

Title

Head-mounted sensors reveal visual attention of free-flying homing pigeons

Fumihiko Kano* (1, 2)

James Walker (2)

Takao Sasaki (2)

Dora Biro (2)

1. Kumamoto Sanctuary, Wildlife Research Center, Kyoto University, Uki, Kumamoto, Japan

2. Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3PS, UK

Correspondence: *fkanou@gmail.com

Abstract

Gaze behavior offers valuable insights into attention and cognition. However, technological limitations have prevented the examination of animals' gaze behavior in natural, information-rich contexts, for example during navigation through complex environments. Therefore, we developed a lightweight custom-made logger equipped with IMU (Inertial Measurement Unit) and GPS (Global Positioning System) to simultaneously track the head movements and flight trajectories of free-flying homing pigeons. Pigeons have a limited range of eye movement, and their eye moves in coordination with their head in a saccadic manner (similar to primate eye-saccades). This allows head movement to act as a proxy for visual scanning behavior. Our IMU sensor recorded the 3D movement of the birds' heads in high resolution, allowing us to reliably detect distinct saccade signals. The birds moved their head far more than necessary for maneuvering flight, suggesting that they actively scanned the environment. This movement was predominantly horizontal (yaw) and sideways (roll), allowing them to scan the environment with their lateral visual field. They decreased their head movement when they flew solo over prominent landmarks (major roads and a railway line) and also when they flew in pairs (especially when flying side by side, with the partner maintained in their lateral visual field). Thus, a decrease in head movement indicates a change in birds' focus of attention. We conclude that pigeons use their head-gaze in a task-related manner and that tracking flying birds' head movement is a promising method for examining their visual attention during natural tasks.

Keywords: flocking; head movement; homing pigeon; Inertial Measurement Unit; navigation

Introduction

Like humans and many other animals, birds rely on vision to guide their behavior. Previous studies have examined how birds use visual information during various natural activities such as tracking and catching prey (Brighton et al., 2017; Land, 1999b), detecting predators (Fernández-Juricic, 2012; Jones et al., 2007), and recognizing landmarks during navigation (Biro et al., 2004; Lipp et al., 2004; Martinho et al., 2015; Pritchard et al., 2018). However, we are still lacking a detailed understanding of how birds strategically deploy vision to gather relevant information about the natural environment: existing studies are largely limited to inferring visual attention during navigation from flight trajectories (e.g., Guilford et al., 2004), EEG recordings (Vyssotski et al., 2009) and head tilts (Rattenborg et al., 2016), to direct observations of head movement in the field during vigilance and prey pursuit (e.g., Fernández-Juricic, 2012; Land, 1999b), or to detailed analyses of head movement in the laboratory to analyze its basic functions such as gaze stabilization (e.g. Aldoumani et al., 2016; Troje and Frost, 2000; Warrick et al., 2002). As a few exceptions, Kane and Zamani (2014), Kane et al. (2015), and Brighton et al. (2017) used head-mounted cameras to examine the gaze behavior of frontally-eyed birds of prey, such as hawks, falcons, and peregrines, albeit limited to the context of prey pursuit over short distances. Currently lacking is the study of gaze behavior during long-range navigation and in laterally-eyed birds such as pigeons. In this study, we developed state-of-the-art miniature head-mounted sensors for pigeons to examine how these birds use their gaze while orienting through visually complex natural environments.

A common method for examining visual attention in human and nonhuman mammals is eye-tracking, which can record the orientation of a subject's gaze with high temporal and spatial resolution. This technology can offer valuable insights into attention and cognition in non-verbal or pre-verbal subjects such as human infants (Gredebäck et al., 2009), great apes (Kano et al., 2017), monkeys (Ghazanfar and Shepherd, 2011), and dogs (Téglás et al., 2012). Like primates, birds also have only limited parts of their retina specialized for higher visual acuity (i.e., the fovea), and they foveate a visual target by shifting their head and eye (i.e. gaze) (Dawkins and Woodington, 2000; Fernández-Juricic, 2012). For birds, a method equivalent to eye-tracking can be provided by head-tracking. This is because while most primate species have a high degree of eye movement, most bird species have a limited range of eye movement and instead rely on head movement to shift their gaze. Laboratory studies have shown that although the range of eye positions can exceed 20 degrees (in head-unrestrained pigeons), it is typically about 2-3 degrees during walking (Wohlschläger et al., 1993). A recent experiment incorporating both head and eye tracking in pigeons confirmed that during flight the range of eye positions is predominantly confined to 5 degrees (Ivo Ross, personal communication). During feeding, such as pecking at grain, pigeons use their eye to maintain visual fixation (in their frontal vision) by converging both eyes onto individual targets to the degree according to the distance between their eyes

and the target. Critically, pigeons show almost perfect temporal coordination between head and eye movement during both walking and feeding: head movement accounts for over 90% of overall gaze shifts, and eye movement only supports head movement (Gioanni, 1988; Haque and Dickman, 2005; Wohlschläger et al., 1993). Although the degree of eye movement varies significantly between species, such head-eye coordination is commonly observed in other birds such as chickens (Pratt, 1982) and quails (Haque and Dickman, 2005). Additionally, most bird species move their heads in a saccadic manner, with periods of fixation between saccades, similar to primate eye movement (Land, 1999a). Between saccades, the head orientation of birds is stabilized in all rotational axes (yaw, roll, and pitch) without eye movement, both during flying (Eckmeier et al., 2008; Green et al., 1992; Kress et al., 2015; Ros and Biewener, 2017) and walking (Eckmeier et al., 2008; Gioanni, 1988; Haque and Dickman, 2005; Kress et al., 2015; Wohlschläger et al., 1993). The role of such stabilization is likely the minimization of motion blur in retinal images between saccades (Land, 1999a). Due to these features, head movement is often used as a proxy for gaze movement in studies of bird vision, although the projected direction of gaze (or fovea) can differ between the laterally-eyed birds (Eckmeier et al., 2008; Green et al., 1992; Kress et al., 2015; Ros and Biewener, 2017) and frontally-eyed birds (Brighton et al., 2017; Kane et al., 2015; Kane and Zamani, 2014).

Although the visual system of birds has much in common with that of primates, there are some important differences that need to be taken into consideration when we interpret birds' gaze behavior. Many species of birds, particularly laterally-eyed birds of prey, have two foveae in each eye, one specialized for viewing objects frontally and the other for viewing objects laterally (Maldonado et al., 1988). Previous studies have examined the patterns of head-movement in pigeons and chickens while they were pecking, stationary, walking, landing, and flying over a short distance. They found that these laterally-eyed birds tend to use their frontal visual field when examining a stationary or slow-moving object at close range (e.g., during pecking and landing) and use their lateral visual field when examining a fast-moving object or an object at a greater distance (Dawkins, 2002; Erichsen et al., 1989; Maldonado et al., 1988). Unlike mammals, birds such as pigeons, chickens and finches view the movements of objects mostly with a stationary head and eye, although some predatory bird species track their prey with smooth head movements (Land, 1999b). Furthermore, one study showed that when chickens spotted a novel object on the ground, rather than staring straight at it (as a primate would), they continued to move their head and eyes to such a degree that they appeared to be examining it with a different part of the retina (Dawkins, 2002). Given these differences, to accurately evaluate birds' visual attention, it is crucial to understand what aspects of their head movements are most relevant to their visual attention.

