



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

Anthropogenic landscapes? Modelling the role of hunter-gatherers in interglacial ecosystems in Europe

Nikulina, A.

Citation

Nikulina, A. (2025, November 21). *Anthropogenic landscapes?: Modelling the role of hunter-gatherers in interglacial ecosystems in Europe*. Retrieved from <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4283281>

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden](#)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4283281>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Anthropogenic Landscapes?

*Modelling the Role of Hunter-Gatherers in Interglacial
Ecosystems in Europe*

Anastasia Nikulina

Anthropogenic Landscapes?

Modelling the Role of Hunter-Gatherers in Interglacial Ecosystems in Europe

PROEFSCHRIFT

ter verkrijging van
de graad van doctor aan de Universiteit Leiden, op gezag van
rector magnificus prof.dr.ir. H. Bijl, volgens besluit van het college
voor promoties te verdedigen op vrijdag 21 november 2025
klokke 11.30 uur

door
Anastasia Nikulina

geboren te Novosibirsk, Russia
in 1993

Promotor: Prof.dr. J.W.M. Roebroeks

Copromotoren: Dr.ir. F. Scherjon
Dr. K. MacDonald (deceased)
Prof.dr. D.M. Roche
(Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, Université Paris-Saclay)

Promotiecommissie: Prof.dr. W.D. Gosling (University of Amsterdam)
Prof.dr. J. Kolen
Prof.dr. K. Lambers
Dr. J. Bunting (University of Hull)
Dr. I. Romanowska (Aarhus University)
Dr. A. Verpoorte



The research is financed through the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme within the TERRANOVA project, No 813904.

© 2025 Anastasia Nikulina

Printed by Gildeprint
Cover design by Darya Derzhavets
Layout by Douwe Oppewal

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I owe deep gratitude to the many people who supported me throughout this PhD study and beyond. Each piece of advice and every dataset shared by these generous people has contributed to a unique mosaic of knowledge. This unwavering support was especially invaluable during times of upheaval, and I am profoundly thankful for the help and encouragement of each of you.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisory team, especially Prof. Wil Roebroeks and Dr. Fulco Scherjon, for their endless support, belief in me, trust, and knowledge they shared with me. I am also grateful to Prof. Didier Roche, whose expertise was strategically crucial for this research. I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my late supervisor, Dr. Katharine MacDonald, for her constant support and invaluable knowledge. I extend my heartfelt thanks to her family for their support and for allowing me to benefit from her mentorship. I was incredibly proud and fortunate to work with such a great team. Thank you so much for everything!

I would like to extend my gratitude to every member of the Terranova project. I am particularly grateful to the researchers who contributed to the development of this project, specifically Dr. Sjoerd Kluiving and Prof. Jan Kolen. I am grateful to Dr. Angelina Zapolska, Dr. Maria Antonia Serge, Dr. Marco Davoli, and Dr. Elena A. Pearce, whose collaboration, mutual support, and shared efforts in publishing have been invaluable. I also would like to thank Prof. Jens-Christian Svenning, Dr. Florence Mazier, Prof. Ralph Fyfe, Dr. Dave van Wees, Prof. Marie-Jose Gaillard, Dr. Frank Arthur, Dr. Kailin Hatlestad, Emily Vella, Alexandre Martinez, Prof. Karl-Johan Lindholm, and Prof. Hans Renssen for the knowledge and support they provided throughout our work.

Of course, I would not have been able to even begin this study without the knowledge and skills I obtained at Novosibirsk State University. I would like to thank Prof. Ivan D. Zolnikov, Prof. Yaroslav V. Kuzmin, and Dr. Olga I. Novikova for everything you taught me. Your encouragement and belief in me have been invaluable! I also wish to thank all the members of the Laboratory of GIS and Remote Sensing at the Sobolev Institute of Geology and Mineralogy (Siberian Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences), especially Dr. Darya A. Chupina and Dr. Nadezhda V. Glushkova, for their support and help. Special thanks to Dr. Hugues Plisson, Dr. Malvina Bauman, and Dr. William E. Banks for their help and encouragement.

I am very happy to have become part of the Leiden University community, where I have met many wonderful people. I especially want to thank every member

of the Human Origins group for the inspiring discussions. I am very grateful for the unwavering support from the friends I made during my time in Leiden.

I also extend my gratitude to all the people listed in the acknowledgments of my papers. You were very responsive and helpful with various aspects of this study. Thank you so much for sharing your expertise with me.

