



The gibbon's Achilles tendon revisited: consequences for the evolution of the great apes?

Peter Aerts, Kristiaan d'Août, Susannah Thorpe, Gilles Berillon, Evie Vereecke

► To cite this version:

Peter Aerts, Kristiaan d'Août, Susannah Thorpe, Gilles Berillon, Evie Vereecke. The gibbon's Achilles tendon revisited: consequences for the evolution of the great apes?. Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences, 2018, 285 (1880), pp.20180859. 10.1098/rspb.2018.0859 . mnhn-03932797

HAL Id: mnhn-03932797

<https://mnhn.hal.science/mnhn-03932797>

Submitted on 10 Jan 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

The gibbon's Achilles tendon revisited: consequences for the evolution of the great apes?

Peter Aerts ^{1,2}, Kristiaan D'Août ^{3,1}, Susannah Thorpe ⁴, Gilles Berillon ⁵ and Evie Vereecke ⁶

¹: Department Biology, University of Antwerp (BE)

²: Department of Movement and Sports Sciences, University of Ghent (BE)

³: Department of Musculoskeletal Biology, University of Liverpool (UK)

⁴: School of Biosciences, University of Birmingham (UK)

⁵: Department of Prehistory, MNHN, CNRS (FR)

⁶: Department of Development and Regeneration, University of Leuven (BE)

Corresponding Author:

Peter Aerts

FunMorph-lab

Department of Biology

University of Antwerp (CDE)

Universiteitsplein 1

B2610 Wilrijk

Belgium

peter.aerts@uantwerpen.be

Abstract

The well-developed Achilles tendon in humans is generally interpreted as an adaptation for mechanical energy storage and reuse during cyclic locomotion. All other extant great apes have a short tendon and long-fibered triceps surae, which is thought to be beneficial for locomotion in a complex arboreal habitat as this morphology enables - a large range of motion. Surprisingly, highly arboreal gibbons show a more human-like triceps surae with a long Achilles tendon. Evidence for a spring-like function similar to humans is not conclusive.

We revisit and integrate our anatomical and biomechanical data to calculate the energy that can be recovered from the recoiling Achilles tendon during ankle plantar flexion in bipedal gibbons. Only 7.5% of the required external positive work in a stride can come from tendon recoil, yet it is delivered at an instant when the whole body energy level drops. Consequently, an additional similar amount of mechanical energy must simultaneously dissipate elsewhere in the system. Altogether, this challenges the concept of an energy-saving function in the gibbon's Achilles tendon.

Cercopithecids, sister group of the apes, also have a human-like triceps surae. Therefore, a well-developed Achilles tendon, present in the last common 'Cercopithecoidea-Hominoidea' ancestor, seems plausible. If so, the gibbon's anatomy represent an evolutionary relict ('no harm – no benefit'), and the large Achilles tendon is not the premised key-adaptation in humans (although the spring-like function may have further improved during evolution). Moreover, the triceps surae anatomy of extant non-human great apes must be a convergence, related to muscle control and range of motion. This perspective accords with the suggestions put forward in literature that the last common hominoid ancestor was not necessarily great-ape-like but might have been more similar to the small-bodied catarrhines.

State of the art

When looking at the gross morphology of the triceps surae in the extant great apes¹, the difference between humans and the other species is conspicuous (Fig1). In humans, the bellies of the gastrocnemius muscle are short-fibered and pennate, and insert together with the soleus via a well-developed Achilles tendon onto the calcaneus (e.g. Frey, 1913; Swindler and Wood, 1973; Standring, 2016). In contrast, in non-human great apes, an Achilles tendon is externally barely visible and the bellies of the gastrocnemius muscle are extended with a more parallel orientation of the long muscle fibres (e.g. Frey, 1913; Hanna and Schmitt, 2011; Swindler and Wood, 1973; Thorpe et al, 1999; Vereecke et al., 2005a; Myatt et al, 2011). These contrasting morphologies correlate with differences in locomotor repertoire: while the orangutans, gorillas, chimpanzee and bonobo share a wide range of, often arboreal, locomotor behaviours such as orthograde (upright trunked) suspension and clambering, quadrupedalism, vertical climbing and hand-assisted bipedalism (see Thorpe and Crompton, 2006 and Hunt, 2016 for reviews), modern humans are primarily terrestrial habitual bipeds.

The well-developed human's Achilles tendon is considered to be an adaptation for energy-efficient cyclic locomotion and is assumed to have originated at some point after 3 million years (Myr) ago in the genus *Homo* (Bramble and Lieberman, 2004). The tendon is stretched and loaded with strain energy during initial dorsiflexion (decreasing ankle angle) of the stance phase and recoils during the plantar flexion (increasing ankle angle) later in stance to power the foot push-off. As such, the Achilles tendon is a component of the spring element in the SLIP-mechanism (Spring Loaded Inverted Pendulum; Full and Koditschek, 1999; Geyer et al., 2006) that is optimally functioning during running: the kinetic and potential energy that must be extracted from the system at the whole body level early in stance (the so-called negative external work) is converted - at least partly - to strain energy in the spring element and this is recycled to power part of the subsequent push off (e.g. Alexander, 2003; Bertram, 2016). In humans, at a running speed of 4.5 ms⁻¹ 35% of the required external positive work per stride can thus be recovered from the recoil of the Achilles tendon (e.g. Alexander, 1991, 2003).

