

1
2 **Come dine with me: food-associated social signalling in wild bottlenose**
3 **dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*)**
4

5 **Authors:** Stephanie. L. King¹ and Vincent. M. Janik¹

6 **Affiliations:** ¹ Sea Mammal Research Unit, School of Biology, University of St Andrews, St
7 Andrews, Fife, KY16 8LB, U.K

8
9 **Corresponding author:** Stephanie King; Sea Mammal Research Unit, School of Biology,
10 University of St Andrews, St Andrews, Fife, KY16 8LB, U.K. Email: slk33@st-andrews.ac.uk.
11 Tel: (44) (0) 1334 461829.

12
13 **Abstract**

14 The occurrence of food-related signaling is prolific in the animal kingdom with some food-
15 associated vocalizations considered functionally referential. Food calls can, however, vary
16 greatly in the type of information they convey. Thus, there are a multitude of purposes for which
17 food calls are used, including social recruitment, caller spacing, the indication of type, quantity,
18 quality, divisibility of food and/or the caller's hunger level and even as tools to manipulate prey
19 behaviour. Yet little work has focused on the social aspect of food calling in animals. We
20 investigated the association of social signals in wild bottlenose dolphins with foraging behaviour
21 where context specific food-associated calls are commonly produced. Our data showed that
22 specific social signals were significantly correlated with food call production and these calls
23 rarely occurred in the absence of food calls. We suggest that animals are sharing additional
24 information on the food patch itself with their social affiliates.

25 **Keywords:** food calls, bottlenose dolphin, signature whistles, vocal learning, call matching.

26

27 **Introduction**

28
29

30 Food calls are found throughout the animal kingdom when animals are trying to attract others to
31 a foraging site (Clay et al. 2012). In many cases, these vocalizations function in attracting related
32 animals to increase the caller's inclusive fitness. Animals may also call to attract non-related
33 partners, which may help enhance the caller's social standing (Slocombe et al. 2010).
34 Alternatively, the presence of others may increase the caller's food intake by helping to herd
35 prey (Brown et al. 1991) or protecting against predators (Radford and Ridley 2007) or competing
36 conspecifics (Heinrich 1988). Animals may also communicate more detailed information such as
37 the type, quality or quantity of food available (Clay et al. 2012). Thus much interest has been
38 placed on understanding how food-related signaling benefits the caller. Yet little focus has been
39 placed on the other types of social signals that may accompany the production of food-associated
40 calls.

41 In cetaceans, for example, food-associated vocalizations have been described for several species
42 in the wild, including killer whales (*Orcinus orca*, Ugarte et al. 2006; Deecke et al. 2011),
43 humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*, Stimpert et al. 2011; Parks et al. 2014), and
44 bottlenose dolphins (Janik 2000a). While these calls may be used to attract conspecifics, reports
45 suggest that their primary function may be one of manipulating prey to facilitate capture (Janik
46 2000a). While this is an interesting possibility, there is so far no experimental confirmation. One
47 study looked at the effect of high, mid and low frequency dolphin clicks on fish behaviour but
48 found no effect (Benoit-Bird et al. 2006). Many of these food-related burst-pulsed calls,
49 however, are stimulus specific and therefore particular calls may have evolved to modify the
50 behaviour of particular prey species. If food associated calls do play a role in facilitating prey
51 capture in wild animals then the attraction of conspecifics may be a by-product that does not

52 actually benefit the caller. However, animals may use other social calls concurrently with food-
53 associated vocalizations in order to share information on the food patch.

54 Ridgway et al. (2014) reported calls in a food context in captive bottlenose dolphins and beluga
55 whales that were structurally different from other dolphin food calls, such as the bray call (Janik
56 2000a). Ridgway et al. (2014) believed these calls signalled the emotional state of the animal
57 where by an animal is anticipating a food reward. Thus, these calls should not be specific to a
58 food context and would therefore not qualify as food calls (Clay et al. 2012). Interpreting calls in
59 training contexts can be difficult and further work on wild animals is required to explore the
60 distinction between such calls.

61 To investigate the possibility of added communication through other social calls when food calls
62 are given, we investigated the association of whistle interactions with bray calls in bottlenose
63 dolphins. Bray calls have a frequency spectrum that makes them suitable for manipulating prey,
64 but also for attracting conspecifics to the foraging location (Janik 2000a). We investigated
65 whether there was a correlation between food calling and a certain sign of social interaction, the
66 matching of whistles between different animals (Janik 2000b).