I would like to thank my family for their endless support. My parents, Olga I. Kudashkina and Vyacheslav V. Nikulin, have always been an unlimited source of love, guidance, and motivation. I would also like to thank my granddad, Ivan P. Kudashkin, who always believed that I would become a doctor one day. Special thanks to my brothers and sisters, especially Svyatoslav V. Nikulin, Michail V. Nikulin, and his partner, Anastasia A. Nikulina. I am also grateful to my nephews and nieces, particularly Kirill M. Nikulin. I would also like to thank my partner's parents Brigitte Bruyère and Serge Coupas for their constant support while I was far from my hometown. I am also very fortunate to have amazing friends I made before starting this PhD research. We stayed in constant touch throughout these years. Thank you for your support despite the distances.

I am very grateful to my partner, Julian Coupas, for going through this challenging journey with me. Without your support, my ideas would never have become a reality. I would also like to thank our cocker spaniel, Vivaldi, for his unconditional love, fluffy companionship, and his persistent reminders to take regular walk breaks.

Contents

List of tables	12
List of figures	15
Summary	21
English	21
Nederlands	23
Русский	25
Français	28
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	31
1.1 Background	32
1.2 Research questions	35
1.3 Datasets and research methodology	35
1.3.1 Literature review of proxy-based evidence for hunter-gatherer impact on European environment	36
1.3.2 CARAIB-REVEALS comparison and their integration into HUMLAND ABM	36
1.3.3 HUMLAND ABM	37
1.3.4 Genetic algorithm	38
1.3.5 Quantification of Neanderthal and Mesolithic impacts on vegetation	38
1.4 Thesis structure	39
CHAPTER 2 AVAILABLE EVIDENCE FOR HUNTER-GATHERER IMPACT ON EUROPEAN ENVIRONMENT	41
2.1 Introduction	43
2.2 Ethnographic observations of hunter-gatherer impact on landscapes	47
2.3 Types of evidence related to past hunter-gatherer niche construction activities	50
2.3.1 Proxies for identification of modification of vegetation communities via burning	52
2.3.1.1 <i>Biological indicators</i>	52
2.3.1.2 <i>Geochemical indicators</i>	56
2.3.2 Proxies for identification of small-scale plant manipulation by hunter-gatherers	57
2.3.2.1 <i>Tools as indicators of plant manipulation</i>	57
2.3.2.2 <i>Biological indicators of plant manipulation</i>	58
2.3.3 Proxies for landscape modifications to impact animal presence and their abundance in specific locations	60
2.4 Case Studies	62
2.4.1 The visibility of hunter-gatherer activity in Last Interglacial records at Neumark-Nord	63
2.4.2 Impact of Mesolithic hunter-gatherers on their surroundings	67
2.5 Discussion	73
2.6 Conclusion	75
2.7 Acknowledgements	77

CHAPTER 3 HUMLAND ABM: MODELLING HUNTER-GATHERER IMPACT ON EUROPEAN LANDSCAPES	79
3.1 Introduction	81
3.2 Material and methods	83
3.2.1 Datasets used in the HUMLAND ABM	83
3.2.2 CARAIB, REVEALS and ABM output comparison	88
3.2.3 Agent-based model	91
3.2.3.1 Climatic impact	91
3.2.3.2 Anthropogenic fires	92
3.2.3.3 Thunderstorms	94
3.2.3.4 Megafauna vegetation consumption	95
3.2.4 Experiments, observations, and analysis	96
3.3 Results	97
3.3.1 CARAIB and REVEALS datasets comparison	97
3.3.2 Natural fires and megafauna impact without human presence	100
3.3.3 Anthropogenic impact on vegetation without natural fires and megafauna plant consumption	101
3.3.4 Sensitivity analysis: combined impact of humans, megafauna, climate and natural fires on vegetation	104
3.4 Discussion	106
3.4.1 How much do pollen-based estimates correspond to climate-based vegetation cover?	106
3.4.2 What defines the intensity of anthropogenic impact?	107
3.4.3 First insights into the role of hunter-gatherers and other agents in continental-level vegetation change	108
3.5 Conclusion	114
3.6 Acknowledgements	115
CHAPTER 4 IMPACT OF NEANDERTHALS AND MESOLITHIC HUNTER-GATHERERS ON INTERGLACIAL VEGETATION IN EUROPE	119
4.1 Introduction	121
4.2 Materials and methods	128
4.2.1 HUMLAND ABM	129
4.2.2 Datasets used in the HUMLAND ABM	135
4.2.3 Genetic algorithm	139
4.3 Results	142
4.3.1 Comparison of REVEALS and CARAIB datasets	142
4.3.2 Vegetation dynamics without human-induced burning: megafauna plant consumption, hunting, and natural fires	143
4.3.3 Vegetation dynamics with human-induced burning: megafauna plant consumption, hunting, natural and anthropogenic fires	145
4.3.4 Continental scale visibility of different types of impact	148
4.4 Discussion	149
4.4.1 Temporal vegetation dynamics: CARAIB vs REVEALS	149
4.4.2 HUMLAND scenarios with and without human-induced vegetation burning	150
4.4.3 Human-megafauna interaction	151