108 This study had two complementary goals. Our first goal was to establish a new method of
109 tracking visually guided behavior in pigeons in the field through simultaneous recordings of head
110 movements using IMU (Inertial Measurement Unit) and flight trajectories using GPS (Global Positioning
111 System) during homing flights. While lightweight GPS devices have become well established as a reliable
112 technology for tracking moment-to-moment changes in the flight trajectories of pigeons (Biro et al., 2004;
113 Dennis et al., 2007; Gagliardo et al., 2011; Guilford et al., 2004; Lipp et al., 2004; Martinho et al., 2015;
114 Portugal et al., 2017; Schiffner and Wiltschko, 2009), the use of an IMU to track head movement has
115 never been attempted in the field. IMUs are equipped with an accelerometer, a gyroscope, and a
116 magnetometer, and hence can provide highly accurate reconstructions of motion and turns; they also can
117 provide an estimate of absolute orientation with respect to gravity and the Earth's magnetic field (e.g.,
118 north). Aldoumani et al. (2016) used an IMU system to track the 3D head movement (yaw, roll, and pitch)
119 of pigeons in the laboratory and found that the system was able to more reliably track subjects' head
120 movement than video-tracking analysis.

121 Our second goal was to conduct a systematic series of releases with homing pigeons to reveal
122 patterns in, and functions of, head movements during large-scale navigation through natural environments.
123 Specifically, we examined how birds adjust their gaze behavior in relation to their own flight maneuvers
124 and the visual cues in the environment. More specifically, we examined how they changed the pattern of
125 their head movement 1) when they were in straight, steady flight compared to when they were on the
126 ground, or when they made steep turns during flight, 2) over the course of learning a specific route
127 through repeated flights over the same terrain, 3) when they flew over prominent visual landmarks such
128 as major roads, identified as key visual cues in previous studies (Biro et al., 2004; Lipp et al., 2004), and
129 4) when they flew with a partner, i.e., when a prominent visual target was introduced, and/or vigilance
130 and navigational tasks could be shared with a conspecific.

131

Methods

Subjects

Twenty-two homing pigeons (*Columba livia*) bred at the Oxford University Field Station at Wytham (51°46'58.34"N, 1°19'02.40"W) participated in this study. All pigeons were between 1 and 11 years old (4.1 ± 2.5 years; mean \pm SD), and weighed 443 ± 25 g (mean \pm SD). They lived in two adjacent lofts home to a social group of ~140 pigeons, and received *ad libitum* food, water and grit daily throughout the study. All were experienced with homing to the loft from sites up to 10 km, but had not been released from the vicinity of the current release site. The study protocols were approved by the Local Ethical Review Committee of the University of Oxford's Department of Zoology (No. APA/1/5/ZOO/NASPA/Biro/PigeonsHeadmountedsensors).

Apparatus

To record pigeons' head-movements and flight trajectories simultaneously, we built a custom-made logger named "pSensor." The device weighed 21.7 g, 1 g of which was the head unit (Fig. 1A), and was equipped with a microcomputer (Adafruit Feather, USA, New York), GPS (Adafruit Ultimate GPS, -165 dBm sensitivity, 66 channels; positional accuracy < 3m, velocity accuracy < 0.1 m/s), 9-axis IMU sensor (Inertial Measurement Unit; a combination of gyroscope, accelerometer, and magnetometer; BNO055 Absolute Orientation Sensor; Adafruit), a micro-SD card (32 GB; SanDisk, USA, California), and a battery (110 mAh, 3.7V, giving a battery life of approximately 1.5 hours). This logger was able to record GPS data at 10 Hz and IMU data at 60 Hz. The sampling frequency of our GPS, 10 Hz, is the highest among currently available GPS devices, and has been shown to be able to reconstruct pigeons' flight trajectories with high accuracy during both solo and group flights (Flack et al., 2013; Nagy et al., 2010; Pettit et al., 2013). We did not record altitude in order to improve the logging rate (using the minimum GPS sentences) and because of the known inaccuracies of GPS altitude data. The sampling frequency of our IMU device, 60 Hz, is commonly used in eye-tracking of primates and is able to reconstruct saccadic movements (Duchowski, 2007; Krupenye et al., 2016); note that speed of a bird head saccade is similar to, or slightly slower than, that of a primate eye saccade (Fuchs, 1967; Wohlschläger et al., 1993). The IMU sensor was glued to a custom-built mask (3.8 g) made to fit each subject's unique head shape. This mask was made of wires, felt and elastic bands. The mask was fitted to the bird's head sufficiently firmly that it could not slip out of place or be shifted by the wind or the bird's head movement. The mask had two fixation points: the root of the beak (by an arch-shaped solid wire) and the back of the head (by an elastic band extended from the connections to the bottom of the arch-shaped wire). Importantly, no part of the mask was near the bird's throat so as to avoid any interference with breathing (Fig. 1B-C). The IMU sensor was glued to the flattest upper surface of the mask, and the roll axis of the sensor was roughly

parallel to the line connecting the root of the upper beak and the back of the head (the center of the occipital crest). The shape of the mask was customized for each bird so that the mask was positioned identically every time it was worn by the bird. The IMU sensor was connected via four thin cables (26-28 AWG) to the remainder of the unit, which was carried in a backpack made of lightweight fabric and elastic straps (3 g). Including the mask, backpack, and pSensor, pigeons carried a total of 28.5 g. Calibration was conducted before each release by following a standard procedure for this IMU device (the device was kept still for a few seconds in a minimum of 6 orientations).

Procedure

Habituation to wearing the mask and backpack. All birds were habituated to wearing the custom-made mask and backpack prior to flight testing. Backpacks were individually fitted to birds following established procedures (Nagy et al., 2010), to be worn for the duration of the study, and we verified that birds were able to walk and fly normally whilst wearing them. Many of the current subjects were already familiar with these backpacks from recent experiments (e.g., Sasaki and Biro, 2017; Taylor et al., 2017; Watts et al., 2016). Birds typically preened the elastic straps into their breast feathers; we checked these daily to ensure they had not slipped. Mask habituation lasted a minimum of 7 days (with each daily session lasting a maximum of 4 hours) inside or around the birds' home loft. For safety and comfort, masks were designed such that birds could take them off by themselves using their feet, so the purpose of the habituation sessions was to accustom them to masks to the point that they stopped removing them. The criterion for a bird passing habituation was that it did not take the mask off on two consecutive days out of a total of 7 days. No bird was dropped from the study for failing to meet this criterion. After 7 days of habituation, birds rarely removed the mask, although they occasionally made apparent attempts to do so (e.g., by shaking their head) particularly at the beginning of a daily session. However, we confirmed that the frequency of such attempts decreased considerably within the first hour of the session (typically 4 times per hour in the first hour to 0-1 time per hour in the remaining hours). Importantly, after the 7 mask habituation days, we confirmed that all birds exhibited normal locomotive patterns (e.g., walking, flying, landing, taking off) and other essential activities (e.g., drinking, eating, tending to chicks/eggs) inside and around the loft.