67 **Materials and Methods**

68 During May to September 2010, we collected acoustic recordings from the dolphins that frequent
69 St. Andrews Bay, Scotland. These animals are members of a resident population of
70 approximately 195 bottlenose dolphins that range between the Moray Firth and the Firth of Forth
71 (Cheney et al. 2013). To identify foraging, we looked for the presence of food-related bray calls
72 in our acoustic recordings. Animals produce bray calls at depth (20m-30m) (Hastie et al. 2006)

73 and often return to the surface visibly chasing and foraging on large fish (Janik 2000a; Hastie et
74 al. 2006). We then explored if whistle matching occurred in close proximity to bray calls.

75 Group follows were conducted from a 6-m boat at Beaufort sea state three or less and animals
76 were photographed with a Canon Digital 30D SLR camera with a Sigma 100-300mm, F4 zoom
77 lens. Acoustic recordings were taken using two HTI-96 MIN hydrophones (frequency response:
78 0.002 to 30 kHz \pm 1 dB) towed at 2-m depth and a Toshiba Satellite Pro Laptop with an Edirol
79 UA-25 sound card (sampling rate: 96 kHz, 16 bit).

80 We analysed acoustic recordings by screening the spectrographic displays (FFT length 1024,
81 87.5% overlap, Hanning window) in Adobe Audition v2.0 (Adobe Systems) by eye for
82 occurrences of low-frequency bray calls and frequency modulated whistles. Those recording
83 segments where engine noise exceeded 2 kHz were discarded from the analysis. Bray calls are
84 highly distinctive and were identified by detecting their two-part structure consisting of a long,
85 low frequency (peak at less than 2 kHz) pulsed sound followed by a short down-sweep (Janik
86 2000a). Each bray call is 500 to 600 milliseconds in length (dos Santos et al. 1995; Janik 2000a)
87 and can be recorded from over a km from the calling animal. Bray calls are usually produced in
88 bouts (Janik 2000a) and therefore a series of brays in close proximity was treated as one braying
89 event (Figure 1). Bray sequences can last up to 30 s (dos Santos et al. 1995). Frequency
90 modulated whistles were identified and could either be continuous in their frequency contour
91 pattern or could be multi-loop whistles. Multi-loop whistles were defined as a repeated
92 modulation pattern that could be separated by periods of stereotyped silence up to 250ms in
93 length (Esch et al. 2009). Whistles with periods of silence of less than 250ms but not overlapping
94 were treated as one whistle. A total of 23 hours and 51 minutes of recordings were inspected
95 spanning 18 days from June to August 2010, of which 12 hours and 08 minutes from 15 days

96 were of sufficient sound quality for further analysis. A total of 81 braying events were identified
97 in this recording time.

98 The simple two-element recording system used in this study meant we were unable to localise
99 whistles to individual animals. Instead we used overlapping whistle interactions as an indicator
100 of two animals communicating with each other. We focused on those overlaps in which both
101 animals were using the same whistle type, an indicator of animals addressing each other (Janik
102 2000b; King and Janik 2013; King et al. 2014).

103 An 'overlap match' was defined as two whistles of the same contour pattern (change of
104 frequency over time) where the end point of one whistle finished after the start of the other
105 whistle (Figure 2). All identified occurrences of overlap whistle matching were separately
106 checked and then agreed by both authors who have been shown to agree with classifications by
107 groups of independent observers (Janik 1999; Deecke and Janik 2006; Janik, King, Sayigh,
108 Wells 2013).

109 To be sure the overlapping of whistles was not merely a result of an increase in call rate, we also
110 looked at the occurrence of different whistle types that overlapped but did not match. An
111 'overlap no match' was defined as two whistles with different contour patterns where the end
112 point of one whistle finished after the start of the second whistle.

113 Permutation tests were performed to test whether overlap matching and bray calls occurred in
114 close temporal proximity above chance levels. The times between each 'overlap match' and the
115 nearest bray call (n=30) were shuffled with the times between each 'overlap no match' and the
116 nearest bray call (n=55). The random distribution was calculated from 10000 permutations under
117 the null hypothesis that there was no relationship between the timing of the 'overlap matches'

118 and bray call production. The observed test statistic (mean proximity between ‘overlap matches’
119 and bray calls) was then compared with the random distribution. The observed difference in
120 mean proximity to bray calls between overlap matches and overlap non-matches was also
121 compared to a random distribution of differences in mean proximities between the two whistle
122 categories, which was calculated from 10000 permutations.