4.4.4	Neanderthal and Mesolithic human impacts on vegetation	152
4.4.4.1	<i>Preferences for vegetation openness around campsites</i>	153
4.4.4.2	<i>Vegetation burning range size around campsites</i>	153
4.4.4.3	<i>Potential minimal population size estimates</i>	154
4.4.4.4	<i>Visibility of anthropogenic burning on continental level</i>	156
4.5	Conclusion	157
4.6	Acknowledgements	159
CHAPTER 5	DISCUSSION	161
5.1	Visibility of hunter-gatherer impact on landscapes within archaeological contexts	163
5.2	Comparison of potential “natural” and pollen-based vegetation reconstructions	166
5.3	Challenges in development of the HUMLAND ABM	167
5.4	Sensitivity analysis. Which factors defined the intensity of hunter-gatherers’ impact on vegetation?	172
5.4.1	Summary of the sensitivity analysis methodology	172
5.4.2	Discussion of sensitivity analysis results	172
5.5	Neanderthal and Mesolithic human impacts on vegetation: insights from HUMLAND ABM scenarios generated via genetic algorithm	173
5.5.1	Summary of the genetic algorithm methodology	173
5.5.2	Discussion of the genetic algorithm results	173
5.6	Conclusion. Future perspectives	177
BIBLIOGRAPHY		
APPENDICES		219
	Appendix I Supplementary data to Nikulina et al. (2024b)	219
	Appendix II HUMLAND ABM 1.0 Overview, design concepts and details (ODD) protocol	235
All.1	Purpose	236
All.2	Entities, state variables, and scales	236
All.3	Process overview and scheduling	238
All.4	Design concepts (after Nikulina et al., 2024b)	241
All.4.1	<i>Basic principles</i>	241
All.4.2	<i>Emergence</i>	242
All.4.3	<i>Adaptation</i>	242
All.4.4	<i>Objectives</i>	242
All.4.5	<i>Learning</i>	243
All.4.6	<i>Prediction</i>	243
All.4.7	<i>Sensing</i>	243
All.4.8	<i>Interaction</i>	243
All.4.9	<i>Stochasticity</i>	243
All.4.10	<i>Collectives</i>	244
All.4.11	<i>Observation</i>	244
All.5	Initialization (after Nikulina et al., 2024b)	244
All.6	Input data (after Nikulina et al., 2024b)	247

All.7	Submodels (after Nikulina et al., 2024b)	248
All.7.1	<i>Climatic impact</i>	248
All.7.2	<i>Anthropogenic impact</i>	252
All.7.3	<i>Natural fires</i>	254
All.7.4	<i>Fire spread</i>	256
All.7.5	<i>Megafauna consumption</i>	256
Appendix III	Supplementary data to Nikulina et al. (in press)	261
AIII.1	Paleoenvironmental modelling setup	274
AIII.1.1	<i>ILOVECLIM: paleoclimate simulation</i>	274
AIII.1.2	<i>VECODE: dynamic vegetation modelling</i>	275
AIII.1.3	<i>CARAIB: high-resolution vegetation modelling</i>	275
AIII.2	Pearson correlation coefficients and Principal component analysis	276
AIII.3	CARAIB–REVEALS comparison for 11,700–10,200 BP	276
Appendix IV	HUMLAND ABM 2.0 Overview, design concepts and details (ODD) protocol	279
AIV.1	Purpose	280
AIV.2	Entities, state variables, and scales	281
AIV.3	Process overview and scheduling	283
AIV.4	Design concepts (after Nikulina et al., 2024b, in press)	285
AIV.4.1	<i>Basic principles</i>	285
AIV.4.2	<i>Emergence</i>	287
AIV.4.3	<i>Adaptation</i>	287
AIV.4.4	<i>Objectives</i>	287
AIV.4.5	<i>Learning</i>	287
AIV.4.6	<i>Prediction</i>	287
AIV.4.7	<i>Sensing</i>	287
AIV.4.8	<i>Interaction</i>	288
AIV.4.9	<i>Stochasticity</i>	288
AIV.4.10	<i>Collectives</i>	288
AIV.4.11	<i>Observation</i>	288
AIV.5	Initialization (after Nikulina et al., 2024b, in press)	289
AIV.6	Input data (after Nikulina et al., 2024b, in press)	292
AIV.7	Submodels (after Nikulina et al., 2024b, in press)	293
AIV.7.1	<i>Climatic impact</i>	293
AIV.7.2	<i>Anthropogenic impact</i>	297
AIV.7.3	<i>Natural fires</i>	299
AIV.7.4	<i>Fire spread</i>	301
AIV.7.5	<i>Megafauna consumption</i>	301
GLOSSARY		307
CURRICULUM VITAE		313