Testing. All flights in this study were from a site 3.82 km north of the home loft (51°49'02.85"N, 1°18'50.05"W; bearing to the loft, 185.1°). Each pigeon performed one homing flight per day, on days when the sun's disc was visible, and wind speeds were below 7 m/s. On the days of testing, each bird was fitted with the mask at the home loft. After 30 minutes of habituation to the mask inside the loft, they were transported to the release site by car. At the release site, the IMU sensor was calibrated and then attached to the mask of each bird. The birds were released facing the home direction, a minimum of 5

minutes after confirming that the previously-released birds had disappeared from view. The masks were removed soon after birds arrived at the loft.

The releases were conducted in three phases. We first released each bird singly 8 times (Phase 1 solo flights), to analyze head movements during individual navigation and route learning. The number of flights in this phase was chosen based on previous work which showed that the greatest route learning effects (evidenced by the emergence of shorter, more efficient routes) are observed in the first 4-6 flights from a novel release site, and that by the 8th flight birds have settled on preferred routes that they recapitulate without much evidence of further improvement (Meade et al., 2005; Pettit et al., 2013; Taylor et al., 2017). Furthermore, previous studies from similar terrains have reported that pigeons have a strong tendency to use linear structures, such as roads and railway lines (Biro et al., 2004; Lipp et al., 2004; Vyssotski et al., 2009). The solo releases thus also allowed us to examine how our birds changed the pattern of their head movement near such structures; our birds flew across two major roads (A44 and A40) and a railway line on the way to the loft.

We then released subjects in pairs (Phase 2, paired flights) to examine whether patterns in birds' head movements change when a prominent visual target (the flight partner) is introduced, and when vigilance and navigational tasks can be shared with a conspecific. Each bird flew 9 paired releases, and pairs were constructed in a trial-unique manner, i.e., no bird flew with the same partner more than once. Finally, we conducted two more solo trials (Phase 3 solo flights) to ensure that any key differences observed between Phases 1 and 2 were not caused by continued route learning (but by the presence of the partner). The logger failed to record data in a total of 10 trials (four Phase-1 solo and six paired flights), due to a break in its circuit, and thus these flights were treated as missing data (including the partner's data in paired flights). In addition, those paired flights in which the birds did not flock (defined as the two birds spending more than 50% of the total flight time at distances greater than 200 m from each other) were excluded from the analysis. The value of 200 m was based on previous experiments that confirmed this distance as the limit for two birds to interact during flight (Biro et al., 2006; Pettit et al., 2013). In all, we obtained data for a total of 172, 172, and 44 flights for Phases 1, 2 and 3, respectively.

Data analysis. The head-mounted sensor records the head movement of the birds with respect to the environment (i.e. in an inertial reference frame, not with respect to the body). 3D movements of the head can be analyzed as the rotational movements along three axes: yaw, roll and pitch (Fig. 2). The gyro sensor estimates the angular velocity ($^{\circ}$ /sec) in yaw, roll, and pitch. The integration of those angular velocities yields the angles of each axis (Fig. 2C). The combined angular velocity was calculated as $\sqrt{y^2 + r^2 + p^2}$, where y, r and p are yaw-, roll- and pitch-angular velocity, respectively (Fig. 2D). Spikes in the combined angular velocity indicate head-saccades. A saccade was defined if the combined angular

velocity exceeded $60^{\circ}/s$ and the saccade duration was longer than 50 ms (see Fig. S1). Some birds occasionally shook their head during flights; these events were detected as large head saccades (defined as combined angular velocity $> 800^{\circ}/s$) and were removed from the analysis. We defined saccade amplitude as the angular distance traveled by the head in each saccade, saccade frequency as the mean number of saccades per second, and head-angular velocity as the combined angular velocity calculated by including only saccadic periods. Note that the head-angular velocity is the combined value of the saccade frequency and amplitude (i.e., saccade amplitude \times frequency). In the human eye-movement literature (e.g., Henderson, 2003), both frequency and amplitude of saccades are often reported because those two measures convey slightly different meanings; the former indicates how long an individual attended to one location over another (i.e., timing), while the latter indicates how large the area is that the subject scanned (i.e., size).

We also analyzed the absolute orientation of yaw, roll, and pitch (i.e., Euler angles relative to gravity and north) using fused sensor data provided by our IMU sensor (Fig. 3). Integrated gyro data is insufficient to provide absolute orientation due to the accumulation of small drifts in recordings lasting several minutes. Our IMU sensor provided real-time calibration accuracies of the system on a scale from 0 (failed) to 3 (very good). Unfortunately, this calibration does not work when quick movements of the head are performed (e.g., head shaking). However, the system calibration was 3 for 49% of the full solo tracks and 11 % of the full paired tracks. These data still allow us to describe the overall patterns of absolute orientation by pooling all the collected data. We used the normalized values for the analysis so that the means of the roll or pitch orientation, and the difference between the yaw orientation and flight direction were adjusted to zero in each flight.

The GPS data were processed by cropping the track to include only samples in which instantaneous ground speed was greater than 10 km/h (i.e., flight). We then excluded samples during taking off and landing from the flights by removing periods in which the bird was within 50 m from the release site or the loft. The data were then filtered by detecting the spikes in the derivatives of each coordinate (longitude and latitude), and we smoothed each coordinate using a 1-sec moving window. The data were then interpolated to 60 Hz and synchronized with the head-movement IMU data (60 Hz). Finally, we converted longitude and latitude to meters (X and Y) using a Universal Transverse Mercator projection. Instantaneous flight direction was defined as the vector pointing from the previous to the current coordinate. Note that this instantaneous flight direction is the bird's ground vector and will be offset from its air vector (the body orientation) due to wind. Ground speed and rate of change in flight direction were defined as the momentary changes in coordinate (km/h) and flight direction ($^{\circ}/sec$), respectively. Distances from major roads (A44 and A40) or the railway line were calculated for each

sample as the straight-line distance from the given bird to the road/railway; those linear features were determined as a series of line segments plotted using an online map and custom program. In the paired flights (Phase 2), we excluded the periods in which the focal bird was separated from the partner bird farther than 200m (unless these represented more than 50 % of the total flight time, in which case the entire flight was removed from the analysis, as described above).

Previous studies confirmed that a GPS device can reliably capture pigeons' turns and speeds (or relative changes in direction and position) both in solo and group flights; see previous studies by Flack et al. (2013), Nagy et al. (2010), and Pettit et al. (2013) for these validations (and see also Brighton et al., 2017 for validation in the context of studying peregrine falcons' prey-pursuit). However, in general, GPS cannot reliably capture small-scale movements in pigeons' flight paths (on a scale of < 3 m) due to the inherent inaccuracies associated with its technology and the built-in filtering method. An additional IMU mounted on the bird's body would allow to compensate for such inaccuracies but it was not used in this study due to weight restrictions. Previous studies using back-mounted accelerometers revealed that, during flapping (3-10 Hz), pigeons show substantial vertical accelerations (Taylor et al., 2017; Usherwood et al., 2011) which may induce small correction movements of the head and may actually explain the short and small saccades (< 50 ms, < 4 degrees) that we frequently observed in this study (Fig. S1). Because such small saccades were not reliably distinguishable from noise and were likely unrelated to visual scanning (but likely related to correction for gaze stabilization), we filtered them out in the data analysis.

