1 **Red deer *Cervus elaphus* blink more in larger groups**

2

3 Zeke W. Rowe*, Joseph H. Robins* and Sean A. Rands†

4

5 School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, Life Sciences Building, Tyndall Avenue,
6 Bristol BS8 1TQ, United Kingdom

7

8 ORCID: ZWR: 0000-0002-9617-5539

9 JHR: 0000-0001-8980-8150

10 SAR: 0000-0002-7400-005X

11

12 * JR and ZR are considered as joint first authors

13

14 † author for correspondence: sean.rands@bristol.ac.uk

15

16

17 **ABSTRACT**

18

19 Most animals need to spend time being vigilant for predators, at the expense of other
20 activities such as foraging. Group-living animals can benefit from the shared vigilance effort
21 of other group members, with individuals reducing personal vigilance effort as group size
22 increases. Behaviours like active scanning or head lifting are usually used to quantify
23 vigilance, but may not be accurate measures as the individual could be conducting them for
24 other purposes. We suggest that measuring an animal's blinking rate gives a meaningful
25 measure of vigilance: increased blinking implies reduced vigilance, as the animal cannot
26 detect predators when its eyes are closed. We demonstrate that as group size increases in
27 red deer, individuals increase their blink rate, confirming the prediction that vigilance should
28 decrease. Blinking is a simple non-invasive measure, and offers a useful metric for
29 assessing the welfare of animals experiencing an increase in perceived predation risk or
30 other stressors.

31

32 INTRODUCTION

33

34 Most animal species spend some part of their lives aggregated together in groups, and
 35 many benefits have been proposed and tested for this behaviour [1,2]. For prey species,
 36 grouping behaviour can offer protection from predators through both the dilution of individual
 37 risk if an attack occurs [3–5] and an increase in the chance of successfully detecting an
 38 approaching predator due to the combined vigilance effort of the group [5–7], along with
 39 other anti-predator advantages of grouping behaviour such as synchronising activity to dilute
 40 risk [8–11]. If an animal is being actively vigilant, it may be unable to conduct (or less
 41 efficient at) other important behaviours (like foraging or resting) at the same time (e.g. [12]).
 42 Group membership means that vigilance can be pooled among the group members, which
 43 could mean that each individual can spend less time being vigilant and more time
 44 conducting other fitness-enhancing behaviours. A rich body of theory and research has
 45 explored how group size and individual vigilance effort are related [13–16], with much of it
 46 focussing on the prediction that individual vigilance effort will decrease as the group
 47 becomes larger. This prediction requires each individual to show a trade-off between
 48 vigilance and other behaviours, where being actively vigilant either cannot occur at the same
 49 time as other behaviours, or leads to a reduction in the efficiency of other behaviours that
 50 are conducted at the same time as being vigilant.

51

52 Vigilance is usually assumed to be occurring when an animal is actively scanning its
 53 surrounding environment with its head upwards, although there is no obvious consensus in
 54 how vigilance is defined in any particular species (see [17] for discussion of this problem in
 55 studies on primates). Although scanning behaviour is likely to stop an animal from actively
 56 collecting food, this head-up activity may not completely interfere with simultaneous
 57 conducted behaviours, such as chewing or social interaction. If a behaviour that is recorded
 58 as vigilance allows an individual to do other things at the same time, then we may be falsely
 59 assuming that this behaviour incurs the time and attention costs that are associated with
 60 vigilance [18]. Without careful experimentation, it is difficult to assess how much of an
 61 individual's attention is devoted to vigilance when we observe scanning or other forms of
 62 vigilance-like behaviour, which may add to the huge variation (e.g. [13]) in whether a study
 63 demonstrates that individual vigilance is related to group size or not.

64

65 Although it is difficult to define exactly when an individual is being vigilant, we may instead
 66 be able to define when it is *not* able to be vigilant. Blinking (the temporary closure of both
 67 eyes, involving movements of the eyelids [19]) is a good example of an activity where an
 68 individual is momentarily unable to visually scan the environment. It is an essential

maintenance behaviour to keep the eyes moist and clean [20], and is conducted tens of times every minute in some species of diurnal mammals [21–23] and birds [24]. Although a blink takes only a fraction of a second, the sum of this loss of visual information over multiple blinks could be substantial for the individual. In humans, spontaneous blinking is accompanied by attentional suppression, where the individual experiences a blackout in visual attention for the duration of the blink, meaning that there is no awareness of the temporary blindness and lack of visual information whilst the blinking is occurring [25,26]. Blinking suppresses activity in both the visual cortex and other areas of the brain that are associated with awareness of environmental change [27]. If we assume that other animals show similar attentional suppression, then they are essentially blind and unaware of changes in their visual environment during each blink, which in turn means that they cannot be vigilant for predators.