List of tables

Table 2.1	Proxies and their maximum possible temporal representation (availability) and spatial scale (scale which is reflected in specific type of proxy) for reconstruction of burning of vegetation communities by hunter-gatherers (category 1).	50
Table 2.2	Proxies and their maximum possible temporal representation (availability) and spatial scale (scale which is reflected in specific type of proxy) for reconstruction of plant manipulation organised by hunter-gatherers (category 2).	51
Table 2.3	Proxies and their maximum possible temporal representation (availability) and spatial scale (scale which is reflected in a specific type of proxy) for identification of landscape changes to impact animal presence and their accessibility in specific locations (category 3).	51
Table 2.4	Summary of main evidence associated with human-induced burning of vegetation around Mesolithic sites and the Last Interglacial site Neumark-Nord 2 in Europe.	68
Table 3.1	Datasets used in HUMLAND.	83
Table 3.2	PFTs used in ABM (HUMLAND PFTs) and correspondence between CARAIB PFTs and REVEALS plant taxa.	86
Table 3.3	Details of the sensitivity analysis experiment.	104
Table 4.1	HUMLAND 2.0 parameter overview.	132
Table 4.2	Genetic algorithm setup details. A black dot indicates that a variable was optimized within its specified minimum and maximum values (as outlined in Table 4.1), whereas a white dot signifies that the variable remained constant. The experiment subsets are categorized as follows: 1) megafauna impact; 2) megafauna impact combined with natural fires; and 3) megafauna impact, natural fires, and human-induced fires.	141
Table 4.3	Percentage of possible scenarios with output similar to REVEALS without anthropogenic fires. In these scenarios humans do not engage in vegetation burning, but they exert hunting pressure on herbivores.	143
Table 4.4	Percentage of possible scenarios with output similar to REVEALS with anthropogenic fires. These scenarios include the combined direct impact of all agents on vegetation: human induced and natural fires, and megafauna plant consumption.	145

Table AI.1	CARAIB and REVEALS conflicting grid cells excluded from the analysis.	220
Table AI.2	Existing estimates of FRI/fire frequency from sediment sites dated to the Early–Middle Holocene in Europe.	222
Table AI.3	Experiment results for human-induced vegetation changes caused by 100 groups with different other parameter values. Equilibrium indicates the step when the simulation output does not vary dramatically. Minimum varied parameter values show the starting impact of the agent, and maximum varied parameter values define the maximal possible impact of an agent (i.e., when REVEALS estimates are reached).	224
Table AI.4	Experiment results for human-induced vegetation changes caused by 1000 groups with different other parameter values. Equilibrium indicates the step when the simulation output does not vary dramatically. Minimum varied parameter values show the starting impact of the agent, and maximum varied parameter values define the maximal possible impact of an agent (i.e., when REVEALS estimates are reached).	226
Table AI.5	Experiment results for human-induced vegetation changes caused by 4000 groups with different other parameter values. Equilibrium indicates the step when the simulation output does not vary dramatically. Minimum varied parameter values show the starting impact of the agent, and maximum varied parameter values define the maximal possible impact of an agent (i.e., when REVEALS estimates are reached).	227
Table AI.6	Confusion matrix for CARAIB and REVEALS PFT comparison.	230
Table AI.7	Experiment results for megafauna, thunderstorm and climatic impact on vegetation. Equilibrium indicates step at which the simulation output reaches a stable state. Minimum varied parameter values show the starting impact of the agent, and maximum varied parameter values define the maximal possible impact of an agent (i.e., when REVEALS estimates are reached).	231
Table AI.8	Experiment results for human-induced vegetation changes caused by different group numbers. Equilibrium indicates the step at which the simulation output reaches a stable state. Minimum varied parameter values show the starting impact of the agent, and maximum varied parameter values define the maximal possible impact of an agent (i.e., when REVEALS estimates are reached).	232
Table AI.9	Confusion matrix for HUMLAND and REVEALS PFT comparison.	233
Table AII.1	Hominin state variables.	237
Table AII.2	Grid cells state variables.	237
Table AII.3	Patch state variables and their values at the end of the initialization stage.	245