The morphology of the non-human great apes, on the other hand, is generally considered to represent the ancestral state (Bramble and Lieberman, 2004), being beneficial when moving about in an arboreal environment. Movement patterns are less cyclic and less uniform and the long-fibered muscles facilitate muscular control over a large range of motion, which is essential to deal efficiently with the high 3-dimensional complexity of the habitat and to respond to the compliance of the substrate (Myatt et al., 2011; Preuschoft et al., 1992; Thorpe et al., 1999).

Remarkably, given their phylogenetic position and their largely arboreal lifestyle, the gibbon's triceps surae has a more human-like appearance (Fig1). There is a long and well-developed Achilles tendon, firmly attaching onto the heel bone, and the muscle bellies of the gastrocnemius are short-fibered and pennate (Frey, 1913; Vereecke et al., 2005a). Questioning the adaptive meaning of this morphology in the primarily brachiating lesser apes seems essential to understand the evolution of locomotor diversity in the apes.

Because of the high resemblance between the gibbon and human Achilles tendon, it is tempting to search for an explanation for gibbons that follows a similar line of thought to that assumed for the human Achilles tendon. When on the ground to cross gaps between trees, too large to cross arboreally, or when moving on large tree branches, gibbons most often use a bipedal gait (Vereecke et al., 2006a; Baldwin and Teleki, 1976; Fleagle, 1976; Gittins, 1983; Sati and Alfred, 2002). Despite

¹ Here, orangutans, gorillas, chimpanzees, bonobos *and* humans are considered the extant great apes (i.e. extant Hominidae).

the presence of a double support phase (i.e. both feet on the ground simultaneously; there is no aerial phase in the bipedal cycle), this gait must be classified as ‘grounded running’ (cf. Vereecke et al., 2006b,c) as is also found for terrestrial locomotion in birds (e.g. Andrada et al., 2013, 2015): at the whole body level, kinetic and potential energy fluctuations accord to the dynamics of running (i.e. in-phase decrease and subsequent increase of kinetic and potential energy in each single step; Vereecke et al., 2006b, Vereecke & Aerts, 2008). As such, the SLIP-mechanism might be functional. Moreover, the safety factor of the Achilles tendon (i.e. tendon strength over tendon loading) appears, together with that of the patella tendon, to be the lowest of all the hind limb muscles in the gibbon (Vereecke et al., 2005a; Channon et al., 2009; Vereecke and Channon, 2013). A low (but safe) safety factor is required for functionally significant energy storage and recoil. Furthermore, the ratio of the tendon length over the effective muscle fascicle length (i.e. accounting for pennation angle) is rather high for the triceps surae (Vereecke et al., 2005a; Channon et al., 2009; Vereecke & Channon, 2013). Such muscle-tendon morphology can be expected if the tendon needs to do the work. One may also look at this from a slightly different perspective. Channon et al. (2009) presented the relationship between the physiological cross-sectional area (PCSA; measure for potential maximal load) of the limb muscles and their fascicle length (measure for the potential shortening), thus representing a sort of concentric work space, as it expresses the potential maximal load against potential shortening. Muscle-tendon-complexes that are part of the spring-element of the SLIP-mechanism should combine a high PCSA or force output with short fibres, enabling the tendon to do most of the concentric work. Surprisingly, all plantar flexors occupy a rather ‘unspecialized’ region in the concentric work space where small PCSA and short fibres are combined (see Channon et al., 2009). In this respect, gibbons appear to be no different from the non-human great apes.

The role of the tendon revisited

The evidence provided above for the gibbon’s Achilles tendon working as energy-saving device during ‘grounded’ running is indirect. Moreover, its identification as ‘unspecialized’ in the muscle-tendon workspace could be interpreted as a counter-indication for this role and former analyses (Vereecke et al., 2006b; Vereecke and Aerts, 2008) were also unable to categorically demonstrate an energy-saving role during grounded running. Here we take a novel approach to resolve this debate. The amount of strain energy that is stored *in vivo* in the tendon of the white-handed gibbon (*Hylobates lar*) during walking steps at the onset of plantar flexion, and that can thus be recovered via recoil, is calculated and compared with the mechanical work input needed at the whole body level (the so-called positive external work) to complete a walking cycle (i.e. stride = left + right step). In order to do so, the kinematic, dynamic, material property and anatomical data collected by Vereecke et al. (2005a,b, 2006a,b,c), Vereecke and Aerts (2008), Channon et al. (2009, 2010b) and Vereecke and Channon (2013) will be combined in a new synthesis. (A short synopsis of the Materials and Methods of these papers is included as supplementary material).

When the Centre Of Pressure [COP; instantaneous position of the point of application of the resultant Ground Reaction Force (GRF) at the plantar surface of the foot] is known throughout the ground contact phase, the moment of the GRF with respect to the ankle joint can be determined quite accurately as a function of stance time by multiplying at any instant the GRF with the perpendicular distance from the joint centre to the GRF (Fig2A)². This moment (dashed curve) is presented together with the ankle joint kinematics (thin curve) as a function of normalized stance time in Fig2B. For the

² Inertial effects can safely be neglected in this account, given the small mass (1.2% of total body mass) and the low accelerations of the slender foot segments (cf. Vereecke et al., 2006b; Vereecke and Aerts, 2008).

larger part of stance (about 79%), the ankle joint dorsiflexes and only during the last 21% of stance, does it plantar flex again, to power the foot push-off. At the onset of plantar flexion, the (minimal) ankle joint angle reaches 103° and the *in vivo* moment of the GRF that tends to dorsiflex the joint equals 2.60 Nm (see Fig2B).