An individual's blink rate therefore presents a trade-off between the physiological benefits of blinking and the loss of visual information during the blink [20]. If an animal needs to dedicate more time to vigilance in a risky environment, then it has to reduce or suppress blinking to accommodate this increased vigilance. This is anecdotally demonstrated in American crows *Corvus brachyrhynchos*, which reduce their blink rates when looking at potentially dangerous stimuli [28], and in horses *Equus caballus*, which decrease their spontaneous blink rate in response to stress-inducing stimuli [29]. This link between blink rate and vigilance implies that blink rate will also be related to group size. As group size increases, theory predicts that individual vigilance can be reduced [5], and so any requirement to suppress blinking will be relaxed. Blink rate may therefore increase with an increase in group size. Evidence supporting this is anecdotal: a comparison of chickens *Gallus gallus* feeding solitarily or in pairs showed a non-significant increase in blink rate in the group-feeding birds [30], while a comparison of the blink rates of olive baboons *Papio anubis* [31] showed individuals in a small group blinked less than those in a large group (although the two groups were studied in different years). Here, we test this hypothesis by observing the blink rates of group-living red deer *Cervus elaphus*. Red deer are a prey species that spend most of their lives in dispersed groups, and females are known to reduce vigilance behaviour as group size increases [32,33]. Because they increase vigilance in smaller groups, we therefore predict that they should also reduce their blink rate to avoid losing visual information about their environment. Given that vigilance has been shown to be related to the sex and age of an individual [32,33], we included these individual characteristics in our analysis.

METHODS

Study area, time and subjects

This observational study was conducted on the herd of red deer within the 40.5 hectare deer park in Ashton Court Estate, Bristol, England (51.4440° N, 2.6378° W), which is composed mainly of open grassland, with scattered forestry. The herd, managed by Bristol City Council, consists of c. 110 individuals of varying age and sex, who appear to mix freely. The enclosure is open to the public outside of the rutting season, so the deer are habituated to both dogs and humans. Our observations were conducted over five days during the rutting season; observations were restricted between 1200-1630 h so they were outside of the dawn and dusk peaks of regular rutting activity [34].

Behavioural sampling and observations

A random individual was selected as described in previous research on this herd [35]. The selected individual was observed and dichotomously aged (mature or young) and sexed (male or female). The individual was sexed by the presence of antlers, as after one year of age only males have antlers [36]. Age was identified by an individual's size and morphology (larger individuals were older). If the individual was observed suckling, it was discarded and randomisation was repeated, as young individuals are hard to sex and exhibit behaviours uncommon to the rest of the herd [34]. A count of the total number of young/mature males and females, along with suckling young, was made on three different days. The rounded averages of these five demographic classes were calculated, and used in the pseudoreplication analyses presented (see the Supplementary Information).

Prior to the study, the observers (ZWR and JHR, who both conducted the measurements described) were trained in identifying the recorded behaviours, and pilot trials ensured repeatability of measurements. A blink was defined as a rapid full closure of the eye. Group size was arbitrarily defined as the number of individuals aggregated no more than five body lengths away from at least one member of the group containing the focal deer, meaning a measured group was composed of individuals associated by a chain rule of association (see [37] for discussion of defining groups by associated neighbours within arbitrary distances). Before starting any set of observations, the observers waited 10 minutes at the site to habituate the deer. Observations were conducted approximately 10-100 m away from focal individuals using a 30x zoom spotting scope. An observation for a single selected individual was recorded for a maximum of 10 minutes. At the start of each minute the group size was counted by one observer, with blink rate (blinks per minute) being continuously recorded for

each minute by the other observer. If the deer's eye(s) were obstructed or there was a human/animal disturbance the observations were stopped with the current minute's measures being disregarded. 75 individuals were observed using this method.