Table AII.4	Mean FRI for each dominant PFT.	246
Table AII.5	CARAIB and REVEALS conflicting cells excluded from the analysis during initiation stage.	246
Table AII.6	Input datasets to the simulation environment (after Nikulina et al., 2024b).	248
Table AII.7	Mean number of years to recover for each dominant PFT (after Nikulina et al., 2024b).	252
Table AIII.1	PFTs used in ABM (HUMLAND PFTs) and correspondence between CARAIB PFTs and REVEALS plant taxa (after Nikulina et al., 2024b).	267
Table AIII.2	Datasets used in HUMLAND (after Nikulina et al., 2024b)	268
Table AIII.3	PCA results for the successful genetic algorithm outputs aiming to minimize the HUMLAND–REVEALS difference in mean percentage of grid cells dominated by trees. The experiments include the combined impact of all agents on vegetation: anthropogenic and natural fires, hunting, climatic impact and megafauna plant consumption.	269
Table AIII.4	PCA results for the successful genetic algorithm outputs aiming to minimize the HUMLAND–REVEALS difference in mean vegetation openness. The experiments include the combined impact of all agents on vegetation: anthropogenic and natural fires, hunting, climatic impact and megafauna plant consumption.	270
Table AIII.5	Mean, mode and standard deviation (SD) for parameter values obtained via the genetic algorithm with outputs similar to REVEALS. The distribution of parameter values is in Fig. 4.7 of the main body of the article.	271
Table AIII.6	Details of HUMLAND runs conducted to track the extent and visibility of modifications done by each agent.	273
Table AIV.1	Hominin state variables.	281
Table AIV.2	Grid cells state variables.	281
Table AIV.3	Patch state variables and their values at the end of the initialization stage.	289
Table AIV.4	Mean FRI for each dominant PFT.	291
Table AIV.5	CARAIB and REVEALS conflicting cells excluded from the analysis during initiation stage.	291
Table AIV.6	Input datasets to the simulation environment (after Nikulina et al., 2024b).	293
Table AIV.7	Mean number of years to recover for each dominant PFT (after Nikulina et al., 2024b).	297

List of figures

Figure 2.1	Neumark-Nord 2 (Germany) HP 7 sequence, with lithological units and the archaeological find levels (Sier et al., 2011), the stratigraphical distribution of charcoal particles, carbonised seeds (Kuijper, 2014), arboreal (AP) and non-arboreal pollen (NAP) and data regarding vegetation openness (Pop & Bakels, 2015); correlation of archaeological layers containing fire-related findings with vegetation openness episodes shown in red.	65
Figure 2.2	Pollen analysis (pollen percentage of trees, shrubs, upland herbs and <i>Corylus avellana</i>) from Weimar-Niederweimar II.2 profile and macrofossil evidence (percentage of wood, charcoal and remains from plants occupying open, disturbed and nutrient-rich areas) from different palaeochannel fills at Weimar-Niederweimar (Germany). The sequence shown here is dated to the Younger Dryas (11,640 BP, gravel layer), Preboreal (11,400–10,970 BP, gravel layer) and Boreal periods (10,420–9510 BP, sand/gyttja and gyttja layers); phases of Early Mesolithic anthropogenic impact within the Lahn valley area are shown in red (after Bos & Urz, 2003).	70
Figure 2.3	Pollen analysis (pollen percentage of <i>Corylus</i> , <i>Melampyrum</i> , <i>Succisa</i> , <i>Potentilla</i> -type and microcharcoal) and non-pollen palynomorphs (NPP) evidence (percentage of <i>Gelasinospora</i> , <i>Neurospora</i> , <i>Sporormiella</i>) from a profile at North Gill 5B (North York Moors within England and Wales). This evidence reflects post-disturbance phases after burning and intensive grazing during the Late Mesolithic at North Gill. The profile consists of amorphous peat resting on sand at 100 cm. The inferred age of the basal peat lies within the Late Mesolithic based on dates available for a section a few tens of meters away from North Gill 5 (5270 BP) and higher section of this site (4540 BP at 73 cm) (after Innes & Blackford, 2003). Red shows the phase with the highest herbivore concentrations; this follows a phase with intensive burning.	72
Figure 3.1	The reconstructed environment prior to the HUMLAND simulation runs for 9200–8700 BP: distribution of first dominant HUMLAND PFTs (A) and vegetation openness (B). Legend: 1–large rivers and lakes; 2–herbs; 3–shrubs; 4–broadleaf trees; 5–needle trees; 6–high mountains; 7–vegetation openness in percentages.	84