At any instant in the stride, the moment of the GRF with respect to the ankle must be balanced by the muscle-tendon-systems that cross the joint. It is therefore possible to estimate the *in vivo* tensile force acting along the Achilles tendon at the onset of ankle plantar flexion, provided that the moment arm of the Achilles tendon (i.e. perpendicular distance from the joint centre to the tendon; Fig2A) at the coinciding joint angle (103°) is known^{3,4}. Muscle moment arms were accurately determined by Channon et al. (2010b). For an ankle joint of 103° , the moment arm of the Achilles tendon in *Hylobates lar* recalculates to 1.48 cm. Consequently, the *in vivo* tensile force along the tendon at the onset of ankle plantar flexion equals 175.67 N [i.e. $2.60 \text{ Nm} / (1.48 \text{ cm } 10^{-2})$].

Cyclic tensile load-deformation tests on the Achilles tendon were carried out by Vereecke and Channon (2013). The tendon's behaviour conforms to that of the text book examples (e.g. Alexander, 2003): apart from a toe-region at low loads, the load-deformation relationship is rather linear at higher loading; at recoil, a hysteresis of on average 13.5% (mean $\pm$ SD = 3.4%; n=14) is observed (i.e. difference between loading and unloading energy). The slope of the linear loading part gives the stiffness, which is on average 99.6 Nmm^{-1} (mean $\pm$ SD = 42.7 Nmm^{-1} ; n=14). Since the tensile force divided by the stiffness equals the extension of the tendon, the *in vivo* stretch of the Achilles tendon at the onset of the ankle plantar flexion amounts to 1.76 mm (i.e. $175.67 \text{ N} / 99.6 \text{ Nmm}^{-1}$).

Finally, the amount of strain energy that is stored in the Achilles tendon at the onset of ankle plantar flexion (and which is available to power the plantar flexion) is represented by the area under the load-deformation curve. Because of the largely linear behaviour when loaded, this area is given by $(175.67 \text{ N} \times 1.76 \text{ mm } 10^{-3}) / 2$ which equals 0.15 J.

At the whole-body level, the positive work needed to complete a stride amounts on average to 3.56 J (Vereecke et al., 2006b)⁵. Taking the 13.5% hysteresis into account, 0.26 J [i.e. $(0.15 \text{ J left} + 0.15 \text{ J right}) \times (1 - 0.135)$] of this can theoretically be recovered from the recoiling left and right Achilles tendons during the push-off of the feet. This amounts to merely 7.5% of the required external positive work per stride. This amount can directly be compared with the 35% mentioned above for humans (but see also⁶). **More importantly, however, the plantar flexion seems to come at the wrong instant. To be**

³ In this approach is assumed that the balancing activity is taken entirely by the triceps surae, hence solely acting along the Achilles tendon. As such, the estimate for the tensile force along the tendon at the onset of ankle plantar flexion represents a maximal estimate, as co-contraction of the digital flexors would result in a reduction of the Achilles tendon stress.

⁴ It should be noted that co-contraction of the dorsiflexors (which could lead to higher tensile stress in the Achilles tendon) at that instant in stance is highly unlikely.

⁵ This must be considered as a minimal estimated for the required positive work input, as this concerns the external work only (i.e. whole body level; movements of the Body Centre Of Mass or BCOM). Swinging the limbs with respect to the BCOM can represent a considerable extra cost (see for instance Marsh et al., 2004).

⁶ Similar approaches on human running (4.5 ms^{-1}) show 35% of the external positive work (mechanical energy) comes from elastic recoil of the Achilles tendon during the second half of the ground contact phase (Ker et al., 1987, Alexander, 1991, 2003) in each cycle; i.e. energy that is stored during the first half of stance. This is probably even a conservative estimate. Lai et al. (2014) show that at comparable running speeds energy recovery from the triceps surae tendon can amount up to more than 50J per step (which is about 140% of what was determined from the former ex-vivo experiments; see Lai et al., 2014 and references there in). Clearly, the eccentric-concentric work of the triceps surae during running steps will still require metabolic energy, even when the entire strain cycle of the muscle tendon unit (MTU) is taken by the tendon. Cross bridge cycling is needed to prevent extension of the muscle belly and enable loading of the tendon (e.g. Fletcher and

effective, tendon recoil should happen when the mechanical whole body energy level increases (i.e. mechanical energy is added to the system). However, most often (step-to-step variability is observed) plantar flexion just occurs when, at the whole body level, mechanical energy must be extracted from the system (i.e. negative work must be performed). Consequently, Achilles tendon recoil during plantar flexion (which means that mechanical energy is added to the system) could eventually come at the extra cost for energy dissipation by eccentric muscle contraction⁷.

If not for energy storage and recoil during grounded running locomotion, what could the explanation of the well-developed Achilles tendon in gibbons be? Clearly, other, even rare behaviours may entail selective pressure and morphological adaptation. Gibbons also engage, for instance, in bipedal and tripedal gallops and sort of half bound (crutching gallop) (cf. Vereecke et al., 2006a) and show excellent leaping performance. The potential use of tendon recoil for energy recovery (while galloping) or power amplification (for leaping) cannot be excluded, but biomechanical results presented by Channon et al. (2010a, 2011a,b) neither support this for leaping.