Statistical analysis

Data were recorded as blinks per minute with group size recorded for that minute. Individuals were recorded a mean of 4.9 ($\pm$ 2.0 SD) minutes before the data collection had to be discontinued due to the observer's view of the eyes being obstructed. For each individual, we calculated the mean number of blinks in a minute, and the mean group size per minute. To compensate for any unevenness caused by some mean values being based on more observations than others, we conducted the same analyses using just the first minute of data for all individuals (see the Supplementary Material): these data gave qualitatively similar results to the analysis involving mean group sizes, and are not discussed further.

Using *R* 4.0.3 [38], we constructed a linear mixed effects model where the natural logarithm of mean blink rate was described by the natural logarithm of group size, and the maturity and sex of the focal individual, including the observation date as a random effect. Logarithms were used to satisfy model conditions. A full model including interactions was initially considered, but no interaction terms were significant and so the basic additive model with the three explanatory variables was used. The Supplementary Material describes resampling analysis conducted to explore any effects of pseudoreplication arising from potentially observing the same individuals multiple times.

RESULTS

Blink rate increased with group size ($t_{67} = 11.38$, $p < 0.001$; figure 1), and adults blinked more than young deer ($t_{67} = 2.11$, $p = 0.038$; figure 1). There was no relationship between sex and blinking ($t_{67} = 0.35$, $p = 0.727$). Model estimates and effect sizes are given in the Supplementary Material, along with analyses demonstrating that pseudoreplication is unlikely to have influenced the group size effect.

Figure 1. Scatterplot showing that blink rate increases with group size and maturity (where orange triangles and the fitted solid line represent young individuals, and black circles and the fitted dashed line represent adults).

DISCUSSION

Our results demonstrate that blinking increases as group size increases. Given that blinking interferes with vigilance behaviour, and that individual vigilance is predicted to decrease as groups get larger, this supports our argument that the blink rate represents a trade-off between gaining visual information through vigilance and the physiological benefits of blinking. We note that these results are only correlational, and we suggest that a link between vigilance and blinking could be demonstrated with suitable experimental manipulation of perceived risk (e.g. [8,39–41]).

We argued earlier that observed behaviours that are typically recorded as vigilance (such as holding a head upright or active scanning – see [42,43] for discussion) may not be conducted solely for vigilance. Similarly, blinking may not solely be a maintenance behaviour that is traded-off against being able to collect visual information. Blinking may include a social element, as rhesus macaques *Macaca mulatta* are able to entrain their blink rate in response to social cues, coordinating their blinking with partners that they were interacting with [44]. Our results suggest that the proportion of scanning time that an individual red deer allocates to vigilance is related to the size of its immediate group, but we should acknowledge that scanning behaviour may be influenced by social behaviour as well as

204 vigilance. Earlier studies showed that young red deer were less vigilant than older ones
205 [32,33], and suggest this may be because the younger individuals are unlikely to be able to
206 outrun a predator if one appears. If the young in our study are following this behavioural
207 pattern, this also suggests that blinking may not be completely correlated with vigilance
208 level, as the younger deer had low blink rates when compared to mature adults. This may
209 reflect some form of social signalling between adults, although we note that we did not see a
210 difference between males and females (which contradicts previous results showing sex-
211 determined patterns of vigilance, where only females altered behaviour proportionally to
212 group size [32,33]). Other aspects of social behaviour may also be important for determining
213 blink rates, such as position within the group (echoing the vigilance changes seen in [33]).
214 Theory predicts that individuals on the outside of the group should be more vigilant than
215 those in the middle, and anecdotal evidence from olive baboons suggests that peripheral
216 individuals may blink less [31]. It may be possible to test many of the standard predictions
217 connecting vigilance and group size (e.g. [13–16]) using blink rate as a proxy for vigilance.
218

219 The blink rate may also be influenced by factors other than the size of the group, including
220 rainfall and wind (which have been shown to influence blink rate in captive grackles
221 *Quiscalus mexicanus* [45,46]). Similarly, the behaviour that an individual conducts
222 simultaneously to the blink may be important. Experiments in humans suggest a mechanism
223 controlling the timing of blinks, which occurs to minimise the chance of missing crucial
224 information [20,47–50], with evidence of similar behaviours in rhesus macaques *Macaca*
225 *mulatta* [44]. Peafowl *Pavo cristatus* also time their blinks to coincide with gaze shifts [51]
226 while grackles blink less during flight behaviours [52] and chickens blink more when feeding
227 when compared to scanning [30], all minimising the time where visual information cannot be
228 collected from the environment. Therefore, if an individual is moving, the timing and
229 frequency of its blinks may reflect this movement, and it may therefore be sensible to assay
230 blinking in response to group size in resting deer groups, which would not be undergoing
231 head and body movements that could confound the measure of blinking that is recorded.
232 Similarly, animals in different attentional states may change their frequency of blinking, such
233 as during sleep in herring gulls *Larus argentatus* [53].
234