Figure 3.2	CARAIB (A) and REVEALS (C) first dominant HUMLAND PFT distribution accompanied with bar graphs of the proportions (100% on the bar graphs equals the number of grid cells with both REVEALS and CARAIB estimates) of CARAIB (B) and REVEALS (D) after excluding the grid cells where CARAIB predicts lower vegetation openness than the REVEALS results. Legend: 1–herbs; 2–shrubs; 3–broadleaf trees; 4–needleleaf trees; 5–no data.	98
Figure 3.3	Vegetation openness of CARAIB (A) and REVEALS (B) with a summary of these datasets and their values' distribution only for grid cells with both REVEALS and CARAIB estimates (C) after excluding the grid cells where CARAIB predicts lower vegetation openness than the REVEALS results. In subfigure C the dot indicates the mean value for each dataset. Legend: 1–vegetation openness in percentages; 2–no data.	99
Figure 3.4	Percentage of cells dominated by trees (A) and mean vegetation openness (B) after natural fires caused by thunderstorms and impact of climate, and percentage of cells dominated by forest (C) and mean vegetation openness (D) after megafauna vegetation consumption and impact of climate. Each line depicted on the experiment output graph represents the mean of 30 simulation runs. The horizontal dashed line indicates REVEALS estimates, and the vertical dotted line shows the step when simulations reach equilibrium.	100
Figure 3.5	Percentage of grid cells dominated by trees (A) and mean vegetation openness (B) caused by different numbers of hunter-gatherer groups and climatic impacts. Each line depicted on the experiment output graph represents the mean of 30 simulation runs. The horizontal dashed line indicates REVEALS estimates, and the vertical dotted line shows the step when simulations reach equilibrium.	101
Figure 3.6	Results of experiments conducted for 4000 hunter-gatherer groups: A–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the accessible radius was varied; B–mean vegetation openness after the accessible radius was varied; C–percentage of cells dominated by trees after the openness criteria to burn was varied; D–mean vegetation openness after the openness criteria to burn was varied; E–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the percentage of moving campsites was varied; F–mean vegetation openness after the percentage of moving campsites was varied; G–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the movement frequency was varied; H–mean vegetation openness after the movement frequency was varied. Each line depicted on the experiment output graph represents the mean of 30 simulation runs. The horizontal dashed line indicates REVEALS estimates, and the vertical dotted line shows the step when simulations reach equilibrium.	102

