

# Behavioral Ecology and Sociobiology

## Cue-conflict experiments between magnetic and visual cues in dunlin *Calidris alpina* and curlew sandpiper *Calidris ferruginea*

--Manuscript Draft--

<b>Manuscript Number:</b>	BEAS-D-16-00614R2	
<b>Full Title:</b>	Cue-conflict experiments between magnetic and visual cues in dunlin <i>Calidris alpina</i> and curlew sandpiper <i>Calidris ferruginea</i>	
<b>Article Type:</b>	Original Article	
<b>Corresponding Author:</b>	Lorenzo Vanni, Ph.D. Universita degli Studi di Pisa Pisa, Livorno ITALY	
<b>Corresponding Author Secondary Information:</b>		
<b>Corresponding Author's Institution:</b>	Universita degli Studi di Pisa	
<b>Corresponding Author's Secondary Institution:</b>		
<b>First Author:</b>	Lorenzo Vanni, Ph.D.	
<b>First Author Secondary Information:</b>		
<b>Order of Authors:</b>	Lorenzo Vanni, Ph.D. Natale Emilio Baldaccini Dimitri Giunchi	
<b>Order of Authors Secondary Information:</b>		
<b>Funding Information:</b>	Ministero dell'Istruzione, dell'Università e della Ricerca (PRIN 20083ML4XC)	Dr Dimitri Giunchi
<b>Abstract:</b>	<p>Despite our extensive knowledge on various aspects of their lives, there has been limited investigation into the hierarchical relationships among different compass systems in shorebirds. The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between magnetic and celestial compasses in two species of shorebirds, the curlew sandpiper (<i>Calidris ferruginea</i>; pre-breeding migration) and the dunlin (<i>Calidris alpina</i>; post-breeding migration) using cue-conflict experiments. Birds were captured in a Mediterranean stopover site, after which their magnetic orientation was determined under simulated overcast conditions at sunset using modified Emlen funnels fitted with infrared video cameras. Birds that demonstrated a well-defined directional preference were then exposed over two sunsets to conflicting directional information between the local geomagnetic field and the <math>\pm 90^\circ</math> shifted band of maximum polarisation. These individuals were tested again for magnetic orientation at sunset in the same conditions as previous test, to determine whether their directional choices had changed after the cue-conflict. Our results showed that individuals from both species did not recalibrate their magnetic compass from visual cues after the cue-conflict, even though at least dunlins did not appear to completely disregard the information derived from celestial cues. This study is one of the few experimental studies on the migratory orientation of Charadriiformes and on the hierarchical relationships between the different compasses used by these birds during their extensive migratory movements.</p>	
<b>Response to Reviewers:</b>	<p>Dear Dr Bakker,</p> <p>Thank you for your positive decision on the manuscript No. BEAS-D-16-00614R1 "Cue-conflict experiments between magnetic and visual cues in dunlin <i>Calidris alpina</i> and curlew sandpiper <i>Calidris ferruginea</i>".</p> <p>I checked all comments and made the requested corrections. I inserted the requested p values for the t-tests in the Results section (lines 194 and 211); however I can not use the exact p value for the Moore test (lines 195 and 204) since the values derive from the table in the paper by Moore (1980; <i>Biometrika</i> 67:175–180).</p>	

Best Regards,  
Lorenzo



Click here to access/download  
**Supplementary Material**  
Online\_Resources\_Vanni\_BEAS.doc



[Click here to view linked References](#)

1 **Cue-conflict experiments between magnetic and visual cues in dunlin *Calidris alpina* and curlew sandpiper**  
2 ***Calidris ferruginea***

3  
4 Lorenzo Vanni<sup>1</sup>, N. Emilio Baldaccini<sup>2</sup>, Dimitri Giunchi<sup>1,2</sup>

5  
6 <sup>1</sup>Department of Biology, Pisa University, Via Volta 6, 56126 Pisa, Italy. E-mail: lorenzo.vanni@for.unipi.it

7 <sup>2</sup>C.I.R.Se.M.A.F., Centro Interuniversitario di Ricerca sulla Selvaggina e sui Miglioramenti Ambientali a fini  
8 Faunistici, Florence University, Piazzale Cascine 18, I-50144, Florence

9  
10 **Abstract**

11 Despite our extensive knowledge on various aspects of their lives, there has been limited investigation into the  
12 hierarchical relationships among different compass systems in shorebirds. The aim of this study was to investigate the  
13 relationship between magnetic and celestial compasses in two species of shorebirds, the curlew sandpiper (*Calidris*  
14 *ferruginea*; pre-breeding migration) and the dunlin (*Calidris alpina*; post-breeding migration) using cue-conflict  
15 experiments. Birds were captured in a Mediterranean stopover site, after which their magnetic orientation was  
16 determined under simulated overcast conditions at sunset using modified Emlen funnels fitted with infrared video  
17 cameras. Birds that demonstrated a well-defined directional preference were then exposed over two sunsets to  
18 conflicting directional information between the local geomagnetic field and the  $\pm 90^\circ$  shifted band of maximum  
19 polarisation. These individuals were tested again for magnetic orientation at sunset in the same conditions as previous  
20 test, to determine whether their directional choices had changed after the cue-conflict. Our results showed that  
21 individuals from both species did not recalibrate their magnetic compass from visual cues after the cue-conflict, even  
22 though at least dunlins did not appear to completely disregard the information derived from celestial cues. This study is  
23 one of the few experimental studies on the migratory orientation of *Charadriiformes* and on the hierarchical  
24 relationships between the different compasses used by these birds during their extensive migratory movements.

25  
26 **Keywords:** *orientation, cue-conflict, polarized light, shorebirds, magnetic compass*

27  
28 **Significance Statement**

29 Migrating birds are able to use different compass mechanisms based on geomagnetic or celestial cues and it seems  
30 reasonable to hypothesise that birds calibrate their various compasses to maintain the correct direction especially when

31 the directional information does not agree. The hierarchy among different compasses has been studied largely on night  
32 migrating passerines, but it is still poorly understood. We investigated the hierarchy among geomagnetic and celestial  
33 cues (band of maximum polarization) in two species of *Charadriiformes* by means of cue-conflict experiments. Our  
34 result showed that the geomagnetic cues have a dominant role in the orientation mechanisms of the studied species,  
35 even though the information derived from celestial cues did not appear to be completely disregarded.