Here, we propose an alternative perspective. Available information from the literature and our own observations suggest that the Achilles tendon is also well-developed and firmly attaching to the heel bone in extant Cercopithecoidea (e.g. Frey, 1913; Swindler and Wood, 1973; own dissections on *Theropithecus gelada* (gelada baboon), *Papio anubis* (olive baboon), *Macaca maura* (Moor macaque), *Macaca mulatta* (rhesus monkey), *Semnopithecus entellus* (Hanuman langur), *Colobus guereza kikuyensis* (mantled guereza), *Colobus spec.*, *Trachypithecus francoisi* (François' leave monkey); see supplementary material and Fig1). It seems therefore conceivable to assume that this morphological character was also present in the basal ancestor of this superfamily, hence also in the basal representative of the sister taxon, the Hominoidea (Fig1). Is it plausible that the Achilles tendon is retained as a relict in the branch leading to the Hylobatidae (Fig1)?

If selection acted predominantly on the principal locomotor mode in gibbons, i.e. on brachiation (e.g. Bertram 2004; Bertram & Chang, 2001; Bertram et al., 1999; Chang et al., 1997, 2000; Fleagle, 1976; Michilsens et al., 2011, 2012; Preuschoft & Demes, 1984; Usherwood & Bertram, 2003; Usherwood et al., 2003), adaptations can be expected at the level of the forelimbs in the first place. During brachiation, hindlimb movements are potentially useful to modulate whole body rotational inertia and to avoid hitting lower lying branches, a role which, most likely, did not imply important adaptive modifications of the lower hind limb muscles. As such, it can be hypothesized that the triceps surae, with its long tendon, was not under selective pressure (no harm, no benefit) and could keep its ancestral appearance during hylobatid evolution.

Consequence for the evolution of the great apes

If the above hypothesis is supported, then the short-fibred gastrocnemius muscle with a long Achilles tendon should also be ancestral for the Hominidae. Given that this also represents the extant human morphology, it seems most parsimonious that this ancestral morphology was retained rather than re-

MacIntosh, 2015). For this purpose, short-fibred (pinnate) bellies are the best option: these can deliver the required force at a minimal metabolic cost. At the MTU-level, in humans, up to 75% of the positive work output comes from the tendon (e.g. Hof et al., 2002; Lai et al., 2014). Given an efficiency of 0.2 – 0.25 for concentric work in muscle (e.g. Woledge et al., 1985; Alexander, 2003), similar MTU stress-strain cycles for 'long-fibred – short tendon' triceps surae muscle would become very expensive.

⁷ It should be noted that this conclusion refers to the role of the Achilles tendon during plantar flexion of the foot only. It may well be that other muscle-tendon systems (for instance the digital flexors or the knee extensors) do act as functional energy-saving mechanisms.

acquired in the evolutionary lineage leading to the habitually bipedal, terrestrial modern humans. This lends weight to Thorpe et al.'s (2007) conclusion that human bipedalism is less an innovation than an exploitation of a locomotor behaviour retained from the common great ape ancestor. To be effective, the recoiling Achilles tendon should work against a stiff lever as it is functionally present during the push-off phase in the modern human foot. Considerable evidence exists that early hominins had more mobile feet and therefore most probably a less complete toe-off function compared to modern humans (e.g. Lieberman, 2012). Thus, although the performance of the Achilles tendon as energy-saving device might well have been further improved during human evolution, considering the emergence of the human Achilles tendon as a key adaptation for economical cyclic bipedal locomotion, is probably no longer appropriate.

This also implies that the 'long-fibered – short tendon' appearance of the triceps surae in the orangutan, the gorilla, the chimpanzee and the bonobo does not represent the retained ancestral state as it is generally considered (cf. above). Rather, it might represent further convergent evolution from an above-branch quadrupedal ancestor (cf. Almécija et al, 2009; Alba et al., 2015) with short-fibred gastrocnemius muscles and a long Achilles tendon, towards the long-fibered muscles facilitating the muscular control and large range of motion that is beneficial for the arboreal lifestyles of each of the large-bodied extant non-human Hominidae (see for instance Myatt et al., 2011; Preuschoft et al., 1992; Thorpe et al., 1999)⁸. This view conforms to the suggestion by Alba et al. (2015) that the last common hominoid ancestor was not necessarily great-ape-like and that small-bodied catarrhines could have played a remarkable role in ape evolution. It also accords with the suggestions by Almécija et al.(2009) (based on their analysis of hominoid forelimbs) that above-branch quadrupedalism inherited from stem hominoids constituted a significant component of the locomotor repertoires of different hominoid lineages at least until the late Miocene. And finally, it also supports the suggestion by Lovejoy et al.(2009a,b) that the last common ancestor of the African apes likely had feet that functioned like those of living monkeys rather than like those of apes. Based on the present revision it seems not too farfetched to include the evolution of the Achilles tendon in their functional perspective and to extend this to all extant great apes.

Author Contribution

PA provided the new perspective, revisited and integrated the original data, participated in some of the original data collection, participated in the final discussion and drafted the manuscript; KD participated in the collection of the original data and participated in the final discussion on the manuscript; ST brought in the evolutionary insights and participated in the final discussion on the manuscript; GB provided the anatomical data on *Macaca*, *Papio* and *Colobus* and participated in the final discussion on the manuscript; EV carried out and/or supervised all the studies providing the original data and participated in the final discussion on the manuscript. All authors gave final approval for publication.