123 All analyses were performed in R (R project for statistical computing; GNU project).

124 **Results**

125 A total of 30 occurrences of overlap matching and 55 occurrences of overlap non-matching
126 events were identified from recordings made during 10 encounters across 9 days (Table 1).

127 Individual re-sightings of animals across the 10 encounters were relatively low (mean: 1.85,
128 range: 1-5) and group sizes were large (mean: 9.5 animals, range: 3-23); see Table 2. A total of
129 46 animals were identified plus 4 calves. Of those, 69% were only sighted in one or two
130 encounters, 22% in three encounters, and 9% in four or five encounters. No single animal was
131 found in all 10 encounters.

132 Overlap matches occurred in significantly closer temporal proximity to bray calls than whistles
133 that overlapped but did not match ($P < 0.0066$, permutation test, Table 1 and Figure 3). Under
134 the random distribution only 57% of whistles were expected to occur within 1 minute of a bray
135 call. However, 73% of observed overlap matches occurred within 1 minute of a bray call
136 whereas of those cases where whistles overlapped but did not match, only 49% occurred within 1
137 minute of a bray call. The randomization test showed that overlap matches and bray calls
138 occurred in tight temporal proximity with the mean proximity between overlap matches and bray
139 calls significantly smaller than expected by chance (permutation, $P < 0.0001$; Figure 4). In

140 contrast, the mean proximity between whistles that overlapped but did not match and bray calls
141 was significantly larger than expected by chance (permutation, $P < 0.0001$; Figure 4).

142 Thus the rapid matching of call-types was closely associated with bray call production and
143 appears to play a significant role in bottlenose dolphin foraging behaviour while the animals
144 decrease rapid, non-matching interactions during foraging.

145 The majority (60%) of whistles used in overlap matching events were variations of one particular
146 whistle pattern (type A; Figure 2 & Table 2), with a second whistle pattern (type D) produced in
147 20% of events (Figure 5 & Table 2).

148

149

150 **Discussion**

151 We have shown that bottlenose dolphins repeatedly produce specific social signals, overlap
152 matches, alongside food-associated calls and that they rarely produce these signals independently
153 of the food call. In addition, they appear to decrease the production of overlapped non-matched
154 calls when foraging. This suggests that there is a social aspect of food calling in animals that has
155 not previously been reported.

156 A few studies have reported matching exchanges (Janik 2000b; King et al. 2013) and
157 overlapping in dolphin whistles (Caldwell and Caldwell 1968; Nakahara and Miyazaki 2011).
158 Bottlenose dolphins use vocal learning to develop individually distinctive signature whistles that
159 allow for individual recognition (Janik and Sayigh 2013). In specific contexts, these are also
160 used in matching interactions (Janik and Slater 1998; King et al. 2013). In captive bottlenose

161 dolphins, signature whistle matching i.e. copying the signature whistle of an animal right after it
162 produced one, leads to further signature whistling (King et al. 2014). This does not occur when
163 using whistles of other types as a reply. Furthermore, the animals show no sign of aggression
164 when matched, suggesting that signature whistle matching is affiliative and helps to maintain
165 contact (King et al. 2013; King et al. 2014). In the wild, the matching of call types in quick
166 succession in coordinated foraging, as shown here, could facilitate the directing of signals to
167 particular individuals that share a large communication network (McGregor and Dabelsteen
168 1996; Janik 2005).

169 The production of food-related bray calls in dolphins has previously been correlated with
170 animals swimming quickly towards the caller's location, perhaps facilitating joining events
171 between individuals or groups of animals (Janik 2000a). Animals who wish to join may therefore
172 use overlap matching to signal their intention when approaching a caller. However, although
173 dolphins are known to increase whistle rates dramatically when groups join together, whistle
174 matching has not been observed during these joining events (Quick and Janik 2012). It is thus
175 unlikely that overlap matching facilitates group joins, but it may help coordination between
176 animals within a group when rapid reactions are needed.