36

## 37 **Introduction**

38 Migrating birds are able to use different compass mechanisms based on geomagnetic (Wiltschko and Wiltschko 1996)  
39 or celestial cues, including the sun (Kramer 1953; Moore 1987), stars (Emlen 1975) and skylight polarization pattern  
40 (Able and Able 1995; Cochran et al. 2004; Muheim et al. 2006b). However, the redundancy of various cues may be a  
41 problem for migrating birds, especially when the directional information does not agree (Wiltschko and Wiltschko  
42 1999; Muheim et al. 2006a). Therefore, it seems reasonable to hypothesise that birds calibrate their various compasses  
43 to maintain the correct direction (Muheim et al. 2006a; Sjöberg and Muheim 2016), however, the hierarchy among  
44 different compasses remains poorly understood (Liu and Chernetsov 2012). While there is general agreement that  
45 celestial cues dominate over magnetic cues during the pre-migratory period (Bingman 1983; Able and Able 1990; Prinz  
46 and Wiltschko 1992; Wiltschko et al. 1998; Wiltschko and Wiltschko 1999), the relationship between these cues during  
47 migration remains unclear (Muheim et al. 2006a; Wiltschko and Wiltschko 2009). It has recently been proposed that at  
48 sunset, and possibly also at sunrise, the Band of Maximum Polarization of skylight (BMP) may be the reference system  
49 used by birds to recalibrate their magnetic compass during the migratory period (Muheim et al. 2006a, b). This use of  
50 BMP would give birds a reference system that is independent from both topography (Liu and Chernetsov 2012) and  
51 magnetic anomalies. Unlike the sun compass (Schmidt-Koenig 1990), the use of BMP does not require any time  
52 compensation as at sunrise and sunset it intersects vertically the horizon roughly along the North-South axis,  
53 independent of latitude (Phillips and Waldvogel 1988; Muheim et al. 2006a). Some cue-conflict (CC) experiments seem  
54 to have confirmed this hypothesis (Phillips and Moore 1992; Cochran et al. 2004; Muheim et al. 2006b, 2007),  
55 however, the role of polarisation pattern is still a topic of debate (Wiltschko et al. 2008a, b; Muheim et al. 2008).  
56 Further studies on both caged and free-flying birds have cast doubts on the use of BMP for recalibrating magnetic  
57 references (Chernetsov et al. 2011; Schmaljohann et al. 2013; Åkesson et al. 2015), or have suggested that birds may  
58 not always reconcile conflicting information from geomagnetic and celestial (star) cues, therefore making a form a  
59 compromise between the directions indicated by the two reference systems (Giunchi et al. 2015). Sjöberg and Muheim  
60 (2016) recently attempted to integrate the different outcomes by suggesting that the discrepancies observed between

61 cue-conflict experiments may be due to a combination of both the availability of polarised light information near the  
62 horizon and stars. While intriguing, this explanation is highly speculative and a number of experimental observations  
63 remain unexplained (see Sjöberg and Muheim 2016 for further details).

64         Until recently, almost all available data concerning the orientation mechanisms of wild birds have been derived  
65 from experiments on a few species of nocturnal passerine migrants. Furthermore, while there is a significant amount of  
66 information regarding the migratory ecology and routes of shorebirds (see Colwell 2010), only few studies have  
67 investigated the orientation mechanisms of these species. To our knowledge, only four papers have been published on  
68 this topic. Sauer (1963) and Sandberg and Gudmundsson (1996) initially investigated shorebird orientation in modified  
69 Emlen funnels (Emlen and Emlen 1966), demonstrating that both Pacific golden plovers (*Pluvialis fulva*) and dunlins  
70 (*Calidris alpina*) showed directional preferences consistent with the predicted migratory direction when tested under a  
71 clear sky. Following these initial observations, the use of magnetic cues were demonstrated by studies that showed that  
72 sanderlings (*Calidris alba*; Gudmundsson and Sandberg 2000) and sharp-tailed sandpipers (*Calidris acuminata*;  
73 Grönroos et al. 2010) responded as expected to a  $\pm 90^\circ$  deflection in the local magnetic field. To date, the hierarchy  
74 between different compass mechanisms has not yet been investigated in shorebirds.

75         The aim of the present study was to investigate the relationship between magnetic and visual compasses (i.e.  
76 the pattern of skylight polarisation) in two species of shorebirds using cue-conflict experiments.

77

## 78 **Materials and methods**

### 79 *Study location and experimental birds*

80 Birds were caught with mist nets during the pre-breeding (curlew sandpiper *Calidris ferruginea*; April–May) and post-  
81 breeding (dunlin *Calidris alpina*; August–September) migrations from 2012 to 2015 in the Lame di San Rossore  
82 wetland complex (Massaciuccoli Regional Park, Migliarino, San Rossore, Pisa, Lucca, Italy; 43°41'N, 10°17'E). After  
83 the standard ringing procedures (Busse and Meissner 2015) the birds were aged and sexed according to Prater et al.  
84 (1977). Due to the migratory strategies of these species (del Hoyo et al. 1996), our experimental sample of curlew  
85 sandpiper was composed entirely of adults, while we tested both adults and juvenile dunlins. Birds were weighed using  
86 an electronic scale ( $\pm 0.1$  g) and then held in captivity in the Arnino Field Station (43°39'N 10°18'E; capture site  
87 direction = 327°, capture site distance = 3.5 km) for a maximum of 10 days in cylindrical plastic cages (diameter = 100  
88 cm, height = 30 cm). The birds were fed with mealworm (*Tenebrio molitor*) larvae and were provided water *ad libitum*.  
89 According to the social habits of the considered species (del Hoyo et al. 1996), individual were kept in groups of 3 to 5  
90 birds per cage. The cages were placed in rooms with artificial lighting that was synchronised with the natural

91 photoperiod so that birds could not observe any celestial cues. During captivity, the mean weight of the curlew  
92 sandpipers and dunlins increased by 9.7 g ( $t_{12} = 6.7$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , paired t-test; capture weight:  $49.7 \pm 3.6$  g SD) and 13.8 g  
93 ( $t_9 = 10.4$ ,  $p < 0.01$ , paired t-test; capture weight:  $39.5 \pm 2.7$  g), respectively.