Acknowledgements

⁸ It should be noted that this alternative scenario does not necessarily imply a larger number of character-state changes (i.e. being less parsimonious) than the classical scenario in which the 'short-fibered - long tendon' triceps surae evolved independently from a 'long-fibred – short tendon' ancestral state in both the gibbons and humans. If it is agreed that the common ancestor of the cercopithecoids and hominoids shared the 'long-tendon' character state (cf. main text and see supplementary material), this feature must first have been lost, in order to re-appear then in the stem hylobatids (as these all seem to have now the well-developed tendon) and in humans independently. This implies an identical number of character-state changes as for the premised convergent appearance of the 'long-fibred – short tendon' state of the triceps surae in the non-human great apes.

We would like to thank the staff of the Animal Park Planckendael for access and support in studying the gibbons. We also want to acknowledge Timo Van Leeuwen for the art work in this manuscript. Part of the original studies were funded by the Research Foundation Flanders, and part of the dissections of cercopithecoids were funded by the International Research Network (IRN, CNRS) *Bipedal Equilibrium*. R. Lacoste (CNRS Primatology Station, Rousset, France), Dr. M. Herbin (National Museum of Natural History, Paris, France), Dr. François Druelle (University of Antwerp) and dr. Mélanie Berthet (zoo of Besançon, FR) were very helpful in collecting additional cadaver material of cercopithecoids and in assisting with the dissections.

References

- Alba, D., S. Almécija, D. DeMiguel, J. Fortuny, M. Pérez de los Ríos, M. Pina, J. Robles, S. Moyà-Solà (2015) Miocene small-bodied ape from Eurasia sheds light on hominoid evolution. *Science*. 350: DOI: 10.1126/science.aab2625.
- Almécija, S., D. Alba & S. S. Moyà-Solà (2009) Pierolapithecus and the functional morphology of Miocene ape hand phalanges: paleobiological and evolutionary implications. *Journal of Human Evolution* 57: 284–97.
- Alexander, R. McN (1991) Energy-saving mechanisms in walking and running. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 160: 55–69.
- Alexander, R. McN. (2003) *Principles of animal locomotion*. Princeton University Press.
- Andrada, E., C. Rode & R. Blickhan (2013) Grounded running in quails: Simulations indicate benefits of observed fixed aperture angle between legs before touch-down. *Journal of Theoretical Biology*. 335: 97–107.
- Andrada, E., D. Haase, Y. Sutedja, J. Nyakatura, B. Kilbourne, J. Denzler, M. Fischer & R. Blickhan (2015) Mixed gaits in small avian terrestrial locomotion. *Scientific Reports*. 5, 13636; doi: 10.1038/srep13636.
- Baldwin, L. & G. Teleki (1976) Patterns of gibbon behavior on Hall's island, Bermuda. In: *Gibbon and Siamang*, Vol. 4, (ed. D. Rumbaugh). pp. 21–105. Karger, Basel,
- Bertram, J. (2004) New Perspectives on Brachiation Mechanics. *Yearbook of Physical Anthropology* 47:100–117.
- Bertram, J. & Y-H. Chang (2001) Mechanical energy oscillations of two brachiation gaits: measurement and simulation. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 115: 319–326.
- Bertram, J., A. Ruina, C. Cannon, Y-H, Chang & M. Coleman (1999). A point-mass model of gibbon locomotion. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 202: 2609–2617.
- Bertram, J. (2016) *Understanding mammalian locomotion. Concepts and applications*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Bramble D. & D. Liebermann (2004) Endurance running and the evolution of Homo. *Nature*. 432: 345–352.
- Chang, Y-H., J. Bertram & A. Ruina (1997) A dynamic force and moment analysis system for brachiation. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 200: 3013–3020.
- Chang, Y-H., J. Bertram & D. Lee (2000) External Forces and Torques Generated by the Brachiating White-Handed Gibbon (*Hylobates lar*). *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 113:201–216

286 Channon, A., M. Günther, R. Crompton & E. Vereecke (2009) Mechanical constraints on the
 287 functional morphology of the gibbon hind limb. *Journal of Anatomy*. 215: 383–400.

288 Channon, A., R. Crompton, M. Günther, K. D’Août, E. Vereecke (2010a) The Biomechanics of Leaping
 289 in Gibbons. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 143: 403–416.

290 Channon, A., M. Günther, R. Crompton & E. Vereecke (2010b) Muscle moment arms of the gibbon
 291 hind limb: implications for hylobatid locomotion. *Journal of Anatomy*. 216: 446–462.

292 Channon A., M. Günther, R. Crompton, K. D’Août, H. Preuschoft & E. Vereecke (2011a) The effect of
 293 substrate compliance on the biomechanics of gibbon leaps. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 214:
 294 687-696.

295 Channon, A., J. Usherwood, R. Crompton, M. Günther & E. Vereecke (2011b) The extraordinary
 296 athletic performance of leaping gibbons. *Biology Letters*. doi:10.1098/rsbl.2011.0574.

297 Fleagle, J. (1976) Locomotion and posture of the Malayan siamang and implications for hominid
 298 evolution. *Folia Primatologica*. 26: 245–269.

299 Fletcher J & B. MacIntosh (2015) Achilles tendon strain energy in distance running: consider the
 300 muscle energy cost. *Journal of Applied Physiology*. 118: 193-199.

301 Frey, H. (1913) Der Musculus Triceps Surae in der Primatenreiche. *Morphologische Jahrbuch*, 47 : 1-
 302 191.

303 Full, R. & D. Koditscheck (1999) Templates and anchors: neuromechanical hypotheses of legged
 304 locomotion on land. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 202: 3325–3332.

305 Geyer, H., A. Seyfarth & R. Blickan (2006) Compliant leg behaviour explains basic dynamics of walking
 306 and running. *Proceedings of the Royal Society (London)*, B. 273: 2861-2867.

