

Reply to Auersperg et al.: Puffin tool use is no fluke

Annette L Fayet¹, Erpur Snær Hansen², Dora Biro¹

¹ Department of Zoology, University of Oxford, South Parks Road, OX1 3PS, UK

² South Iceland Nature Research Centre, Ægisgata 2, 900 Vestmannaeyjar, Iceland

* Corresponding Author: Email: annette.fayet@gmail.com; Tel: +44(0)7539015972, Address: see ¹

Auersperg et al.(1) question whether our observations (2) provide compelling evidence of tool use in puffins. While we welcome their possible alternative explanations in which birds picked up sticks for another purpose, then scratched only accidentally, we argue that (i) these other purposes are unlikely given the behavioural ecology of our study populations but (ii) regardless, they are not mutually exclusive with the subsequent behaviour qualifying as tool use, and (iii) careful examination of the video evidence refutes interpretation as merely an accidental application of the object.

Puffins on our colonies prefer soft nest material (in Iceland, E.S.H.'s endoscope inspections of 1000+ nests revealed exclusively grass and feathers), and the sticks were not taken into nests. As for the suggestion of courtship, displays with sticks have never been seen in puffins on our colonies (nor, to our knowledge, elsewhere). Furthermore, our observations were made during chick-rearing, beyond the peak of courtship and nest-making.

However, even if the stick initially had another purpose, this would not preclude the actions that followed from representing tool use. Object manipulation is often discussed as a precursor – developmentally and evolutionarily – to tool use (3, 4), and many tool-using animals handle objects well before they begin to use them as tools (5–7). Furthermore, careful viewing of our footage shows that the bird's movements were precise and delicate: its head stops in time such that the stick neither bumps against the body nor shifts/dislodges from the beak, and upon contact the head moves side to side in a scratching motion (i.e. the bird is not simply “touching” its chest as Auersperg et al. wrongly recount). Hence the stick itself was likely part of the “intended” behavioural sequence. The point that the sequence is unrepeated is moot: the automated video-recording ends before the bird drops the stick, hence we cannot tell if it was repeated or not. Our other observation was very similar to that captured on video, except the bird came into view

already holding the stick, and scratched for ~5s. As for the scepticism whether birds would use tools to scratch within-reach body parts, the same is true of other species scratching with tools (8, 9), and our paper offered possible explanations for how the stick might have increased the efficiency or convenience of the behaviour.

We agree our observations were few, but novel tool-use discoveries often report similarly small numbers (e.g.(10, 11), including the interesting cormorant report mentioned by Auersperg et al.). Besides, with <1% of puffins monitored in the few populations under scientific study, the behaviour could have recurred unnoticed. We provided new observations of a novel type of behaviour in wild birds, and in a new suborder of birds. As highlighted on the PNAS website, “Brief Reports describe observations of immediate impact that may hold potential to initiate new avenues of research”. We hope our account will do exactly that – drive future research by encouraging others to look for and report novel behaviours, and to explore their cognitive implications through further observation and experimentation.

1. A. M. I. Auersperg, R. Schwing, B. Mioduszevska, M. O’Hara, L. Huber, Do puffins use tools? *PNAS*.
2. A. L. Fayet, E. S. Hansen, D. Biro, Evidence of tool use in a seabird. *PNAS* **117**, 1277–1279 (2020).
3. M. Hayashi, T. Matsuzawa, Cognitive development in object manipulation by infant chimpanzees. *Animal Cognition* **6**, 225–233 (2003).
4. K. Koops, T. Furuichi, C. Hashimoto, C. P. van Schaik, Sex Differences in Object Manipulation in Wild Immature Chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes schweinfurthii*) and Bonobos (*Pan paniscus*): Preparation for Tool Use? *PLoS One* **10** (2015).
5. Y. Eshchar, P. Izar, E. Visalberghi, B. Resende, D. Frigaszy, When and where to practice: social influences on the development of nut-cracking in bearded capuchins (*Sapajus libidinosus*). *Animal Cognition* **19**, 605–618 (2016).
6. N. Inoue-Nakamura, T. Matsuzawa, Development of stone tool use by wild chimpanzees (*Pan troglodytes*). *Journal of Comparative Psychology* **111**, 159–173 (1997).

7. B. Kenward, C. Rutz, A. A. S. Weir, A. Kacelnik, Development of tool use in New Caledonian crows: inherited action patterns and social influences. *Animal Behaviour* **72**, 1329–1343 (2006).
8. S. M. Lindshield, M. A. Rodrigues, Tool use in wild spider monkeys (*Ateles geoffroyi*). *Primates* **50**, 269–272 (2009).
9. J. Boswall, Tool-using by birds and related behaviour. *Aviculture Magazine* **83**, 88-97 (1977).
10. T. Breuer, M. Ndoundou-Hockemba, V. Fishlock, First Observation of Tool Use in Wild Gorillas. *PLOS Biology* **3**, e380 (2005).
11. C. Rutz, S. Deans, Nuthatch uses tool in London park. *Ethology* **124**, 135–138 (2018).