To compare the pattern of head movement when the birds were in flight vs. when they were standing still on the ground, we sampled periods in which the ground speed dropped below 10 km/h in the vicinity of the loft (indicating that the bird was landing or had landed). To make sure that the bird was indeed on the ground, we removed the first minute of the cropped data. We then selected the next 3 minutes of the cropped data and from this removed the periods in which the bird was either walking or had taken off again (4 % of the 3-min datastreams) by detecting the translational movements in the accelerometer. Head-bobbing while walking was thus not included in our analysis (for the description of this behavior, see Davies and Green, 1988; Green et al., 1992; Troje and Frost, 2000).

Statistical analyses were conducted in R (ver. 3.2.0). To test the difference in behavior between a pair of conditions (e.g., solo vs. paired flights), we used paired t-tests. To test linear trends in behavior across multiple variables (e.g., the repeated flights), we used linear mixed models (LMMs) with Gaussian error structure and identity link function using the R package "lme4". We included subject as a random factor affecting the slopes and intercepts of fixed factors. We tested significance using a likelihood-ratio

test comparing the full model to a model without the effect in question. We checked the assumptions of Gaussian error and homogeneous variance by visual inspection of plotted residuals in these tests.

Results

The head-mounted IMU of pSensor was able to reliably detect pigeons' head movement during flight. Calculating the combined angular velocity of yaw, roll, and pitch rotations revealed clearly distinctive "spikes" in the data, which indicate saccadic movement of the head (Fig. 2D). To describe the basic patterns of saccades, we pooled all the saccades detected from all our subjects during solo flights ($n = 11.0 \times 10^4$). During saccades, the mean angular velocity of the head was $150.6^\circ/\text{s} \pm 65.0$ in the combined angle (\pm SD; $96.6^\circ/\text{s} \pm 62.3$ in yaw, $93.2^\circ/\text{s} \pm 61.9$ in roll, $26.2^\circ/\text{s} \pm 22.0$ in pitch), while it was much slower during inter-saccadic intervals, $21.3^\circ/\text{s} \pm 19.4$, in the combined angle (\pm SD; $8.8^\circ/\text{s} \pm 12.7$ in yaw, $11.0^\circ/\text{s} \pm 14.3$ in roll, $12.0^\circ/\text{s} \pm 11.0$ in pitch). The duration of each saccade was $0.07 \text{ sec} \pm 0.03$ (\pm SD). The inter-saccadic interval varied greatly in duration, and the amplitude of each saccade also varied greatly in size (Fig. S1). Importantly, these values varied systematically according to the birds' flight maneuvers as well as the visual cues in the environment, as detailed below. Our IMU sensor could also record absolute head orientations (Fig. 3A), although only half of the recordings gave accurate readings (i.e. where system calibration was 3) during solo flights. To describe the basic patterns of absolute head orientations, we pooled all the samples with system calibrations of 3 during solo flights ($n = 17.6 \times 10^5$). The birds oriented their head to a maximum of approximately ± 30 degrees in yaw (relative to the flight direction; ± 21.1 SD; Fig. 3B), ± 20 degrees in roll (relative to gravity; ± 17.3 SD) and ± 10 degrees in pitch (± 7.6 SD; Fig. 3C). These results indicate two main points. First, the birds moved their head far more than necessary for the changes in flight direction (i.e. the yaw orientation was distributed widely around the flight direction). Second, the birds moved their heads predominantly in the yaw and roll axes (i.e., horizontal and sideway-tilting movement) and less so in the pitch axis (i.e., up-down movement; Fig. 2C and Table 1). Greater roll than pitch movement of the head allow birds to shift the lateral visual fields more than the frontal visual field (compare Fig. 3B and C).

We then compared these characteristics of head movement to two additional contexts: when the birds were (i) stationary on the ground and (ii) making steep turns during flight. While standing still, birds moved their head overall more compared to when they were flying, especially in the yaw (Table 1), likely indicating that the yaw movement was, to some degree, constrained during flight. When the birds turned more steeply during flight (i.e. as the rate of change in flight direction increased), they increased their head movement in the yaw direction but decreased it in the roll direction (Fig. S2). The analysis of contingency between the yaw-head orientation and flight direction (Fig. S3) revealed that (i) when birds

turned either left or right, they oriented their head (in yaw) slightly toward the corresponding direction (mean \pm SD was $5.5^\circ \pm 21.7$ and $5.4^\circ \pm 20.0$ for left and right turns, respectively), but (ii) when they turned more steeply (up to $30\text{--}40^\circ/\text{sec}$), they oriented their heads (in yaw) to a more pronounced degree toward the corresponding direction (Fig. S3), consistent with previous findings from a laboratory setting (Ros and Biewener, 2017). As a result, changes in head angle consistently preceded changes in flight direction by about half a second, irrespective of the rate of change in flight direction.

We next examined how birds in flight changed the pattern of their head movement according to experience and to the presence of specific visual cues in the environment. First, we examined the pattern of changes over consecutive releases. Birds sharply increased their homing efficiency (the beeline distance between the release site and the loft divided by the length of the path flown) over consecutive flights (LMM, $\chi^2 = 24.4$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 4A). Moreover, nearest-neighbor distances between successive flights decreased progressively ($\chi^2 = 17.9$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$), indicating the establishment and recapitulation of individually preferred routes (Fig. 4B). These changes occurred mostly over the first four flights. Changes in head movement over successive releases were small overall: birds did not change the rate of head-turning over consecutive flights ($\chi^2 = 0.70$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.40$; Fig. 4C). Yet, when we restricted our analysis to the first four flights, during which the route learning occurs most prominently, we found that the rate of head-turning increased ($\chi^2 = 16.2$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 4D), with higher saccade frequency ($\chi^2 = 9.8$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.002$; Fig. 4E) and saccade amplitude ($\chi^2 = 4.7$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.03$; Fig. 4F). After the first four flights, the birds did not increase their homing efficiency ($\chi^2 = 3.6$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.059$) or decrease the distance from their previous paths ($\chi^2 = 0.0$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.96$), and did not change the rate of head turning over consecutive flights ($\chi^2 = 2.3$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.13$).

Second, we examined how the birds changed the pattern of their head movement when they flew across prominent visual features in the landscape, such as two major roads and a railway line that passed across the terrain between the release site and the home loft. Consistent with previous studies (Guilford et al., 2004; Schiffner and Wiltshko, 2009), we saw an increase in the rate of change in flight direction (or tortuosity; LMM, $\chi^2 = 35.6$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 5B) and a decrease in ground speed ($\chi^2 = 32.1$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 5C) on approach and leave of these linear landmarks during solo flights. In addition, we found that the birds decreased their rate of head turning ($\chi^2 = 15.6$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 5D), with lower saccade frequency ($\chi^2 = 11.7$, $df = 1$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 5E) and saccade amplitude ($\chi^2 = 9.9$, $df = 1$, $p = 0.002$; Fig. 5F) the closer they were to the roads/railway line during solo flights.

