakly informative priors for all parameters, reflecting our partial knowledge about their distributions and to ensure a sensible posterior distribution (Gelman 2013: 55). After a burn-in of 1,000 iterations, we sample an additional 20,000 iterations as the basis for inference. Conventional MCMC diagnostics yielded no concerns about the mixing of the MCMC chains.

To calculate the extent to which dogs and humans from the same household exhibit comparably high or low \(\delta^{13}\)C and \(\delta^{15}\)N values, we computed Pearson’s \(r\), the correlation between the predicted values of humans and dogs from the same household. We report the average of the resulting distribution of correlations and the 90% range as credible intervals (see https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/DBXE9).

### Results

All samples met with quality control criteria (DeNiro 1985; O’Connell and Hedges 1999; van Klinken 1999). Figure 2 shows the plotted isotope results for both humans and dogs (see Supplemental Figure 2 for household-level plots). Human \(\delta^{15}\)N values range from 6.9‰ to 12.8‰ and dog \(\delta^{15}\)N values range from 8.4‰ to 10.8‰. Human \(\delta^{13}\)C values range from -24.7‰ to -19.0‰ and dog \(\delta^{13}\)C values range from -24.3‰ to -20.1‰. See Supplemental Table 1 for raw data.
Figure 2. Carbon and nitrogen values for humans and dogs at Arang Dak and Suma Pipi.

The parameters for our models are reported in Table 2. A comparison of the WAIC values indicates that the inclusion of the demographic control variables in Model 1 considerably improves model fit. Whereas the addition of wealth and the corresponding interaction terms evidently does not improve model fit, the three-way-interaction terms in Model 3 results in the most preferable model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Base model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept (Human Ref)</td>
<td>-22.57 (0.09)</td>
<td>9.52 (0.06)</td>
<td>-23.04 (0.10)</td>
<td>9.14 (0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog</td>
<td>0.08 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.06 (0.10)</td>
<td>0.14 (0.22)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.81 (0.18)</td>
<td>1.44 (0.15)</td>
<td>1.81 (0.18)</td>
<td>1.44 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog * Age</td>
<td>-0.24 (0.57)</td>
<td>-0.81 (0.45)</td>
<td>-0.33 (0.57)</td>
<td>-0.88 (0.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.07)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.06)</td>
<td>-0.06 (0.07)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog * Male</td>
<td>0.27 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.03 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.20)</td>
<td>0.02 (0.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log (Wealth)</td>
<td>0.39 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.21 (0.09)</td>
<td>0.49 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.16 (0.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog * Wealth</td>
<td>-0.68 (0.32)</td>
<td>-0.31 (0.20)</td>
<td>-0.02 (0.43)</td>
<td>-0.37 (0.28)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age * Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11 (0.41)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog * Age * Wealth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.14 (1.31)</td>
<td>0.48 (0.94)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Human-dog Correlations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Carbon</th>
<th>Nitrogen</th>
<th>Nitrogen</th>
<th>Nitrogen</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>0.30 (0.01, 0.60)</td>
<td>0.18 (-0.07, 0.44)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.02, 0.60)</td>
<td>0.30 (0.02, 0.58)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>0.40 (-0.11, 0.97)</td>
<td>0.18 (-0.34, 0.74)</td>
<td>0.16 (-0.40, 0.79)</td>
<td>0.11 (-0.42, 0.75)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variances**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Base model</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
<td>Carbon</td>
<td>Nitrogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Intercept</td>
<td>0.26 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.05)</td>
<td>0.25 (0.07)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species Coefficient</td>
<td>0.44 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.12 (0.12)</td>
<td>0.61 (0.16)</td>
<td>0.17 (0.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>0.42 (0.03)</td>
<td>0.29 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.31 (0.02)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAIC</td>
<td>1341.7 (58.4)</td>
<td>1201.6 (58.8)</td>
<td>1205.5 (59.2)</td>
<td>1192.4 (60.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2.** Model output. Reported quantities are the means (standard deviations in parentheses) from the posterior samples of the MCMC chains. Asterisks between terms denote interaction effects. For the
human-dog correlations, the reported values are the means calculated from the posterior samples and the quantities in parentheses are the 90% credible intervals of those calculations.