177
178 An example for this type of rapid signaling can be found in the pied-babbler (*Turdoides bicolor*),
179 a species that uses a close call, called the 'chuck' to regulate spacing between foraging
180 competitors (Radford and Ridley 2008). Although not used aggressively, the close call did deter
181 conspecifics that attempted to share an individual's foraging patch, and was effective in
182 indicating the forager's current position. Pied-babblers increased chuck production rate when in
183 larger groups, and when neighbours were closer (Radford and Ridley 2008).

184

185 Overlapping can occur in a chorus when animals compete over resources such as females
186 (Staicer et al. 1996) or aim at an acoustic dilution effect for predator avoidance (Gerhardt and
187 Huber 2002). We suggest a more interactive function here where overlapping of shared whistles
188 regulates the spacing of individuals during intensive feeding bouts where group sizes are large.
189 Such directed overlapping can be an aggressive signal in some species (e.g. manakins; Maynard
190 et al. 2012), and a sign of social bonding (e.g. chimpanzees; Fedurek et al. 2013) or social
191 cohesion (e.g. wolves; Mazzini et al. 2013) in others. Additional studies are needed to clarify the
192 function of overlapping during foraging in dolphins.

193

194 As one may expect with vocal matching interactions, the number of whistles that occurred within
195 an overlap match was usually two, indicating only two animals were vocalizing. However, there
196 were two occasions where three matching whistles overlapped (Figure 2). Janik (2000b) also
197 found that matching interactions mostly involved two animals, where each produced a single
198 whistle. He used a randomisation test to show that the number of matching interactions was
199 significantly greater than expected if all animals were calling independently of each other (Janik
200 2000b). The fact that mainly pairs and sometimes trios of animals engaged in these relatively
201 isolated sharing events, makes them different from the production of food calls found in other
202 species (Clay et al. 2012). In the events we reported here, the bray call is the food call, and
203 whistles are used additionally to apparently coordinate behavior between pairs or trios of animals
204 within the larger foraging group.

205 Interestingly, the fact that only a small number of whistle types appear to be represented in this
206 dataset suggests that these calls may not be signature whistles. While we had re-sightings of

207 animals in encounters, our sample comprised a large number of animals. We therefore think that
208 these whistles may represent shared whistles, which are used by multiple animals in this very
209 specific context. If so, the matching of calls by bottlenose dolphins may go beyond the exchange
210 of signature whistles. However, since we cannot completely rule out that the whistles are not
211 signatures of specific animals, further investigation into whistle use during group foraging is
212 needed.

213 We do not know how many different individuals participated in these matching events. Whether
214 it was a small or large number of animals, our results show that overlap matching is closely
215 related to bray call production across multiple recordings. Further work is required to fully
216 understand the function of overlap matching, now that we have shown that there is a social
217 aspect to food calling. Future studies should investigate not only the use of the food call itself,
218 but the social signals that accompany those calls in order to give further insight into the cognitive
219 significance of food-associated vocalizations.

220

221 **Acknowledgements**

222 We would like to thank Thomas Götz and all our field assistants for their help during this study.
223 The project was funded by a BBSRC Studentship to SLK, and a Royal Society University
224 Research Fellowship and a Fellowship of the Wissenschaftskolleg Berlin to VMJ. It was carried
225 out under Scottish Natural Heritage Research License number 10778. The data reported in this
226 paper are archived at the Sea Mammal Research Unit, University of St Andrews.