Third, we examined how the birds changed the pattern of their head movement in the presence of a partner during the paired flights compared during the solo flights (Fig. 6). The birds decreased the rate of head-turning during paired flights relative to solo flights (paired t-test, $t(21) = 13.3$, $p < 0.001$; Fig. 6C),

with decreased saccade frequency ($t(21) = 7.1, p < 0.001$; Fig. 6D) and saccade amplitude ($t(21) = 13.0, p < 0.001$; Fig. 6E). These changes were not due to route learning and increasing familiarity with the landscape over consecutive flights because the same patterns emerged when comparing the paired flights with the solo flights conducted after the paired flights (Table 1; head-angular velocity, $t(21) = 13.1, p < 0.001$, saccade frequency, $t(21) = 10.5, p < 0.001$, saccade amplitude, $t(21) = 11.2, p < 0.001$). We also examined whether the birds decreased their head movement when they flew across the highways and the railway during paired flights. In contrast to the patterns found during solo flights, the birds did not show any changes in head movement when crossing these landmarks in pairs (head-angular velocity: $\chi^2 = 2.66, df = 1, p = 0.10$).

Finally, we examined how birds changed the pattern of their head movement during paired flights, in response to the partner's position relative to themselves. Birds in pairs typically flew approx. 5-10 meters from each other and rarely at distances greater than 30 meters, consistent with previous findings (Pettit et al., 2013). When pairs approached each other closely or flew at distances greater than 5-10 meters, this did not change the pattern of their head movement (Fig. S4). Birds in pairs also preferred to fly side-by-side; each bird spent proportionally more time flying alongside the partner than behind or in front of it (paired t-test, $t(21) = 7.15, p < 0.001$; Fig. 7C), again consistent with previous findings (Pettit et al., 2013). When their partner was located to the side, birds moved their head less overall than they did when the partner was in front or behind ($t(21) = 5.22, p < 0.001$; Fig. 7G), with decreased saccade frequency ($t(21) = 5.92, p < 0.001$; Fig. 7H) and saccade amplitude ($t(21) = 3.90, p = 0.001$; Fig. 7I). Interestingly, the analysis of head orientation revealed that the birds did not change their yaw-head orientation according to their partner's relative position, but instead kept orienting their head direction (or the center of their frontal visual field) towards their flight direction (Fig. S5). These results indicate that the birds decreased their head movement especially when the partner birds were in their lateral vision (at least within 30 meters).

It should be noted that these observed changes in head movement were not simply due to potential correlations between head movement and flight turns. As mentioned above, when the birds turned more steeply during flight, they increased their head movement in the yaw direction but decreased it in the roll direction (Fig. S2). Due to such offsets, the correlation between the combined head movement and the flight turn was minimal during the solo flights. However, during the paired flights, there was a clear positive correlation between the combined head movement and the flight turn (Fig. S2; this is presumably because the birds decreased their head movement overall when flying straight while they could not do so when turning steeply during the paired flights). Importantly, however, this observed correlation during the paired flights could not account for the observed differences in head movement

between the solo and paired flights because those differences were observed independently of the rate of changes in flight direction (Fig. S2). Furthermore, the difference in the rate of change in flight direction when the partner was flying alongside versus in front/behind was small and statistically non-significant (5.47 ± 0.10 vs. 5.63 ± 0.12 , mean \pm SE, paired t-test, $t(21) = 2.0$, $p = 0.06$) and thus could not account for the observed large differences in head movement between those conditions.

Discussion

We successfully obtained high-resolution data on the head movements of homing pigeons completing large-scale navigational tasks in their natural environment. Our sensor reliably recorded the 3D movement of the head and detected clearly distinctive saccade signals in the movement. Our analysis revealed that birds' head movement has at least three main functions: the stabilization of gaze, the guidance of flight, and the scanning of the environment.

Specifically, with regard to the first function, the birds stabilized their head with respect to the environment along all three axes of head rotation (roll, yaw, and pitch). This observation is consistent with previous studies which examined pigeons' head movement when they were standing still, walking, and flying short distances inside a laboratory setting (e.g., Aldoumani et al., 2016; Eckmeier et al., 2008; Ros and Biewener, 2017; Troje and Frost, 2000; Warrick et al., 2002). The role of such stabilization is likely the minimization of motion blur (Land, 1999a) and the simplification of motion images experienced while moving, by separating the rotational from translational components of optic flow, particularly during turns (Bhagavatula et al., 2011; Eckmeier et al., 2008; Kress et al., 2015).

Another function of head movement may be the guidance of flight, as the birds adjusted their head orientation during flight maneuvers. We found that the birds turned their head slightly ahead of time in the corresponding direction when the flight trajectories curved, consistent with previous findings obtained in a laboratory setting (Ros and Biewener, 2017). These observations indicate that pigeons tend to orient their head direction toward the immediate goal of their flight path. The purpose of such orientation is likely to take a vantage point from which they can view obstacles approaching them, much like human drivers do (Land and Lee, 1994). Such behavior may also help birds to analyze the steepness of their turns based on the relative speed of the experienced motions in the left and right eye, given that birds use optic flow to guide flight by balancing the speeds of image motions that are experienced in the two eyes during flight (Bhagavatula et al., 2011). Ros and Biewener (2017) pointed out that the consistent angle of the neck relative to the steering direction may allow pigeons to control body and wing movements through cervical feedbacks.

Importantly, despite the observation that flight maneuvers affected (or constrained) the pattern of head movement to some degree, overall, the birds moved their head far more than necessary for the changes in flight direction. This suggests that they deliberately scanned the environment or actively attended to external visual cues. During such scanning, they moved their head mainly in the roll and yaw directions, and less so in the pitch direction. As such movement of the head allows birds to move their lateral visual fields more widely than their frontal visual fields (compare Fig 3B and C), our subjects appeared to use mainly their lateral visual field to scan the environment during flight. This is consistent with the idea that pigeons preferentially use their lateral fovea to view distant objects (Dawkins, 2002; Erichsen et al., 1989; Maldonado et al., 1988). Also, it may explain our observation that the birds moved their head much more in the yaw direction (horizontal scan) when they were standing still on the ground compared to when they were flying, presumably to scan the objects at ground level.

During such scanning of the environment, the birds changed the pattern of their head movements in response to prominent visual cues in the environment. For example, we found that head movements decreased when our birds flew across major roads and a railway line. Previous studies have reported that pigeons have strong tendencies to follow linear structures during navigation when these structures run roughly in the direction of home (Biro et al., 2004; Lipp et al., 2004). Previous studies have also reported, and our results confirmed, that birds increase their rate of change in flight direction (i.e. they fly more tortuous paths) and decrease their ground speed near these structures, when they run perpendicular to the direction of home and thus are crossed rather than followed (Guilford et al., 2004; Schiffner and Wiltschko, 2009). This is likely because such prominent edge-type visual landmarks are sources of information within the landscape that aid navigation (Lau et al., 2006; Mann et al., 2014). Therefore, the observed decrease in head movement near linear structures may indicate that the birds changed their focus of attention at such times; either by increasing their attention to those landmarks or decreasing the search for other landmarks. We did not observe the same changes when birds flew as a pair, perhaps because birds flying together share the navigational task with each other and this may weaken signatures of individual attention. Our findings echo those of Vyssotski et al. (2009), who showed that flying pigeons show distinct activation of EEG signals when crossing highways. They also found that EEG signals did not change when the birds flew in a flock. Together, these results suggest that flying pigeons visually process and attend to prominent landmarks at the point of decision-making during navigational tasks.

