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Supplementary information 2 – data sources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Grouping Level</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Elephant</strong>&lt;br&gt;Loxodonta africana</td>
<td>Amboseli</td>
<td>Sub-population (1) 312&lt;br&gt;Clan (5) 62.4&lt;br&gt;Bond Group (3) 23&lt;br&gt;Family (32) 9.75&lt;br&gt;M-O Unit (3) 3.33</td>
<td>Moss (1981); Moss &amp; Poole (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gelada</strong>&lt;br&gt;Theropithecus gelada</td>
<td>Bole</td>
<td>Community (1) 181&lt;br&gt;Band (3) 60.3&lt;br&gt;Team (3) 27.0&lt;br&gt;OMU (10) 17.1&lt;br&gt;Clique (1) 5.1</td>
<td>Dunbar &amp; Dunbar (1975); Dunbar unpubl. Kawai et al. (1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gich</td>
<td>(1) 278&lt;br&gt;139.0&lt;br&gt;(25) 10.1</td>
<td>Dunbar (1984); Dunbar unpubl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sankaber</td>
<td>(1) 577&lt;br&gt;139.8&lt;br&gt;(46) 13.5</td>
<td>Mori et al. (1999)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arsi</td>
<td>(1) 58&lt;br&gt;13.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>345.3&lt;br&gt;99.3&lt;br&gt;27.9&lt;br&gt;12.2&lt;br&gt;5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hamadryas</strong>&lt;br&gt;Papio hamadryas hamadryas</td>
<td>Eritrea</td>
<td>Troop (2) 255&lt;br&gt;Band (6) 139.2&lt;br&gt;Clan (92) 7.7</td>
<td>Zinner et al. (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>(3) 73&lt;br&gt;(32) 39.6&lt;br&gt;(5) 59.4</td>
<td>Kummer (1968)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td></td>
<td>Biquand et al. (1992)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awash 1968</td>
<td></td>
<td>Nagel (1973)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Awash 1975</td>
<td>(1) 63&lt;br&gt;(2) 29.0&lt;br&gt;(8) 7.3</td>
<td>Sugawara (1979)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Filoha</td>
<td>(1) 165&lt;br&gt;(24) 4.9</td>
<td>Swedell (2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ErerGota 1971</td>
<td>(1) 232&lt;br&gt;(3) 77.3&lt;br&gt;(3) 20.0&lt;br&gt;(7) 8.6</td>
<td>Sigg et al. (1982); Abbeglen (1977)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ErerGota 1977</td>
<td>(1) 69&lt;br&gt;(3) 23.0&lt;br&gt;(10) 6.8</td>
<td>Sigg et al. (1982)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Captive</td>
<td></td>
<td>Kudo &amp; Dunbar (2001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>243.5&lt;br&gt;85.7&lt;br&gt;24.0&lt;br&gt;7.0&lt;br&gt;2.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Orca</strong>&lt;br&gt;Orcinus orca</td>
<td>British Colombia</td>
<td>Community (1) 216&lt;br&gt;Clan (4) 74.8&lt;br&gt;Pod (13) 19.8&lt;br&gt;Matriline (53) 5.62</td>
<td>Ford et al. (2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Data set of mean group sizes at each grouping level for elephants, gelada, hamadryas and orca. Numbers in parentheses indicate samples sizes at each grouping level (OMU: one-male unit). * Data reported in Kudo & Dunbar (2001) scaled to OMU size of wild populations and to include immature animals.