Figure 3.7	Results of LHS/PRCC sensitivity analysis with bars representing standard errors.	105
Figure 3.8	Percentage of grid cells dominated by trees (A) and mean vegetation openness (B) after combined impact of humans, climate, megafauna and natural fires. The following parameters were varied: number of hunter-gatherer groups, accessible radius and openness criteria to burn. Movement frequency of campsites (500), the number of them which move at specific time (50%), proportion of terrestrial cells with thunderstorms (0.04%) remained constant with fixed presence of megafauna plant consumption. Each line depicted on the experiment output graph represents the mean of 30 simulation runs. The horizontal dashed line indicates REVEALS estimates.	111
Figure 3.9	Possible scenario of modified first dominant PFTs (A), vegetation openness (B), bar graph of dominant PFT proportions (C), summary statistics of vegetation openness and their values' distribution (D; the dot indicates the mean value for each dataset) in the end of a HUMLAND run, and mean percentage of cells modified by different agents (impact on dominant PFTs (E) and vegetation openness (F) during equilibrium state). Dominant PFT proportions and summary statistics of vegetation openness were calculated for the cells with REVEALS and CARAIB estimates after excluding the grid cells where CARAIB predicts lower vegetation openness than the REVEALS results. Legend: 1–recently burnt areas; 2–herbs; 3–shrubs; 4–broadleaf trees; 5–needleleaf trees; 6–no data; 7–vegetation openness in percentages.	113
Figure 4.1	LIG (A) and Early Holocene (B) study area. Legend: 1–elevations (in meters above sea level, m a.s.l.); 2–no data; 3–case studies indicating possible vegetation burning by LIG and Early–Middle Holocene hunter–gatherers (Heidgen et al., 2022; Innes & Blackford, 2023; Latałowa, 1992; Nikulina et al., 2022; Poska et al., 2004; Sevink et al., 2023; Wacnik, 2008). List of case studies: a–Neumark-Nord; b–Bonfield Gill Head; c–Campo Lameiro; d–Dudka Island; e–Dumpokjauratj; f–Ipmetisjauratj; g–Kunda-Arusoo; h–Lahn valley complex; i–Lake Miłkowskie; j–Meerstad; k–Mesolithic site at Soest; l–North Gill; m–Pulli; n–Rottenburg-Siebenlinden sites; o–Star Carr; p–Vingen sites; q–Wolin II.	122
Figure 4.2	Vegetation openness: CARbon Assimilation In the Biosphere (CARAIB) LIG (A), CARAIB 8700–8200 BP (B); Regional Estimates of VEgetation Abundance from Large Sites (REVEALS) mesocratic I (C), REVEALS 8700–8200 BP. Vegetation openness for other time windows available in Appendix III (Figs. AIII.1 and AIII.2). Legend: 1–no data; 2–vegetation openness (%).	123

Figure 4.3	Distribution of dominant plant functional types (PFTs): CARAIB LIG (A), CARAIB 8700–8200 BP (B); REVEALS mesocratic I (C), REVEALS 8700–8200 BP. PFT distribution for other time windows available in Appendix III (Figs. AIII.3 and AIII.4). Legend: 1–no data; 2–herbs; 3–shrubs; 4–broadleaf trees; 5–needleleaf trees.	124
Figure 4.4	Overview of research steps including the comparison of CARAIB (climate-driven potential natural vegetation) and REVEALS (pollen-based vegetation reconstruction) data, the development and upgrade of the HUMLAND ABM, its integration with a genetic algorithm, and the generation of scenarios to quantify the impacts of Neanderthals, Mesolithic population, megafauna, natural fires, and climate on vegetation.	125
Figure 4.5	CARAIB–REVEALS comparison of mean vegetation openness (black dots) and the mean percentage of grid cells dominated by herbs (yellow) and trees (green) for the LIG and the Early Holocene.	142
Figure 4.6	Summary statistics and values' distribution of the Hunting_pressure parameter values required to generate HUMLAND scenarios with output similar to REVEALS without anthropogenic fires. Humans do not engage in vegetation burning, but they exert hunting pressure on herbivores. The dot indicates the mean value for each dataset. For the LIG, most simulations matching REVEALS outputs have Hunting_pressure values around 20–25%, whereas for the Early Holocene, they typically cluster around 80–90%.	144
Figure 4.7	Summary statistics and distribution of the parameters' values required to generate scenarios with output similar to REVEALS for PFT distribution (A, C, E, G) and vegetation openness (B, D, F, H) with hunting and anthropogenic fires. The dot indicates the mean value for each dataset.	146
Figure 4.8	Mean percentages of grid cells modified by different agents during the HUMLAND equilibrium state: A–LIG most frequent scenarios; B–Early Holocene most frequent scenarios.	148
Figure AI.1	Vegetation openness representation in REVEALS (A) and in CARAIB (B, C).	220
Figure AI.2	HUMLAND activity diagram.	221