#### 94 *Experimental procedures*

95 Our experimental protocol was followed as described below:

96 1) After a minimum of two days in captivity the magnetic orientation of birds was tested at sunset under  
97 simulated overcast conditions (hereafter referred to as the pre-CC test).

98 2) Birds that demonstrated a well-defined directional preference in the pre-CC test were exposed (CC  
99 exposure) at sunset for two consecutive days to conflicting directional information between the local geomagnetic field  
100 and the  $\pm 90^\circ$  shifted BMP (for further details, see Giunchi et al. 2015). After each CC exposure, birds were returned to  
101 their indoor cages and prevented from seeing any visual cue.

102 3) Treated birds were tested again the day following the second CC exposure for their magnetic orientation at  
103 sunset in the same conditions as the pre-CC test. The purpose of this test (post-CC test) was to evaluate the consistency  
104 of directional choices exhibited before and after the cue-conflict.

105

#### 106 *Experimental apparatus*

107 The orientation tests were performed using modified Emlen funnels which were made out of non-magnetic transparent  
108 material (LEXAN; Sabic Innovative Plastic, Pittsfield, MA), the size of which was consistent with that described by  
109 Sandberg and Gudmundsson (1996) (top external diameter = 52 cm, base diameter = 18 cm and height = 22 cm). Each  
110 funnel was divided into eight sectors of  $45^\circ$  using strips of tape, and then placed in plastic containers (70 cm high). An  
111 infrared camera was positioned at the bottom of the plastic containers (see Online Resources, Fig. S1) which was  
112 powered by a 12 V battery and connected to a digital video recorder. Each funnel was covered by plastic mesh netting  
113 ( $2 \times 2$  mm). We measured the magnetic field inside the funnels using a fluxgate magnetometer (Applied Physics  
114 Systems, Mountain View, CA) to ensure that the magnetic field perceived by the experimental birds was not affected by  
115 the experimental apparatus. Before the beginning of each test, each funnel was oriented randomly with respect to the  
116 magnetic North. A cubic wooden box ( $90 \times 90 \times 50$  cm) with four square windows ( $48 \times 48$  cm) was placed on the top  
117 of each funnel in the centre of each side. The top of the funnel and the windows were covered by milky-white  
118 Plexiglass lids (3 mm thickness). This structure prevented birds from perceiving the light polarisation (Sandberg et al.  
119 1988; Åkesson et al. 2015) and other visual cues while also avoiding excessive darkness inside the funnels (Fig. S1).

120 To manipulate the skylight polarisation pattern we replaced the Plexiglass windows on the same cubic wooden boxes  
121 with panels of two outer layers of pseudo-depolarising filters composed of two sheets of polyester (180  $\mu\text{m}$  thick;  
122 Metalloy Italiana, Vicenza, Italy) which were aligned at an angle of  $45^\circ$  relative to each other, in addition to one inner  
123 layer composed of a polarising filter (0.8 mm thick, cellulose triacetate; Intercast Europe, Parma, Italy), as described by  
124 Gaggini et al. (2010). The polarising filters from the two opposite windows were aligned so that the e-vector was  
125 vertical, while the e-vector was horizontal for the other two windows (Gaggini et al. 2010). The top of each box was  
126 covered by a milky-white Plexiglass lid (3 mm thick).

127 During CC exposure, the birds were kept in a small wooden cage ( $40 \times 20$  cm) with netting on each side,  
128 which was placed in the centre of the larger wooden box. The small size of this holding cage compared to the box was  
129 used to reduce any parallax effect on the alignment of the artificial polarisation axis (Muheim et al. 2006b). When the  
130 vertical filters were aligned with the solar azimuth, the caged birds perceived the BMP shifted by  $\pm 90^\circ$  relative to  
131 natural conditions (Gaggini et al. 2010). The entire structure was placed on wooden stands (70 cm high) to give the  
132 birds a broad view of the horizon through the polarising filters.

133 We performed both orientation tests and exposures to cue-conflict only in calm evenings with a wind speed of  
134  $< 10$  m/s and no rain. We did not perform exposures to cue-conflict when cloud cover was higher than  $3/8$ . The  
135 orientation tests lasted for 40 minutes and were performed between 20 minutes before and 70 minutes after the civil  
136 twilight (sun elevation  $< -6^\circ$ ). Exposures lasted for 40 minutes and occurred between 20 minutes before and 20 minutes  
137 after civil twilight. The orientation of each individual was tested over a maximum of three consecutive evenings, and  
138 birds that remained inactive (see below) during all these trials were released close to the capture site. The first test in  
139 which the individual showed to be active was considered for the analyses.

140

#### 141 *Data analyses*

142 The video recordings were analysed to determine the directional preferences of each individual. The first 10 minutes of  
143 the recordings were discarded in order to allow the birds to acclimatise to the funnel. The remaining 30 minutes were  
144 subdivided into 600 frames (1 frame every 3 seconds) which was then combined into a single multipage Tiff file. A  
145 circle was drawn on each image 6 cm from the bottom of the funnel for use as the reference line. Only well-defined  
146 movements (WDMs) were considered for the analysis, i.e. only when birds crossed the reference line with at least a  
147 third of the front of its body. The WDMs within a given sector were assigned to the mid-angle of the sector. Only active  
148 birds (WDMs  $\geq 10$ ) were included in the analyses. Individual directional preferences were calculated as the circular  
149 mean of the WDM distribution (Batschelet 1981). Each of the multipage Tiff files was independently examined by three



150 observers blind to the experimental condition. As the circular means estimated by the three observers did not differ by  
151 more than 30°, all active birds were included in the analysis. The orientation of each bird was calculated by averaging  
152 the three directional choices estimated by the three observers. Birds were excluded from the analyses if the result of the  
153 Rayleigh test (Batschelet 1981) applied to the circular distribution of their individual headings was not significant ( $p >$   
154  $0.05$ ). As previously reported (see e.g. Muheim and Åkesson 2002), the Rayleigh test was only used as a guideline as  
155 the movement of birds inside the funnel could not be considered to be independent. Actually all active birds of both  
156 species turned out to be oriented according to this criterion.