Another clear result was that birds decreased their head movement when they flew with a partner compared to when flying alone. Following on from the observations mentioned above, this finding suggests that the birds changed their focus of attention during paired flight, either because they attended to their partner or because they decreased the search for landmarks or predators. Moreover, we found that

the birds decreased their head movement primarily when the partner was flying alongside them rather than in front or behind. Therefore, these results together suggest that pigeons are particularly likely to decrease their head movement when they detect partners in their lateral visual field – presumably in the part of the retina they predominantly use during flight.

Two further interesting findings will require additional studies for thorough interpretations, but already at present they provide crucial hints at the way pigeons use their gaze during flight. First, we found that over the course of the first four solo flights from a given release site the birds increased their head movement, and that it was during the same four flights that they established idiosyncratically preferred homing routes (a well-known feature of route learning in pigeons; see Guilford and Biro (2014) for a review). One speculation based on this result is that birds may modulate their visual scanning behavior during critical learning periods, i.e., as their familiarity with a given terrain increases. That is, during the initial few flights, when familiarity is low, birds may scan more actively for landmarks. Once they have established their own routes, such search/scanning efforts diminish. Interestingly, and largely consistent with the patterns found in this study, a recent experiment examined pigeons' flight speeds and wingbeat characteristics and found a distinct pattern of changes before and after the establishment of preferred routes (Taylor et al., 2017). Together, these results suggest that pigeons may employ distinct sensory and flight strategies depending on their degree of visual familiarity with a landscape. However, it should be noted that our releases were from a relatively close release site (4 km from the loft), and that all subject birds had had previous experience of homing flights. Future tests using the same instrumentation should investigate the role of experience more thoroughly and examine the correlations between learning, head movement and several other parameters of navigation (e.g. point of decision, frequently-visited landmarks, and visibility of distant landmarks or altitudes).

Second, the birds did not foveate their partners in that they did not try to hold them at a constant visual angle (Fig. S5). Specifically, they did not change their yaw-head orientation according to their partner's location but instead kept orienting their head direction (or the center of their frontal visual field) towards their flight direction (or towards the immediate goals when making turns). One possibility is that pigeons move their eyes but not their head to foveate the partner during pair flights. Yet, this is unlikely given the consistent previous findings that pigeons rarely move their eyes without head movement (at least when they were on the ground; Gioanni, 1988; Haque and Dickman, 2005; Wohlschläger et al., 1993). Thus, they seemed to attend to the partner mainly via their peripheral vision. This is presumably because flying birds need to maintain their head direction in a consistent orientation to analyze their flight direction. Possibly, as an alternative solution to actively foveating the partner with their head and eye, birds seemed to instead adjust their position relative to each other, by adjusting their flight speeds and

directions (as described in Pettit et al., 2013). Side-by-side configurations in flight may allow the partner to be most readily seen via lateral vision. However, it remains unclear whether flying birds do not foveate the partners at least occasionally. To answer such questions, the measurement of the gaze targets in the bird's simulated retina are necessary. As a last note, however, one limitation of our current system is the difficulty of conducting such precise measurements due to the instability of determining absolute orientations in the IMU sensor (see Method) and the known inaccuracies of determining longitudes/latitudes in the GPS system. Instead of the IMU-GPS system, a lightweight, head-mounted, wide-angle camera may be a good alternative in future studies because it can capture short-lasting events or stimuli directly in the video images and may thus allow us to further narrow down the birds' focus of attention.

To conclude, despite the above limitation, our pSensor could reliably record pigeons' head movement. The results revealed systematic changes in the pattern of the birds' head movement during large-scale navigation, indicating that the birds changed their gaze strategy in a task-related manner. Tracking birds' head-gaze as they freely traverse natural landscapes can thus reveal how they visually attend to the environment during navigation, both individually and in groups.

Acknowledgements

We thank Lucy Larkman, David Wilson and Phil Smith for animal husbandry and technical support. Financial support was provided by the Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science, and Technology of Japan (K-CONNEX to FK), a Royal Society Newton International Fellowship and a Marie Skłodowska-Curie Fellowship (to TS), and the Biotechnology and Biological Sciences Research Council UK (to JW).

References

- Aldoumani, N., Meydan, T., Dillingham, C. M. and Erichsen, J. T.** (2016). Enhanced tracking system based on micro inertial measurements unit to measure sensorimotor responses in pigeons. *IEEE Sensors Journal* **16**, 8847-8853.
- Bhagavatula, P. S., Claudianos, C., Ibbotson, M. R. and Srinivasan, M. V.** (2011). Optic flow cues guide flight in birds. *Current Biology* **21**, 1794-1799.
- Biro, D., Meade, J. and Guilford, T.** (2004). Familiar route loyalty implies visual pilotage in the homing pigeon. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **101**, 17440-17443.
- Biro, D., Sumpter, D. J., Meade, J. and Guilford, T.** (2006). From compromise to leadership in pigeon homing. *Current Biology* **16**, 2123-2128.
- Brighton, C. H., Thomas, A. L. R. and Taylor, G. K.** (2017). Terminal attack trajectories of peregrine falcons are described by the proportional navigation guidance law of missiles. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*.
- Davies, M. N. and Green, P. R.** (1988). Head-bobbing during walking, running and flying: relative motion perception in the pigeon. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **138**, 71-91.
- Dawkins, M. S.** (2002). What are birds looking at? Head movements and eye use in chickens. *Animal Behaviour* **63**, 991-998.
- Dawkins, M. S. and Woodington, A.** (2000). Pattern recognition and active vision in chickens. *Nature* **403**, 652-655.
- Dennis, T. E., Rayner, M. J. and Walker, M. M.** (2007). Evidence that pigeons orient to geomagnetic intensity during homing. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **274**, 1153.
- Duchowski, A. T.** (2007). Eye tracking methodology: Theory and practice. New York: Springer.
- Eckmeier, D., Geurten, B. R., Kress, D., Mertes, M., Kern, R., Egelhaaf, M. and Bischof, H.-J.** (2008). Gaze strategy in the free flying zebra finch (*Taeniopygia guttata*). *PLoS One* **3**, e3956.
- Erichsen, J. T., Hodos, W., Evinger, C., Bessette, B. B. and Phillips, S. J.** (1989). Head orientation in pigeons: postural, locomotor and visual determinants. *Brain, Behavior and Evolution* **33**, 268-278.
- Fernández-Juricic, E.** (2012). Sensory basis of vigilance behavior in birds: synthesis and future prospects. *Behavioural Processes* **89**, 143-152.
- Flack, A., Ákos, Z., Nagy, M., Vicsek, T. and Biro, D.** (2013). Robustness of flight leadership relations in pigeons. *Animal Behaviour* **86**, 723-732.
- Fuchs, A. F.** (1967). Saccadic and smooth pursuit eye movements in the monkey. *The Journal of Physiology* **191**, 609-631.
- Gagliardo, A., Filannino, C., Ialè, P., Pecchia, T., Wikelski, M. and Vallortigara, G.** (2011).

Olfactory lateralization in homing pigeons: a GPS study on birds released with unilateral olfactory inputs. *The Journal of Experimental Biology* **214**, 593.

Ghazanfar, A. A. and Shepherd, S. V. (2011). Monkeys at the movies: what evolutionary cinematics tells us about film. *Projections* **5**, 1-25.