307 Gittins, S. (1983) Use of the forest canopy by the agile gibbon. *Folia Primatologica*. 40: 134–144.

308 Hannah, J. a D. Schmitt (2011) Interpreting the Role of Climbing in Primate Locomotor Evolution: Are
 309 the Biomechanics of Climbing Influenced by Habitual Substrate Use and Anatomy? *International*
 310 *Journal of Primatology*, 32 : 430-444.

311 Hof, A., J. Van Zandwijk & M. Bobbert (2002) Mechanics of human triceps surae muscle in walking,
 312 running and jumping. *Acta Physiologica Scandinavica*. 174: 17-30.

313 Hunt, K. (2016) Why are there apes? Evidence for the co-evolution of ape and monkey
 314 ecomorphology. *Journal of Anatomy*. 228: 630–685.

315 Ker, R., M. Bennett, S. Bibby, R. Kester & R.McN. Alexander (1987) The spring in the arch of the
 316 human foot. *Nature*. 325: 147-149.

317 Lai, A., A. Schache, Y. Lin & Marcus G. Pandy (2014) Tendon elastic strain energy in the human ankle
 318 plantar-flexors and its role with increased running speed. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 217: 3159-
 319 3168.

320 Lieberman, D (2012) Those feet in ancient times. *Nature*. 483: 550-551.

321 Lovejoy C., B. Latimer, G. Suwa, B. Asfaw & T. White (2009a) Combining Prehension and Propulsion:
 322 The Foot of *Ardipithecus ramidus*. *Science*. 326: 72e1-72e8.

323 Lovejoy C., G. Suwa, S. Simpson, J. Matternes & T. White (2009b) The Great Divides: *Ardipithecus*
 324 *ramidus* Reveals the Postcrania of Our Last Common Ancestors with African Apes. *Science*. 326: 100-
 325 106.

326 Michilsens, F., K. D'Août & P. Aerts (2011) How Pendulum-Like Are Siamangs? Energy Exchange
 327 During Brachiation. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 154: 581-591.

328 Michilsens, F. K. D'Août, E. Vereecke & P. Aerts (2012) One step beyond: Different step-to-step
 329 transitions exist during continuous contact brachiation in siamangs. *Open Biology*. doi:
 330 10.1242/bio.2012588

331 Marsh, R., D. Ellerby, J. Carr, H. Henry & C. Buchanan (2004) Partitioning the Energetics of Walking
 332 and Running: Swinging the Limbs Is Expensive. *Science*. 303: 80-83.

333 Myatt, J., R. Crompton & S. Thorpe (2011) Hindlimb muscle architecture in non-human great apes and
 334 a comparison of methods for analysing inter-species variation. *Journal of Anatomy*. 219: 150-166.

335 Preuschoft, H. & B. Demes (1984) Biomechanics of brachiation. In *The Lesser Apes: Evolutionary And*
 336 *Behavioral Biology* (eds.: H. Preuschoft, D. J. Chivers, W. Y. Brockelman & N. Creel). pp. 96-118.
 337 Edinburgh University Press.

338 Preuschoft H., H. Witte & B. Demes (1992) Biomechanical factors that influence overall body shape of
 339 large apes and humans. In: *Topics in Primatology, Vol. 3 Evolutionary Biology, Reproductive*
 340 *Endocrinology and Virology* (eds Matano S, Tuttle RH, Ishida H, Goodman M), pp. 259–289. University
 341 of Tokyo Press.

342 Sati, J. & J. Alfred (2002) Locomotion and posture in Hoolock gibbon. *Ann. For.* 10: 298-306.

343 Standring, S. (2016) *Gray's Anatomy: The Anatomical Basis of Clinical Practice* (ed. 41). Elsevier.

344 Swindler, D. & C. Wood (1973) *An atlas of primate gross anatomy. Baboon, chimpanzee and men.*
 345 University of Washington Press.

346 Thorpe, S. & R. Crompton (2006) Orangutan Positional Behavior and the Nature of Arboreal
 347 Locomotion in Hominoidea. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 131: 384–401.

348 Thorpe, S., Crompton, R., Günther, M., Ker, R. & Alexander, R. McN. (1999) Dimensions and Moment
 349 Arms of the Hind- and Forelimb Muscles of Common Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *American*
 350 *Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 110: 176-199.

351 Thorpe S, R. Holder & R. Crompton (2007) Origin of human bipedalism as an adaptation for
 352 locomotion on flexible branches. *Science*. 316: 1328–1331.

353 Usherwood, J. & J. Bertram (2003) Understanding brachiation: insight from a collisional perspective.
 354 *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 206: 1631-1642.

355 Usherwood, J., S. Larson & J. Bertram (2003) Mechanisms of Force and Power Production in
 356 Unsteady Ricochet Brachiation. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 120: 364–372

357 Vereecke, E. & P. Aerts (2008) The mechanics of the gibbon foot and its potential for elastic energy
 358 storage during bipedalism. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 211: 3661-3670.

359 Vereecke, E. & A. Channon (2013) The role of hind limb tendons in gibbon locomotion: springs or
 360 strings? *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 216: 3971-3980.

361 Vereecke, E., K. D'Août,, R. Payne & P. Aerts (2005a) Functional analysis of the foot and ankle
362 myology of gibbons and bonobos. *Journal of Anatomy*. 206: 453-476.