157         The group statistics were calculated from individual mean directions so that each data point represented one  
158 bird (Batschelet 1981). When the mean vector length resulting from doubling the angles was larger than the unimodal  
159 vector length, we used a mean axis of orientation as the basis of the analysis. Randomness was tested with the Rayleigh  
160 test and the 95% confidence interval for the mean group directions were calculated using bootstrap methods with 5000  
161 resampled datasets (Adams and Anthony 1996) only for significantly oriented samples. The effect of CC exposure was  
162 determined by analysing the distribution of the angular differences of individual headings between the pre-CC and post-  
163 CC tests (post–pre) and using the non-parametric paired-sample test described by Moore (1980). As either unimodal  
164 and axially bimodal circular distributions did not seem to describe satisfactorily the post-pre sample distribution in  
165 dunlins, we used a model based clustering approach (Hornik and Grün 2014 and references therein) by means of the R  
166 package Directional 2.4 (Tsagris et al 2016) to evaluate whether a mixture of two von Mises-Fisher distributions fitted  
167 the data better than the standard unimodal model. We firstly calculated the Bayesian information criterion (BIC;  
168 Schwarz 1978) of the models with one or two components using the `bic.mixvmf` function, assuming a mixture of two  
169 von Mises-Fisher distributions. The model with the lowest BIC value was chosen to best describe the data. If a bimodal  
170 model had the lowest BIC value then a mixture of two von Mises-Fisher distributions were fitted to the data using the  
171 `mix.vmf` function, which gave the predicted group assignment for each observation. As a check of this approach, we  
172 applied this method to all samples (Table S1). All statistical analyses were performed with the software R 3.3.2 (R Core  
173 Team 2016); standard circular statistic analyses were performed using the R package `circular` 0.4–7 (Agostinelli and  
174 Lund 2013).

175

## 176 **Expectations**

177 We expected that in the pre-CC test the birds would orient themselves according to the distribution of  
178 recovery/recapture of birds ringed in Italy during the spring (curlew sandpiper) or autumn (dunlin) migration (Spina and

179 Volponi 2008). Depending on the hierarchy determined by the information provided by the celestial cue (BMP) and the  
180 geomagnetic field, each individuals could respond to the cue-conflict in two possible ways:

181           If the magnetic cue was dominant over BMP, we expected that there would be no differences in the orientation  
182 of the birds between the pre-CC and post-CC tests (Fig. 1).

183           If BMP was used to calibrate the magnetic compass, we expected to observe a significant  $\pm 90^\circ$  shift in  
184 directional preferences in the post-CC test compared to the pre-CC test (Fig. 1; Cochran et al. 2004; Muheim et al.  
185 2006b).

186

## 187 **Results**

188

### 189 *Curlew sandpiper*

190 30 adult curlew sandpipers tested in the spring of 2013 and 2014, 15 were active in the pre-CC test. Two birds were  
191 inactive during the post-CC test for three consecutive trials, therefore, they were excluded from the analyses. The  
192 directional preferences of the remaining 13 individuals were bimodally distributed during the pre-CC test along the  
193 WSW-ENE axis (Fig. 2). We did not find any difference in body weight between WSW [225°-300°] and ENE [350°-  
194 110°] oriented birds ( $54.5 \pm 4.3$  g vs  $57.4 \pm 3.2$  g;  $t_{10.8} = 1.37$ ,  $p = 0.2$ , Welch's t-test). The distributions before (pre-CC  
195 test) and after (post-CC test; see Fig. 2) the CC exposure were not significantly different ( $r_m = 0.12$ ,  $p > 0.05$ , Moore  
196 test). The angular differences between the post-CC test and the pre-CC test (post-pre) were unimodally distributed and  
197 the mean direction ( $\alpha = 13^\circ$ ) was not significantly different from  $0^\circ$  (95% CI = [331°-35°]; Fig. 2).

198

### 199 *Dunlin*

200 We tested 19 dunlins during the post-breeding migration between 2012 and 2015. Eleven birds were active in the pre-  
201 CC test, but only 10 (five juveniles and five adults) were found to be active in the post-CC test and hence included in  
202 the analyses. In the pre-CC test (Fig. 2) birds headed in a SSW direction, and no significant differences were recorded  
203 between the heading distributions before (pre-CC test) and after (post-CC test; see Fig. 2) the CC exposure ( $r_m = 0.70$ ,  $p$   
204  $> 0.05$ , Moore test). The angular differences between post-CC test and pre-CC test (post-pre, Fig 2) were unimodally  
205 distributed with a mean direction of  $-58^\circ$  (95% CI: [261°-342°]). The model based clustering approach analysis  
206 indicated that a model with two components (a mixture of two von Mises-Fisher distribution) described the post-pre  
207 distribution better than a unimodal model (BIC = 33.07 vs 33.47, respectively; see Table S1). This approach identified  
208 two well-defined clusters: birds belonging to one cluster shifted their directional preferences  $109^\circ$  counter-clockwise,

209 while individuals belonging to the second cluster did not change their directional preferences after the cue conflict (Fig.  
210 2; Table S1). The mean weight of birds belonging to the two cluster, recorded just before the post-CC test, was not  
211 significantly different (cluster 1 =  $52.5 \pm 7.2$  g vs cluster 2 =  $54.1 \pm 0.7$  g;  $t_{4.08} = 0.52$ ,  $p = 0.63$ , Welch's t-test)

212

## 213 **Discussion**

214 This work is one of the few studies aimed at investigating the migratory orientation of *Charadriiformes* and the  
215 hierarchical relationship between the visual and magnetic compass systems. Our results show that both curlew  
216 sandpipers and dunlins are able to orient themselves under simulated overcast conditions, as previously demonstrated  
217 for sanderlings (Gudmundsson and Sandberg 2000) and sharp-tailed sandpipers (Grönroos et al. 2010).

218 The percentage of inactive individuals was noticeable (ca. 50% in both species), but it is consistent with the  
219 results of a number of orientation studies on waders, which reported that these birds are more likely to not show  
220 migratory restlessness when tested under overcast conditions (see e.g. Sandberg and Gudmundsson 1996;  
221 Gudmundsson and Sandberg 2000, but see Grönroos et al. 2010). Even though free-flying waders can depart from  
222 stopover/staging sites and orient correctly under solid overcast, it should be noted that (1) Alerstam et al. (1990)  
223 reported that in most occasions knot and turnstone flocks departed under clear sky conditions and (2) all the 277  
224 departures of wader flocks observed by Piersma et al. (1990) in the Dutch Wadden Sea occurred when the sun was  
225 clearly visible. Furthermore, it should be noted that the migratory behaviour of shorebirds is often quite different from  
226 that of passerines, being characterized by long flights followed by prolonged stay at staging site (Piersma 1987); this  
227 behaviour might affect the motivation to migrate of birds captured while refuelling thus increasing the inter-individual  
228 variability in the expression of migratory restlessness. For this reasons we suggest that the fraction of inactive birds is  
229 not an artifact due to our experimental apparatus, but a consequences of having tested birds without available visual  
230 cues.