Gioanni, H. (1988). Stabilizing gaze reflexes in the pigeon (*Columba livia*). *Experimental Brain Research* **69**, 567-582.

Gredebäck, G., Johnson, S. and von Hofsten, C. (2009). Eye tracking in infancy research. *Developmental neuropsychology* **35**, 1-19.

Green, P. R., Davies, M. N. and Thorpe, P. H. (1992). Head orientation in pigeons during landing flight. *Vision Research* **32**, 2229-2234.

Guilford, T. and Biro, D. (2014). Route following and the pigeon's familiar area map. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **217**, 169-179.

Guilford, T., Roberts, S., Biro, D. and Rezek, I. (2004). Positional entropy during pigeon homing II: navigational interpretation of Bayesian latent state models. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **227**, 25-38.

Haque, A. and Dickman, J. D. (2005). Vestibular gaze stabilization: different behavioral strategies for arboreal and terrestrial avians. *Journal of Neurophysiology* **93**, 1165-1173.

Henderson, J. M. (2003). Human gaze control during real-world scene perception. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences* **7**, 498-504.

Jones, K., Krebs, J. and Whittingham, M. (2007). Vigilance in the third dimension: head movement not scan duration varies in response to different predator models. *Animal Behaviour* **74**, 1181-1187.

Kane, S. A., Fulton, A. H. and Rosenthal, L. J. (2015). When hawks attack: animal-borne video studies of goshawk pursuit and prey-evasion strategies. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **218**, 212-222.

Kane, S. A. and Zamani, M. (2014). Falcons pursue prey using visual motion cues: new perspectives from animal-borne cameras. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **217**, 225-234.

Kano, F., Krupenye, C., Hirata, S. and Call, J. (2017). Eye tracking uncovered great apes' ability to anticipate that other individuals will act according to false beliefs. *Communicative & Integrative Biology* **10**, e1299836.

Kress, D., Van Bokhorst, E. and Lentink, D. (2015). How lovebirds maneuver rapidly using super-fast head saccades and image feature stabilization. *PLoS One* **10**, e0129287.

Krupenye, C., Kano, F., Hirata, S., Call, J. and Tomasello, M. (2016). Great apes anticipate that other individuals will act according to false beliefs. *Science* **354**, 110-114.

Land, M. F. (1999a). Motion and vision: why animals move their eyes. *Journal of Comparative Physiology A* **185**, 341-352.

Land, M. F. (1999b). The roles of head movements in the search and capture strategy of a tern (*Aves*,

- Laridae*). *Journal of Comparative Physiology A* **184**, 265-272.
- Land, M. F. and Lee, D. N.** (1994). Where we look when we steer. *Nature* **369**, 742.
- Lau, K.-K., Roberts, S., Biro, D., Freeman, R., Meade, J. and Guilford, T.** (2006). An edge-detection approach to investigating pigeon navigation. *Journal of Theoretical Biology* **239**, 71-78.
- Lipp, H.-P., Vyssotski, A. L., Wolfer, D. P., Renaudineau, S., Savini, M., Tröster, G. and Dell'Omo, G.** (2004). Pigeon homing along highways and exits. *Current Biology* **14**, 1239-1249.
- Maldonado, P. E., Maturana, H. and Varela, F. J.** (1988). Frontal and lateral visual system in birds. *Brain, Behavior and Evolution* **32**, 57-62.
- Mann, R. P., Armstrong, C., Meade, J., Freeman, R., Biro, D. and Guilford, T.** (2014). Landscape complexity influences route-memory formation in navigating pigeons. *Biology Letters* **10**.
- Martinho, A., Biro, D., Guilford, T., Gagliardo, A. and Kacelnik, A.** (2015). Asymmetric visual input and route recapitulation in homing pigeons. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Science* **282**, 1471-2954.
- Meade, J., Biro, D. and Guilford, T.** (2005). Homing pigeons develop local route stereotypy. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London B: Biological Sciences* **272**, 17-23.
- Nagy, M., Ákos, Z., Biro, D. and Vicsek, T.** (2010). Hierarchical group dynamics in pigeon flocks. *Nature* **464**, 890-893.
- Pettit, B., Perna, A., Biro, D. and Sumpter, D. J.** (2013). Interaction rules underlying group decisions in homing pigeons. *Journal of the Royal Society Interface* **10**, 20130529.
- Portugal, S. J., Ricketts, R. L., Chappell, J., White, C. R., Shepard, E. L. and Biro, D.** (2017). Boldness traits, not dominance, predict exploratory flight range and homing behaviour in homing pigeons. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **372**.
- Pratt, D. W.** (1982). Saccadic eye movements are coordinated with head movements in walking chickens. *Journal of Experimental Biology* **97**, 217-223.
- Pritchard, D. J., Hurly, T. A. and Healy, S. D.** (2018). Wild hummingbirds require a consistent view of landmarks to pinpoint a goal location. *Animal Behaviour* **137**, 83-94.
- Rattenborg, N. C., Voirin, B., Cruz, S. M., Tisdale, R., Dell'Omo, G., Lipp, H.-P., Wikelski, M. and Vyssotski, A. L.** (2016). Evidence that birds sleep in mid-flight. *Nature Communications* **7**, 12468.
- Ros, I. G. and Biewener, A. A.** (2017). Pigeons (*C. livia*) Follow Their Head during Turning Flight: Head Stabilization Underlies the Visual Control of Flight. *Frontiers in Neuroscience* **11**, 655.
- Sasaki, T. and Biro, D.** (2017). Cumulative culture can emerge from collective intelligence in animal groups. *Nature Communications* **8**.
- Schiffner, I. and Wiltshko, R.** (2009). Point of decision: when do pigeons decide to head home? *Naturwissenschaften* **96**, 251-258.

- Taylor, L. A., Portugal, S. J. and Biro, D.** (2017). Homing pigeons (*Columba livia*) modulate wingbeat characteristics as a function of route familiarity. *The Journal of Experimental Biology* **220**, 2908.
- Téglás, E., Gergely, A., Kupán, K., Miklósi, Á. and Topál, J.** (2012). Dogs' gaze following is tuned to human communicative signals. *Current Biology* **22**, 209-212.
- Troje, N. F. and Frost, B. J.** (2000). Head-bobbing in pigeons: how stable is the hold phase? *Journal of Experimental Biology* **203**, 935-940.
- Usherwood, J. R., Stavrou, M., Lowe, J. C., Roskilly, K. and Wilson, A. M.** (2011). Flying in a flock comes at a cost in pigeons. *Nature* **474**, 494-497.
- Vyssotski, A. L., Dell'Omo, G., Dell'Araccia, G., Abramchuk, A. N., Serkov, A. N., Latanov, A. V., Loizzo, A., Wolfer, D. P. and Lipp, H.-P.** (2009). EEG responses to visual landmarks in flying pigeons. *Current Biology* **19**, 1159-1166.
- Warrick, D., Bundle, M. and Dial, K.** (2002). Bird maneuvering flight: Blurred bodies, clear heads. *Integrative and Comparative Biology* **42**, 141-148.
- Watts, I., Nagy, M., Burt de Perera, T. and Biro, D.** (2016). Misinformed leaders lose influence over pigeon flocks. *Biology Letters* **12**.
- Wohlschläger, A., Jäger, R. and Delius, J. D.** (1993). Head and eye movements in unrestrained pigeons (*Columba livia*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology* **107**, 313.