363 Vereecke, E., K. D'Août, L. Van Elsacker & P. Aerts (2005b) Functional Analysis of the Gibbon Foot
364 During Terrestrial Bipedal Walking: Plantar Pressure Distributions and Three-Dimensional Ground
365 Reaction Forces. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 128: 659-669.

366 Vereecke, E., K. D'Août, & P. Aerts (2006a) Locomotor versatility in the white-handed gibbon
367 (*Hylobates lar*): A spatiotemporal analysis of the bipedal, tripedal, and quadrupedal gaits. *Journal of*
368 *Human Evolution*. 50: 552-567.


369 Vereecke, E., K. D'Août, & P. Aerts (2006b) The dynamics of hylobatid bipedalism: evidence for an
370 energy-saving mechanism? *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 209: 2829-2838.

371 Vereecke, E., K. D'Août, & P. Aerts (2006c) Speed modulation in hylobatid bipedalism: A kinematic
372 analysis. *Journal of Human Evolution*. 51: 513-526.

373

374

375



377

378 Figure 1 : Phylogenetic tree of the Catarrhini, with dorsal views on the baboon, gibbon, chimpanzee
 379 and human lower leg showing the Achilles tendon and the gastrocnemius muscle (anatomical
 380 drawings: courtesy of Timo Van Leeuwen).

381




Figure 2 A: Schematic representation of the lower leg and foot of the white-handed gibbon (grey sticks) at the instant of initial foot contact during bipedal 'grounded' running (background: still frame of a video sequence). The ankle (talocrural) (TC), tarsometatarsal (TM) and metatarsophalangeal (MP) joints are shown. The moment arm (fMA) of the ground reaction force (GRF, green arrow) and the moment arm (mMA) of the balancing force acting along the Achilles tendon, both with respect to the ankle joint, are indicated. The triceps surae and its Achilles tendon are schematically represented in red. The fMA is the perpendicular distance from the TC to the GRF; the mMA from the TC to the line of action of the Achilles Tendon (laAT). B: Average ankle joint angle (solid curve; left vertical axis) and average joint moment of the GRF at TC (dashed curve; right vertical axis) are given as a function of normalized stance time (0% = initial foot contact; 100% = toe off) in the white-handed gibbon. The vertical blue line indicates the instant of transition from ankle dorsiflexion to ankle plantar-flexion (= extension of the ankle joint). This plantar flexion represents the foot push-off which can partially be powered by the release of strain energy stored in the Achilles tendon. At this transition, the ankle joint angle equals 103°, while the according joint moment is 2.60 Nm (for more explanation: see text). (Based on Vereecke and Aerts, 2008; see also Supplementary Material for more details in methods).

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

1) Achilles tendon anatomy of gibbons

Gibbon cadavers were obtained from animals that had died in captivity, via collaboration with different zoos and institutes in Europe. Fourteen fresh-frozen cadavers were dissected to study the properties of the Achilles tendon (see further). The sample consisted of different genera and species: *Hylobates lar* (n=6), *Hylobates moloch* (n=2), *Hylobates pileatus* (n=2) and *Symphalangus syndactylus* (n=4). A well-developed Achilles tendon was observed in each dissected specimen; only one leg per specimen was included in the analysis (unilateral sampling).

In the context of other projects, we also dissected several ape specimens (Vereecke et al. 2005a: 3 gibbons and 2 bonobos) but without full quantification of the Achilles tendon anatomy or material properties.

We always observed a well-developed Achilles tendon in the gibbon sample, amounting to on average 76% of the total muscle-tendon unit length. In contrast, we only found a short Achilles tendon in the bonobo specimens, amounting to 4-8% of the muscle-tendon unit length and without externally visible tendon. During our dissections, we also noted that both the (short) bonobo and (long) gibbon Achilles tendon invariably insert onto the tuber calcanei and is not continuous with the plantar aponeurosis.

Figure 1 : Triceps surae of a gibbon



Table 1. Measurements of the triceps surae complex in Hylobatidae.

N=14 (Vereecke & Channon 2013)	Average	Standard deviation
Triceps surae FL (mm)	31	7
Triceps surae MTU (mm)	183	21
Achilles tendon CSA (mm ²)	10	4
Achilles tendon TL (mm)	139	23
Achilles tendon ETL (mm)	74	12
TL/MTUL	0.76	

Legend: MTU, muscle-tendon unit length; CSA, cross-sectional area; TL, tendon length; ETL, external tendon length.

2) The Achilles tendon in cercopithecoids

The Achilles tendon of eight cercopithecoids, covering phylogeny and including more terrestrial as well as arboreal species, were investigated (ranked from more terrestrial to more arboreal): *Theropithecus gelada* (gelada baboon), *Papio anubis* (olive baboon), *Macaca maura* (Moor macaque), *Macaca mulatta* (rhesus monkey), *Semnopithecus entellus* (Hanuman langur), *Colobus guereza kikuyensis* (mantled guereza), *Colobus spec.*, *Trachypithecus francoisi* (François' leaf monkey).

Three *Papio anubis* and one *Macaca mulatta* cadavers were obtained from animals that died in captivity at the CNRS Primatology Station (Rousset, France) and had been preserved on site in a freezer at -18°C. One *Colobus* was obtained from an animal that died in captivity at the Museum National d'Histoire Naturelle (Paris), preserved in its collection in formaldehyde. Specimens were all adult. We dissected the specimens on site and took linear measurements of the hind limb musculature using a digital calliper (according to Vereecke & Channon, 2013). A well-developed Achilles tendon was

observed in each specimen within this cercopithecoid sample, amounting to 38% to 52% of the total muscle-tendon unit length (Table 1). In all specimens, the Achilles tendon firmly inserted on the posterior side of the tuber calcanei.