**Prediction 1: Species-level differences**

Our base model permits a test of Prediction 1, and the model’s parameters for dogs’ $\delta^{13}C$ ($\beta = 0.09$) and $\delta^{15}N$ ($\beta = 0.07$) show that, on average, the isotope values are expected to be largely identical for humans and dogs. At the level of the community, in other words, these results provide support for the CSA.

**Prediction 2: Household-level correlations**

Do humans and dogs from the same household exhibit similar isotope signatures? Contrary to our predictions, strong correlations are not evident in the statistical models. In general, the correlations are positive ($\delta^{13}C = 0.30$ and $\delta^{15}N = 0.40$ in the base model), but correlations are modest and the credible intervals are wide. The correlation for nitrogen particularly weakens once the effects of covariates are included in the models. Together, these results suggest that dogs are imperfect proxies for dietary inferences about the humans with whom they reside.

**Prediction 3: Wealth as a predictor of isotope variation**

In Model 2, we add wealth as a predictor variable, which exhibits a positive effect on both $\delta^{13}C$ ($\beta = 0.39$) and $\delta^{15}N$ ($\beta = 0.21$) in human diets. Consistent with our third prediction, that is, humans in wealthier households consume more foods that increase their $\delta^{13}C$ and $\delta^{15}N$ values, respectively. Notably, the effects are attenuated for dogs, particularly for $\delta^{13}C$ ($\beta = -0.68$). This result suggests that the effects of wealth do not entail the same benefits for dogs as they do for their owners (Figure 3).

![Figure 3](image-url)  
**Figure 3.** Isotope values as a function of wealth. Circles denote humans, and triangles denote dogs. Gray shading reflects 95% intervals of simulated predictions from the posterior samples. Model predictions assume female individuals of ages at 25% of maximum lifespan for the respective species.
Prediction 4: Interactions of age and household wealth

Model 3 reveals diverse effects of the interaction of age and wealth for humans and dogs, which we display in Figure 4. For human $\delta^{13}$C, the main effect of wealth ($\beta = 0.49$) continues to suggest that wealthier households consume more foods that increase $\delta^{13}$C values, and the weak interaction term ($\beta = 0.11$) suggests that this effect is not moderated by age. For $\delta^{15}$N, by contrast, the informative interaction term ($\beta = 0.78$) suggests that the benefits of wealth are largely consolidated among the older individuals from wealthier households.

The $\delta^{13}$C of dogs reveal a divergent pattern, as dogs from poorer households are predicted to have a higher $\delta^{13}$C value as they age than their counterparts in wealthier households ($\beta = -3.14$). The $\delta^{15}$N of dogs from wealthy households, by contrast, tend to mirror the increase seen among wealthier humans, but there is little overall evidence to conclude that wealth moderates the dogs’ $\delta^{15}$N isotope values across the lifespan ($\beta = 0.48$).

Figure 4. Isotope values as a function of age, moderated by household wealth. Gray shading reflects 95% intervals of simulated predictions from the posterior samples. Predictions are calculated for households.
with respective wealth values of 3.05 and 5.6 on the logarithmic scale. Model predictions further assume female individuals.

7. Discussion

Because the overall values for humans and dogs are broadly comparable, our results suggest that the Canine Surrogacy Approach (CSA) functions at our sites on a community level. There are evident limitations to CSA applications, though, as the human-dog correlations do not hold at the household level, suggesting that dog diets do not necessarily reflect the diets of their owners. These results therefore suggest that CSA may be suitable for community-level dietary averages, but there are limitations to dogs' usefulness as straightforward isotope proxies for the human residents of their households.

Predictors of isotopic variation

At these sites, $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta^{15}$N vary as a function of wealth, as wealthier households exhibit greater consumption of C4 and animal products than poorer households (Figure 2). This result therefore echoes a large body of archaeological research showing that wealthier households parlay their wealth into high-status, nutritious diets (e.g., Somerville et al. 2013, Stantis et al. 2015, Waterman et al. 2016). Because wealthy households keep more domestic animals and purchase more harvested meat, their higher $\delta^{15}$N values are unsurprising. Given the relative unimportance of maize as a staple crop, however, the source of the association between wealth and $\delta^{13}$C is less clear. One possibility is that pigs and fowl are routinely provisioned with maize, resulting in $\delta^{13}$C values in the meat that is disproportionately consumed by wealthy households. Another possibility is that wealthier households consume more processed foods, which may contain corn oil and corn syrups derived from C4 plants corresponding to higher $\delta^{13}$C values (Jahren et al. 2006). Although the primary source of the $\delta^{13}$C is not clear, it is evident that dogs in wealthy households do not partake in the consumption of these foods. To a lesser extent, this generalization may be true for $\delta^{15}$N values as well. However, $\delta^{13}$C enrichment in some dogs, especially older, poorer dogs, may be related to scavenging livestock feces, particularly that of pigs provisioned with maize. Local residents also report that hungry dogs are more likely to consume the feces of calves that are not yet weaned, and thus on a rich milk-based diet. In archaeological contexts where dogs had access to livestock or wild animal feces, their isotope values may partly reflect the consumption of these feces.