231

### 232 *Orientation preferences in the pre-CC test*

233 Dunlins showed a clear directional preference toward a SSW direction, which is in agreement with the distribution of  
234 the ringing recoveries reported by Spina and Volponi (2008) and to the expected direction for the post-breeding  
235 migration (Cramp and Simmons 1983). The bimodal distribution of the directional preferences of curlew sandpipers is  
236 more puzzling. According to previous studies (Wilson et al. 1980; Delany et al. 2009), curlew sandpipers crossing the  
237 Mediterranean appear to follow an eastern route during spring migration, moving from Western Africa to their breeding  
238 grounds via Tunisia, Crimea and the Caspian Sea. The number of Italian recoveries of abroad ringed birds during the

239 spring migration is quite low; however, most of the recoveries were located along a SW-NE axis between the African  
240 Atlantic coast and the Crimea peninsula (Scebba and Moschetti 2006; Spina and Volponi 2008). Therefore, the axis of  
241 orientation of tested curlew sandpipers is consistent with the migration axis of migrating Curlew sandpipers in spring,  
242 as supported by Italian ringing data. The fact that the majority of birds preferred a westward direction is however  
243 problematic. The orientation of experimental birds may have been affected by a positive phototaxis towards the setting  
244 sun (see e.g. Åkesson and Sandberg 1994; Muheim et al. 2006a), as the solar azimuth in the mid-period of the  
245 experiments was approximately 295°. This explanation seems however unlikely because the experiments were  
246 performed under simulated overcast conditions obtained by opaque milky plexiglass lids, which diffuse the low ambient  
247 light present at the time of the experiments. A phototactic response should characterize mostly birds tested in the first  
248 period of the experiments (20 minutes before to 20 minutes after the civil twilight), but this was not confirmed by the  
249 data reported in Fig. 2 (pre- and post-CC tests). Furthermore, this kind of response was absent in dunlins, that were all  
250 tested in the first period of the experiments (sun azimuth in the mid-period of the experiments = ~287°). The directional  
251 preferences of the sub-group westward oriented can be interpreted as reverse migration (Åkesson et al. 1996). While  
252 reverse migration is more likely when the access to visual cues is prevented (Åkesson et al. 2001; Nilsson and Sjöberg  
253 2016), such as in this study, this behaviour is usually shown by lean birds facing an ecological barrier (Sandberg and  
254 Moore 1996; Åkesson et al. 1996; Sandberg et al. 2002; Deutschlander and Muheim 2009; Schmaljohann et al. 2011).  
255 The individuals tested were found to be in good condition (see Materials and Methods) and did not appear to be facing  
256 an ecological barrier, therefore, this explanation seems unlikely. It can be speculated that at least a part of the tested  
257 individuals oriented toward the sea-coast (located about 1.7 km west of the test site), possibly relying on infra-sounds,  
258 as previously suggested for homing pigeons (Hagstrum 2000, 2013). In addition to providing an important food source  
259 (Colwell 2010), the coastline is also an important landmark for migrating birds (Åkesson 1993), and therefore, the  
260 directional preferences of the curlew sandpipers may have been affected by the closeness of the coast. However, it  
261 should be noted that this effects was absent in dunlins; moreover, as reported by Holland (2014) the effect of infrasound  
262 on bird migration has never been experimentally demonstrated.

263

#### 264 *Response to the cue-conflict*

265 We did not record any significant difference between pre- and post-CC distributions in both species, which suggest that  
266 neither dunlins nor curlew sandpipers significantly changed their directional preferences after CC exposure, contrary to  
267 that expected if birds had recalibrated their magnetic compass based on the artificial skylight polarisation pattern  
268 (Cochran et al. 2004; Muheim et al. 2006a, b, 2007, 2009). Our results are hence in broad agreement with recent studies

269 indicating the primary role of the magnetic cues in the migratory orientation of passerines (Gaggini et al. 2010;  
270 Chernetsov et al. 2011; Schmaljohann et al. 2013; Åkesson et al. 2015). Actually, the majority of songbird species  
271 tested did not appear to recalibrate their magnetic compass based on the skylight polarisation pattern (Åkesson et al.  
272 2015). The results from the current study add two species of non-passerine long-distance migrants to this pattern, and  
273 taken together, these results suggest that recalibration is less widespread than that hypothesized by Muheim et al.  
274 (2006a). However, the outcomes from some studies may have been affected by issues in methodology (see also Giunchi  
275 et al. 2015). According to Wiltschko et al. (2008a) the experimental protocol also used in our experiments may lead to  
276 artefacts due to the totally artificial nature of the band of polarization. It should to be noted that the experiments  
277 performed by Muheim et al. (2009), where birds were exposed either to shifted magnetic fields or to shifted artificial  
278 polarization pattern, produced consistent results, thus suggesting that the potential artefacts due to polarizing filters *per*  
279 *se* are at least negligible. Sjöberg and Muheim (2016) recently modified the model proposed by Muheim et al. (2006a)  
280 to suggest that the discrepancies observed in the various experiments may be due to a combination of the availability of  
281 polarised light information near the horizon and of the stars during the conflict. According to this model, birds  
282 recalibrate their magnetic compass using polarised light cues, provided they have access to the BMP and the view of  
283 surroundings. In our study birds had a full view of the BMP and distant landmarks (a pinewood strip running parallel to  
284 the coast, in particular). Therefore, according to Sjöberg and Muheim (2016), we would still expect to observe  
285 recalibration of the magnetic compass even though the birds did not have access to stars information. This recalibration  
286 however was not observed, as no significant difference between pre- and post-CC tests was recorded for both species.  
287 Birds might not had recalibrated their magnetic compass because of a "switching off" of the calibration after prolonged  
288 exposure to visual landmarks in the same area (Sjöberg and Muheim 2016). Our tested birds were displaced from the  
289 capture site and held indoor with no access to landmarks before and during the experiments; they could see the  
290 surroundings only during the exposure to the cue-conflict. It thus seems quite unlikely that they did not pay attention to  
291 calibration cues due to the familiarity to local landmarks. It can be suggested that birds did no recalibrate their magnetic  
292 compass because they could rely on infra-sounds to sense the sea-coast which can be used as a prominent directional  
293 cue. While deserving further investigation, this explanation has to be regarded as highly speculative, as no experiment  
294 has demonstrated yet the effect of infra-sounds on the orientation of migratory birds (Holland 2014). The reaction of  
295 birds to the cue-conflict might depend also on the reliability of the compass information that they experienced in  
296 different geographic areas (Chernetsov et al. 2011; Åkesson et al. 2015). It should be noted, however, that the analysis  
297 reported by Sjöberg and Muheim (2016) did not find any relationship between the temporal and spatial variability of