235 Our results suggest that the measurement of blinking presents a simple and non-invasive
236 technique for observing attention that can be conducted remotely. Although we conducted
237 our sampling in the field, this could be done using video footage. Being able to analyse video
238 footage means that information about blink duration can also be collected, and previous
239 studies have demonstrated that this additional metric can also vary between individuals and
240 species [22,23,30,31,45,46], and may increase in relation to group size [30]. Given that

241 blinking has been shown to decrease under stressful conditions [28,29], this simple
242 technique could help us to understand the welfare requirements of managed animals that
243 normally live in social groups.
244

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

ZWR and JHR conducted this work as their final year BSc projects. We thank the the School of Biological Sciences teaching lab team for help with equipment, and two anonymous reviewers whose comments greatly improved the manuscript,

FUNDING

SAR was supported a Natural Environment Research Council (UK) standard grant (NE/P012639/1).

REFERENCES

1. Krause J, Ruxton GD. 2002 *Living in groups*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
2. Ward A, Webster M. 2016 *Sociality: the behaviour of group-living animals*. Switzerland: Springer.
3. Bednekoff PA, Lima SL. 1998 Re-examining safety in numbers: interactions between risk dilution and collective detection depend upon predator targeting behaviour. *Proc R Soc B* **265**, 2021–2026. (doi:10.1098/rspb.1998.0535)
4. Hamilton WD. 1971 Geometry for the selfish herd. *J Theor Biol* **31**, 295–311. (doi:10.1016/0022-5193(71)90189-5)
5. Pulliam HR. 1973 On the advantages of flocking. *J Theor Biol* **38**, 419–422. (doi:10.1016/0022-5193(73)90184-7)
6. Lima SL. 1990 The influence of models on the interpretation of vigilance. In *Interpretation and explanation in the study of animal behavior, volume 2: explanation, evolution and adaptation* (eds M Bekoff, D Jamieson), pp. 246–267. Boulder: Westview Press.
7. McNamara JM, Houston AI. 1992 Evolutionarily stable levels of vigilance as a function of group size. *Anim Behav* **43**, 641–658.
8. Mónus F, Barta Z. 2016 Is foraging time limited during winter? – a feeding experiment with tree sparrows under different predation risks. *Ethology* **122**, 20–29. (doi:10.1111/eth.12439)
9. Carere C, Montanino S, Moreschini F, Zoratto F, Chiarotti F, Santucci D, Alleva E. 2009 Aerial flocking patterns for wintering starlings, *Sturnus vulgaris*, under different predation risk. *Animal Behaviour* **77**, 101–107. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2008.08.034)