Table

Table 1. Summary of head-movement results when birds were stationary on the ground, flying alone, flying in a pair, and flying alone after completing all the paired flights. Values are subject means (SE) from all birds.

	Ground	Solo	Pair	Solo after Pair
Saccade frequency (saccades/sec)	1.21 (0.03)	1.74 (0.04)	1.47 (0.04)	1.79 (0.03)
Saccade amplitude (°/saccade)	24.24 (0.41)	12.65 (0.32)	9.51 (0.25)	12.44 (0.38)
Yaw	19.57 (0.44)	8.13 (0.22)	5.63 (0.14)	7.83 (0.21)
Roll	8.35 (0.29)	7.84 (0.31)	6.05 (0.23)	7.84 (0.41)
Pitch	6.00 (0.36)	2.15 (0.07)	1.96 (0.06)	2.18 (0.07)
Head angular velocity (freq × amp; °/sec)	29.21 (1.02)	21.96 (0.76)	14.12 (0.62)	22.32 (0.90)
Rate of change in flight direction (°/sec)	-	7.67 (0.26)	6.87 (0.11)	6.99 (0.31)
Flight speed (km/h)	-	52.65 (1.20)	49.00 (0.59)	61.60 (0.80)
Homing efficiency (proportion)	-	0.72 (0.02)	0.85 (0.01)	0.81 (0.02)

Figure legends

Figure 1. The “pSensor” logger. (A) GPS logger, microcomputer, micro-SD card and battery (left; to be carried in a backpack) connected to IMU mounted on the custom-made mask (right; to be carried on the head). (B-C) A pigeon wearing the mask and logger.

Figure 2. An example 30-second flight segment (approx. 500m) recorded by the pSensor. (A) Flight trajectory recorded by the GPS. (B) 3D movements of the head recorded by the IMU, represented as yaw, roll, and pitch. The arrows indicate the direction of rotation. (C) Changes in flight direction (degrees; recorded by the GPS), and yaw-, roll-, and pitch-angle of the head (degrees; recorded by the IMU). (D) Changes in velocity (degree/sec) of the head in the combined angle, defined as $\sqrt{y^2 + r^2 + p^2}$, where y, r, and p are gyro-speed of yaw, roll, and pitch, respectively. For a video showing simultaneous head-movement and trajectory reconstruction, visit <https://youtu.be/tpQ4IPUCWfg>


Figure 3. Movement of the center points of the frontal visual field (yaw against pitch) and the lateral visual field (yaw against roll). (A) Examples of such movement. Gray and black dots represent the samples classified as saccades and inter-saccade intervals, respectively. (B) The distribution of the center points of the frontal and (C) lateral visual field. These data are from all 22 birds during the solo flights.





Figure 4. Flight performance and head movement as a function of solo release number. (A) Flight trajectories of all 22 birds during solo flights. Lighter color indicates a later flight from the same release site. (B) Homing efficiency (defined as the beeline distance between the release site and the loft divided by the length of the path flown). (C) Average nearest-neighbor distance to previous path. Decrease in the distance to a bird's own previous track indicates the appearance of route recapitulation. (D-F) Head-movement characteristics. Values are subject means (\pm SE) from all 22 birds during solo flights.




Figure 5. Changes in head movement and flight patterns as a function of the distance from two major roads and a railway line during solo flights (both before and after crossing). (A) Schematic showing location of roads and railway line on the way to the loft. (B) Rate of change in flight direction ($^{\circ}$ /sec). (C) Speed (km /h). (D-F) Head movement characteristics. Values are subject means (\pm SE) from all 22 birds during solo flights.







Figure 6. Head movement in solo vs. paired flights (A-B) Examples of head movement (yaw-, roll-, and pitch-angle, and the combined angular velocity) in solo vs. paired flights performed by the same bird. (C-E) Head-movement characteristics. Values are subject means (\pm SE) from all 22 birds during the solo and paired flights.







Figure 7. Saccade properties as a function of the partner's position during paired flights. (A) Angle to the partner (in comparison with the flight direction of the focal bird). (B-C) Likelihood of partner presence (the mean proportion of total flight time when the partner was present). (D-I) Head movement characteristics. The bar graphs (C, G, H, I) show the means of the bins in which the partner was flying either in the "front/back" (-45° to 45° and $\pm 135^{\circ}$ to $\pm 180^{\circ}$) or the "side" position of the focal birds ($\pm 45^{\circ}$ to $\pm 135^{\circ}$). Values are subject means (\pm SE) from all 22 birds during paired flights.













A**B****C****D**

A**B****C**

A**B****C****D****E****F**

A**B****C****D****E****F**





Movie S1. Examples of the data obtained by the “pSensor”. To view it online, visit

<https://youtu.be/tpQ4IPUCWfg>








Figure S1. Definition of head-saccades. We defined saccades as the periods in which the head-angle speed exceeded 60 degree/sec, and the duration of each saccade is longer than 50 ms. (A) Changes in head-angles and the combined head-angular velocity. The periods that exceeded 60 degree/sec are indicated as shades. (B) The distribution of saccade amplitudes before we filtered out those saccades shorter than 50 ms. There were two distinguishable population of saccades with a peak around 2 degrees and 10 degrees respectively. Those short saccades ($< 50\text{ms}$) are possibly correction saccades that stabilize gaze while vigorously moving their bodies, and often not distinguishable from the recording noises. We filtered them out in our analysis (D-E). (C) The distribution of saccade amplitudes as a function of the saccade duration. The shorter saccades were smaller in amplitude. The distribution of saccade amplitudes and inter-saccadic intervals before and after filtering those short saccades.




Figure S2. Relationship between head movement and body turn. (A, D) Saccade frequency (count/sec), (B, E) saccade amplitude (°/saccade), (C, F) head turning rate (frequency \times amplitude; °/sec), for the solo flight and pair flight. The values are the subject means (\pm SE). When the birds turned more steeply during flight (the rate of changes in flight direction increases), they increased their head movement in yaw direction but decreased their head movement in the roll direction. Due to such offsets, the correlation between head movement and body turn was minimal during the solo flights. However, during the paired flights, there was a positive correlation between head movement and body turn (presumably because the birds decreased their head movement when flying straightly while they could not do so when turning steeply during the paired flights).




Figure S3. Relationship between head direction and flight direction. (A) Section of flight illustrating changes in flight direction and time-matched head-yaw angle. (B) Distribution of head-yaw angles relative to flight direction when birds were turning left or right. (C) Yaw angle (relative to flight direction) as a function of the rate of change in flight direction (positive values indicate rightward turns). These data are from solo flights.




Figure S4. Head movement as a function of the partner position (distance in meter) in a pair flight. (A) The distance from the partner. (B) The likeliness of partner presence (the proportion of the time when the partner was present) as a function of the partner position. (C-E) The saccade characteristics as a function of the partner position.




Figure S5. Head-yaw angle relative to the flight direction as a function of the partner position (angle in degree). The birds oriented their head directions (or the center of their frontal visual field) to the flight direction independently of the partner position. Note that the birds moved their head less when the partner was on their sides (as indicated as the sharper distribution).