227

228 Literature Cited

- 229 Benoit-Bird KJ, Au WWL, Kastelein R (2006) Testing the odontocete acoustic prey debilitation
230 hypothesis: No stunning results. *J Acoust Soc Am* 120:1118–1123. doi: 10.1121/1.2211508
- 231 Brown CR, Brown M, Shaffer ML (1991) Food-sharing signals among socially foraging cliff
232 swallows. *Anim Behav* 42:551–564.
- 233 Caldwell MC, Caldwell DK (1968) Vocalization of Naive Captive Dolphins in Small Groups.
234 *Science* (80-) 159:1121–1123.
- 235 Cheney B, Thompson PM, Ingram SN, et al. (2013) Integrating multiple data sources to assess
236 the distribution and abundance of bottlenose dolphins *Tursiops truncatus* in Scottish waters.
237 *Mamm Rev* 43:71–88.
- 238 Clay Z, Smith CL, Blumstein DT (2012) Food-associated vocalizations in mammals and birds:
239 what do these calls really mean? *Anim Behav* 83:323–330. doi:
240 10.1016/j.anbehav.2011.12.008
- 241 Deecke V, Nykänen M, Foote A, Janik V (2011) Vocal behaviour and feeding ecology of killer
242 whales *Orcinus orca* around Shetland, UK. *Aquat Biol* 13:79–88.
- 243 Deecke VB, Janik VM (2006) Automated categorization of bioacoustic signals: avoiding
244 perceptual pitfalls. *J Acoust Soc Am* 119:645–653.
- 245 Dos Santos ME, Ferreira AJ, Harzen S (1995) Rhythmic sound sequences emitted by aroused
246 bottlenose dolphins in the Sado estuary, Portugal. In: Kastelein RA, Thomas JA, Nachtigall
247 PE (eds) *Sens. Syst. Aquat. Mamm. De Spil Publishers, Woerden, The Netherlands*, pp
248 325–334
- 249 Esch HC, Sayigh LS, Wells RS (2009) Quantifying parameters of bottlenose dolphin signature
250 whistles. *Mar Mammal Sci* 24:976–986.
- 251 Fedurek P, Machanda ZP, Schel AM, Slocombe KE (2013) Pant hoot chorusing and social bonds
252 in male chimpanzees. *Anim Behav* 86:189–196. doi: 10.1016/j.anbehav.2013.05.010
- 253 Gerhardt H, Huber F (2002) *Acoustic communication in insects and frogs: common problems
254 and diverse solutions*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago
- 255 Hastie GD, Wilson B, Thompson PM (2006) Diving deep in a foraging hotspot: acoustic insights
256 into bottlenose dolphin dive depths and feeding behaviour. *Mar Biol* 148:1181–1188.
- 257 Heinrich B (1988) Winter foraging at carcasses by three sympatric corvids, with emphasis on
258 recruitment by the raven, *Corvus corax*. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 23:141–156.
- 259 Janik VM (2000a) Food-related bray calls in wild bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Proc
260 Biol Sci* 267:923–7.

- 261 Janik VM (2000b) Whistle matching in wild bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Science*
262 (80-) 289:1355–1356.
- 263 Janik VM (1999) Pitfalls in the categorization of behaviour: a comparison of dolphin whistle
264 classification methods. *Anim Behav* 57:133–143. doi: 10.1006/anbe.1998.0923
- 265 Janik VM (2005) Underwater acoustic communication networks in marine mammals. In:
266 McGregor PK (ed) *Anim. Commun. Networks*. Cambridge University Press, pp 390–415
- 267 Janik VM, Sayigh LS (2013) Communication in bottlenose dolphins: 50 years of signature
268 whistle research. *J Comp Physiol A* 199:479–489.
- 269 Janik VM, Slater PJ (1998) Context-specific use suggests that bottlenose dolphin signature
270 whistles are cohesion calls. *Anim Behav* 56:829–838.
- 271 Janik, V.M., King, S.L., Sayigh, L.S., Wells RS (2013) Identifying signature whistles from
272 recordings of groups of unrestrained bottlenose dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Mar Mammal*
273 *Sci* 29:109–122. doi: 10.1111/j.1748-7692.2011.00549.x
- 274 King SL, Harley HE, Janik VM (2014) The role of signature whistle matching in bottlenose
275 dolphins (*Tursiops truncatus*). *Anim Behav* 96:79–86.
- 276 King SL, Janik VM (2013) Bottlenose dolphins use learned vocal labels to address each other.
277 *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 110:13216–13221.
- 278 King SL, Sayigh LS, Wells RS, et al. (2013) Vocal copying of individually distinctive signature
279 whistles in bottlenose dolphins Vocal copying of individually distinctive signature whistles
280 in bottlenose dolphins. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci* 280:20130053.
- 281 Maynard DF, Ward KA, Doucet SM, Mennill DJ (2012) Calling in an acoustically competitive
282 environment : duetting male long-tailed manakins avoid overlapping neighbours but not
283 playback-simulated rivals. *Anim Behav* 84:563–573.
- 284 Mazzini F, Townsend SW, Virányi Z, Range F (2013) Wolf howling is mediated by relationship
285 quality rather than underlying emotional stress. *Curr Biol* 23:1677–80. doi:
286 10.1016/j.cub.2013.06.066
- 287 McGregor PK, Dabelsteen T (1996) Communication Networks. In: Kroodsma DE, Miller EH
288 (eds) *Ecology and Evolution of Acoustic Communication in Birds*. Comstock Publishing
289 Associates, Ithaca pp 409–425
- 290 Nakahara F, Miyazaki N (2011) Vocal exchanges of signature whistles in bottlenose dolphins
291 (*Tursiops truncatus*). *J Ethol* 29:309–320.
- 292 Parks SE, Cusano D a, Stimpert AK, et al. (2014) Evidence for acoustic communication among
293 bottom foraging humpback whales. *Sci Rep* 4:7508. doi: 10.1038/srep07508