298 magnetic field properties (declination, intensity and inclination) and the outcomes from cue-conflict experiments  
299 performed in North America and Europe.

300         While the heading distributions obtained before and after the CC exposure was not significantly different in  
301 dunlins, the 95% CI of the mean direction of the angular differences between pre- and post-CC tests did not include 0°,  
302 while they marginally included 90°, thus indicating that dunlins shifted their orientation after the CC exposure at least  
303 slightly. Actually, according to the model-based clustering approach, the circular distribution of these angular  
304 differences should be properly described as a mixture of two unimodal distributions, which suggests that the way  
305 dunlins reacted to the cue-conflict was individually variable, but that the skylight polarisation pattern is not completely  
306 disregarded. According to this model, half of the tested dunlins (cluster 1 in Fig. 2) did not change their directional  
307 preferences after the cue-conflict, whereas the remaining individuals (cluster 2 in Fig. 2) shifted their directional  
308 preferences close to the 90° shift predicted if birds were to recalibrate their magnetic compass based on the skylight  
309 polarisation pattern. It can be speculated that this pattern might be due to the inclusion of birds in different phases of  
310 migration (see e.g. Wiltschko et al. 2008a), but this seems unlikely as dunlins were tested well after the beginning of  
311 their migration (Cramp and Simmons 1983). The heterogeneity observed in the responses to the cue-conflict might be  
312 ascribe also to population specific differences (i.e. birds breeding at different latitudes with different reliability of  
313 magnetic cues - Muheim et al. 2003; Åkesson and Bianco 2015) or to the previous experience of tested individuals, as  
314 the ecological context and the regional availability of orientation cues may affect the use of various compasses  
315 (Sandberg and Moore 1996; Chernetsov et al. 2011; Giunchi et al. 2015). Interestingly, the same pattern was not evident  
316 in curlew sandpipers, although even in this species the individual variability was not negligible. While we acknowledge  
317 that the sample size was small, these inter-specific differences may suggest an effect of different migratory periods (but  
318 see Chernetsov et al. 2011), even though possible inter-specific differences in the way the different cues are integrated  
319 might be considered. In addition, we cannot excluded an effect of the proximity of the coastline, as this could have also  
320 affected the directional preferences of curlew sandpipers during the post-CC test, which may have been responsible for  
321 the lack of an effect of the cue-conflict on the majority of tested birds.

322         In conclusion, the data reported in this study suggest that the variability observed in cue-conflict experiments  
323 may be affected by the responses of individuals in prioritising different cues. This individual variability should be taken  
324 into account when interpreting the results of cue-conflict studies, particularly with species that tend to live longer than  
325 small songbirds, and therefore, have more opportunities to learn from previous migrations.

326

327 **Acknowledgments**

328 We would like to thank all the people who helped us in the field: F. Chini, S. Formento, M. Ricciardi, S. Pardini, S.  
329 Volpi and all the ringers working in the ringing station of the “Osservatorio F. Caterini” in San Rossore, and in  
330 particular R. Gambogi and A. Galardini. The comments of three anonymous reviewers greatly improved an  
331 earlier draft of the manuscript. This paper have been submitted to ProofReading-Service.com for editing and  
332 proofreading.

333

334 **Ethical statement**

335 **Ethical approval:** All protocols performed in studies involving animals complies with the ethical standards and Italian  
336 laws on animal welfare. All procedures involving animals were approved by the Italian Istituto Superiore per la  
337 Protezione e la Ricerca Ambientale (ISPRA).

338

339 **Funding:** This study was partly funded by the Italian Ministero dell’Istruzione, dell’Università e della Ricerca (MIUR -  
340 PRIN 20083ML4XC).

341

342 **Conflict of Interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

343

344 **Informed consent:** Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

345

346

347

348 **References**

- 349 Able KP, Able MA (1995) Interactions in the flexible orientation system of a migratory bird. *Nature* 375:230–232
- 350 Adams DC, Anthony CD (1996) Using randomization techniques to analyse behavioural data. *Anim Behav* 51:733–738
- 351 Agostinelli C, Lund U (2013) R package “circular”: Circular Statistics (version 0.4-7), [https://r-forge.r-](https://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/circular/)
- 352 [project.org/projects/circular/](https://r-forge.r-project.org/projects/circular/)
- 353 Åkesson S (1993) Coastal migration and wind drift compensation in nocturnal passerine migrants. *Ornis Scand* 24:87–
- 354 94
- 355 Åkesson S, Bianco G (2015) Assessing vector navigation in long-distance migrating birds. *Behav Ecol* 27:865–875
- 356 Åkesson S, Karlsson L, Walinder G, Alerstam T (1996) Bimodal orientation and the occurrence of temporary reverse
- 357 bird migration during autumn in south Scandinavia. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 38:293–302
- 358 Åkesson S, Odin C, Hegedüs R, Ilieva M, Sjöholm C, Farkas A, Horvát G (2015) Testing avian compass calibration:
- 359 comparative experiments with diurnal and nocturnal passerine migrants in South Sweden. *Biol Open* 4:35–47
- 360 Åkesson S, Sandberg R (1994) Migratory orientation of passerines at dusk, night and dawn. *Ethology* 98:177–191
- 361 Åkesson S, Walinder G, Karlsson L, Ehnbohm S (2001) Reed warbler orientation: initiation of nocturnal migratory
- 362 flights in relation to visibility of celestial cues at dusk. *Anim Behav* 61:181–189
- 363 Alerstam T, Gundmundsson G, Jönsson P, Karlsson J, Lindström Å (1990) Orientation, migration routes and flight
- 364 behaviour of Knots, Turnstones and Brant Geese departing from Iceland in spring. *Arctic* 43:201–214
- 365 Batschelet E (1981) Circular statistics in biology. Academic Press, New York
- Bingman VP (1983) Magnetic field orientation of migratory Savannah sparrows with different first summer experience.
- Behaviour 87:43–52
- 366 Busse P, Meissner W (2015) Bird Ringing Station Manual. De Gruyter Open Ltd, Warsaw/Berlin
- 367 Chernetsov N, Kishkinev D, Kosarev V, Bolshakov CV (2011) Not all songbirds calibrate their magnetic compass from
- 368 twilight cues: a telemetry study. *J Exp Biol* 214:2540–2543
- 369 Cochran WW, Mouritsen H, Wikelski M (2004) Migrating songbirds recalibrate their magnetic compass daily from
- 370 twilight cues. *Science* 304:405–408
- 371 Colwell MA (2010) Shorebird Ecology, Conservation, and Management. University of California Press, Berkeley
- 372 Cramp S, Simmons KEL (1983) The Birds of the Western Palearctic, Vol. III. Oxford University Press, Oxford
- 373 del Hoyo J, Elliot A, Sargatal J (1996) Handbook of the Birds of the World, Vol. 3. Lynx Edicion, Barcelona