Our control model (Model 1) revealed the main effects of age, suggesting that older humans exhibit higher $\delta^{13}$C and $\delta^{15}$N values. As noted, our exploratory plots of the data led us to identify an evident interaction between age and wealth, as in Model 3. When predicting $\delta^{13}$C, however, the interaction term was uninformative. That is, although these two variables independently exhibit positive effects on human $\delta^{13}$C in Model 2, there is little statistical support for a moderating effect in Model 3. When predicting human $\delta^{15}$N, by contrast, Model 3 reveals an interaction between wealth and age, as the predicted values are highest for elderly individuals from wealthy households. We emphasize again that we had no a priori hypotheses about these effects, but we draw on our ethnographic insight to offer a possible explanation for the age-related effects. That is, our research on food sharing in this setting has revealed the importance of meat sharing among parents and offspring (Koster 2011). When a successful hunter returns with harvested game, for instance, he almost invariably delivers a portion to his parents. Although it is not immediately clear how this normative altruism toward elders could result in elevated

---

3 Notably, the household that exhibits the highest $\delta^{13}$C value is one that maintains a small store from which they sell processed foods that have been imported into the reserve. Members of this household can routinely be observed consuming these products in between meals.
$\delta^{15}$N among older individuals in wealthier households, we tentatively speculate that elders in such households may feel less onus to share meat with other family members.

For dogs, Model 3 reveals contrasting effects, namely that older dogs from poorer households have the highest predicted $\delta^{13}$C values. However, there is evidently little interaction between age and wealth for dogs’ $\delta^{15}$N values. Previously, researchers have noted consistently lower $\delta^{15}$N values in dog diets as compared to local humans at archaeological sites (Cannon et al. 1999, Hogue 2003, Kusaka et al. 2008, Katzenberg 2006, Katzenberg et al. 2010). Several observations have been made in an attempt to explain this difference, including trophic level shifts as a result of human consumption of dog meat (Richards et al. 2009), coprophagy by dogs (Cannon et al. 2009, Allitt et al. 2008), and differences in human and dog metabolisms and tissue isotope incorporation (Clutton-Brock and Noe-Nygaard 1990, Jay and Richards 2006). At our sites, average $\delta^{15}$N values between humans and dogs show little difference. Humans also do not consume dogs, nor do dogs consume human feces. We can offer few comments on metabolic variation among dogs and humans in this study, but we highlight the age-related variation and interactions with wealth in case future research addresses analogous effects in other settings. For similar reasons, we note that sex evidently has minimal effects on dietary variation, whether for the humans or the dogs in this sample, though sex-based dietary variation may be relevant for CSA applications at other sites (Cheung et al. 2017, Dong et al. 2017).

**Additions to the Guiry CSA Framework**

In addition to the factors already documented in Guiry’s (2012) framework, we include here a number of additional factors, including sampling strategies, that potentially affect applications of the Canine Surrogacy Approach, particularly in archaeological contexts.

**Special foods**

In Arang Dak the average household consumes maize approximately 22 days a year (Koster 2007). $\text{C}_4$ plant foods like maize are typically associated with $\delta^{13}$C values greater than $-19\%$ (O’Leary 1988, Schwartz and Schoeninger 1991, Schoeninger and Moore 1992, Schurr 1992), yet Tankersley and Koster (2009) previously noted that neither human or dog hair samples in a test household with known maize consumption produced values greater than $-19\%$. Furthermore, only 6% of dog hair samples from across the entire village produced a signature of maize consumption. Tankersley and Koster (2009) suggest significantly greater amounts of maize need be consumed to produce $\delta^{13}$C values greater than $-19\%$. While CSA may detect maize and other $\text{C}_4$ plant consumption in significant quantities (e.g., Barton et al. 2009), there seems to be an increased possibility for false negatives given low-level consumption.