- 294 Quick NJ, Janik VM (2012) Bottlenose Dolphins Exchange Signature Whistles when Meeting at
295 Sea. Proc. R. Soc. B-Biological Sci.
- 296 Radford AN, Ridley AR (2007) Individuals in foraging groups may use vocal cues when
297 assessing their need for anti-predator vigilance. Biol Lett 3:249–52. doi:
298 10.1098/rsbl.2007.0110
- 299 Radford AN, Ridley AR (2008) Close calling regulates spacing between foraging competitors in
300 the group-living pied babbler. Anim Behav 75:519–527.
- 301 Ridgway SH, Moore PW, Carder DA, Romano TA (2014) Forward shift of feeding buzz
302 components of dolphins and belugas during associative learning reveals a likely connection
303 to reward expectation, pleasure and brain dopamine activation. J Exp Biol 217:2910–2919.
304 doi: 10.1242/jeb.100511
- 305 Slocombe KE, Kaller T, Turman L, et al. (2010) Production of food-associated calls in wild male
306 chimpanzees is dependent on the composition of the audience. Behav Ecol Sociobiol
307 64:1959–1966. doi: 10.1007/s00265-010-1006-0
- 308 Staicer C, Spector D, Horn A (1996) The dawn chorus and other diel patterns in acoustic
309 signalling. In: Kroodsma D, Miller E (eds) Ecology and Evolution of Acoustic
310 Communication in Birds. Comstock Publishing Associates, Ithaca, pp 426–453
- 311 Stimpert AK, Wiley DN, Au WWL, et al. (2011) “Megapclicks”: acoustic click trains and buzzes
312 produced during night-time foraging of humpback whales (*Megaptera novaeangliae*). Biol
313 Lett 3:467–470.
- 314 Ugarte SM, Wahlberg M, Miller LA (2006) Icelandic killer whale *Orcinus orca* use a pulsed call
315 suitable for manipulating the schooling behaviour of herring *Clupea harengus*. Bioacoustics
316 26:57–74.

317

318

319

320

321

322

323

324 **Table 1.** The number of occurrences of the two whistle categories and their mean proximity to
325 the nearest bray call.

Whistle Category	# of occurrences	mean proximity to bray call (seconds)
overlap match	30	82 (range: 0.0001-627)
overlap no match	55	392 (range: 0.0001-3163)

326

327

328


329 **Table 2.** The number of different recording days where overlap matching occurred, the number
330 of overlap matches that were recorded, the group size at the time of recording, with the
331 additional number of calves identified provided in parentheses, and the whistle type (frequency
332 contour pattern).

Recording Day	# of overlap matches	Group Size	Whistle Type
1	1	7	A
2	1	3	B
3	1	4 (1)	A
4	3	3 (1)	BC
5	4	5	A
6	6	8	AD
7	5	18 (2)	AD
8	4	8	ABD
9.1	2	21 (2)	A
9.2	3	11 (1)	A

333

334

335 **Figure 1.** Food-associated calls in wild bottlenose dolphins; example of a braying bout.



336

337

338

339

340


341

342

343

344


345 **Figure 2.** Examples of two occurrences of a matching overlap, where three and then two
346 whistles of the same type (whistle type A) overlap in time. The end of the first whistle occurs
347 after the start of the second and third whistle.



348

349


350 **Figure 3.** The distribution of proximities to the nearest bray call for the two whistle categories;
351 the median proximity to the nearest bray call is 13.5 seconds for overlap matches and 71 seconds
352 for whistles that overlap but do not match.



353

354


355 **Figure 4.** Histograms of the expected mean proximities, based on 10 000 randomisations, of
356 each whistle category to the nearest bray call (seconds), the dotted line indicates the observed
357 mean proximity.



358

359

360 **Figure 5.** Example of overlap matching, where two whistles of the same type (whistle type D)
361 overlap in time. The end of the first whistle occurs after the start of the second whistle. A third
362 whistle (type D) follows later.



363