374 Delany S, Scott D, Helmink ATF, Dodman T, Flink S, Stroud D, Haanstra L (2009) An Atlas of Wader Populations in  
375 Africa and Western Eurasia. Wetlands International, Wageningen, The Netherlands

376 Deutschlander ME, Muheim R (2009) Fuel reserves affect migratory orientation of thrushes and sparrows both before  
377 and after crossing an ecological barrier near their breeding grounds. *J Avian Biol* 40:85–89

378 Emlen ST (1975) The stellar-orientation system of a migratory bird. *Sci Am* 233:102–111

379 Emlen ST, Emlen JT (1966) A technique for recording migratory orientation of captive birds. *Auk* 83:361–367

380 Gaggini V, Baldaccini N, Spina F, Giunchi D (2010) Orientation of the pied flycatcher *Ficedula hypoleuca*: cue-conflict  
381 experiments during spring migration. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 64:1333–1342

382 Giunchi D, Vanni L, Baldaccini NE, et al (2015) New cue-conflict experiments suggest a leading role of visual cues in  
383 the migratory orientation of Pied Flycatchers *Ficedula hypoleuca*. *J Ornithol* 156:113–121

384 Grönroos J, Muheim R, Åkesson S (2010) Orientation and autumn migration routes of juvenile sharp-tailed sandpipers  
385 at a staging site in Alaska. *J Exp Biol* 213:1829–1835

386 Gudmundsson GA, Sandberg R (2000) Sanderlings (*Calidris alba*) have a magnetic compass: orientation experiments  
387 during spring migration in Iceland. *J Exp Biol* 203:3137–3144

388 Hagstrum JT (2000) Infrasound and the avian navigational map. *J Exp Biol* 203:1103–1111

389 Hagstrum JT (2013) Atmospheric propagation modeling indicates homing pigeons use loft-specific infrasonic  
390 “map” cues. *J Exp Biol* 216:687–699

391 Holland R A (2014) True navigation in birds: from quantum physics to global migration. *J Zool* 293:1-15

392 Hornik K, Grün B (2014) movMF: An R package for fitting mixtures of von Mises-Fisher distributions. *J Stat Softw*  
393 58:1-31

394 Kramer G (1953) Die Sonnenorientierung der Vögel. *Verh Dtsch Zool Ges* 1:77–84

395 Liu X, Chernetsov N (2012) Avian orientation: multi-cue integration and calibration of compass systems. *Chin Birds*  
396 3:1–8

397 Moore BR (1980) A modification of the Rayleigh test for vector data. *Biometrika* 67:175–180

398 Moore FR (1987) Sunset and the orientation behaviour of migrating birds. *Biol Rev* 62:65–86

399 Muheim R, Åkesson S (2002) Clock-shift experiments with Savannah sparrows, *Passerculus sandwichensis*, at high  
400 northern latitudes. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 51:394–401

401 Muheim R, Åkesson S, Alerstam T (2003) Compass orientation and possible migration routes of passerine birds at high  
402 arctic latitudes. *Oikos* 103:341–349

403 Muheim R, Åkesson S, Phillips J (2007) Magnetic compass of migratory Savannah sparrows is calibrated by skylight  
404 polarization at sunrise and sunset. *J Ornithol* 148:485–494

405 Muheim R, Åkesson S, Phillips JB (2008) Response to R. Wiltschko et al. (*J. Ornithol.*): Contradictory results on the  
406 role of polarized light in compass calibration in migratory songbirds. *J Ornithol* 149:659–662

407 Muheim R, Moore FR, Phillips JB (2006a) Calibration of magnetic and celestial compass cues in migratory birds - a  
408 review of cue-conflict experiments. *J Exp Biol* 209:2–17

409 Muheim R, Phillips JB, Åkesson S (2006b) Polarized light cues underlie compass calibration in migratory songbirds.  
410 *Science* 313:837–839

411 Muheim R, Phillips JB, Deutschlander ME (2009) White-throated sparrows calibrate their magnetic compass by  
412 polarized light cues during both autumn and spring migration. *J Exp Biol* 212:3466–3472

413 Nilsson C, Sjöberg S (2016) Causes and characteristics of reverse bird migration: an analysis based on radar, radio  
414 tracking and ringing at Falsterbo, Sweden. *J Avian Biol* 47:354–362

415 Phillips JB, Moore FR (1992) Calibration of the sun compass by sunset polarized light patterns in a migratory bird.  
416 *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 31:189–193

417 Phillips JB, Waldvogel JA (1988) Celestial polarized light patterns as a calibration reference for sun compass of homing  
418 pigeons. *J Theor Biol* 131:55–67

419 Piersma T (1987) Hop, skip, or jump? Constraints on migration of Arctic waders by feeding, fattening, and flight speed.  
420 *Limosa* 60:185–191

421 Piersma T, Zwarts L, Bruggemann JH (1990) Behavioural aspects of the departure of waders before long-distance  
422 flights: flocking, vocalizations, flight paths and diurnal timing. *Ardea* 78:157–184