Additionally, there may be differential consumption by dogs of certain food products, including maize, if these products are seen as limited, high or low status, or forbidden. For example, dogs may be fed food items not consumed by humans, such as the meat of tabooed species (Sponsel 1981:192, Descola 1996:233). Koster (2007) previously noted that all the villagers at Arang Dak and Suma Pipi consider certain animals, such as giant anteaters, sloths, tayras, and all species of rats, bats, and skunks, to be inedible. Other animals, such as howler monkeys, coatis, and pumas, are variably consumed across individuals and households. Tabooed species are sometimes accidentally killed by hunters, mauled and killed by dogs, or killed by hunters to protect dogs. If one of these animals is killed during a hunt, dogs are occasionally able to consume it, further complicating a proposed analogous relationship between human and dog diets at our sites.

The regular consumption of bone by scavenging dogs may also affect the level at which dogs can be used as human dietary proxies. For example, higher carbon values in older, poorer dogs at our sites may be the result of several factors, including the more frequent consumption of bone, which is up to 2.5 (fish) to 4% (mammal) higher in $\delta^{13}$C than muscle (Schoeninger and Deniro 1984, Misarti et al. 2009).
Future ethnoarchaeological applications of CSA should focus on whether bone consumption in dogs varies by age and household wealth and whether bone-scavenging dogs have increased carbon values as compared to dogs that do not scavenge bones at the same site.

**Types of sample**

No human or dog at Arang Dak or Suma Pipi had δ¹³C values greater than -19‰, despite direct maize consumption, the consumption of maize-provisioned livestock, and the consumption of processed foods with corn-based products. Even in a previous bone collagen analysis from the sites (Tankersley and Koster 2009), only 5 of 12 dogs analyzed showed evidence of maize in their diet. Given this, we would suggest that the use of hair for stable isotope analysis does not appear to be a good indicator for the identification of low-level maize consumption. Bone collagen appears to give moderately better, but still weak results.

**Sample size**

The archaeological record represents only a limited portion of a living population. Sampling further reduces the total population analyzed and CSA applications have routinely used fairly low dog samples sizes (Guiry 2012). Small sample sizes of dog bones used for CSA may inadvertently lead to sampling only dogs at extreme ends of dietary variation or dogs with specialized diets. For example, the sampling of village-buried dogs may reflect the diets of pet dogs instead of hunting dogs, which often die and are buried in the forest. At our sites, a small sample size may inadvertently capture the diet of dogs from only one household, overlooking the actual range of household-level dietary variation among both dogs and humans. In previous isotope analyses from our sites (Tankersley and Koster 2009), inter-individual variation in 34 dog hair samples was up to 5.9‰ for δ¹³C and 2.9‰ for δ¹⁵N. For the 57 dog hair samples from this study, the range of variation in δ¹³C is 4.5‰ and 2.6‰ for δ¹⁵N. These values represent a wide range of dietary variation within the dogs alone and similar ranges of variation may not be captured given smaller sample sizes, such as those often employed in archaeological applications of CSA. We agree with Guiry (2012: 359) that some issues regarding CSA applications may be remedied by including larger dog sample sizes, though we acknowledge that limited sample availability is often unavoidable given the nature of archaeological remains.

**Multilevel Modeling Analysis of Isotope Data**

This paper demonstrates advantages of the multilevel modeling approach to isotope data. For instance, although our primary interest lies in household-level effects (e.g., wealth) and correlations, the multilevel modeling approach allows us to model outcomes at the primary unit of analysis: individual hair samples. This approach allows us to incorporate appropriate individual-level predictors, such as age and sex, and the approach also circumvents the statistical problems that sometimes ensue from relying on averages and aggregations (Pollet et al. 2014). We recognize that the limited sample sizes that characterize archaeological studies may necessitate statistical compromises, but we advocate increased use of multilevel modeling for research on stable isotopes.

Possible extensions of our approach include adding complementary isotope data, such as sulfur, oxygen, and strontium isotopes, among others (e.g., Somerville and Froehle 2011). Correlations across these responses could then be calculated at all levels of the data hierarchy, much like we have calculated household-level correlations for people and dogs as well as individual-level correlations. As seen in the supplemental materials, multivariate response models are relatively straightforward to fit using brms and comparable software packages.