Figure 2. Triceps surae and its distal attachments in the right lower leg of (A) *Papio anubis*, (B) *Macaca mulatta* and (C) *Colobus sp.* in posterior view. Legend: LGm, Lateral gastrocnemius muscle; MGm, Medial gastrocnemius muscle; Sm, Soleus muscle; AT, Achilles tendon; PT, Plantaris tendon; TC, Tuber calcanei. Scales in cm.




Table 2. Measurements of the triceps surae complex in the baboon, the macaque and the colobus..

	<i>Papio anubis</i>			<i>Macaca mulatta</i>	<i>Colobus sp.</i>
	sp. 1	sp. 2	sp. 3	sp. 4	sp. 5
Triceps surae MTU (mm)	227	383	201	186	143
Achilles tendon TL (mm)	111	167	105	72	54
Achilles tendon ETL (mm)	84	111	75	49	45
TL/MTU	0.49	0.44	0.52	0.39	0.38

Legend: MTU, muscle-tendon unit length; TL, tendon length; ETL, external tendon length.

Visual inspection of the Achilles tendon was done for *Theropithecus gelada*, *Macaca maura*, *Semnopithecus entellus*, *Colobus guereza kikuyensis*, and *Trachypithecus francoisi*, obtained from the zoo of Besançon (FR). The skin was opened along the dorsal side of the lower leg and dorsal view photographs were taken for us by dr. Mélanie Berthet. Unfortunately linear measures were not taken on the cadavers, but a well-developed Achilles tendon, firmly attached to the heel bone, is also clearly seen in these species. Estimated from the photographs, in each specimen about 50% of the total muscle-tendon unit length is taken by the Achilles tendon.



Figure 3: A, *Gelada baboon*; B, *Moor Macaque*; C, *Hanuman langur*; D, *mantled guerza*; E, *François' leave monkey*

3) Information on the source data

Inverse Dynamics

Inverse dynamics was used to determine the ankle joint moment throughout the stance phase which, in turn, was then used to calculate the loading of the Achilles tendon. The kinematical data (high speed video recordings, 250Hz) and the dynamics data (ground reaction forces and plantar pressure distribution, 250hz) were collected for a group of *Hylobates lar* specimens at the Animal park of Planckendael (BE). The data specifically used for this study are the average profiles of 8 representative strides of one male *H. lar* (6.3 kg; see also 'Moment arms') selected on the basis of steadiness, speed, and position regarding the camera (perfect sagittal view) from a much larger data. The representativeness of this sample (intra- and inter individual) is argued in Vereecke and Aerts (2008). The ground reaction force data and the position of the centre of pressure are the averages of the profiles of 32 cycles extracted for the same individual and for the same speed range of the large data set collected for and analysed in Vereecke et al. (2005b). The full details concerning the data

used for the inverse dynamics calculations are published in Vereecke et al., 2005b and Vereecke and Aerts (2008).

Moment arms

In order to calculate the loading of the Achilles tendon throughout stance, moment arms of the ground reaction force and the balancing force from the triceps surae with respect to the ankle joint are needed. Combining the kinematical and plantar pressure data provided accurate moment arm profiles for the ground reaction force. The moment arm profile for the Achilles tendon was determined for the ankle range of motion observed during stance by means of the tendon travel method. For the full details of the procedure we refer to Channon et al. (2010). Several species were used in this study. For the present integration and re-analysis we used, however, the results for the *H. lar* individual used for the kinematical and dynamical experiments. This animal died a natural death.

Material properties

An Instron material testing machine was used to impose dynamic loading-cycles on the Achilles tendon of 14 gibbons (10 *Hylobates* spec., 4 *Symphalangus*, spec., 8 male, 6 female, age ranging from 9 to 35 years, 5 specimens were labelled only as 'adult') obtained from zoos and animal parks (n= 9) and museums (n = 5). Load-controlled sine wave-cycles at the frequency mimicking that of the loading-defomation cycles occurring during stance were used. Tendon stiffness is obtained from the slope of linear loading part of the load-deformation cycles. Given the diversity of the sample, average stiffness is used for the present study. Hysteresis is determined as the percentage difference in the area under respectively the loading and unloading parts of the load-deformation cycles. As for the stiffness, average hysteresis is used. The full details of the calculation of the material properties of the Achilles tendon are given in Vereecke & Channon (2013).

References

- Channon, A., M. Günther, R. Crompton & E. Vereecke (2010) Muscle moment arms of the gibbon hind limb: implications for hylobatid locomotion. *Journal of Anatomy*. 216: 446–462.
- Vereecke, E. & P. Aerts (2008) The mechanics of the gibbon foot and its potential for elastic energy storage during bipedalism. *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 211: 3661-3670.
- Vereecke, E. & A. Channon (2013) The role of hind limb tendons in gibbon locomotion: springs or strings? *Journal of Experimental Biology*. 216: 3971-3980.
- Vereecke, E., K. D'Août, R. Payne & P. Aerts (2005a) Functional analysis of the foot and ankle myology of gibbons and bonobos. *Journal of Anatomy*. 206: 453-476.
- Vereecke, E., K. D'Août, L. Van Elsacker & P. Aerts (2005b) Functional Analysis of the Gibbon Foot During Terrestrial Bipedal Walking: Plantar Pressure Distributions and Three-Dimensional Ground Reaction Forces. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology*. 128: 659-669.