423 Prater AJ, Merchant JH, Vuorinen J (1977) Guide to the Identification and Ageing of Holarctic Shorebirds. BTO, Tring

424 Prinz K, Wiltschko W (1992) Migratory orientation of pied flycatchers: interaction of stellar and magnetic information  
425 during ontogeny. *Anim Behav* 44:539–545

426 R Core Team (2016) R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing,  
427 Vienna, Austria, <https://www.R-project.org/>

428 Sandberg R, Gudmundsson GA (1996) Orientation cage experiments with Dunlins during autumn migration in Iceland.  
429 *J Avian Biol* 27:183–188

430 Sandberg R, Moore FR (1996) Migratory orientation of red-eyed vireos, *Vireo olivaceus* in relation to energetic  
431 condition and ecological context. *Behav Ecol Sociobiol* 39:1–10

432 Sandberg R, Moore FR, Bäckman J, Löhmus M, Smith KG (2002) Orientation of nocturnally migrating Swainson's  
433 thrush at dawn and dusk: importance of energetic condition and geomagnetic cues. *Auk* 119:201–209

434 Sandberg R, Pettersson J, Alerstam T (1988) Shifted magnetic fields lead to deflected and axial orientation of migrating  
435 robins, *Erithacus rubecula*, at sunset. *Anim Behav* 36:877–887

436 Sauer EF (1963) Migration habits of golden plovers. In: Sibley CG (ed) *Proc 13 Int Ornithol Congr*, Lawrence: Allan  
437 Press, pp 454–467

438 Scebba S, Moschetti G (2006) Migration patterns and fat reserves of Curlew Sandpiper *Calidris ferruginea* at a  
439 stopover site in southern Italy. *Int Wader Stud* 19:138–143

440 Schmaljohann H, Becker PJ, Karaardic H, Liechti F, Naef-Daenzer B, Grande C (2011) Nocturnal exploratory flights,  
441 departure time, and direction in a migratory songbird. *J Ornithol* 152:439–452

442 Schmaljohann H, Rautenberg T, Muheim R, Naef-Daenzer B, Bairlein F (2013) Response of a free-flying songbird to  
443 an experimental shift of the light polarization pattern around sunset. *J Exp Biol* 216:1381–1387

444 Schmidt-Koenig K (1990) The sun compass. *Experientia* 46:336–342

445 Schwarz G (1978) Estimating the dimension of a model. *Ann Stat* 6:461–464

446 Sjöberg S, Muheim R (2016) A new view on an old debate: type of cue-conflict manipulation and availability of stars  
447 can explain the discrepancies between cue-calibration experiments with migratory songbirds. *Front Behav Neurosci*  
448 10:29

449 Spina F, Volponi S (2008) *Atlante delle migrazioni in Italia*. Ministero dell'ambiente e della tutela del territorio e del  
450 mare ISPRA, Roma

451 Tsagris M, Athineou G, Sajib A (2016) *Directional: Directional Statistics*. R package version 2.4, [https://CRAN.R-](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Directional)  
452 [project.org/package=Directional](https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=Directional)

453 Wilson JR, Czajkowski MA, Pienkowski MW (1980) The migration through Europe and wintering in West Africa of  
454 Curlew Sandpipers. *Wildfowl* 31:107–122

455 Wiltschko R, Munro U, Ford H, Wiltschko W (2008a) Contradictory results on the role of polarized light in compass  
456 calibration in migratory songbirds. *J Ornithol* 149:607–614

457 Wiltschko R, Munro U, Ford H, Wiltschko W (2008b) Response to the comments by R. Muheim, S. Åkesson, and J.B.  
458 Phillips to our paper “Contradictory results on the role of polarized light in compass calibration in migratory  
459 songbirds.” *J Ornithol* 149:663–664

460 Wiltschko W, Weindler P, Wiltschko R (1998) Interaction of magnetic and celestial cues in the migratory orientation of  
461 passerines. *J Avian Biol* 29:606–617

462 Wiltschko W, Wiltschko R (1996) Magnetic orientation in birds. *J Exp Biol* 199:29–38  
463 Wiltschko R, Wiltschko W (1999) Celestial and magnetic cues in experimental conflict. In: Adams NJ, Slotow RH  
464 (eds) *Proc 22 Int Ornithol Congr, Durban. BirdLife South Africa, Johannesburg*, pp 988–1004  
465 Wiltschko R, Wiltschko W (2009) Avian navigation. *Auk* 126:717–743

466  
467  
468

469 **Figure legends**

470 **Fig. 1** Scheme of the expectations from the cue-conflict experiments with curlew sandpipers, with an expected direction  
471 of north. The expectations for dunlins were similar, however, the expected direction was south instead of north. The  
472 direction of the magnetic north and geographic north are represented by orange and black triangles, respectively. See  
473 the Materials and Methods section for further details

474

475 **Fig. 2** Heading distribution of curlew sandpipers and dunlins prior (pre-CC test) and after (post-CC test) the cue conflict  
476 and distribution of the angular differences in the heading of individuals between post-CC test and pre-CC test (post –  
477 pre). In curlew sandpipers, different colours were used to identify birds tested in the first (20 minutes before – 20  
478 minutes after the civil twilight; light grey circles) or in the second experimental period (30 minutes – 70 minutes after  
479 the civil twilight; dark grey circles). Open and filled circles in dunlins were used to identify adults and juveniles,  
480 respectively. Cluster 1 and 2 correspond to the clusters identified by the model based clustering approach (see Materials  
481 and Methods and Table S1). The mean vector ( $\alpha$ ) of each distribution is represented by an arrow, the length ( $r$ ) was  
482 drawn relative to the radius of the circle = 1. The significance is indicated by \*  $p < 0.05$ , \*\*  $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ , and  
483 n.s.  $p > 0.05$  as determined by the Rayleigh test. The 95% confidence intervals (broken lines) were reported only for  
484 significantly oriented samples

485






Fig. 1



**Curlew sandpiper**




**Dunlin**




*post-CC test*



490










*post - pre*




491



Fig. 2



**Curlew sandpiper****Dunlin****post-CC test****post - pre**









Click here to access/download

**Marked manuscript**

BEAS-D-16-00614\_R1\_MARKED\_LV.doc