We have used “random coefficient” models to distinguish household-level effects of people and dogs. This approach could be extended to nearly any categorical distinction between members of a
higher-level grouping. For example, if there were substantive interests in the diets of males and females at a large number of archaeological sites (e.g., Reitsema and Vercellotti 2012, Pearson et al. 2013) our base model could be adapted to examine site-level variation in gender-related differences.

8. Conclusions

Our study shows that dog diets from two neighboring horticulturalist communities in Nicaragua reflect the general diet of humans at the sites, but do not necessarily correlate with the diets of their owners. This suggests that archaeological applications of CSA may work on the site level via averaging of human and dog diets, but may not hold on a household or intra-household level (e.g., Ames et al. 2015). In particular, our results suggest that while CSA may provide some generalized proxy of human diets at a site, it potentially misses more nuanced variation, such as those related to social stratification. For example, at our sites human diets vary positively with wealth in ways that dogs’ diets do not, suggesting that CSA may not capture dietary indicators of wealth inequality in the human population. These results indicate that CSA can allow some general conclusions about human dietary practices, but should be used with caution due to a variety of factors primarily associated with the varied treatment of dogs across cultural contexts.

Potential issues with CSA may be largely related to individual-level versus population-wide approaches. Our study included the sampling of a total population of dogs, allowing for the full range of dietary variation. Limited sampling in an archaeological context cannot necessarily control for the possibility of sampling dogs on extreme ranges of this dietary spectrum. How many samples are enough to account for this variability, an ongoing dilemma in archaeology, is unclear. A previous isotope study of populations from these same sites (Tankersley and Koster 2009) suggested humans and dogs in the same household had the same diet, based on a sample size of five humans and one dog. It is now clear that this preliminary result does not hold given an analysis of the broader population, highlighting potential spurious inferences made from small CSA sample sizes. Paradoxically, the only way to confirm whether a valid surrogacy effect is being identified is to analyze the human isotopes as well, largely negating the advantages of CSA methods.

A contribution of this study is that CSA does not apply in all socio-ecological contexts, and archaeologists need to be cautious when considering dogs as proxies. As has been noted previously (e.g., Bocherens et al. 2000, Eriksson and Zagorska 2003, Eriksson 2004, Guiry 2012, Guiry and Grimes 2013), it is questionable whether CSA can work consistently given the varied treatment of dogs in different settings. In some archaeological contexts, dogs were revered and treated as family; in others they were considered pests or butchered and eaten (Morey 2010, Perri 2014, Perri 2017). As an example of these considerations, although CSA works in a broad sense for our Nicaraguan study sites, on a more precise scale the diets of dogs do not closely reflect the diets of their owners.

Ultimately, the use of CSA is dependent on a firm understanding of the cultural context, the resolution of the dietary proxy that one is trying to obtain, and the use of additional lines of evidence (e.g., faunal remains, macrobotanicals, residue analysis). With enough samples, dog diets are evidently likely to reflect the general diet of humans at a site, but it is unclear what the approach can contribute beyond the dietary information provided by zooarchaeological and archaeobotanical analyses. The approach appears most useful in the identification of C₄ plant consumption, such as maize and millet, in the absence of other evidence, but seemingly only at substantial levels of consumption. There is also a need for agreement about the threshold at which dog dietary isotope values are considered close enough to human values to be viable proxies. Many CSA analyses show dog values within 2-3‰ of human values in both δ₁⁵N and δ¹³C (Guiry 2012), which raises questions about the usefulness of dogs as proxies because such differences can be substantial enough to reflect separate trophic levels (Bocherens and Drucker 2003, Hedges and Reynard 2007). Additional applications of the CSA model to other
ethnographic studies, particularly across a range of cultures and environments, will continue to clarify the ways in which CSA may or may not be useful in archaeological contexts.
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Supplemental Figure 1. A Mayangna hunter cuts the footpad from a paca to give to the dog as a food reward for locating the animal.
Supplemental Figure 2. Bi-plots for the 29 households that have at least one dog.

Supplemental Table 1. Raw data for the sampled individuals (humans and dogs; id.code), their associated households (house_code), C/N isotopic values, age, sex, and wealth (log_wealth).