- 282 10. Rands SA, Cowlshaw G, Pettifor RA, Rowcliffe JM, Johnstone RA. 2003 The
283 spontaneous emergence of leaders and followers in a foraging pair. *Nature* **423**, 432–
284 434. (doi:10.1038/nature01630)
- 285 11. Rands SA. 2011 Approximating optimal behavioural strategies down to rules-of-thumb:
286 energy reserve changes in pairs of social foragers. *PLoS One* **6**, e22104.
287 (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0022104)
- 288 12. Fernández-Juricic E, Smith R, Kacelnik A. 2005 Increasing the costs of conspecific
289 scanning in socially foraging starlings affects vigilance and foraging behaviour. *Anim.*
290 *Behav.* **69**, 73–81. (doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2004.01.019)
- 291 13. Beauchamp G. 2019 On how risk and group size interact to influence vigilance. *Biol Rev*
292 **94**, 1918–1934. (doi:10.1111/brev.12540)
- 293 14. Beauchamp G. 2008 What is the magnitude of the group-size effect on vigilance? *Behav*
294 *Ecol* **19**, 1361–1368. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arn096)
- 295 15. Beauchamp G. 2003 Group-size effects on vigilance: a search for mechanisms. *Behav*
296 *Process* **63**, 111–121.
- 297 16. Elgar MA. 1989 Predator vigilance and group size in mammals and birds: a critical
298 review of the empirical evidence. *Biol Rev* **64**, 13–33. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-
299 185X.1989.tb00636.x)
- 300 17. Allan ATL, Hill RA. 2018 What have we been looking at? A call for consistency in studies
301 of primate vigilance. *Am J Phys Anthropol* **165**, 4–22. (doi:10.1002/ajpa.23381)
- 302 18. Treves A. 2000 Theory and method in studies of vigilance and aggregation. *Anim Behav*
303 **60**, 711–722.
- 304 19. Blount WP. 1927 Studies of the movements of the eyelids of animals: blinking. *Q J Exp*
305 *Physiol* **18**, 111–125. (doi:10.1113/expphysiol.1927.sp000426)
- 306 20. Ranti C, Jones W, Klin A, Shultz S. 2020 Blink rate patterns provide a reliable measure
307 of individual engagement with scene content. *Sci Rep* **10**, 8267. (doi:10.1038/s41598-
308 020-64999-x)
- 309 21. Stevens JR, Livermore A. 1978 Eye blinking and rapid eye movement: pulsed photic
310 stimulation of the brain. *Exp Neurology* **60**, 541–556. (doi:10.1016/0014-4886(78)90009-
311 2)
- 312 22. Tada H, Omori Y, Hirokawa K, Ohira H, Tomonaga M. 2013 Eye-blink behaviors in 71
313 species of primates. *PLoS One* **8**, e66018. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0066018)
- 314 23. Rands SA. 2021 Phylogenetically-controlled correlates of primate blinking behaviour.
315 *PeerJ in press*.
- 316 24. Kirsten SJ, Kirsten EB. 1983 Spontaneous blink rates of birds. *Condor* **85**, 92–93.
- 317 25. Volkman FC, Riggs LA, Moore RK. 1980 Eyeblinks and visual suppression. *Science*
318 **207**, 900–902. (doi:10.1126/science.7355270)
- 319 26. Riggs LA, Volkman FC, Moore RK. 1981 Suppression of the blackout due to blinks.
320 *Vision Res* **21**, 1075–1079. (doi:10.1016/0042-6989(81)90012-2)

- 321 27. Bristow D, Haynes J-D, Sylvester R, Frith CD, Rees G. 2005 Blinking suppresses the
322 neural response to unchanging retinal stimulation. *Curr Biol* **15**, 1296–1300.
323 (doi:10.1016/j.cub.2005.06.025)
- 324 28. Cross DJ, Marzluff JM, Palmquist I, Minoshima S, Shimizu T, Miyaoka R. 2013 Distinct
325 neural circuits underlie assessment of a diversity of natural dangers by American crows.
326 *Proc R Soc B* **280**, 20131046. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2013.1046)
- 327 29. Merkies K, Ready C, Farkas L, Hodder A. 2019 Eye blink rates and eyelid twitches as a
328 non-invasive measure of stress in the domestic horse. *Animals* **9**, 562.
329 (doi:10.3390/ani9080562)
- 330 30. Beauchamp G. 2017 Half-blind to the risk of predation. *Front Ecol Evol* **5**, 131.
331 (doi:10.3389/fevo.2017.00131)
- 332 31. Matsumoto-Oda A, Okamoto K, Takahashi K, Ohira H. 2018 Group size effects on inter-
333 blink interval as an indicator of antipredator vigilance in wild baboons. *Sci Rep* **8**, 10062.
334 (doi:10.1038/s41598-018-28174-7)
- 335 32. Childress MJ, Lung MA. 2003 Predation risk, gender and the group size effect: does elk
336 vigilance depend upon the behaviour of conspecifics? *Anim Behav* **66**, 389–398.
337 (doi:10.1006/anbe.2003.2217)
- 338 33. Lung MA, Childress MJ. 2007 The influence of conspecifics and predation risk on the
339 vigilance of elk (*Cervus elaphus*) in Yellowstone National Park. *Behav Ecol* **18**, 12–20.
340 (doi:10.1093/beheco/arl066)
- 341 34. Clutton-Brock TH, Guinness FE, Albon SD. 1982 *Red deer: behavior and ecology of two*
342 *sexes*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- 343 35. Rands SA, Muir H, Terry NL. 2014 Red deer synchronise their activity with close
344 neighbours. *PeerJ* **2**, e344. (doi:10.7717/peerj.344)
- 345 36. Mitchell B, Staines BW, Welch D. 1977 *Ecology of red deer: a research review relevant*
346 *to their management in Scotland*. Cambridge: Institute of Terrestrial Ecology.
- 347 37. Rands SA. 2015 Nearest-neighbour clusters as a novel technique for assessing group
348 associations. *Royal Society Open Science* **2**, 140232. (doi:10.1098/rsos.140232)
- 349 38. R Development Core Team. 2019 *R: a language and environment for statistical*
350 *computing*. Vienna: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- 351 39. Fey K, Banks PB, Ylönen H, Korpimäki E. 2010 Behavioural responses of voles to
352 simulated risk of predation by a native and an alien mustelid: an odour manipulation
353 experiment. *Wildl Res* **37**, 273–282. (doi:10.1071/WR08031)
- 354 40. Abbey-Lee RN, Mathot KJ, Dingemanse NJ. 2016 Behavioral and morphological
355 responses to perceived predation risk: a field experiment in passerines. *Behav Ecol* **27**,
356 857–864. (doi:10.1093/beheco/arv228)
- 357 41. Rands SA, Cuthill IC. 2001 Separating the effects of predation risk and interrupted
358 foraging upon mass changes in the blue tit *Parus caeruleus*. *Proceedings of the Royal*
359 *Society B* **268**, 1783–1790. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2001.1653)