- Figure AI.3** Results of experiments conducted for 100 hunter-gatherer groups: A–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the accessible radius was varied; B–mean vegetation openness after the accessible radius was varied; C–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the openness criteria to burn was varied; D–mean vegetation openness after the openness criteria to burn was varied; E–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the percentage of moving campsites was varied; F–mean vegetation openness after the percentage of moving campsites was varied; G–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the movement frequency was varied; H–mean vegetation openness after the movement frequency was varied. Each line depicted on the experiment output graph represents the mean of 30 simulation runs. The horizontal dashed line indicates REVEALS estimates, and the vertical dotted line shows the step when simulations reach equilibrium. 223
- Figure AI.4** Results of experiments conducted for 1000 hunter-gatherer groups: A–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the accessible radius was varied; B–mean vegetation openness after the accessible radius was varied; C–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the openness criteria to burn was varied; D–mean vegetation openness after the openness criteria to burn was varied; E–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the percentage of moving campsites was varied; F–mean vegetation openness after the percentage of moving campsites was varied; G–percentage of grid cells dominated by trees after the movement frequency was varied; H–mean vegetation openness after the movement frequency was varied. Each line depicted on the experiment output graph represents the mean of 30 simulation runs. The horizontal dashed line indicates REVEALS estimates, and the vertical dotted line shows the step when simulations reach equilibrium. 225
- Figure AI.5** CARAIB bare ground. Legend: 1–fraction of bare ground in percentages; 2–no data. 228
- Figure AI.6** Datasets used in the current ABM: DEM (A), major rivers and lakes (B), CARAIB distribution of first dominant PFTs (C) and vegetation openness (D), REVEALS distribution of first dominant PFTs (E) and vegetation openness (F) and its standard errors (G), CARAIB NPP (H), megafauna vegetation consumption (I). Legend: 1–elevation (m); 2–no data; 3–major rivers and lakes; 4–herbs; 5–shrubs; 6–broadleaf trees; 7–needleleaf trees; 8–vegetation openness in percentages; 9–standard errors for REVEALS vegetation openness; 10–CARAIB NPP (g/m^3); 11–megafauna vegetation consumption (g/m^3). 229

Figure AII.1	Activity diagram of process overview.	240
Figure AII.2	Activity diagram for climatic impact on vegetation openness.	250
Figure AII.3	Activity diagram for climatic impact on distribution of dominant PFTs.	251
Figure AII.4	Activity diagram for anthropogenic impact.	253
Figure AII.5	Activity diagram for thunderstorm impact.	255
Figure AII.6	Activity diagram for megafauna impact.	257
Figure AIII.1	CARAIB vegetation openness for the Last Interglacial (A), 11,700–11,200 BP (B), 11,200–10,700 (C), 10,700–10,200 (D), 10,200–9700 (E), 9700–9200 (F), 9200–8700 (G), 8700–8200 BP (H). Legend: 1–no data, 2–vegetation openness (in %).	262
Figure AIII.2	REVEALS vegetation openness for Mesocratic I (A), Mesocratic II (B), 11,700–11,200 BP (C), 11,200–10,700 (D), 10,700–10,200 (E), 10,200–9700 (F), 9700–9200 (G), 9200–8700 (H), 8700–8200 BP (I). Legend: 1–no data, 2–vegetation openness (in %); 3–The northern European and Alpine Saalian glaciation (Lehmkuhl et al., 2021; Svendsen et al., 2004).	263
Figure AIII.3	CARAIB distribution of the first dominant PFTs for the Last Interglacial (A), 11,700–11,200 BP (B), 11,200–10,700 (C), 10,700–10,200 (D), 10,200–9700 (E), 9700–9200 (F), 9200–8700 (G), 8700–8200 BP (H). Legend: 1–no data, 2–herbs, 3–shrubs; 4–broadleaf trees; 5–needleleaf trees.	264
Figure AIII.4	REVEALS distribution of the first dominant PFTs for Mesocratic I (A), Mesocratic II (B), 11,700–11,200 BP (C), 11,200–10,700 (D), 10,700–10,200 (E), 10,200–9700 (F), 9700–9200 (G), 9200–8700 (H), 8700–8200 BP (I). Legend: 1–no data, 2–herbs, 3–broadleaf trees; 4–needleleaf trees, 5–the northern European and Alpine Saalian glaciation (Lehmkuhl et al., 2021; Svendsen et al., 2004).	265
Figure AIII.5	Correlation matrices and Pearson correlation coefficients (PCC) between variables of the possible scenarios for LIG (A) and Early Holocene (B) tree distribution scenarios; LIG (C) and Early Holocene (D) vegetation openness scenarios. The experiments include the combined direct impact of all agents on vegetation: anthropogenic and natural fires, climatic impact and megafauna plant consumption. The darkest blue indicates the strongest negative correlation between the Number_of_groups and Accessible_radius parameters within the Early Holocene vegetation openness scenarios. Lighter colours represent either absent/low or modest correlations for the other parameters.	266
Figure AIV.1	Activity diagram of process overview.	284
Figure AIV.2	Activity diagram for climatic impact on vegetation openness.	295

Figure AIV.3 Activity diagram for climatic impact on distribution of dominant PFTs.	296
Figure AIV.4 Activity diagram for anthropogenic impact.	298
Figure AIV.5 Activity diagram for thunderstorm impact.	300
Figure AIV.6 Activity diagram for megafauna impact.	303