- 360 42. Mónus F. 2018 Competing activities as measures of fear and vigilance. *Anim Sentience*
361 2. (doi:10.51291/2377-7478.1312)
- 362 43. Beauchamp G. 2015 *Animal vigilance: monitoring predators and competitors*. London:
363 Academic Press. See <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2014-0-01423-2>.
- 364 44. Ballesta S, Mosher CP, Szep J, Fischl KD, Gothard KM. 2016 Social determinants of
365 eyeblinks in adult male macaques. *Sci Rep* 6, 38686. (doi:10.1038/srep38686)
- 366 45. Yorzinski JL, Argubright S. 2019 Wind increases blinking behavior in great-tailed
367 grackles (*Quiscalus mexicanus*). *Front Ecol Evol* 7, 330. (doi:10.3389/fevo.2019.00330)
- 368 46. Yorzinski JL. 2020 Blinking behavior in great-tailed grackles (*Quiscalus mexicanus*)
369 increases during simulated rainfall. *Ethology* 126, 519–527. (doi:10.1111/eth.13003)
- 370 47. Nakano T, Yamamoto Y, Kitajo K, Takahashi T, Kitazawa S. 2009 Synchronization of
371 spontaneous eyeblinks while viewing video stories. *Proc R Soc B* 276, 3635–3644.
372 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2009.0828)
- 373 48. Shin YS, Chang W, Park J, Im C-H, Lee SI, Kim IY, Jang DP. 2015 Correlation between
374 inter-blink interval and episodic encoding during movie watching. *PLoS One* 10,
375 e0141242. (doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0141242)
- 376 49. Wiseman RJ, Nakano T. 2016 Blink and you'll miss it: the role of blinking in the
377 perception of magic tricks. *PeerJ* 4, e1873. (doi:10.7717/peerj.1873)
- 378 50. Maffei A, Angrilli A. 2019 Spontaneous blink rate as an index of attention and emotion
379 during film clips viewing. *Physiol Behav* 204, 256–263.
380 (doi:10.1016/j.physbeh.2019.02.037)
- 381 51. Yorzinski JL. 2016 Eye blinking in an avian species is associated with gaze shifts. *Sci*
382 *Rep* 6, 32471. (doi:10.1038/srep32471)
- 383 52. Yorzinski JL. 2020 A songbird inhibits blinking behaviour in flight. *Biol Lett* 16, 20200786.
384 (doi:10.1098/rsbl.2020.0786)
- 385 53. Amlaner CJ, McFarland DJ. 1981 Sleep in the herring gull (*Larus argentatus*). *Anim*
386 *Behav* 29, 551–556. (doi:10.1016/S0003-3472(81)80118-2)
- 387